

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A quarterly journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

Spring, 1991

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A Quarterly Journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

EDITORIAL BOARD

Slava Stetsko <i>Editor</i>	Roman Zwarycz <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Borys Potapenko <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Lev Shankovsky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Dr. Oleh S. Romanyshyn <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Volodymyr Zarycky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Stephen Oleskiw <i>Associate Editor</i>

**Price: £5.00 or \$10.00 a single copy,
Annual Subscription: £20.00 or \$40.00**

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.

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

Vol. XXXIX, No. 1

A Quarterly Journal

Spring, 1991

CONTENTS

Editorial: DEMOCRATIC REFERENDUM — OR IMPERIALIST HOAX?	2
1990 IN UKRAINE: THE EMPIRE STRIKES BACK <i>Eugene Kachmarsky</i>	3
QUO VADIS; THE DIALECTICS OF LIBERATION POLITICS IN THE SOVIET UNION <i>Roman Zwarycz</i>	10
UKRAINE AND THE UNION TREATIES OF 1920 AND 1922 <i>Yaroslav Dashkevych</i>	19
ENGLAND, RUSSIA AND THE UKRAINIAN QUESTION DURING THE GREAT NORTHERN WAR (PART 1) . . . <i>Theodore Mackiw</i>	26
NEWS FROM UKRAINE	35
DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS	80

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

Democratic Referendum — or Imperialist Hoax?

The right of every nation to independence, sovereignty and statehood cannot be denied, particularly in this contemporary historical period in the development of humankind, which has oftentimes been characterised as the “age of decolonisation”. This right was one of the cornerstones upon which US President Woodrow Wilson laid the foundation for a “new world order” in his Fourteen Points. It has been “guaranteed” in a series of binding international documents and agreements, most prominent among which is the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of 1960. The level of respect and active adherence accorded to this right of all peoples to national independence has been one of the critical benchmarks by which a nation-state’s behaviour is judged and measured in the international community.

A nation, or a people, which has been colonised, i.e., forcibly annexed, within an imperialist structure, can never genuinely express its national will. With regard to the USSR, the entire Soviet political and legal system in the so-called “Soviet republics” has fundamentally been a colonial device, the primary purpose of which was two-fold: a) to establish a legal basis for the legitimacy of an ostensibly “democratic and federated” Soviet state, through which a colonial policy of subjugation could be further reinforced under the legal auspices of maintaining “law and order”; b) to create and promote the illusion of “lawfulness” and of the “rule of law” before the world, and to, thereby, obscure the inherent lawlessness and illegitimacy of the Soviet Russian imperialist infrastructure.

Imperialism, in all its forms, precludes democracy. There can be no basis for genuine citizenship in a colony, in which each individual is alienated from a forcibly-imposed political and pseudo-legal system that is buttressed by brute military force, and disenfranchised from participating in real, genuinely democratic processes. Democracy can never develop within the constricting, politically asphyxiating conditions of colonial subjugation. A colonised nation is comprised only of serfs without any rights, since the fundamental prerequisite for such human rights and individual liberties is completely lacking: an independent and sovereign nation-state.

On March 17, 1991, a referendum will be held throughout the USSR on the draft proposal of a new union treaty, which purports to allocate greater “sovereign” powers to the “republics”. In Ukraine and the other subjugated nations, this referendum is being presented as an opportunity for “Soviet citizens” to manifest their will in a popular, mass expression of “self-determination”. Regardless of the results of this deceptive colonial referendum, under no circumstances can it become an acceptable vehicle for the expression of the genuine will of the subjugated peoples. Under conditions of military occupation, continuing state-sponsored terror, political, cultural and religious repression, and colonial lawlessness, any and all political, legal and/or constitutional procedures cannot be regarded as valid, since there are absolutely no grounds for Soviet — or more precisely — Soviet Russian colonial legitimacy and legality.

How can a colonised nation truly, fully and freely express its will within the parameters of a political process that has been initiated, sanctioned and “legitimated” by the very same illegitimate system of repression and lawlessness, within which this nation is denied its fundamental right to independence, and within which every individual is treated as a politically disenfranchised serf? Simply put — this referendum is completely non-binding on the Ukrainian people, regardless of how Moscow decides to manipulate and present its results.

1990 IN UKRAINE: THE EMPIRE STRIKES BACK

By Eugene Kachmarsky

With the dawning of 1991, yet another year has passed and, in Ukraine, high hopes turned to great disappointments and harsh, brutal realisations.

Revival

The new year in Ukraine was rung in with a sense of long-awaited jubilation. Glasnost was allowing Ukrainians to release the anger building up from over seventy years of repression. Perestroika was promising to rebuild the political and economic systems and usher in a democratic polity and a better life. Ukrainians, at least massively in western Ukraine and on a smaller scale in the eastern half, openly celebrated Christmas in the traditional Ukrainian way — with religious services, carolling and public *vertepy* (dramatisations of Christmas themes). The events of the months preceding 1990 saw increased nationalist activity go unpunished by Soviet authorities and this caused the latent nationalist spirit in Ukraine to reawaken, bringing with it great expectations for the year to come.

Following the Christmas season, the first popular manifestation of this rebirth on a wide scale was the commemoration of the 22 January 1918 Declaration of an Independent Ukrainian State. The public meetings to mark the date held in various cities throughout Ukraine served to emphasise the point that the nationalist rebirth was not an isolated outburst, but a nation-wide phenomenon. Nothing better underscored this than the human chain which was formed in Kyiv, passed through Zhytomyr, Rivne, Ternopil, and was finally completed in Lviv, a distance of over 500 km. Although the chain remained intact for only one hour, the very fact of its completion and the massive turnout it inspired demonstrated to Ukrainians, to Soviet authorities and to the world, that the Ukrainian people stood united in their desire for an independent state. The human chain became the symbol of this unity.

Perhaps most indicative of the popular distaste for the Communist Party and its rule was a demonstration to commemorate the anniversary in Donetsk. The party proposed a counter-demonstration on the same day, and pleaded with the people of Donetsk to rally around the red flag of the USSR. The people, however, crossed to the other side of the square where the blue-and-yellow Ukrainian national flag stood. This act is especially significant when considering the fact that due to several hundred years of direct Russification, eastern Ukraine was thought to have been lost to the nationalist cause. The people of Donetsk and elsewhere proved this an erroneous assumption.

The early months of 1990 prior to the 4 March elections witnessed the continuation of the national rebirth in all spheres of public and even private life.

Publicly, the time preceding the elections saw the creation of various political parties and organisations, youth and student groups, cultural and religious organisations, all of which had a strictly Ukrainian character and supported the concept of Ukrainian independence, autonomy and freedom of choice in all affairs. Thus, groups such as Rukh (which existed in the pre-1990 months), the Ukrainian Language Society, the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (later reorganised into the Ukrainian Republican Party), the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front, the Memorial Society, the Lev Society, and the Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth became more and more open in their activities and prominent in public Ukrainian life. The proliferation of such organisations and the wide scale support they received from the general populace was evidence that Ukrainians wanted to live in a state where for once they could be proud of their national character and their history and culture, without having to be ashamed of them or fearing reprisals for their manifestation. Privately, even the individual became transformed from a prisoner to a free entity, if only in the realm of thought. People were no longer afraid to think, yet more importantly, they were no longer afraid to speak and to act on the basis of their thoughts. This freeing from intellectual and psychological shackles was perhaps the most significant development of the pre-election period.

The election campaign only further demonstrated the continuity and mass scale of the national revival. Candidates from nationalist-minded parties or groups were put forth to such a great extent that it was decided to form a coalition of democratic nationalist candidates, the Democratic Bloc (DemBloc). In their election campaigns, democratic nationalist candidates endeavoured to gain support by appealing to the people's sense of national pride and reiterating the fact that the ills of the system were directly and unequivocally to be blamed on communist rule. This strategy proved to be a sound one, and the people gave overwhelming support to the DemBloc. Thus, it was no surprise that 80,000 gathered to support Rukh candidates in Kyiv. Mass public meetings in support of DemBloc candidates were also held in Mykolayiv, Odessa, Donetsk, Chernivtsi, Kharkiv, Poltava, Rivne, Zhytomyr, Dnipropetrovsk, Vinnytsia and Lviv.

However, while the people were demonstrating popular support for the DemBloc, communist authorities were busy ensuring that power remained in their hands, at least at the national level. Thus, the Ukrainian Communist Party tried to capitalise on the tide of independence-oriented nationalism, thereby gaining votes, by proclaiming its independence from the Moscow-based party. The communists did not shy away from proven methods of Soviet electioneering, employing election-rigging tactics. Although "openness" would no longer allow blatant electoral violations, election-rigging methods were used and the communist majority that emerged in the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet after the elections can be attributed to this, despite mass popular support for the DemBloc. The most popular tactic was to have the electoral committees, which were government-

controlled, refuse to register DemBloc candidates on a series of contrived reasons. The KGB did not remain inactive either in this period. Several documented cases arose where KGB instigators attempted to provoke inter-ethnic animosity or violence, which served to discredit democratic nationalists in constituencies with large non-Ukrainian populations. In Kyiv, 25 Rukh campaigners were arrested on the eve of the election, which contributed to the failure of their candidates' campaigns. In addition, a group of students was arrested, which prompted widespread student strikes all across Ukraine.

Recovery

Although the elections ended with an "anti-democratic" majority in the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, they were seen as a victory in a sense that for the first time since the inception of Soviet rule in Ukraine, candidates with democratic nationalist platforms were chosen to represent the desires of the Ukrainian people. (At the start, the DemBloc claimed only 100 People's Deputies. However, as the year went on, many Deputies crossed over to join the DemBloc — later People's Council — to increase the democratic deputy contingent to 200). With this sense of victory, an added impulse was given to the Ukrainian people in general. Ukrainians began to hope that the DemBloc would be able to meaningfully influence the legislative and executive processes in a manner conducive to nationalist aspirations.

It was also with great expectations that regional governments began their work. In western Ukraine, the Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk and Ternopil provincial councils, all with overwhelming DemBloc majorities, began their sessions with agendas including a complete restructuring of political, economic and socio-cultural life along nationalist lines. Programmes were put forth in all these provincial legislatures that foresaw such aspects as regional control and allocation of economic, human and natural resources, the clean-up of ecologically threatened areas, educational reforms. All the while, the leaders of the provincial councils stressed that no representatives of any political persuasions would be excluded from the legislative or executive process. Thus, at the first session of the Lviv provincial council, the newly-elected chairman, Vyacheslav Chornovil, pointed out to a hotheaded deputy who was for excluding communists from the council, that the council was a democratic body in which all voices had a right to be heard and to participate in the governing process.

The highlights of this second period included the raising of the Ukrainian national flags over the Lviv and Kyiv city council buildings, and later, over the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet itself, all of which were very emotional events. Other events included the commemoration in many cities and villages of the anniversary of the 30 June 1941 re-establishment of an independent Ukrainian state, which again proved to be a highly emotional celebration. None of the events,

however, surpassed the emotionalism of the celebration of Easter. In 1990, Ukrainians were able to openly celebrate Easter for the first time in fifty years. Masses thronged to already overfilled churches for Easter services. All the traditional customs of Easter celebrations were observed. In Lviv's Shevchenkovskyi Hai park, thousands of youth and residents from the whole province turned out for performances of Ukrainian Easter songs and for outdoor concerts. The custom of dousing people with water on Easter Monday was carried out with extreme vigour, especially when youths in Lviv bombarded militia with water from buckets or balloons. The reason for the special jubilation of the 1990 Easter celebration was obvious to all: Easter is symbolic with rebirth, and just as Christ rose from death to new life, so Ukrainians felt that their nation had risen. No one, however, could foresee, or wanted to foresee, that the rebirth would soon be threatened by a different kind of rebirth — that of communist reaction.

Relapse

While the Ukrainian people were experiencing a mass rebirth and manifestation of popular support for democratic nationalism and Ukrainian state independence, the authorities in Kyiv and Moscow were not idle. Moscow was not about to allow its most productive and richest republic to leave. The authorities in Moscow felt that as long as the manifestations of nationalism remained apolitical, they could be tolerated. However, they miscalculated from the very start in that any nationalist tendencies, at least in Ukraine, would inexorably be political, with the goal of complete independence from Moscow being a chip that would not be bargained for by Ukrainians. Therefore, in order to put the cork back in the bottle, Moscow began to orchestrate a campaign that would slowly and subtly reintroduce its primacy over Ukraine.

According to Serhiy Holovaty, DemBloc Deputy from Kyiv, the last straw for Moscow came with the first session of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, in which President Volodymyr Ivashko stated that a conciliation between nationalist and communist forces in Ukraine was possible. This was perceived by Moscow as a direct threat to Soviet rule over Ukraine, for Moscow correctly understood that were the nationalists to gain unequivocal popular support and an upper hand in the halls of power, it would not be long before Ukraine would be leaving the USSR. Thus, Ivashko was recalled to Moscow, ostensibly for the CPSU Congress in late June, and there he announced his resignation as President of the Ukrainian SSR and Head of the CPU. His replacement with Leonid Kravchuk, a well-known hard-liner and Sovietophile, was interpreted in Ukraine as a step backwards, and democratic nationalists began to augment their anti-Soviet campaigns.

In order to dispel these fears and to take the wind out of nationalist sails, the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet passed a Declaration of Sovereignty on 16 July. It theoretically approved a whole spectrum of measures that would in principle lead

towards the establishment of a sovereign Ukraine. Yet, wedged into the clauses regarding economic autonomy and military service in Ukraine only, was a clause stating that the Ukrainian SSR had no intentions of leaving the USSR. Everyone, including many in Ukraine and Ukrainians in the West, were blinded with celebration, heralding the coming of an independent Ukrainian state on the basis of this declaration.

However, the celebrations did not yet die down before Ukrainians began to realise that the Declaration was no more than a classic exercise in Soviet double-talk. Ukrainians began to demand that the promises made in the Declaration be transformed into concrete action, legislated by law. The damage, though, was already done. The temporary period of jubilation in Ukraine gave the anti-democratic forces in Kyiv and their mentors in Moscow time to finalise the plan for neutralising the democratic nationalist threat.

Meanwhile, mass rallies began to be organised all over Ukraine, demanding the realisation of the Declaration promises. Strikes were instigated. At a rally in Kyiv on 12 August, Mykhailo Ratushnyi, head of the Kyiv Strike Committee, called for the demands of Ukrainians to be met by the Supreme Soviet, and set a deadline of 17 September. When the demands were not met and the promises of the Declaration were not fulfilled, mass rallies were again held, at which democratic nationalists threatened more radical action.

At this time, a secret directive was sent to all Ukrainian MVD units, instructing them to disrupt nationalist rallies in any way possible. Provocations of all kinds were suggested to instigate violence so that pretexts could be made for the arrest of nationalist activists. MVD troops were placed in a constant state of readiness to deal with demonstrations and with incidents provoked by MVD and KGB plainclothesmen.

The authorities did not foresee, however, the student phenomenon of October. Ukrainian students set up a tent city in Kyiv and proclaimed a hunger strike in order to force the communist-dominated Supreme Soviet to meet their demands. The students were soon joined by thousands of young supporters, and a rally of over 100,000 was held in conjunction with the hunger strike. The students were partially appeased when Leonid Kravchuk announced that Ukrainian SSR Premier Vitaliy Masol would be forced to resign, and the demands of the students would be considered. What went unrealised was that Masol served as a sacrificial lamb. Kravchuk could not afford to have a hunger striker die, which would fuel the nationalist cause, therefore, to end the strike, he put Masol's head on the block. The students dismantled their tent city and went home. Thus, it is evident that the events of the summer and mid-autumn constituted a series of democratic nationalist advances, which were met by government appeasement in order to stop the nationalists from going too far. If any one of the protests was allowed to be prolonged, the communist majority in the Supreme Soviet correctly feared that it would snowball into country-wide unrest. They

thus devised measures (a toothless Declaration of Sovereignty and the forced resignation of Masol) to avert such a development.

This strategy, however, gave the reactionary forces in Kyiv and Moscow time to put their plan into action. Its culmination came with the demonstration in Kyiv on 7 November to protest against the military parade on the anniversary of the 1917 Bolshevik coup. While the military parade was scheduled to go on, democratic nationalists planned a counter-demonstration at the other end of the city, so that no possibilities would exist for any altercations between the military and the protesters. However, the protest was attended by MVD plainclothesmen, whose aim it was to provoke an incident. One such incident took place when MVD Colonel Ihor Hryhoriev was disarmed by a group of nationalists led by People's Deputy Stepan Khmara and Mykhailo Ratushnyi, after a woman complained she was harassed by Hryhoriev. (It was later revealed that the woman was employed by the KGB). When Khmara and others appealed to nearby militia to deal with the matter, their pleas were ignored. The group then harmlessly disarmed Hryhoriev, and a ring was formed around him while militia help was sought, so that no harm could be done to him. The incident was used as the basis for the arrest of Khmara and Ratushnyi (as well as others), on the false charges of assault. The absurdities of the charges became evident as circumstances of the incident were revealed by witnesses. While witnesses verified that Hryhoriev was unharmed, authorities claimed he was severely beaten and was in hospital. Khmara and Ratushnyi were imprisoned and as a result of their hunger strikes were in very poor health, the former so much so that he was transferred to a hospital for treatment.

This incident was followed by the arrest or detainment of various other leading nationalist figures over the last few months, including the arrest of 21-year-old Oles Doniy, the organiser of the October student hunger strike in Kyiv.

These recent events are sadly proving that the latest reformist cycle in the USSR has come to an end. Gorbachev has amassed for himself more power in the party/state apparatus than any other leader in Soviet history, including Stalin. With the December state structure reorganisation approved by Moscow's Congress of Peoples' Deputies, Gorbachev can legally invoke direct presidential rule wherever and whenever he sees fit. This means that Gorbachev can resort to armed force to protect the Soviet hold over the republics. The creation of a Federation Council, headed by Gorbachev, also gives him direct rule over the republics. The ramming through of the new union treaty is an example of the new Soviet intolerance of nationalistic and independence-minded republics.

The growing anti-nationalist campaign in Ukraine, with a new wave of arrests and harassment of nationalists, indicates that Moscow, with its surrogate in Kyiv, has ended its tolerance of popular revolt. Defence Minister Dmitri Yazov, in a televised speech from Moscow, stated that the army will no longer allow the demolition of Soviet monuments and the erection of monuments to "fascist

collaborators and murderers", a veiled reference to the tearing down of Lenin monuments in Ukraine and the erection of a statue in the native village of Ukrainian nationalist leader Stepan Bandera, who was assassinated by the KGB in Munich in 1959. This threat became less veiled when in late December a bomb exploded at the Bandera monument, destroying the statue and a nearby chapel.

It is clearly evident that we are today witnessing the beginning of a new phase in the Soviet cycle. When Gorbachev announced his reformist policies in 1985, he did not foresee that he would literally be opening Pandora's Box. When he realised that the forces he unleashed were on the brink of tearing apart the Soviet empire, Gorbachev had no choice, as the head of the imperial government, to take measures to prevent its downfall and his own. Thus, troops have been sent into Kyiv and Vilnius and Tbilisi and other capitals where anti-Soviet nationalism has been strong over the past year. It is perhaps no coincidence that these troops were being deployed at a time when the West was involved in war in the Persian Gulf. With the West at war, Gorbachev knew that he could safely crackdown on the republics without reproach, since the West needed his support against Hussein. Once again, the fate of small nations is being decided by big power politics. Just as Czechoslovakia was sacrificed in Munich in 1938 and Hungary in 1956, so are the republics, foremost of which is Ukraine, being sacrificed now. The horrifying images from the military crackdown in Vilnius on January 13, during which defenceless civilians were beaten with rifle butts, shot at and run over by Soviet tanks are haunting proof that for all intents and purposes, freedom has, for the time being, been subordinated to the more important goal (in the eyes of the Kremlin) of restoring "order" and the primacy of Moscow's dictatorial rule. The placidity with which President Bush and other Western leaders accepted news of these events is even greater cause for alarm, for should Gorbachev go unrepentant for this act (beyond the customary Western expression of indignation), he will certainly be encouraged to extend military dictatorial rule to the other republics.

However, Ukraine is not yet ready to lie down and roll over. The taste of freedom over the past year has demonstrated to the people what is possible, and no one will be satisfied with a reversion to the past. While a change in strategy may be in order, where nationalist activity becomes more small-scale and coordinated as opposed to massive acts, there is no reason to believe that the final chapter has already been written. A possible development of nationalist strategy may be mass individual acts of civil disobedience. As a mass unit, Ukrainians cannot stand up to armed Soviet might without great losses. However, should individuals take to mass and simultaneous acts of civil disobedience, the Soviet authorities will have 51 million individual armies with which to contend. In any case, 1990 proved that Ukraine has the will and the potential to become an independent state.

QUO VADIS?

The Dialectics of Liberation Politics in the Soviet Union

By Roman Zwarycz

Lecturer, New York University

Soviet "Federalism" — False Legitimacy

In 1917 the former tsarist Russian empire was tottering on the brink of an abyss, due to an accelerated degeneration of the basic value system on which the political order of the tsarist ancien regime rested. This process was, of course, further exacerbated by the war and the glaring ineptitude of the Russian tsarist military establishment. When put to a critical test, the Russian tsarist regime miserably failed, because it stubbornly refused to accept the fact that the imperialist order was in a state of advanced "disequilibrium", i.e., its fundamentally autocratic belief system no longer reflected contemporary social and political realities.

The Provisional Government of Alexander Kerensky, although espousing revolutionary democratic ideals, was no more capable of projecting a viable vision for the future than its historically anachronistic predecessor. The ostensibly democratic principles, that the Russian "reformers" claimed they were operating under, were completely dissonant with the Provisional Government's policy of refusing to recognise the right to national independence, sovereignty and statehood of the various non-Russian peoples, subjugated in the Russian empire. Historians of the Russian Revolution are only partially correct when they point to the difficult exigencies of the war and the destabilising revolutionary activity of the various workers' and soldiers' soviets as the primary two factors that led to the rapid demise of the Provisional Government. The volatile post-revolutionary situation in Petersburg in March 1917 perhaps may have been curbed by October, if the Russian "democrats" were to discontinue the futile colonial policies of the Russian tsars and would have allowed the subjugated peoples to break away from the empire. Such a truly progressive policy would have given the Provisional Government the opportunity to concentrate all its efforts towards maintaining power and authority within an attenuated, but nonetheless formidable, ethnographically Russian republic that was on the road towards democracy.

Instead, the tragic sequence of events that unfolded is well known by now. In April 1917, the leader of a seemingly insignificant (in terms of popular support), but well-disciplined faction of "professional revolutionaries" arrived in Petersburg in a "sealed train", and began engineering not only a coup against the Provisional Government, but also a successful, albeit cataclysmic, restructuring of the empire

on the basis of a new set of legitimising principles. This leader's name was V. I. Lenin and the vision that was to re-energise the former tsarist empire by infusing it with a new set of "legitimising" socio-political values was called "Communism", or more properly — "Bolshevism" (understood here as a synthesis of Russian Communism and imperialism). In a short period of time, however, Lenin's projected vision was exposed as a false prophesy, because while the Bolsheviks preached "democracy" the Red Army was invading the territory of formerly subjugated peoples that had proclaimed their independence, e.g., Ukraine and Georgia. The forced, military re-annexation of these independent republics into the Russian empire was completed and "legitimised" with the establishment in 1922 of the "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics". Consequently, the continuity of Russian colonial policy was briefly interrupted, but unbroken, although it was now thinly veiled behind the "constitutional" façade of Soviet "federalism".

By the 1980s, however, the USSR had reached a critical juncture in its history, since the Communist belief system had clearly depleted most of its reserves of false legitimacy. Not only was the Communist ideology incapable of generating the bare minimum of popular support that every political order needs to survive without resorting to blatant terror, but the myopic attempt to effectuate communist principles on every level of Soviet society resulted in the staggered, seemingly haphazard construction of a vast, irrational bureaucracy, which precluded all chances that the USSR had to become a competitive partner with the allegedly degenerate capitalist, "bourgeois" societies of the West.

This moral/political malaise and the concomitant cynicism towards the empty bombast of official Communist propaganda, coupled with the all-too-obvious gaping fissures in the Soviet economic system, was further exacerbated by an even more ominous threat to the integrity of the monolithic Soviet state: the more determined and vociferous aspirations of the subjugated peoples in the USSR towards national independence and statehood. At no stage in the history of the Soviet Union were the various non-Russian, subjugated peoples quiescent enough to convince the Kremlin leadership that they can safely begin dismantling the all-pervasive and very expensive terror apparatus that was so carefully assembled in these "Soviet republics" over the years. Moscow was able to parry any enquiries on the part of the West on this issue by simply denying that it was an issue, and by getting Western leaders and particularly Western scholars to buy into the euphemism of what was innocuously termed a "nationalities question". (If the aspirations of the non-Russian peoples in the USSR were only a "question", then by finding the correct answers a crisis, e.g., the dissolution of the USSR, can easily be averted).

Ever since US President Richard Nixon decided to embark on a course of detente with the USSR, the desire to "do business" with Moscow, with all its foreign policy glamour and fanfare, was considered to be a much too important

policy objective to be tampered with by even considering the liberation agenda of the subjugated nations. The euphemism had firmly taken root. All the while, however, the Soviet "federation" was lying on top of a volcano, that — far from being dormant — had just about reached the critically volatile stage prior to exploding and tearing asunder the tattered veneer of Soviet/Communist legitimacy.

Glasnost — an Attempt to "Re-legitimise" the Empire

Clearly, from the perspective of today's heirs of the Russian empire, something needed to be done to inject some vitality into the Soviet political and socio-economic system. The problem, as the Kremlin viewed it, was basically twofold: a) an enervating moral/political malaise resulting from the irreversible bankruptcy of Communism as a viable political ideal; b) a top-heavy economy, in which the military-industrial sector's priorities far outweighed the consumer and service industries, further complicated by a cumbersome and asphyxiating bureaucratic apparatus. Hence, the solution was a two-pronged attack: glasnost (openness) and perestroika (restructuring). The first represented an attempt to openly break with the somewhat distant (but not altogether forgotten) Stalinist legacy and the immediate Brezhnev past, and to allow for greater mass participation in officially sanctioned political processes. Such controlled mass participation would at least give the impression of all the superficial features of democracy being set into motion, without any of the substance. The primary purpose, however, of this reform programme was the second prong of the offensive — perestroika, which was predicated on the hope that the increased frequency and volume of political participation, although orchestrated from above, would soon cascade down into the socio-economic sectors, thereby re-energising the laconic Soviet economy, which would ultimately catapult the USSR into modernity.

When Andropov died, the responsibility for carrying out this ambitious programme of reform was bequeathed to the man that the former KGB boss had so carefully tutored — Mikhail Gorbachev, who took over the reins of power following the relatively short interregnum of Chernenko's brief tenure. Initially, the policy was effective, as Gorbachev managed to gain the trust of not only the Russian people, but of many people among the subjugated nations, who truly wanted to believe that the present Soviet leader would be true to his promise of rectifying these nations' colonial, even servile, status within the "Soviet federation". Gorbachev also managed to quickly woo all of the leaders of the Western democracies, even those who once spoke of "evil empires". "Time" magazine's "Man of the Year" had become the darling of both the free world and the world behind the rust-infested Iron Curtain.

Despite all of Gorbachev's foreign policy successes, the situation on the home front was rapidly deteriorating, however, as people began to resent the painful,

even prohibitive, costs that an overhaul of the Soviet system entailed. Furthermore, the "nationalities question" had taken an unexpected turn, as the simmering volcano of frustrated nationalist sentiment finally exploded. The crack of freedom in the seams of the Russian colonial monolith, known as glasnost, opened the floodgates of centuries-old repressed national aspirations towards independence and statehood. Lithuania proclaimed a restoration of its independence. Most of the other national republics passed legislation declaring the "sovereignty" of their laws over those of the union. It quickly became painfully apparent to the guardians of the Soviet Russian empire that if they were going to be successful in their attempt to establish a new set of "legitimising" principles, anchored in some nebulous conception of democracy, then the need for "legitimising" the "federation", without altering its essentially monolithic, imperialist nature, must take first priority. In other words, Lenin's success in reorganising a dying and anachronistic imperialist system in the 1920s — by founding it on the basis of a "federation" of national "republics" that was "legitimised" by a new, "revolutionary", Communist value-system — needed to be repeated in the 1990s. The only difference is that the new "federation" that was to emerge was to be "legitimised" not by a Communist value-system that was altogether bankrupt, but rather by a shallow commitment to something called — "democracy".

Referendum on Union Treaty — the First Step

On March 17, 1991, an all-union referendum will be held throughout the USSR, in which voters will be asked to respond to the following question: "Do you consider necessary the preservation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics, in which the rights and freedoms of an individual of any nationality would be fully guaranteed?" Although the question seems to be formulated in a simple, straightforward manner, it is, in fact, "loaded", as Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski points out in an article, recently published in the "International Herald Tribune" ("A 'Taiwan' Approach Could Help the Soviet Republics", IHT, March 6, 1991, page 6). The question seems to imply that a "new union treaty" will secure a greater degree of "sovereignty" for the "republics" and ensure more liberty for each Soviet "citizen". The March 17 referendum is a major first step in Gorbachev's attempt to re-energise the politically vitiated Soviet state and the enervated Soviet economy by "restructuring" the colonial system into a newly-federated, "democratic" state, without altering its essentially monolithic, imperialist nature. More significantly, the colonial façade of "Soviet federalism" will acquire a much needed injection of legitimacy, regardless of how the results of the referendum are presented and manipulated, simply because it will involve the participation of considerable numbers of Soviet "citizens" in an officially sponsored and sanctioned political

process. Mass participation in such a referendum, which is being presented as an opportunity for "Soviet citizens" to manifest their will in a popular, mass expression of "self-determination", not only gives the illusion of democracy, but also partially legitimises the political system that is sponsoring the referendum.

Actually, the attempt to legitimise the Soviet Russian colonial system was initiated much earlier, in March 1990, when opposition parties were permitted to run their candidates against those of the Communist Party. With the exception of the three Baltic "republics", the democratic opposition was not able to gain a majority of the seats in the "Supreme Soviets" in any of the other non-Russian "republics". Moscow's victory, however, was much more pervasive than what is revealed in a post-electoral tally. By permitting the national opposition in its colonies in the USSR to actively campaign and participate in seemingly novel political processes, Moscow not only managed to at least partially co-opt those who were its worst enemies into its colonial administrative/political infrastructure, but it also gained a considerable degree of legitimacy in the eyes of the non-Russian peoples in the USSR. From the perspective of the popular masses, if former dissidents and long-term political prisoners were now taking seats in various "soviets" on all levels, then the political order that gave them this opportunity couldn't be all that bad. From the Kremlin's perspective, none of these "parliamentarians" (as the members of the newly-created "democratic opposition" now called themselves) carried enough weight to be able to constitute a substantial threat.

For that matter, the "re-legitimizing" process was aided and abetted by the simple fact that these former political prisoners, whose Gulag record gave them a considerable degree of moral authority in the eyes of the subjugated peoples, thought of and conducted themselves as "parliamentarians". The operative colonial dialectic was completely convoluted, but very simple: parliamentarians can exist only if a parliamentary body is actually functioning as a genuine legislative/deliberative chamber, i.e., the various soviets on all levels of Soviet life; and if such legitimately democratic institutions are operating, then the system that created them must also be legitimate. Prior to glasnost, these soviets were nothing more than rubber-stamp institutions. Their sessions were held in a carnival-like atmosphere, where "people's deputies", dressed as clowns in traditional, native garb, were paraded into the "legislative" chambers to display the latest fashions from Soviet "democratic" life. Seemingly overnight, however, these same institutions were ostensibly transformed into something that Moscow could claim were genuine legislative chambers. The method by which this remarkable metamorphosis was accomplished was one that many repressive orders had successfully employed in the past: co-opting the enemy.

In some respect, even the "declarations of sovereignty" that were passed by most of the non-Russian "republican" Supreme Soviets were considerably

beneficial to Moscow's long-term objectives. By declaring the "sovereignty" of "republican" laws over the all-union laws, the pseudo-parliamentary bodies in these "republics" were, nonetheless, reinforcing the primacy of Soviet, i.e., colonial, legality; they assisted in legitimising Soviet, albeit "republican", law, thereby paving the way for a restructuring, and certainly not a dismantling, of the Soviet federation. In Ukraine, the "Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine" even states that "the principles of this declaration are [to be] utilised in the effectuation of a [new] union treaty".

Can Colonialism Coexist with Democracy?

Presently, no one denies the imperative need for change in the Soviet Union, including the "hard-liners" in Moscow. What is at issue, however, is whether the changes are to be substantive, and hence have a lasting effect, or whether they will only result in a superficial modification of the existing system, without altering its essential features. To put it bluntly, the question is whether "the world's last multinational empire", as Prof. Brzezinski characterises the USSR, will finally be dismantled, or whether it will remain intact by accommodating a new set of "democratic" legitimising principles? For that matter, this question leads to yet another: given Moscow's categorical refusal to grant independence to the nations that it has subjugated within the USSR, and given its willingness to use brute force to maintain the integrity of its imperialist system of subjugation (the recent events in Lithuania are a clear indication of this willingness), then is such an essentially colonial policy consistent with its ever-more shallow policy utterances about wanting to effectuate "democratic" reforms in the Soviet Union? Prof. Brzezinski writes: "Ultimately, of course, the democratization of the Soviet Union is impossible unless the Kremlin grants the right of self-determination to non-Russian nations. The denial of self-determination inevitably has to involve repression, and repression is incompatible with democracy".

To deny a nation its right to national self-determination can no longer be justified in today's world. This principle was one of the cornerstones of US President Woodrow Wilson's programme of reconstruction following World War I, upon which he truly hoped that a "new world order" could be erected. The principle was subsequently reinforced in a series of binding international agreements, most prominent among which are the United Nations Charter (June 26, 1945), the UN Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (otherwise known as the "Declaration on Decolonisation", December 14, 1960) and the United Nations General Assembly Resolution on the Support of National Liberation Struggles of Enslaved Nations against Colonial Subjugation (December 20, 1976). In all these documents national self-determination is explicitly or implicitly equated with the establishment of independent and

sovereign nation-states of the colonised territory. For example, the UN Declaration on Decolonisation from 1960 explicitly states: "Immediate steps shall be taken, in trust and non-self-governing territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom". (*Italics added — R. Z.*)

The essential principle embodied in this statement is that a nation can express its will and freely exercise its sovereignty in a manifestation of national self-determination only when the preconditions of such sovereignty have been secured, i.e., within the context of a independent state. Under no circumstances can the same occur in conditions of colonial subjugation. As long as a people remains subjugated within an imperialist system that is inimical to its interests, and one that was enforced and continues to be maintained primarily by brute force, as long as a nation is disenfranchised from power and from the roots of its own national base of authority (understood as a moral right to rule) or from what Jean-Jacques Rousseau once called its "general will", such a nation will be a will-less slave of the imperialist power that has negated its right to self-determination.

Each individual in such a colony, a member of such a politically disenfranchised nation, will never be able to actualise his/her inherent potential to become a full human being, capable of making ethical choices in the interests of the common good of that nation to which he/she belongs, in accordance with its "general will". For this reason, there are no genuine "citizens" in a colony, in the strictest sense of the term, i.e., enfranchised participants in genuine democratic political processes, who possess certain constitutionally guaranteed rights and inalienable liberties. A subjugated people consists of nothing more than disenfranchised serfs, who have no rights, since the only vehicle by which such human rights and individual liberties can be secured is completely lacking: a genuinely democratic order in an independent and sovereign nation-state.

Imperialism in all its forms precludes democracy. It does not matter whether the colonisation of a nation was blatant, as in the case of the recent Iraqi aggression against Kuwait, or whether it was deceptively rationalised by a set of pseudo-legitimising principles, as was the case with the Soviet Russian military annexation of Ukraine in the early 1920s, or of the three Baltic countries in 1940. It is impossible to initiate and carry out even the most elementary democratic processes and procedures in conditions of colonial oppression. Every procedure, every "legal" administrative or "legislative" institution, or even every "law" in such a colony are by no means a reflection of the will of the colonised people, but rather are the administrative tools of imperialist force by which this will is suppressed. Colonies are not governed by law, but are instead administered by sheer force, which the

imperialist aggressor sometimes calls — “law and order”, yet another euphemism for the suppression of any “destabilising” national-liberation aspirations.

Colonial “law” precludes the kind of participation in political processes that is characteristic of truly democratic political orders, the legitimacy of which is reflected in the ways that they treat their citizens, viz., as sovereign, politically enfranchised individuals. A colonial regime will force or dupe its “citizens” to participate in a process or procedure that it initiated and sanctioned in order to further reinforce the individual’s serf-like, disenfranchised status within the empire and to attain some measure of false legitimacy. Democracy, which requires maximum opportunity for individual participation in the full scope of political processes, can never coexist with imperialism, which denies this basic right to entire nations. Colonialism is incompatible with democracy.

Conclusion

In light of the argumentation presented above, one is led to conclude that the March 17 referendum on a new “union treaty” has no legitimate basis, because the imperialist system sponsoring it is illegitimate. It is for this reason that six of the Soviet Union’s 15 “republics” — Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Moldavia, Armenia and Georgia — have publicly declared that they will not sponsor the referendum, although most of them also stated that they will not block those who support the idea of a “new union treaty” from organising ballots. It is also for this reason that the national-liberation movements in the other non-Russian republics, who have — as a matter of principle — refused to even participate in the utter sham of “parliamentary” politics, e.g. the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, headed by Yuriy Shukhevych (see: “Inter-Party Assembly Rejects Referendum”, page 96), have stated that they will not recognise the results of the referendum and will continue to wage a revolutionary struggle for full independence and statehood.

Regardless of the results of this referendum, in other words — even if an overwhelming majority of the participants vote “no”, under no circumstances can it be viewed as a genuine manifestation of the true will of the subjugated peoples in the USSR. As long as these illegitimate “republics” continue to be militarily occupied by an inimical, colonial force, as long as the entire political infrastructure in these colonies remains in power, as a colonial administrative body that takes its orders from Moscow, as long as the laws that are passed in the pseudo-parliamentary “soviets” continue to reflect colonial interests, as opposed to the “common good” of the enslaved nations in the USSR, then none of the colonial political, legal and/or constitutional procedures initiated and sanctioned by that regime can be regarded as valid.

Essentially, there is nothing “new” in any union treaty, regardless of whether the word — “Soviet” in USSR is changed to “Sovereign” (as Gorbachev has recently

proposed), or even whether the final draft, that will be ratified by the colonial pseudo-parliamentary bodies known as "soviets", includes a clause "guaranteeing" the right of "secession" to any of the "republics". The labyrinthian semantics of "secession" only confuse what should be a clear-cut issue: the undeniable right of each and every nation, of each and every people, to determine its future fate within its own independent, sovereign and democratic nation-state. This right cannot be denied and it certainly cannot take a back seat to the colonial legality of some illegitimate referendum. To maintain the USSR, in whatever shape or form, means that the Russian empire — the "world's last multinational empire" — will continue to exist as a historical anachronism and a painful eye-sore for all freedom-loving humankind, thereby precluding the emergence of a truly free "new world order". There is nothing new about a world order, which has been heralded by those who view themselves as the "champions of liberty" in the world, if that order negates the right of even one nation to national independence and statehood.

In a rare frank admission (or what perhaps was an unfortunate "slip"), Anatoly Denisov — one of the Kremlin's most loyal supporters in the USSR Supreme Soviet and a stalwart Russian imperialist — recently stated in an interview that was published in "Pravda" (Associated Press, March 10), that the disintegration of the USSR would "destroy a country more than 1,000 years old". (*Italics added* — R. Z.) Given the fact that the USSR was formally established in 1922, the reference to "a country" can only mean "Mother Russia", which over the course of the last 1,000 years has systematically and brutally subjugated countless peace-loving peoples, while terrorising and intimidating its neighbours and the rest of the free world with its plans of global hegemony. The euphemism has been unveiled!

UKRAINE AND THE UNION TREATIES OF 1920 AND 1922*

By Yaroslav Dashkevych

To prevent Ukraine, as a state and as a nation, from signing the Union Treaty, which Moscow is trying to force through with the unconditional support of its conservative surrogates in Ukraine, is one of the key imperatives of the present stage of the new Ukrainian revolution (Mikhail Gorbachev applied the term "revolution" to our era).

In laying the groundwork for a Union Treaty of the 1990s, wrongly termed "new" by the official propaganda machine, the regime has revived the old stereotype of Ukraine as the supposed initiator of the 1922 Union Treaty, which joined the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on a voluntary basis. I will later explain why it is historically inaccurate to regard Gorbachev's proposed Union Treaty as "new".

As regards Ukraine's "voluntary" membership in the USSR, even a superficial knowledge of Ukrainian history of the years 1918-1922 would be sufficient to know that Ukrainian territories had been conquered from the north and an inimical occupational regime was installed in Ukraine. To cover up this act of aggression, Moscow set up its puppet regime — the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukr.SSR — in Ukraine. But the status of these institutions was very clear to everyone: the senior officials were always members of the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) — RCP(B) — whose administrative centre was in Moscow. Although the RCP(B) branch in Ukraine was named Communist Party (Bolshevik) of Ukraine, this fooled no one. The senior members of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee in Kharkiv, elected at the Fifth All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets on March 2, 1921, were Russians: Lenin, Trotsky, and Zinoviev.¹ Can a state whose top government posts are officially reserved for leaders of a foreign country be regarded as independent?

However, even though the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic was completely subservient to the Russian centre, the spectre of the Ukrainian national-liberation movement continued to haunt the leaders of the Russian Federation — Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin.

Not long ago, I noted² that former empires had all collapsed primarily through disintegration processes, which originated on their peripheries: the subjugated

*Translation of an article published in the independent Ukrainian newspaper "Ratusha" (Lviv), No. 8, 18 October 1990.

¹Visty, Kharkiv, 5 March 1921.

²Lviv, *Ratusha* on 2 October 1990, and Kyiv, *Literaturna Ukraina*, 1 October 1990.

peoples rejected central control and either declared independence, or fell victim to neighbouring states or empires. In this respect, the fate of the Russian empire will be decided in Kyiv not in Moscow.

The Russian leaders realised this early on and delivered the first and most devastating blow in 1918-1919 against Kyiv, which dared to break away from the empire. They never trusted Ukraine, even as a Soviet state — either when it was rife with uprisings, or even when it had been silenced by the forced famine of 1932-1933.

I believe there are clear parallels between the events of 70 years ago and the present. For this reason it is worth considering the events leading up to the brutal suppression of the paper sovereignty, which the “independent” Ukr.SSR supposedly enjoyed in 1920-1922 — the historical facts, which Soviet Ukrainian historiography has tried to conceal from the people.

The main blow against the sovereignty of the Ukr.SSR was delivered by the December 8, 1920, Union Treaty between the RSFSR and the Ukr.SSR. The following extracts from the official Ukrainian text of the preamble to the Treaty can very easily apply to a Russo-Ukrainian treaty of today:

“...taking into consideration the right of peoples to self-determination, proclaimed by the Great proletarian revolution, in recognition of the independence and sovereignty of each of the countries taking part in the negotiations, and the need to unite their forces for defence purposes, and also in the interests of their economic development, [the signatories] resolved to conclude this workers’ and peasants’ Union Treaty”.

The primary issues were defence and economics — arguments so often used by present-day advocates of a Russo-Ukrainian union.

The preamble further states: “1. The RSFSR and the Ukr.SSR are forming a military and economic union”, and therefore,

“3. For a more effective realisation of the aim stated in point 1, both governments proclaim the union of the following commissariats: first — military and naval forces; second — the Higher National Economic Council; third — foreign trade; fourth — finances; fifth — labour; sixth — transport; and seventh — post and telegraph”.³

In other words, two years before the widely-publicised Union Treaty of 1922, socialist Ukraine was deprived of all attributes of real sovereignty — the army and navy, the economy, foreign trade, finances, administration of labour resources, transport, and means of communication.

³*Visty*, Kharkiv, 4 January 1921.

This essentially colonial treaty was signed on behalf of Russia by Vladimir Lenin and Georgy Chicherin, and on behalf of Ukraine by Khristian Rakovsky, then chairman of the Ukrainian Council of People's Commissars (Sovnarkom) and the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs. On his appointment as Sovnarkom chairman, Rakovsky, a Bulgarian "adventurer" alien to both Russia and Ukraine, according to Volodymyr Vynnychenko,⁴ cynically remarked that the Ukrainian struggle for freedom was being conducted solely by the Russian proletariat in Ukraine and the Soviet Russian authorities.⁵ So one can imagine how eagerly Rakovsky signed the Union Treaty on December 8, 1920.

But even in those days of terror in Ukraine, the Union Treaty of 1920 was not entirely unopposed. At the second session of the Fifth All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets (February 26, 1921) members of the Ukrainian Communist Party and left-wing social-revolutionaries spoke against the Treaty. Mykhailo Avdienko, a member of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party and a notable Ukrainian revolutionary, who was a member of the All-Ukrainian Revolutionary Committee in 1919 — one of the organisations, which led the anti-Bolshevik uprising in Ukraine — "gave a speech, which the delegates continuously disrupted from their places by outbursts of protest, and which focussed on the demand for the complete secession and separation of the Ukr.SSR from the RSFSR" (report from the Congress). Avdienko also read out a draft resolution expressing a vote of no confidence in the government, which was naturally rejected.⁶ In 1920 Ukraine signed a colonial treaty with the Russian republic. Two years later, therefore, it could not sign another Union Treaty as a sovereign and independent socialist state. Having surrendered its key positions to Russia in 1920, the Soviet Ukrainian government could not then hand these same positions over to the "Union" two years later.

However, even the purely formal fragments of Ukrainian statehood were a huge thorn in the side of the Russian leadership. The persistent illusion of Ukrainian "separatism" (the term is inaccurate as separatism is the separation of a composite part from a single body, and the Ukrainian nation has never been part of the Russian nation) and that of the other peoples continued to trouble the advocates of a single, unified state. This led to the second act in the tragedy of "socialist" Ukraine.

At the Seventh All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets on December 13, 1922, Mikhail Frunze — a russified Rumanian, Rakovsky's deputy, and a representative

⁴V. Vynnychenko, Shchodennyk, T. 2, Edmonton-New York, 1983, p. 330] on the basis of his addresses and activity of Rakovsky — he was a zoological anti-Ukrainian, who denied the very separate existence of the Ukrainian people.

⁵*Izvestia*, Moscow, 3 January 1919.

⁶*Visty*, Kharkiv, 1 March 1921.

of the Russian Revolutionary Military Council in Ukraine — proposed, on Moscow's instructions, another Union Treaty, which would unite all the Soviet republics. But Moscow's *diktat* was too much even for Frunze. Through him, Ukraine rejected a very simplified procedure, which Stalin was trying to force through. Stalin was calling for the ratification of the name Russian Federation for a state uniting all the republics.⁷

At the Congress, Emmanuel Kviring, a delegate from the Donetsk Basin mining region soon to become General Secretary of the CP(B)U,⁸ openly opposed the self-determination of the Ukrainian nation:

"Ukrainian counter-revolution claims in its propaganda that the establishment of a Union would, supposedly, destroy Ukrainian independence [...] To accusations that our republics are fictional, that we are in actual fact representatives of Moscow, we reply: 'Where do we find true self-determination of peoples?'"⁹

The Congress, whose delegates were appointed (democratic elections were at that time completely out of the question), approved the establishment of a Union. Thus the fate of the already subjugated "republic" was decided by foreigners: only 362 (46%) of the 782 delegates were Ukrainians. This happened in a country where more than 80% of the population was Ukrainian, casting serious doubts on the legitimacy of the resolution of the Seventh All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets on Ukraine's intention to join the Union.

A few days later, the Ukrainian delegates were in Moscow for the First Congress of Soviets of the USSR, on December 30, 1922. At the Congress, Stalin read out the Declaration on the establishment of the USSR and the text of the Treaty. Both documents had been approved in advance by a conference of plenipotentiaries and were subsequently reviewed by a Congress at which 63% of the delegates were Russians and only 8% Ukrainians. At the Congress, Stalin proposed that the documents be ratified "by a unanimous decision, characteristic of communists, thereby writing a new page in the history of mankind".¹⁰

Since then the history of the establishment of the USSR has ended on this triumphant note. Every official Soviet textbook, reference book, encyclopaedia, and historical work affirms that on December 30, 1922, the Union Treaty was ratified as a legitimate basis for the existence of the newly-established USSR. Soviet historiography omits all subsequent developments.

⁷*Izvestia*, Moscow, 26 December 1922. In this respect the ideas of Stalin — the tyrant — and Solzhenitsyn — the democrat — are completely synonymous.

⁸Emmanuel Kviring was a russified German.

⁹*Visty*, Kharkiv, 14 December 1922.

¹⁰The First Congress of Soviets of the USSR. Stenographic recording/report with appendices, Moscow, 1923, p. 11.

The Soviet account of these events is, however, false. The Treaty which established the USSR was never ratified and the draft (it never left the draft stage), which was submitted at the First Congress of Soviets of the USSR, never became legally binding and so did not become the legitimate basis for the existence of the Union. When I discovered this, not, I must add, in sealed documents, but in published official sources, generally accessible to anyone who may wish to verify the facts, I was horrified. How could the world have lived for almost 70 years in the shadow of this gross deception concerning the establishment of the Soviet Union?

To answer this question we must begin by examining the facts, which historians ignore. Frunze opposed Stalin at the Congress of Soviets (for which he was repaid in a truly Stalinist fashion: three years later, on December 31, 1925, he was killed on the operating table). On Frunze's proposition, the draft which we now regard as the Union Treaty of 1922 was ratified only in principle. It was to have been submitted for further review by the central and the republican governments. The Treaty was to have been implemented, initially on a temporary basis, at the next session of the government of the USSR only after all addenda and amendments had been incorporated and was then to have been submitted for final ratification at the Second Congress of Soviets of the USSR.¹¹ The document would have become valid only after all the above steps had been taken.

To substantiate my arguments, I will quote the decree of the First Congress of Soviets of the USSR:

"1. To ratify the Declaration and Union Treaty in principle.

2. Considering the extraordinary significance of the adopted Declaration and Final Treaty and the desire to hear the final opinions of all the republics joining the Union regarding the text of the present Treaty, to submit the Declaration and Treaty for further review by the Central Executive Committee of the Union republics. Revisions made by the Union republics are to be submitted to the Central Executive Committee of the USSR at its next meeting.

3. To authorise the next meeting of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR to review the received proposals, amendments or addenda, to finalise the text of the Declaration and Union Treaty and to implement it immediately.

4. To authorise the Central Executive Committee of the USSR to draw up the final text of the Declaration and Union Treaty for the Second Congress of Soviets of the USSR and to submit it for final ratification by the Second Congress".

On Frunze's proposition this decree was ratified unanimously. The draft Declaration and Treaty were never reviewed at the First Congress of Soviets of the USSR.

¹¹First Congress of Soviets of the USSR, 1923, p. 12.

In accordance with the decree of the First Congress, the presidium of the Central Executive Committee in Moscow formed a commission composed of representatives of the Union republics, on January 10, 1923. This commission was delegated to collect all the proposals of the Union republics on the wording and content of the Declaration and Treaty. The commission, however, was very quickly dissolved (Stalin dissolved it with the assistance of the secretary of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR, his kinsman Avel Yenukidze). The second session of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR in July 1923 did not review any proposals, and did not ratify a reviewed Declaration and Treaty or put them into effect on a provisional basis. The decree of the First Congress of Soviets of the USSR was thus not implemented. At the Second Congress in January 1924 the Declaration and Treaty received no mention at all, and were thus not ratified or put into effect either. There can only be one explanation: despite the strong pressure from the centre, the Union republics flooded the commission with so many amendments and revisions that any discussion of the documents would have led to their rejection.

In 1922-1924 (in actual fact for the last 73 years), the Russian leaders did not have much regard for the law, particularly international law, and the Union Treaty, should it have been ratified, would have become an international act. The nomenclature and bureaucracy were spreading their next great lie around the world — that the Soviet Union was established *de jure* on December 30, 1922, on the basis of an international Union Treaty.

Why has the fact that the Union Treaty of 1922 was never ratified as an international act come to light only some 70 or so years after the event, and why has everyone ignored the fact that the former Russian empire was reestablished as the USSR without any basis in legitimacy?

Neither the regime nor Soviet historiography, which served it, were concerned that the truth would one day be revealed. They proclaimed December 30, 1922, the next national holiday, and national holidays are taken for granted, they cannot be questioned; to do so is taboo.

Foreign historians, even Soviet experts, who very harshly exposed the regime of the reestablished empire, never seriously questioned the need for the Russian empire to exist, regardless of its colour. The enormous guilt of Western intellectuals, who for decades idealised and eulogised the world's bloodiest empire, is equal to compliance in this empire's crimes.

In conclusion I would like to make four points:

1. The totalitarian Soviet state was established with the help of brutal force. From the very beginning, the Soviet Union was totally unconcerned about concealing its terrorist existence and legal nihilism with various judicial formulae, which centralists of yesterday and today always treated with contempt. It is only

present-day legalists, or rather pseudo-legalists, who are beginning to realise that, according to the English proverb, "old sins cast a long shadow".

2. At the time Ukraine signed the Union Treaty of 1922 as a supposedly separate socialist state, it was already a colony, a status it acquired with the conclusion of the Russo-Ukrainian Union Treaty in 1920.

3. The so called Union Treaty of 1922 was never more than a draft proposal, requiring review, ratification and implementation. It was never ratified or put into force as an international act. The draft Treaty cannot be regarded as the legitimate basis for the establishment of the USSR and membership of Ukraine and the other republics in the Union.

4. Gorbachev's Union Treaty is not new. No former Union Treaty has ever existed and the renewal of a non-existent treaty is impossible. With a Union Treaty of the 1990s, the successors of Lenin and Stalin are striving to provide a legal basis for a state, which has lacked legitimacy since its inception in the 1920s. Whether they succeed in putting their plan into effect will be seen in the near future.

ENGLAND, RUSSIA AND THE UKRAINIAN QUESTION DURING THE GREAT NORTHERN WAR

(Part 1)

By Theodore Mackiw
The University of Akron

English-Russian Relations Before the Battle of Poltava

Direct relations between Russia and England began in 1553. That year, Richard Chancellor, captain for a London merchant company,¹ travelled to China by the northern sea route and landed at the mouth of the river Dvina. From there he went to Moscow, where he was received by Tsar Ivan the Terrible.²

Two years later, a "Moscow Company" was founded and received exclusive rights for trade with Russia. At the same time, Chancellor succeeded in winning far-reaching trade privileges for the "Moscow Company" in Russia, i.e. duty-free trade and tax exemption for the English merchants, as well as English legal jurisdiction for all English traders on Russian soil.³

For a long time, relations between the two countries were restricted to trade, as England found it very profitable at this time to sell luxury goods, especially textiles and ironware, at high prices in Moscow, and to buy at low prices the natural products of Russia, such as furs, skins, flax, wood, fish, and so on.⁴

The Tsar, however, was not interested solely in trade. He sought an alliance with England, which he could later use against his enemies: Livonia, Sweden, Poland and Turkey. Tsar Ivan also corresponded with Queen Elizabeth I, from which he hoped to benefit. He thought of marrying the Queen's niece, Mary Hastings, and even went as far as to make the necessary preparations to settle in England should he have been compelled to leave Moscow. The plan never materialised. England steered clear of all political connections with Russia to avoid any obligation to the Tsar.

¹English adventurers who discovered unknown territories.

²L. E. Berry and R. O. Crummery, *Rude and Barbarous Kingdom. Russia in the Accounts of Sixteenth Century English Voyages*, Wisconsin University Press (Madison-London, 1968), p. 3-4.

³T. S. Willan, *The Early History of the Russian Company, 1553-1603* (Manchester, 1956).

⁴J. Tolstoy, *Pervyya sorok let snosheniy mezhdu Rossiiyey i Angliyey, 1553-1593*, (St. Petersburg, 1875), also English translation. For more details see: Lindsey Hughes, "V. T. Postnikov's 1687 Mission to London: Anglo-Russian Relations in the 1680s in British Sources", *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 68, No. 3, (1990), pp. 447-460.

The English were primarily interested in trade, which rapidly flourished, and a transit trade with Buchara and Persia through Moscow soon developed. The privileges of the "Moscow Company" were later reconfirmed by Tsars Fyodor Ivanovich, Boris Godunov, Vasilii Shuyskiy and Mikhail Romanov.

The Russians had greatly suffered on account of the tax-free English trade and consequently, using the execution of Charles I in 1649 as a pretext, abolished all the privileges of the English merchants. The new English monarch, Charles II, sought to reinstate the privileges, but the Russian government protected the interests of its own traders and permitted only ten English merchants to travel to Moscow, subject to the usual duties. When Peter I came to power in 1689, the English received the same rights and privileges as other foreign traders. Peter himself visited London in 1698.

Russia had for some time been orientated towards Western Europe. At the beginning of the 18th century, the international situation in Europe was favourable for a Russian recovery of the Baltic territories, acquired by Sweden in 1655-1660.

England, Holland, Austria and France were concerned with preparations for the War of the Spanish Succession and so their active participation in the struggle for the Baltic was unlikely. On the other hand, the rise of Sweden as a military power had led to grave misgivings among the other Baltic states, which were eagerly awaiting an opportunity to move against Sweden. They were Russia's natural allies.

The 17-year-old Charles XII was on the Swedish throne when Denmark, Poland, Saxony and Russia concluded military treaties in preparation for an attack against Sweden. The Tsar, however, first had to make peace with the Turks, which was concluded in July 1700.

Denmark and Saxony commenced military operations against Sweden at the beginning of 1700. Charles XII, however, attacked Copenhagen, compelling the Danish king to sign a separate peace (Treaty of Traventhal, August 1700), thereby forcing him out of the coalition. The Tsar declared war against Sweden at the end of August 1700 — after a solemn promise of peace — but Charles XII turned to the northeast and forced Augustus II of Poland to abandon the siege of Riga. He then inflicted an overwhelming defeat on the 30,000-strong Russian army in November 1700, despite the vastly inferior force under his command (8,000 men). The Tsar, however, who had withdrawn to Novgorod a day before the battle, was saved, as Charles XII abandoned the plan for a direct march on Moscow. Although the situation appeared desperate, Peter I persisted, using the respite to reorganise and rebuild his army.⁵

⁵For details see: A. Brückner, *Peter der Grosse, Onckens Allgemeine Geschichte* (Berlin, 1879), Vol. VI; G. Stöckl, *Russische Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1973), pp. 348-356; R. M. Hatton, *Charles XII of Sweden* (New York, 1968), pp. 126-154; Robert K. Massie, *Peter the Great. His Life and World* (New York, 1980), pp. 302-8.

At this time, on the advice of England, Peter was ready to cease operations against Sweden and requested negotiations. At the start of the war, England's position was not clear to the Tsar. He hoped that even if England declined direct involvement, it would at least remain on friendly terms with Russia and be prepared to arrange a peace with Sweden. The English government proposed that the Swedish king make peace with Russia, particularly since Sweden was in a position to dictate the peace terms. Charles XII, however, was eager to deliver the final blow against his enemies. England realised that if Russia and Sweden signed a peace treaty the Tsar would be free to form an alliance with Charles XII. As this was not in England's interests, London made no further proposals in its role as mediator.⁶

In June 1701 the Russian ambassador to the Hague, A. A. Matveyev, reported that the continuation of the Russo-Swedish war was in the interests of England and Holland, and that the English king would not support Russian interests, as he regarded the Swedish king as a good and trustworthy friend.⁷

At this time, economic relations between England and Russia became stronger than ever.⁸ England needed timber, flax, hemp, tar, and other materials for its fleet, while Russia required supplies for the army, as well as money to finance the Northern War, and was eager to promote trade with England.

In the meantime, the focal point of the military operations had shifted to Poland and Saxony, which allowed the Tsar to considerably improve his position in the north. In 1703 he built a wooden city on the swamps around the river Neva, which he named St. Petersburg.

Russian activities compelled the English government to follow the situation in the Baltic and the progress of the Northern War with increasing interest. England had always maintained an envoy in Moscow (Charles Goodfellow since 1688), who protected the interests of the English traders. At the end of 1704, however, London decided to send an ambassador to the Russian capital.

This decision was precipitated by the fact that in 1703 the French king had sent an envoy extraordinary, Jean de Baluze, to Russia to win the Tsar's support against Austria. The French king was even prepared to assist in the conclusion of a peace treaty between Russia and Sweden.

To forestall the French plan, the English government sent one of its most able diplomats, Charles, Lord Whitworth (1675-1725),⁹ as envoy extraordinary to

⁶S. M. Solov'yev, *Istoriya Rossiya s drevneyshikh vremyon* (St. Petersburg, 1879-1881), Vol. III, p. 1313.

⁷Solov'yev, *op. cit.* p. 1314.

⁸For details see: Dietrich Gerhard, *England und der Aufstieg Russlands* (Munich-Berlin, 1933).

⁹For Whitworth's biography see his book: *An Account of Russia as it Was in the Year 1710* (Strawberry Hill, 1758), pp. 1-20. Also *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. XXI, pp. 161-2.

Moscow.¹⁰ Whitworth arrived in Moscow on February 28, 1705, and conveyed to the Tsar Queen Anne's "desire to enter into a nearer alliance of friendship with him for the mutual benefit of trade and commerce".¹¹

Whitworth was specifically instructed to secure trade privileges for English merchants and the delivery of required goods, and to provide information about Russian finances, foreign treaties, and the Russian army.¹² For this purpose, he established contacts with British officers in the service of the Tsar. Field Marshal George Ogilvy supplied Whitworth with valuable information about the Russian forces.¹³

A month later, in his report from March 25, 1705, Whitworth specified the exact number of Russian regiments and their location, and provided a list of their officers.¹⁴

In his report, Whitworth also mentioned Mazepa,¹⁵ Hetman¹⁶ of the autonomous Ukrainian Military Republic (1649-1764), also known as the "Hetmanate",¹⁷ who played an important role in the Great Northern War.¹⁸ In a subsequent dispatch, on August 11, 1706, Whitworth made a very clear distinction between the Russian

¹⁰Whitworth's reports are located in London at the Public Record Office, State Papers Russia 91, Vols. 4, 5, 6 (thereafter "PRO SP"). Whitworth's reports were published under the title: *Doneseniya i drugiya bumagi chrezvichaynago poslannika angliyskago pri russkom dvore, Charlisa Witworta, s 1704 po 1708 i 1708 po 1711 g.*, in *Sbornik Imperatorskogo Russkogo Istoricheskogo Obchestva*, (hereafter "Sbornik") (St. Petersburg, 1884, 1886, Vol. 39, 50).

¹¹PRO SP 104, Vol. 120. *Sbornik*, Vol. 39, pp. 1-7.

¹²*Ibid.*

¹³Leonid N. Nikiforov, *Russko-angliyskiye otnosheniya pri Petri I* (Moscow, 1950), p. 31.

¹⁴PRO SP 91, Vol. 4, *Sbornik*, Vol. 39, p. 56.

¹⁵Ivan Mazepa-Koledynskyi was born in Mazepyntsi on March 20, 1639; for details, see: O. Ohloblyn, "Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta Yoho Doba", *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka*, (thereafter "ZNTS") (New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960), Vol. CLXX, p. 21. Mazepa died on October 2, 1709, in Varnytsia, a suburb of Bendery; for details, see: B. Krupnytskyi, "Miscellanea Mazepiana", *Pratsi Ukrayinskoho Naukovoho Instytutu* (hereafter "PUNI") (Warsaw, 1939), Vol. XLVII, pp. 90-92.

¹⁶"Hetman" derives from old German word "Hoeftmann" — Commander-in-Chief. The title is approximately equivalent to "Hospodar" of Moldavia or "Doge" of the Republic of Venice.

¹⁷About the Hetmanate, see dissertation by Hans Schumann, *Der Hetmanstaat, 1654-1764* (Breslau, 1936), p.4. (The text of this dissertation is also published in *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (1936), Vol. I, pp. 499-548.

¹⁸For details see: B. Kentrshynskyi, *Mazepa* (Stockholm, 1962); Hatton, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-7, 284-5; Massie, *op. cit.*, pp. 456-466; O. Subtelny, *The Mazepists* (New York, 1981), pp. 8-52.

Kozaks (Cossacks)¹⁹ from the river Don under the jurisdiction of the Tsar, and "the nation of the Cossacks, who are under Mazeppa's command".²⁰

Whitworth was very well informed about the Russian forces. He systematically notified Whitehall not only of important developments in Russia, but also in Ukraine and Poland. In his report of August 4, 1706, for example, Whitworth informed London that the Tsar was heading in the direction of Kyiv with his main forces.²¹

Peter believed that the Swedish king would march on Kyiv and dispatched his main forces to the city. There he ordered the construction of a fortification on the site of the Pecherska Lavra monastery. (The Kozaks built similar fortifications outside Ukraine, even as far away as Livonia. The Russian officers treated them with great cruelty).

The report from August 18, 1706, is an indication of how well Whitworth was informed about Ukrainian and Polish affairs. He knew, for instance, that Mazepa had marched into Volyn at the request of Augustus II to lay waste the estates of Polish magnate Count Lubomirski, who had joined Sweden.²² In subsequent reports (June 8, August 2, December 28, 1707), Whitworth mentioned Mazepa's participation in the suppression of the Don Kozaks and military actions in Volyn and Silesia.²³

After the Tsar occupied Livonia, he was eager to conclude a peace treaty with the Swedish king, who categorically rejected Peter's peace proposals. The Tsar was

¹⁹The word "Kozak" is of Turkman origin. (The Turkmans are descendants of the medieval Oguz tribes. It meant a guard, a free soldier, a messenger or a freebooter, I. I. Sresnevskiy, *Materialy slovaria drevne-russkogo yazyka* (St. Petersburg, 1893), Vol. I, p. 1174. It was first mentioned in 1303 in *Codex Cumanicus* which is preserved in the St. Mark's Bank in Venice ("bibliothecae ad templum Marci Venetiarum"), cf., M. Hrushevskiy, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusy* (New York, 1956), Vol. VII, p.76; see also G. Stöckl, *Die Entstehung des Kosakentums* (Munich, 1953). In the 15th century, the Kozaks developed into a kind of military auxiliary force in Eastern Europe. There were Kozaks in Lithuania, Poland, Russia and Ukraine. In Ukraine, the Kozaks evolved into a military social class whose objective was to defend Ukraine from the attacks of the Tatars. In addition, the Ukrainian Kozaks protected the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and the populace from harassment by the Polish nobility. This led to frequent Polish-Kozak wars, which ended after the great national insurrection of 1648 led by Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, who established an autonomous military republic (Treaty of Zboriv, August 18, 1649). For details see: Hrushevskiy, *op. cit.*, Vol. VIII, Part III, pp. 215-7; also a brief English translation *A History of Ukraine*, ed. by O. J. Frederksen (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948), pp. 144-216.

²⁰PRO SP, Vol. 4; *Sbornik*, Vol. 39, pp. 295-6.

²¹PRO SP 91, Vol. 4.

²²PRO SP 91, Vol. 4.

²³PRO SP 91, Vol. 4.

desperate to find a mediator, but his attempts were fruitless. He even offered England various concessions and trade privileges. London was interested in a trade agreement with Russia and instructed Whitworth to negotiate an appropriate treaty. However, when the Russian chancellor, F. Golovin, informed the English envoy that in return for a trade agreement England would have to negotiate a peace treaty with Sweden, Whitworth declared that he lacked the necessary authorisation.

The Tsar was also interested in commissioning English craftsmen to build the Russian navy and to send Russian sailors to England for training on English warships and merchant vessels. Although at that time Whitworth believed that Russia could not develop into naval power, he supported the Tsar's request in his report of June 17, 1705: "...so it cannot be hindered by the English alone, for they will certainly be sent on board Dutch or French ships and from the same place ship-carpenters will be brought, if they are refused by England".²⁴

The English government met the Tsar's request. Although Whitworth initially believed (report from May 27, 1705) that for the present it would be almost impossible for Russia to build a navy,²⁵ in his February 3, 1706, report he already expressed doubts as to whether "it will be advantageous for England and Holland to open the door to the European trade for the Tsar".²⁶

Whitworth further advised his government to prevent a Swedish or Russian occupation of the cities of Polotsk, Vitebsk, Orscha and Mogilev, otherwise these countries would be in a position to dominate the trade route through Königsberg.²⁷

In 1706 the Tsar was faced with a very grave situation. On September 24, 1706, Augustus II was forced to conclude the peace of Altranstädt. In accordance with this treaty, he renounced his claim to the Polish throne in favour of the newly-elected protegee of Charles XII, Stanislaw Leszczynski, and pledged to join the alliance against Russia.

Facing a possible Swedish attack, the Tsar was ready to make peace with Charles XII, provided that Russia could retain a small part of the Baltic coast. Again he asked England and Holland to mediate, promising their governments various concessions and privileges. Accordingly, in 1706, the Tsar decided to send his envoy to the Hague, Andrey A. Matveyev, to London to persuade England to arrange an armistice between Russia and Sweden. Matveyev landed in England on May 7, 1707. He was received courteously, but reported on May 16, 1707, that "there is no absolute power here and therefore the Queen can do nothing without

²⁴PRO SP 91, Vol. 4.

²⁵PRO SP 91, Vol. 4; *Sbornik*, Vol. 39, p. 39 ("barely possible").

²⁶PRO SP 91, Vol. 4; ("...Nor can I pretend to judge how far England and Holland let the Czar into the affairs and trade of Europe by this door?"), *Sbornik*, Vol. 39, p. 222-3.

²⁷*Sbornik*, Vol. 39, p. 224.

Parliament".²⁸ On May 17, 1707, Matveyev was received by the Queen and presented his credentials to her. In his speech (in French), Matveyev expressed the Tsar's particular desire to maintain and consolidate his friendship with the Queen, and to form "with responsibility, a henceforth firm alliance" with her.²⁹

Several days later, Matveyev proposed to Secretary of State Robert Harley that the Queen should offer to arrange an armistice between Russia and Sweden, and if the Swedish king refused, England should form an alliance with Russia. Harley, on the other hand, informed Matveyev that he required the Russian proposal in writing. On May 21, 1707, Matveyev delivered his memorandum, written in Latin. In this document he further stated that England should not recognise the treaty of Altranstädt or Leszczyński as the new king of Poland.³⁰

Matveyev repeated these proposals in a private audience with the Queen on May 30. The Queen promised to reply through Harley. Harley, however, conveyed no reply or decision and prolonged the discussions. During the May 30 audience, Queen Anne asserted that although England wished to maintain friendly relations with Russia, it "does not desire to make an enemy of our old, immaculate Swedish friend and powerful monarch".³¹

At the same time, the English government tried to persuade Matveyev to conclude a trade treaty with England, to which Matveyev replied that he was not authorised to sign a trade agreement unless the Queen accepted the Tsar's proposals.

Matveyev's demands for a reply grew more insistent and England began to fear for its trade with Russia. The government, thus, decided that it should appear to agree to the proposals. On August 26, 1707, Harley informed Matveyev that the Queen was ready to form an alliance with Russia. Harley made this statement verbally, that is informally, and it did not reflect England's true position regarding the matter. Matveyev took Harley's statement seriously, and, in accordance with the Tsar's instructions of August 11, 1707, demanded the English proposals in writing. The Secretary of State stalled, claiming that England's allies had not yet given their consent to admit Russia into the Grand Alliance.³² Matveyev complained: "The ministry here is superior even to the French in hair-splitting and intrigue; from eel-slippery and fruitless words we garner solely loss of time".³³

Matveyev made desperate attempts to obtain a reply to his proposals, but when he learned from the English government, in February 1708, that it had recognised

²⁸Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

²⁹*Ibid.*

³⁰Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

³¹Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

³²The correspondence between Matveyev and Harley is located at PRO SP 104, Vol. 120.

³³Solovyev, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 1433.

the treaty of Altranstädt, he realised that it would be pointless and humiliating to remain in London any longer. The Tsar wrote in April 1708: "For Andrey Matveyev it is time to depart, as was long discussed, since all negotiations are fruitless".³⁴

The Russian envoy did not realise that England was not interested in mediating in peace negotiations between Russia and Sweden. If the two countries signed a peace treaty, the Swedish king would be free to side with France, which would have been dangerous for the Grand Alliance. Furthermore, Sweden's military successes against Russia in the summer of 1708 convinced England of a Swedish victory. Whitworth, in his report from September 12, 1708, pointed out that Russia's defeat was unavoidable and advised the English merchants to avoid giving the Russians large credits.³⁵

The Tsar was now convinced that England had no intention of mediating in the Russo-Swedish war, and, consequently, became very cool towards the English ambassador. Anglo-Russian relations became even more strained following an incident involving Matveyev, on July 21, 1708. On his way back to Russia, he was arrested between Windsor and London, and thrown into a debtor's prison. The English wrote that "an unfortunate incident occurred over the arrest for debt of the Russian Ambassador",³⁶ but the Russian regarded the incident as a brutal affront and "an unbelievable shame, which never existed before in history, not even in Wikefort's book".³⁷

Matveyev demanded harsh punishment for all those responsible, refused the customary gifts from the Queen and declined the royal yacht for his return crossing. In his report to the Tsar, Matveyev proposed that Whitworth be prevented from leaving Moscow and that he be denied access to the Tsar's court until the English government had made full restitution.³⁸ In his memoirs, Whitworth mentioned that the Queen politely refused to punish English officials, which the Tsar eventually accepted.³⁹ The Tsar had, in fact, demanded the execution of the officials responsible for Matveyev's arrest. Furthermore, Whitworth was denied permission to travel with the Tsar to meet his army. As he noted in his report from September

³⁴*Ibid.*

³⁵PRO SP 91, Vol. 5; *Sbornik*, Vol. 50, pp. 44-5.

³⁶David Bayne Horn, *Great Britain and Europe in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1967), p. 202. Mrs. D'Arcy Collyer, "Notes on the diplomatic correspondence between England and Russia in the first Half of the 18th Century". *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (London, 1900), Vol. XIV, p. 146.

³⁷Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

³⁸Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

³⁹Whitworth, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

12, 1708: "In short, points of honour are not so nicely distinguished here, and the Czar's resentment will not be extraordinary".⁴⁰ The Matveyev affair dragged on for more than two years and was brought to a successful conclusion only after the victory at Poltava (July 9, 1709).

Mazepa's alliance with the Swedish king in 1708, a time when the fate of Russia and the Tsar appeared gloomy, led to numerous speculations and assumptions. The English representative at the Swedish Field Headquarters, Captain James Jeffereyes, indicated in his report from October 7, 1708, that Charles XII sent an emissary to the Hetman at his residence in Baturyn to express his desire for winter quarters in Ukraine. The Swedes hoped, wrote Jeffereyes, "...of coming into a country flowing with milk and honey; that Count Lewenhaupt will soon reinforce our army with the addition of 11 or 12: m. men and that general Mazeppa will declare for us".⁴¹ In another report (October 28, 1708), Jeffereyes affirmed that "tis now certain that Gen:ll Mazeppa has declar'd for the Swedish party, yesterday he pay'd his first visit to His Maj:ty who gave him a gracious reception".⁴²

On November 21, 1708, Whitworth indicated that "the revolt of General Mazeppa to the King of Sweden...will properly give a new turn to these affairs".⁴³ In his November 28, 1708, report, he explained at length and in considerable detail to the Secretary of State why Mazepa had sided with the Swedes.⁴⁴ On December 26, 1708, the English envoy to Vienna, Sir Philip Meadows (or Medows), also sent a lengthy report to the Secretary of State, Charles Spencer III, concerning Mazepa's alliance with Sweden.⁴⁵

English diplomatic reports of the time indicate that London showed an interest in Mazepa's movements and was probably concerned about the future of the Hetmanate.

To be continued

⁴⁰PRO SP 91, Vol. 5, *Sbornik*, Vol. 50, p. 46.

⁴¹PRO SP 95, Vol. 17. Jeffereyes obtained this information from his friend J. Cederhielm, secretary at the Field Chancery, cf., Hatton, *Charles XII of Sweden*, p. 275.

⁴²PRO SP 95, Vol. 17. cf., Hatton, *Historisk Magasin*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 64-66.

⁴³PRO SP 91, Vol. 5, cf., *Sbornik*, Vol. 50, pp. 107-110.

⁴⁴PRO SP 91, Vol. 5, cf., *Sbornik*, Vol. 50, pp. 110-114.

⁴⁵PRO SP 80, Vol. 29. For the text see: T. Mackiw, *English Reports on Mazepa...*, pp. 108-111.

NEWS FROM UKRAINE

"UKRAINE IN DANGER"—THEME OF TERNOPIL RALLY	37
ENTHRONEMENT OF PATRIARCH MSTYSLAV OF THE UAOC	37
COMMUNISTS STRIKE BACK IN UKRAINE	38
MEETING OF THE KYIV STRIKE COMMITTEE	39
MASS RALLY IN KYIV DEMANDS KHMARA'S RELEASE	40
LVIV RALLY DEMANDS KHMARA'S RELEASE	41
UKRAINIANS PROTEST AGAINST GORBACHEV NOBEL PRIZE IN MOSCOW	42
FRANCE AGREES TO HELP CHORNOBYL VICTIMS	43
FORMER UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS TO HOLD CONGRESS IN MAY 1991	43
URP SECRETARIAT MEETS TO DISCUSS CURRENT ISSUES	43
PERSECUTION OF UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS IS CONTINUING IN TERNOPIL	44
KHARKIV RUKH HOLDS SECOND CONFERENCE	44
URP HOLDS CONFERENCE ON ECONOMIC FUTURE OF UKRAINE	44
URP, RUKH PROTEST AGAINST COMMUNIST RALLY TO MARK FORMATION OF USSR	45
THIRD SESSION OF UKRAINIAN INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY	45
UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE SOCIETY HOLDS CONFERENCE	46
UKRAINIAN YOUTH SENTENCED FOR DAMAGING LENIN MONUMENT IN CHERNIVTSI	46
NATIONALIST VETERANS' ORGANISATION FOUNDED IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK	47
BOMB DESTROYS BANDERA MONUMENT	47
MEETING OF THE REGIONAL DONBAS STRIKE COMMITTEES	48
DEMOCRATIC ACTIVIST ASSAULTED	49
"MEMORIAL" BUILDING SET ALIGHT	49
UKRAINE SUPPORTS LITHUANIA AGAINST MILITARY OCCUPATION	49
TRANSCARPATHIAN RUKH HOLDS CONFERENCE	54
CONFERENCE OF SUBJUGATED NATIONS HELD IN ESTONIA	54
UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE AND UNITY DAY CELEBRATED IN MAJOR CITIES	55
DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS ESTABLISHED IN KHARKIV	58
CHERNIVTSI RUKH DEMANDS DISMISSAL OF SOVIET OFFICIALS	60
GREENS HOLD CONFERENCE IN CHERNIVTSI	61
TERNOPIL DEMOCRATS PROTEST AGAINST PARTY CONTROL	61
KRUTY MASSACRE REMEMBERED	61
CONFERENCE ON THE FORMATION OF A UKRAINIAN ARMY HELD IN KYIV	62
RUKH COORDINATING COUNCIL HOLDS MEETING	62
RUKH COUNCIL OF NATIONALITIES HOLDS SESSION	63

UMA PRESS CONFERENCE IN KYIV	63
REPUBLICAN YOUTH REPRESENTATIVES MEET IN MINSK	64
UZHGOROD RUKH CONDEMNS COMMUNIST BACKLASH	64
KHMARA DEFENCE RALLY HELD IN LVIV	64
LVIV URP DISCUSSES PARTY STRATEGY AND TACTICS	65
DNIPROPETROVSK COMMUNISTS LASH OUT AT DEMOCRATIC ACTIVISTS	65
DSU HOLDS GENERAL ASSEMBLY	66
IVANO-FRANKIVSK RUKH LEADERS HOLD CONFERENCE	67
RALLY OPPOSES NEW UNION TREATY	67
RUKH ACTIVIST ARRESTED IN UKRAINE'S CAPITAL	67
KYIV RALLY IN DEFENCE OF POLITICAL PRISONERS	68
LVIV LABOUR LEADER ARRESTED	69
CITY COUNCIL TO RENAME STREETS	69
UNP DISCUSSES STANCE ON UNION TREATY REFERENDUM	70
TRIAL OF YAROSLAV DEMYDAS	70
YEVHEN CHERNYSHOV IMPRISONED	70
"DEMOCRATIC ODESSA" BLOC OPPOSES UNION TREATY	71
RUKH LEADERS MEET AIR FORCE OFFICERS	71
SOMATIC ILLNESSES INCREASE IN ODESSA	72
DEMOCRATIC ORGANISATIONS HOLD ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION IN KYIV	72
KRYVVI RIH ACTIVISTS RALLY AGAINST UNION TREATY	72
MINERS WANT TO FORM SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC UNION	72
DEMOCRATIC COUNCILS AGREE ON COOPERATION AT JOINT SESSION	73
UKRAINIAN PEOPLE'S DEPUTY: "REFERENDUM IS ILLEGAL"	73
KYIV NEWSPAPER: UKRAINE IS PRODUCTION LEADER	74
NATIONALIST YOUTH UNITE IN EAST UKRAINIAN PROVINCE	74
INDEPENDENT LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION FORMED	75
PRO-INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENTS MEET IN GEORGIA	75
UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST LEADER SPEAKS OUT ON CRISIS IN USSR	76
POLITICAL TRIALS AND PERSECUTION IN UKRAINE	78
UKRAINE AGAINST NEW UNION TREATY	79

Unless otherwise stated, all the material in this section was provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service

"UKRAINE IN DANGER" — THEME OF TERNOPIL RALLY

TERNOPIL, November 17 — A public rally was held in this western Ukrainian city, commencing at 3:00 p.m. The event, organised by the Ukrainian Nationalist Association (UNS), had as its main theme — "Ukraine in Danger".

UNS leaders V. Melnyk, O. Vitovych, O. Babiy and V. Mamalyha addressed the participants, stressing the tense situation in Ukraine in connection with the Communist assault against the republic's democratic forces.

Mr. Boyko, chairman of the Ternopil branch of Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine) and M. Kuzenska also addressed the rally.

The participants of the rally adopted a resolution, which pointed out that all national political forces have to be mobilised to counter the assault of the reactionary force and that the patriotic forces have to be prepared to take control of the situation should it get out of hand, as this may be Ukraine's last chance to free itself. The resolution also proposed to Rukh, the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association, the Ukrainian Republican Party, "Memorial", the Ukrainian National Party, the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party and other organisations to take an active part in the formation of a Committee of National Salvation to unite the pro-independence forces in the struggle against the Communist onslaught.

The resolution also included several demands: the dissolution of the Communist Party of Ukraine as a criminal organisation and the convention of a national tribunal to sit in judgment over its activity; the dissolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR and elections to a national congress; the release of Yaroslav Demydas (chairman of the Ternopil Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, arrested on November 6); and a guarantee that Stepan Khmara would not be arrested (Mr. Khmara — a leading deputy in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR and a well-known figure in the Ukrainian liberation movement, was arrested on November 17).

ENTHRONEMENT OF PATRIARCH MSTYSLAV OF THE UAOC

KYIV, November 18 — The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church enthroned its Patriarch, elected by the UAOC Synod on June 5-6, 1990, in Kyiv. Patriarch Mstyslav, who resides in Bound Brook, New Jersey, returned to Kyiv from a week-long trip throughout Ukraine, meeting people who gathered in the Ukrainian capital from around the world to take part in the religious ceremony. He began his visit to Ukraine on October 20.

On Sunday morning, at 10:00 a.m., a Divine Liturgy was held in the Cathedral of St. Sophia, followed by the enthronement ceremony of the first Patriarch of the UAOC.

Patriarch Mstyslav was born Stepan Skrypnyk in 1898 in the town of Poltava. During the Ukrainian war of liberation (1917-1921) he fought in the army of the Ukrainian National Republic. In the inter-war period, he actively defended the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Volyn and Kholm regions and in the Buh valley. From 1930 he worked as a diplomat at the Polish *Sejm* (parliament), defending Ukrainian rights. In 1942 he was appointed bishop, and took part in the second revival of the UAOC in Ukraine, 1942-1943. The Nazis deported Mstyslav abroad, where in 1947 he became the Primate of the UAOC in the USA, South America, Western Europe and Australia.

COMMUNISTS STRIKE BACK IN UKRAINE

KYIV, November 20 — The pro-independence opposition bloc Narodna Rada (People's Council) in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR has been chased into a blind corner, reports the Information Department of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly. Despite serious opposition from the Democratic Bloc, the Communist majority in the Supreme Soviet adopted a decree "On temporary regulations".

According to this decree, should a group of deputies attempt to block a motion through their absence, the remainder have the right to take any decision by a majority vote.

Arrests of those who helped to detain Colonel Hryhoriev are continuing. On November 19, the coordinator of the national Ukrainian strike committee, Mykhailo Ratushnyi, was arrested.

According to a statement by the chairman of the Information Department of the Ukrainian National Party, Volodymyr Fedko, from November 1 Ukrainian Television took various measures to deal with extraordinary situations. Parabolic antennae, which would enable direct broadcast throughout the republic should the television building become occupied or should communications with the building be lost, were installed on top of buildings on October Revolution Square. The newly-installed equipment would enable the television centre to function independently for up to three days.

Several other incidents and developments are particularly troubling. For example: criminal charges have been brought against the students who took part in the occupation of the Kyiv State University, as well as against the chairman of the Poltava branch of the Ukrainian Nationalist Association (UNS), Mr. Hryn, two UNS members from Rivne, and Oleh Vitovych, a UNS leader; the arrest of Yaroslav Demydas, the chairman of the Ternopil Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church; and also the actions of the so-called "group of 239" (the Communist majority in the Supreme Soviet). Taking all this into consideration has left many leading members of the national movement convinced that the incident with Stepan Khmara is merely another move in the game coordinated by Moscow.

Several sources indicate that the authorities are making preparations to introduce a state of emergency, in the belief that this may be the regime's last chance.

On November 20, some 3,000 people from the city of Kryvyi Rih, who were brought in by the regime, were picketing the Supreme Soviet with slogans such as: "Nationalists out of the Supreme Soviet" and "Put Stepan Khmara on trial".

MEETING OF THE KYIV STRIKE COMMITTEE

KYIV, November 27 — At the meeting of representatives of Kyiv's strike, workers' and trade unions committees on September 15, a series of demands to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR were issued, which, should they fail to be met, were to result in a one-day warning strike on October 1.

These demands were completely ignored by the Supreme Soviet. In connection with this, the Kyiv Strike Committee called on the workers' collectives and all workers of Ukraine to stage a political strike on December 11, to put forward the following demands.

- 1) The immediate halt and shut-down of the Chornobyl power station.
- 2) Implementation of the demands of the Donbas (Donetsk Basin) coal miners: the depoliticisation of government agencies, the army, KGB and MVD. Recognition of the urgency of resolving the problems of the Ukrainian miners.
- 3) To prevent military service by the autumn and subsequent call-ups outside Ukraine.
- 4) Refuse to sign a new union treaty for Ukraine.
- 5) Cease state control of the economy and transfer it to workers' and strike committees and control of businesses to workers' collectives.
- 6) Nationalisation of the property of the CPSU in Ukraine. The CPSU is to be declared a criminal organisation.
- 7) Protect the retail and industrial market of Ukraine.

The inability of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet to steer Ukraine out of its serious political, economic and social crisis, the threat of the transfer of CPU funds into the economy, thereby preserving the Communist monopoly in the political and economic life of Ukraine, and the counter-attack of the Communist reactionaries, compelled the delegates to the November 27 meeting to put forward the following additional demands:

- 1) The immediate dissolution of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet and the formation of a Committee of National Salvation, which would include representatives of Ukrainian political parties and civic-political organisations, representatives of the Narodna Rada (People's Council — pro-independence opposition in the Supreme Soviet), and workers' and student strike committees. The formation of a provisional government.

2) An international judicial committee to investigate the incident on November 7 on October Revolution (Independence) Square in Kyiv, involving People's Deputy Stepan Khmara.

An immediate halt to the disinformation and libel campaign in the media in connection with this incident. The immediate dismissal of the Ukr.SSR Procurator, Potebenko, for the deliberate falsification of the circumstances surrounding the incident, which led to the arrest of Mr. Khmara, Mykhailo Ratushnyi, Mykola Holovach, L. Berezanskyi, O. Batovkin, and O. Kovalchuk, and the immediate release of the arrested persons.

3) A ban on the economic-cooperative businesses set up by the CPU.

MASS RALLY IN KYIV DEMANDS KHMARA'S RELEASE

KYIV, December 2 — Some 30,000 people gathered on October Revolution (Independence) Square in the centre of the Ukrainian capital to protest against the signing of a union treaty and in defence of arrested people's deputy, Stepan Khmara, and other pro-democracy activists. The theme of the rally, organised by the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) and the Inter-Party Assembly (UMA), was — "Ukraine in danger".

The speakers, who included People's Deputies Oles Shevchenko, Oleksander Yemets and Volodymyr Hryniiov, and URP and UMA leaders, expressed their protest against the anti-democratic and anti-national decision of the communist majority in the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet to arrest Stepan Khmara and several other persons in connection with the violent incident involving militia colonel Hryhoriev. The speakers also demanded the release of the prisoners and judicial proceedings against Col. Hryhoriev, the republic's prosecutor, Potebenko, and the Kyiv city prosecutor, Shevchenko. The participants of the meeting adopted a resolution with the same demands.

Following the rally, on the initiative of the URP, the UMA and SNUM (Independent Ukrainian Youth Association) the demonstrators marched to the Lukyaniv prison, where Khmara and the others are being held. A picket was then held outside the prison demanding their release. During the action, the chairman of the Bila Tserkva branch of the URP, Olena Ruda-Dehtiar, a mother of four, was arrested and sentenced the same day to three days in prison.

On December 3, at 8:30 a.m., deputies of the Kyiv city council — Anatoliy Shypiko and Mykola Horbal — began a picket of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, demanding an end to the repressions against the democratic forces and the immediate release of Khmara and the other democratic activists. After ten minutes they were arrested by the militia. They were eventually released with a warning and threat of criminal proceedings.

Meanwhile, in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, the Narodna Rada (People's

Council — the pro-independence opposition group), was making attempts to have the arrest of Stepan Khmara reviewed. On December 6, the UMA report says, Narodna Rada deputies refused to register their presence in the debating chamber, in protest against the unlawful arrest of their colleague, Stepan Khmara, thereby depriving the Supreme Soviet of a quorum, and stating their intention to do so again on December 7. In this regard, the meeting was postponed for an hour, after which an agreement was reached to form a parliamentary commission to review Khmara's health.

On the evening of December 6, the Kyiv strike committee, temporarily headed by Viktor Furmanov, the chairman of the Lviv strike committee, in the absence of its own chairman, Mykhailo Ratushnyi, who has been arrested, resolved to stage a political strike on December 13.

Late that same evening, the Political Council of the People's Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) decided to support the strike.

LVIV RALLY DEMANDS KHMARA'S RELEASE

LVIV, December 2 — On the square outside the opera house a public rally was held to discuss the new union treaty, that Moscow is forcing on Ukraine, the arrest of People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, and the general offensive that the communists have launched against the national-liberation movement throughout Ukraine. Approximately 50,000 people attended the rally.

Vyacheslav Chornovil, the chairman of the Lviv provincial soviet, in his address pointed out that the Narodna Rada (People's Council) opposition bloc should leave the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet and form a shadow government in Ukraine. "Personally speaking", Chornovil said, "I will return to the debating chamber of the Supreme Soviet only when Stepan Khmara will take up his seat once again".

People's Deputy Bohdan Horyn in his address pointed out the insidiousness and criminal nature of the union treaty. He said: "The collective author of this document is the Communist Party. It is like a vampire; it wants to feed on the oppressed peoples... We should now struggle not so much against the union treaty, as for Ukraine's secession from the USSR".

People's Deputy Iryna Kalynets spoke about the arrest in Ivano-Frankivsk of six youths who deserted from the Soviet army. Their mothers declared a hunger strike.

The chairman of the Lviv region Soldiers' Mothers Committee, Hanna

Kovalchuk, talked about new cruelties against Ukrainian army recruits. The participants of the rally adopted a resolution protesting against the signing of a new union treaty, the arrest of Stepan Khmara, and the reactionaries' attack against democracy; demanding the immediate release of People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, M. Holovach, L. Berezanskyi, M. Ratushnyi, O. Batovkin and Ya. Demydas; calling for an independent commission to carry out a detailed review of the events in Kyiv on 7 November 1990; for criminal charges against Hryhoriev; expressing a lack of confidence in the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, L. Kravchuk, and the republican prosecutor, M. Potebenko, and calling for criminal charges against them; expressing support for Stepan Khmara's draft law "On the dissolution of the Communist Party"; supporting the idea of an international tribunal and trial of the CPSU; calling on the Narodna Rada deputies to set up a shadow parliament; calling on deputies of all levels to demand the implementation of the Supreme Soviet decree of 30 July 1990 on military service in Ukraine; urging all democratic parties, civic-political organisations, and citizens of the Lviv region to form a united front in the struggle against the CPU attack against democracy.

UKRAINIANS PROTEST AGAINST GORBACHEV NOBEL PRIZE IN MOSCOW

MOSCOW — Leaders of Ukraine's national-democratic movement marked International Human Rights Day by joining a December 10 Moscow protest against the granting of the Nobel Peace Prize to Mikhail Gorbachev.

The demonstration — which consisted largely of former Soviet political prisoners of various nationalities — took place outside the embassy of Norway, whose parliament annually decides to whom to confer the award.

The Ukrainian delegation — which included several people's deputies from both the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR and the Kyiv City Council — condemned the recent imprisonment of several nationalists by hard-line Communist authorities in Ukraine. They laid ultimate blame for the crackdown on national-democratic activity at the feet of Mikhail Gorbachev, who has recently been calling for a return to centralised political control.

"In our view, a joint status of Nobel laureate and organiser of the new wave of political repression in the person of Gorbachev is impossible. Without a doubt, the brutal arrest of Stepan Khmara, a fellow people's deputy, and other activists occurred in line with a particular plan of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, led by Mikhail Gorbachev", said Mykola Horbal, a former political prisoner and current Kyiv City Council people's deputy.

Many Ukrainians who live in Moscow joined the rally, waving the Ukrainian national flag.

FRANCE AGREES TO HELP CHORNOBYL VICTIMS

KYIV, December 14 — The French Secretary of State for Humanitarian Aid, Bernard Coucher, and the Ukr.SSR Minister of Health, Yuriy Spizhenko, signed an agreement on cooperation in the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry. According to the terms of this agreement, a clinic is to be set up in Kyiv to diagnose and treat children suffering from the effects of the 1986 accident at the Chornobyl nuclear plant.

France has promised to provide medical equipment, medicine, and a medical staff for the clinic. The clinic is to become operational in January 1991.

The French government has assigned 15 million francs for the first part of the three-year programme. A similar sum will be spent on training Ukrainian doctors in France.

Spizhenko pointed out that this was the first government-level agreement concluded between Ukraine and France and thanked Bernard Coucher and the French government for its assistance.

FORMER UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS TO HOLD CONGRESS IN MAY 1991

KYIV, December 15 — The Coordinating Council of the Society of the Repressed held a meeting at the Writers' Union of Ukraine.

The primary issue was the preparation of a Congress of Ukrainian Political Prisoners. The proposal to hold such a congress was put forward by the World League of Ukrainian Political Prisoners based in Winnipeg, Canada. The Congress is to be held in Kyiv on May 30, 1991.

An academic conference on the theme "The Repressive Regime in Ukraine, 1918-1990", will be held in Lviv. The meeting also approved a statement reminding the present Communist leadership in Ukraine that it will be held responsible for the repressive measures that have recently been instituted and which curb Ukraine's progress towards democracy and independence.

URP SECRETARIAT MEETS TO DISCUSS CURRENT ISSUES

KYIV, December 21 — The Secretariat of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) met in the Ukrainian capital to discuss a number of current problems.

The URP leaders learned that their party's central newspaper, "Samostiyna Ukrayina" (Independent Ukraine), is already an officially-registered publication

and would soon see the light of day. Mr. Holoborodko, a writer and satirist by profession, was appointed its editor.

The Dnipropetrovsk URP journal "Porohy" (Rapids), edited by Ivan Sokulskyi, was also discussed.

The Secretariat received information that democratic activists in Poltava have recently been subjected to searches, detentions and confinements in psychiatric hospitals, and in Sumy, a woman named Yanchenko, who spoke at a meeting about her imprisonment in a psychiatric hospital and the cruel treatment she suffered there, was arrested. Various other issues were also discussed at the meeting.

PERSECUTION OF UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS IS CONTINUING IN TERNOPIL

TERNOPIL — Repressions against Ukrainian Catholics are continuing in the Ternopil region. On December 21, the children of arrested chairman of the Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Yaroslav Demydas, were permitted to visit their father after one-and-a-half months in prison.

Religious activist Olha Lisko went to trial for participation in an unsanctioned picket in support of Yaroslav Demydas outside the provincial prosecutor's office.

KHARKIV RUKH HOLDS SECOND CONFERENCE

KHARKIV, December 22 — Delegates from 29 district Rukh organisations, representatives of labour collectives, civic, political and national organisations and members of the press gathered in this eastern Ukrainian city to attend the second conference of that city's People's Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) branch. The chairman of the Coordinating Council of the national Rukh organisation, People's Deputy Mykola Porovskiy, was also present.

The speakers pointed out that in the space of a year, Rukh branches have been set up throughout the province and represent a serious opposition to the Communist Party. The primary task of the local branches is to spread the Rukh network in factories, small towns and villages.

URP HOLDS CONFERENCE ON ECONOMIC FUTURE OF UKRAINE

KYIV, December 22-23 — An academic conference on the "Problems of dealing with economic colonialism in Ukraine" was held in the hall of the Writers' Union of Ukraine. The conference was organised by the Ukrainian Republican Party.

Economists, cooperative officials and public activists from URP branches in Kyiv, Odessa, Zaporizhia, Dnipropetrovsk, Poltava, Lviv and other cities attended the conference.

Economist Ivan Rozputenko spoke on "Economic neo-colonialism"; Economist Oleksander Shandruk — "Programme for the privatisation of public ownership for

Ukraine"; Prof. Veniamin Sikora — "Privatisation and nationalisation of public ownership in Ukraine"; academician Ihor Pohorilyi — "The perspectives of the development of agricultural technology and related changes in the agrarian complex"; Mykola Dyvak — "The problems of privatisation in agriculture" and many other professors and associates in economy addressed the participants.

The speakers described the economic situation in Ukraine, pointing out that one of the wealthiest countries of Europe in material resources is at the same time one of the poorest republics of the Soviet Union. They also described the mechanism and methods of exploiting the land in Ukraine, as well as intellectual and labour potential. Several proposals to bring Ukraine out of the economic crisis were discussed. Every speaker pointed out that this would only be possible in an independent Ukraine. People's Deputy Mykhailo Shvayko pointed out that the present measures undertaken by both the Moscow and Ukrainian governments are leading to a worsening of Ukraine's material situation.

The delegates adopted a resolution to draft their own economic programme.

URP, RUKH PROTEST AGAINST COMMUNIST RALLY TO MARK FORMATION OF USSR

LVIV, December 22 — Some 200 members of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) and Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine) gathered outside the sports stadium to protest against a Communist Party rally marking the formation of the Soviet Union.

URP members People's Deputies Putko, Hora and Hukovskyi entered the stadium and met the various performing artists who, it turned out, had not been informed of the occasion and did not know who had invited them to take part. Once they realised they had been deceived, some of the artists refused to go on stage while others returned home.

THIRD SESSION OF THE UKRAINIAN INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY

The Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) held its Third Session on December 22-23, 1990, in Kyiv.

The speakers included the chairmen of the UMA National Council, the Executive Committee and the Coordinating Council of Public Committees.

During the second day, the delegates discussed a National Council draft proposal for the election of a Constituent Assembly, which was deemed premature and rejected by a majority vote. The draft proposal, together with alternatives, is to be made available to the public committees, and will be discussed at the next UMA Session.

A second issue discussed at the Session was the formation of new UMA structures and its leading organs.

Former long-term political prisoner Yuriy Shukhevych, son of the commander-in-chief of the wartime Ukrainian Insurgent Army, Gen. Roman Shukhevych, was elected chairman of the Inter-Party Assembly. Following his election, Shukhevych proposed the following structure for the Inter-Party Assembly: chairman; Executive Council, whose chairman would automatically act as the UMA vice-chairman; members of the Executive Council would chair various sub-committees.

The session ratified these proposals, adding a second vice-chairman. Yu. Mykolskyi was elected vice-chairman.

UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE SOCIETY HOLDS CONFERENCE

DNIPROPETROVSK— More than 200 delegates from southern and eastern regional branches of the Taras Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society (TUM) attended a conference in this mining city's theatre on December 22-23, 1990.

Although the chairmen of the provincial and district soviets and administrations of eastern and southern Ukraine were invited, they failed to attend.

The speakers pointed out that current measures to implement a law establishing Ukrainian as the official state language in the republic are completely inadequate. The Ukrainian government is taking no steps to rectify the situation in eastern and southern Ukraine. The Russian and russified Ukrainian population in these regions as well as Party officials are resisting the implementation of this law.

One of the speakers, Yuriy Badzio — chairman of the National Council of the Democratic Party of Ukraine — pointed out that today the "revolution from above" has turned into a "counter-revolution from above".

In its final resolution the conference condemned the Communist authorities' plans to establish a separate "Kryvyi Rih-Donetsk republic" (major industrial regions of Ukraine), the unlawful referendum on the future of the Crimea, scheduled for January 20, 1991, as well as the signing of a new union treaty.

UKRAINIAN YOUTH SENTENCED FOR DAMAGING LENIN MONUMENT IN CHERNIVTSI

CHERNIVTSI — On December 25, 1990, the provincial court sentenced 19-year-old former student and Komsomol (Communist Youth League) leader, Valeriy Malyk, to two-and-a-half years of forced labour for three attempts to damage the city's Lenin monument.

He was accused of "malicious hooliganism and disrespect for society" (Art. 206-2 of the Ukrainian SSR criminal code).

Mr. Kolotiy, a Lviv lawyer provided by the Ukrainian Republican Party, described the verdict as unlawful.

While in Moscow in 1989 Malyk came into contact with democratic youth

activists and began to read a great deal. He realised the truth about Communism and reoriented his life. The attempts on June 6, July 23 and August 6 to damage the Lenin monument represented his symbolic break with Communism. At the trial he explained his action as a political act not hooliganism.

Malyk's parents were fined 5,000 karbovantsi (roubles) for their son's destruction of public property. Activists began a fund-raising campaign to help pay the fine.

NATIONALIST VETERANS' ORGANISATION FOUNDED IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK

Last autumn (1990), the founding Conference of the Carpathian Brotherhood of Former Soldiers of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) was held in Ivano-Frankivsk.

Former members of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists and the UPA, as well as representatives of various civic-political organisations, attended the event.

Since the Conference, the Brotherhood has established district branches throughout the Ivano-Frankivsk province, mainly in the Dolyna and Nadvirna districts.

BOMB DESTROYS BANDERA MONUMENT

The monument to Stepan Bandera, leader of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) in 1940-1959, was blown up on December 30, 1990, in Stryi Uhryniv — the nationalist leader's birthplace. The monument was unveiled by the residents of the village on October 14, 1990.

The blast was so powerful that it destroyed a chapel, situated some 150 metres from the monument.

Eyewitnesses claim they saw a yellow "Zhiguli" car with Ivano-Frankivsk number plates at the scene of the explosion. Local activists believe the incident is connected with a similar one in Ivano-Frankivsk where two grenades were thrown into the city council building, and a series of explosions in Latvia.

On January 1, 1991, democratic communities in western Ukraine commemorated the 82nd anniversary of Bandera's birth.

In Stryi Uhryniv, where people from Kyiv, Lviv, Ternopil, Ivano-Frankivsk, Odessa, Lutsk and other cities, gathered to mark the anniversary, the event took the form of a Ukrainian Catholic religious service and a commemorative public rally, with addresses by leading activists of independent organisations, People's Deputy Zinoviy Duma from Ivano-Frankivsk and deputies from the Kalush city council. The speakers emphasised Bandera's role in the formation and development of Ukraine's national-liberation movement and condemned the destruction of the monument.

The participants proposed that funds be raised for the erection of a new Bandera

monument. Plans were also being made for the construction of a museum on the site of the former Bandera family home, a museum of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), and a tourist centre. Wreaths were laid on the site of the destroyed monument.

The same day, several thousand people also gathered in Ivano-Frankivsk to commemorate the Bandera anniversary. The rally was held outside the provincial administration building, on which the revolutionary flag of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists was raised. The rally was organised by the political association State Independence of Ukraine (DSU), the Carpathian Brotherhood of UPA veterans and the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM).

Ten speakers, including Deputy Stepan Volkovetskyi, as well as representatives of the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party, the DSU, SNUM, the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP), and the "Memorial" society addressed the participants.

Later, the people marched to the site of Nazi executions of Ukrainian nationalists during the last war, where flowers were laid.

In the evening, an academic conference was held in the city's building of culture to mark the occasion. Similar events took place in Lutsk and Ternopil.

MEETING OF THE REGIONAL DONBAS STRIKE COMMITTEES

On January 2, at a meeting in Donetsk, managing directors of the coalmining industry of Donbas approved an appeal to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Ukrainian SSR President Leonid Kravchuk, and the Premiers of the USSR and Ukrainian SSR governments. They informed the central and republican leaderships of their decision to halt coal shipments from the Donbas mines on January 10 because the price of coal was not reviewed with regard to the increase in prices of machinery and equipment for the mining industry.

According to the representative of the Donetsk Strike Committee, Mykola Volynko, at a January 8 meeting, the regional Donbas strike committees discussed the effectiveness of the management's decision to halt coal shipments, as well as the social and economic problems of the mining industry.

Mykola Volynko particularly underscored that "Our standard of living is progressively decreasing, it is lower now than in the pre-strike period. At this meeting we propose to send an open letter to employees of all branches of the economy — metallurgists, chemical engineers — to show that we are not pulling wool over our eyes, but are taking decisive measures, forced on us by the present situation. That is, everything remains without fundamental improvements", Volynko continued. "As far as I am aware, certain coal-mines have already consented to the decisions reached at the management meeting. This will, of course, be a warning protest action which will last 24 hours. The final decision rests with the participants of this meeting".

According to the secretary of the Regional Association of Donbas Strike

Committees, Ludmyla Kryuchkova, a commission of seven was to be formed by January 14 to conduct negotiations with the Ukrainian SSR government with the aim of resolving the issue of coal prices. In this regard, the protest action planned for January 10 would not take place. However, should the negotiations reach a stalemate, Kryuchkova said, the protest action would take place from January 23-28.

In addition, the delegates agreed to form a commission of civic representatives and state officials, which would include Ukrainian SSR President Leonid Kravchuk and Premier Vitold Fokin, chairmen of workers' collectives and the management of the coal-mining industry, to review the issue on January 25. If the problems were not resolved, the delegates would call on all miners to come out on a general strike on February 1.

DEMOCRATIC ACTIVIST ASSAULTED

ODESSA, January 6 — Three unidentified persons attacked democratic activist Oleh Kodenchuk, a former political prisoner, who was distributing independent press and national symbols at the book market on Martynovskiyi Square. Kodenchuk was physically assaulted and the Ukrainian national flag he was holding was broken.

"MEMORIAL" BUILDING SET ALIGHT

JANUARY 7 — Unidentified persons set fire to the facade of the "Memorial" Society building, situated at 10 Chaikovskiyi Street. The premises are also used by Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine) and various other civic organisations. The perpetrators attached an obscene note directed against Rukh on the door of the building.

UKRAINE SUPPORTS LITHUANIA AGAINST MILITARY OCCUPATION

KYIV, January 13 — Residents of the Ukrainian capital gathered on the city's central October Revolution Square for a rally in support of Lithuania. This public action was organised by the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) and the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly with the support of Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine) to protest against the brutal military suppression of peaceful Vilnius residents.

The speakers who addressed the demonstrators included People's Deputies Oles Shevchenko, Mykhailo Horyn and Volodymyr Yavorivskiyi, city council official Anatoliy Shybiko, as well as representatives of the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party (UNDP), the Ukrainian Students' Association, the all-Ukrainian Strike Committee, the Association of Ukrainian Women, delegates from a conference of Jewish organisations of Ukraine, which was being held the same day, and the Lithuanian Cultural Society in Ukraine.

Deputy Oles Shevchenko read a protest statement, which was signed by several of his colleagues.

Statement of Ukrainian Parliamentarians

On the eve of January 13, Soviet paratroopers carried out a bloody assault against Lithuania's republican television centre. In the process, weapons were used against the peaceful population. According to our information, 13 citizens of the republic of Lithuania died and 144 were wounded as a result of the armed seizure of the television centre. Western correspondents, who witnessed this tragic event, testify that the people of Vilnius defended the building with their bodies without resorting to arms. The military has already declared a curfew in the Lithuanian capital. The collaborators from the so-called National Salvation Committee, with the support of the occupational tanks, are continuing their assault against the democratically-elected government.

This is the new Soviet federation! Reestablished by new blood. Khrushchev's tanks in Hungary, Brezhnev's tanks in Czechoslovakia, Gorbachev's tanks in Lithuania — that's what it is — loyalty to "Socialist values". Or rather, loyalty to the idea of a one, indivisible Russian empire.

But, gentlemen, imperialists, you have miscalculated. What could be realised with the support of two criminal regimes — Hitler's and Stalin's — is now no longer possible. The international community will not allow you to get away with it.

And your hopes that your crimes will go unnoticed because of the looming war with Iraq are in vain. The organisers of the military regime are doomed to isolation from the civilised world and rapid failure. The national-democratic revival cannot be crushed!

We, people's deputies of Ukraine, resolutely condemn the military attack on a sovereign republic. We categorically demand the withdrawal of occupational forces from the territory of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. We appeal to the parliaments of all countries to implement warning sanctions against the Kremlin to force it to adhere to the international laws, which it signed.

Shame on the aggressor!

Signed: Horyn, Shevchenko, Derkach, Yavorivskyi, Korobko, Yemets, Filenko

Deputies in Moscow Issue Statement

In Moscow, Ukrainian People's Deputies of the USSR issued their own statement in support of Lithuania, which they delivered on January 13 to Mr. Egidius Bickjavicius at the Lithuanian representation in the Russian capital.

"Brothers Lithuanians! Russians, Byelorussians, Ukrainians, Poles, representatives of all nationalities who live in Lithuania!

On this black day in the history of Lithuania, Ukrainian people's deputies of the USSR would like to express their sympathy with you.

We bow our heads before the innocent victims of the unlawful military action that deprived the people of Lithuania of the right to decide their own fate through democratic means.

We express our resolute protest against the attempt by reactionary circles to install an unlawful regime in Lithuania, and against the use of the army to resolve difficult socio-political problems.

We demand the immediate withdrawal of the troops and a full restoration of a lawful government, elected by the people.

Brothers, we are with you!

For your and our freedom!"

Signed:

Yuriy Shcherbak , Rostyslav Bratun, Yuriy Koltsov,
Serhiy Ryabchenko, Valeriy Hryshchuk, Volodymyr Yavorivskyi,
Roman Hromiak, Volodymyr Cherniak

Lviv Residents Protest Against Military Occupation of Lithuania

LVIV, January 13 — Thousands also gathered in this western Ukrainian city to express public protest against Moscow's military occupation of Lithuania. The rally was organised by the Lviv regional Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine).

The demonstrators listened to addresses by the chairman of the provincial administration, Vyacheslav Chornovil, and People's Deputies Roman Lubkivskyi, Yaroslav Kendzior, Orest Vlokh and Bohdan Horyn.

The participants approved a resolution, which denounced the military aggression against Lithuania and appealed to all democratic forces in Ukraine and the parliaments of all the countries of the world to help Lithuania.

Similar actions in support of Lithuania were staged throughout Ukraine, particularly in Chernihiv, Kharkiv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Dnipropetrovsk, Luhansk, Zaporizhia, and also in Moscow.

Appeal

To the European Parliament and Governments and peoples of all countries

Before our and your eyes, the world's last empire of evil and oppression — the Soviet Union — is crumbling. The subjugated peoples of this empire have chosen the path of national, social and economic liberation. This is a critical moment in our history — we will either become sovereign peoples, or remain slaves of the empire.

The reactionary Bolshevik empire is using all its might and all the means at its disposal to crush the liberation struggle of the greatly-suffering peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Moldavia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan. Imperial troops were dispatched to the Baltic republics. The blood of our brothers and sisters is being spilt in Lithuania. Today, before your eyes, a sacred right — man's God-given aspiration to freedom, independence and Christian love — is being suppressed with brutal military force. Yesterday, they killed Georgians, Armenians and Azerbaijanis. Today, they are crucifying Moldavians and Lithuanians. Tomorrow, they will annihilate Latvians, Estonians, Byelorussians, Ukrainians and Russians.

At this decisive moment, we appeal to you, distinguished statesmen of free peoples, and to all honest people of the world:

- prevent a new bloody genocide in the Lithuanian republic;
- cease your aid to Bolshevik neo-colonialism;
- use all your diplomatic skills, economic potential, international authority to dethrone the deceptive, demagogic leadership of the Bolshevik empire — the Soviet Union;
- prevent the hypocritical Communist empire from repeating in the newly-established national republics the aggression it exercised earlier in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland.

We believe in your wisdom and dedication to democratic ideals, and hope for your support.

God bless you!

Lithuanian people, we are with you!

Lviv

January 13, 1991

Ukrainian Volunteers Help Defend Lithuanian Parliament

VILNIUS, January 30 — The Ukrainian national flag was raised near the Lithuanian parliament building as a sign of gratitude to the people of Ukraine, according to sources in Ukraine. The right to raise the flag was granted to a member of the voluntary student group of the Ukrainian Committee in Support of Lithuania, Ihor Kolesnikov, from the Kyiv-based “Arsenal” factory. According to the newspaper “Komsomolskoye Znamya”, 11 people from Kyiv, 10 people from Lviv, and 9 Kharkiv residents were taking part in defending the Lithuanian parliament from the Soviet troops. The Committee in Support of Lithuania gave the Lithuanians medical supplies and 10,000 karbovantsi (roubles), collected in Kyiv.

On January 28, a delegation from Kharkiv, headed by People’s Deputy Andriy Sukhorukov, arrived in Vilnius together with a considerable amount of medical supplies. Members of the Ukrainian Student Association, the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) and the Ukrainian Nationalist Association (UNS) arrived in the Lithuanian capital also. The Ukrainian volunteers joined the groups from the Lithuanian defence department. Their primary objective, according to the volunteers, was to help the Lithuanian people defend their independence.

February 2 — A group of Ukrainian patriots, mainly members of the Ukrainian Student Association, formed the guard of honour at the funeral of Jonas Tautkus, a 20-year-old victim of the recent Soviet Russian military aggression. After the funeral, a meeting between the Ukrainian group and the Lithuanian defence minister and President Vytautas Landsbergis took place. During the meeting, the situation in Ukraine was discussed, as well as the affairs of the Ukrainian group. The Ukrainian group informed the Lithuanian President and the other government officials present that they had prepared and distributed leaflets to Ukrainian soldiers in Lithuania, appealing to them not to participate in the assault on the Lithuanian republic.

February 3 — Leaders of the volunteer Ukrainian student group, helping the Lithuanian defence department, gave a press conference at the Lithuanian parliament. Yevhen Nykolenko and Yevhen Dykyi answered questions on the political situation in Ukraine and the future outlook for the further development of Ukraine’s democratic national-liberation movement.

TRANSCARPATHIAN RUKH HOLDS CONFERENCE

VYNOHRADIV, Transcarpathia — On January 13, the Transcarpathian provincial Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine) branch held a conference with 200 delegates from all district and municipal centres in attendance.

A consensus was achieved between the various political parties and national-cultural societies, which have recently come into existence in the province. Ukrainian SSR Deputy Viktor Bed was elected chairman of the provincial Rukh. Philologist Pavlo Chuchka and historian Vasyl Zilgalov were elected vice-chairmen.

The delegates sent a telegram to President Gorbachev in protest against the occupation of Lithuania by Soviet forces and in opposition to the signing of a new union treaty.

The delegates approved the privatisation of land in Transcarpathia and condemned the criminal activities of the Communist Party.

CONFERENCE OF SUBJUGATED NATIONS HELD IN ESTONIA

MAARDU, Estonia, January 19-20, 1991 — The Ninth Conference of the subjugated nations in the USSR was held in this Estonian city. The conference was organised and sponsored by the National Party of Estonian Independence. Twenty-three national-political organisations took part in the conference, representing 12 nations. The delegates to the conference sent a letter to US President Bush, in which they expressed their hopes that the campaign being waged against Saddam Hussein and Iraq would be successful and that this campaign could be linked to sanctions against the USSR for its military aggression against the Baltic republics.

The delegates also ratified separate communiques and three separate resolutions.

Communique

The ninth conference of the USSR Subjugated Nations National Freedom Movements Coordination Council took place in Maardu, Estonia, on January 19-20, 1991. Delegations from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, the Crimea, Estonia, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, the Tartar Movement, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, and also Poland, took part in the conference — representing a total of 23 political organisations. The Bulgarian delegation was unable to attend the conference, since it was denied entry into the USSR.

In conjunction with the conference, a meeting of the coordination centre "Warsaw-90" was held — this group represents parties and organisations from countries within the Soviet empire.

The participants of the conference stated that the political situation in the Soviet empire was deteriorating. A counter-attack has been initiated by those reactionary forces which wish to preserve the empire. This is reflected in attempts to suppress national freedom movements by force, and to provoke inter-ethnic and local conflicts.

The conference participants consider that democratic progress is not possible until the occupation forces are withdrawn, and decisive de-Sovietisation of government bodies and social structures is implemented. Otherwise such national-Bolshevik activities can lead to continuing conflicts with many casualties. In consideration of this, the participants of the conference support the proposal to conduct a public trial of the Communist system and its organs of terror — analogous to the Nuremberg process and the judgment on Nazism.

The participants reject the so-called union treaty in any form whatsoever — any such treaty being an attempt to preserve the Soviet empire in a modified form. The participants support the right of all nationalities to refuse to serve in the armed forces of the USSR — in order that the representatives of one nationality cannot be used to suppress the struggle for freedom of other nationalities. The road to democracy — to the true freedom and independence of peoples — can be achieved through the formation of alternative movements and representative bodies which are independent of the control of Soviet institutions.

During the conference, resolutions were passed on the occupational army, crimes committed by the USSR in Lithuania, the struggles against the preservation of the Soviet empire, political prisoners, the Chornobyl tragedy, support for the Tartar people's independence struggle, the status of the Crimea and the tragic events in Central Asia.

In addition, the delegations signed an appeal by "Warsaw-90" directed to US President George Bush.

The next conference will be held in Tbilisi, Georgia, on February 23-25, 1991.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE AND UNITY DAY CELEBRATED IN MAJOR CITIES

Several major rallies were held on January 20-22 throughout a number of Ukrainian cities to commemorate the 73rd anniversary of the establishment of Ukrainian statehood on January 22, 1918, and the 72nd anniversary of the unity of all Ukrainian lands on January 22, 1919. A brief outline of the major rallies is presented below. (All the information is based on a report by the Ukrainian Independent Information Agency — "Respublika", unless otherwise stated).

KYIV, January 20, 1991 — On the day of the announced rally, the centre of this capital city was adorned with blue-and-yellow banners of Ukrainian independence and with the national symbol of Ukraine — the "trident". A religious service

(*moleben*) was held on St. Sophia Square at 2:00 p.m. The service was conducted by priests of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox and Catholic Churches.

Afterwards, a rally was held in which tens of thousands of people participated. The original text of the Proclamation of January 22, 1919, by which all Ukrainian lands were united into one national independent state, was read out loud at the start of the rally. Many deputies on all levels in Ukraine, as well as several leaders of Ukrainian political organisations, addressed the rally. All those who spoke underscored the fact that the day's celebration was dampened by the tragic events in Lithuania, when the Lithuanian people were burying the victims of Soviet Russian colonial occupation. The organisers of the rally asked for donations from the participants to assist the Lithuanian people in their time of need.

People's Deputy Oles Shevchenko read a letter of greetings from Stepan Khmara, a deputy who remains illegally imprisoned in Kyiv.

Following the rally, the participants paraded down one of the central boulevards of the capital. By this time the crowd had grown to over 40,000 people, who marched to the Taras Shevchenko monument, carrying Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian national flags. Many were carrying placards calling for a rejection of any and all new "union treaties", and condemning the colonial authorities in Moscow for the latest act of imperialist aggression in Lithuania.

That evening a commemorative concert was held in the "Ukrayina" palace.

KHARKIV, January 20 — Approximately 5,000 people gathered for a rally held on Independence Square in this eastern Ukrainian city, the second largest in Ukraine, to commemorate Ukrainian Unity Day. The rally was sponsored by the minucipal Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine) organisation in conjunction with several other Ukrainian civic and political organisations.

For the first time in the period of Soviet Russian colonial occupation, this historic event was commemorated in the various towns and villages surrounding Kharkiv, despite several attempts by members of the Communist Party to disrupt the commemorations.

CHERKASY, January 20 — On the initiative of several independent organisations, that are active in this city, a commemorative rally was held, dedicated to Ukrainian Unity Day. The participants signed a petition in which they voiced their protest against the military aggression in Lithuania. The petition was forwarded to M. Gorbachev and to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR.

LUTSK, January 20 — The commemoration of Ukrainian Unity Day began here with a religious procession headed by Bishop Mykolay of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. A religious service was then celebrated on a central square in the city. The service was dedicated to Ukrainian Unity Day.

Tens of thousands of people participated in a rally which immediately followed the religious service. Many hundreds of Ukrainian and Lithuanian national flags

waved in the winter air over the heads of the participants. The Lithuanian flags were draped in black ribbons in mourning for the victims of the latest military aggression against the Lithuanian people.

VOLYN, January 20 — A series of rallies were held in many towns and villages throughout this region, commemorating Ukrainian Independence and Unity Day. They were organised by the provincial leadership of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP). The rallies were held although many of them were not officially sanctioned by the authorities. No major incidents occurred, despite several reports of disruptions during the commemorations.

LUHANSK, January 20 — Several hundred residents of this city, activists of independent civic and political organisations, formed a human chain to commemorate Ukrainian Unity Day. The participants held placards with the names of all the various lands that make up Ukraine.

VERKHODNIPROVSK, January 20 — A protest picket action was held in this city against the decision of the municipal authorities to prohibit a rally in commemoration of Ukrainian Independence and Unity Day.

The picket action was staged in front of the municipal committee headquarters of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU).

The demonstrators were demanding that the resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR calling for such commemorative rallies be upheld. The demonstrators also carried placards voicing the support of the residents of this city for the independence aspirations of the Baltic peoples. Others called for the immediate rejection of the newly-proposed union treaty.

NOVOMOSKOVSK, January 20 — A rally was also held in this city, commemorating Ukrainian Independence and Unity Day, during which a handful of Communists tried to disrupt the proceedings. In the ensuing melée, Viktor Hryhorenko, a URP activist, was beaten up.

The participants of the rally passed a series of resolutions in which they voiced their support for the independent Lithuanian republic, their protest against the newly-proposed union treaty, and demanding the immediate release of People's Deputy Stepan Khmara.

DNIPROPETROVSK, January 20 — A rally commemorating Ukrainian Independence and Unity Day, sponsored by the local Rukh branch, was attended by nearly 2,000 people, despite the fact that special units of the militia and special purpose troops were called out, ostensibly to prevent any violence from breaking out. The rally organisers stated that this was a not so well disguised attempt on the part of the local authorities to prevent the unsanctioned rally from taking place.

The rally participants carried many blue-and-yellow national banners of an independent Ukraine, as well as the national flags of the Baltic republics, Georgia,

and Azerbaidjan. In a series of resolutions passed during the rally, the participants denounced the military crackdown in Lithuania, and demanded that those responsible for the brutal aggression in Vilnius, Tbilisi, and Baku be brought to justice. The participants also demanded the creation of a Ukrainian national army and denounced the attempts to impose new forms of censorship in Ukraine. Finally, the participants of the rally demanded the resignation of M. Gorbachev and called for new elections.

NIKOPOL, January 22 — A large group of activists within the ranks of several Ukrainian democratic organisations commemorated the Day of Unity by singing the Ukrainian national anthem in the centre of the city under blue-and-yellow national flags of an independent Ukraine. The activists held candles in commemoration of all those who fell in defence of Ukraine's honour and freedom.

TERNOPIL, January 22 — On this day the entire square in the centre of the city was filled with people, who came here to take part in the commemorative rally of Ukrainian independence and unity. The municipal soviet had earlier proclaimed that January 22 was to be a holiday, so that people were off from work. Many hundreds of Ukrainian, Lithuanian, and Latvian national banners were raised over the heads of the rally participants. Several municipal and provincial deputies, as well as leaders of the national-liberation movement addressed the crowd. All the speakers stated that the Kremlin had terminated all movement towards democratic reform and that Moscow is now attempting to impose its totalitarian rule through the use of military force.

In a series of resolutions adopted during the rally, the participants demanded that January 22 be proclaimed a national holiday by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR; that the Communist leaders be brought to trial; that the Federation Council dissolve the Soviet Union; the immediate release of Yaroslav Demydas — the chairman of the provincial branch of the Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church — of People's Deputy Stepan Khmara and of all the other individuals who were arrested in connection with the Khmara case.

Similar rallies commemorating Ukrainian Independence and Unity Day were held throughout most of the towns and villages of the province of Halychyna.

DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS ESTABLISHED IN KHARKIV

KHARKIV, January 26 — One hundred and sixty one delegates from 46 parties and civic organisations, representing Ukraine, Russia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Byelorussia and Kazakhstan, gathered in this eastern Ukrainian city for the founding congress of a new coalition of democratic forces in the USSR. The name of this newly-founded coalition is — the

"Democratic Congress". All the organisations attending the Congress are active strictly within the context of their respective "national", Soviet republics.

Representing Ukraine were: the Party of the Democratic Rebirth of Ukraine (PDVU), the Democratic Party of Ukraine, the Green Party, Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine), the Ukrainian Students' Association. Representatives of the Ukrainian Republican Party attended the Congress as observers.

The first session was addressed by the vice-chairman of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet, Volodymyr Hryniov, who represented the PDVU, and Yuriy Afanasiev from the Democratic Party of Russia. Hryniov pointed out that in order to achieve some semblance of unity among the democratic forces in the USSR, a common platform needs to be agreed upon. But he further underscored that such an agreement will be difficult given the many points of conflict.

Afanasiev, in his address, pointed out that: "Today it should already be clear to everyone that national demands will not succeed until totalitarian political forms are defeated". He also proposed that inter-parliamentary meetings of the above-mentioned republics be established on a permanent basis.

The Sajudis representative, Mr. Nedaniputekas, expressed thanks to those press organs, which objectively covered the recent tragic events in Lithuania and Latvia. "Against the military there is no force other than democracy", Nedaniputekas stated. "On the basis of the Baltic experience, it becomes clear that, although the parliaments have become democratic, the decisions they make remain one thing and their realisation — something else", he further stated. "A vertical rift of the democratic forces from the parliaments took place, as well as a horizontal break — we confused international law with Soviet law. As long as there are tanks in Poland and Hungary, we cannot exclude the possibility of a repetition of Budapest and Prague, or that the Third World War will not break out. Democracy has no borders. And so we should not limit ourselves purely to the democratic movements of the so called union republics. We should also include the European countries".

The representative of the Social-Democratic Party of Russia, Volodymyr Lysenko, presented his analysis of the present situation in the USSR, stressing that today there exists a powerful reactionary bloc, which stands for a single and undivided Union. Lysenko further stressed that the democratic forces ought to rely more on their own strength, rather than place all their hopes on the West. The democratic movement was unable to achieve the dismantling of totalitarianism and today has suffered defeat through the illusion that freedom can be achieved without assistance, Lysenko continued.

The following representatives also spoke during the first day of the Congress: the representative of the United Democratic Party of Byelorussia, Mykola Samsonov; Mr. Oduvanov from the Social-Democratic Party of Kazakhstan; a representative of the Social-Democratic Party of Azerbaijan and the Party of

National and Social Justice of Armenia; the vice-chairman of Rukh, Aleksander Lavrynovych; Yuriy Badzio, chairman of the Democratic Party of Ukraine.

The Ukrainian delegation held a press conference following the addresses. The conference was given by: Aleksander Lavrynovych, Henrikh Altunyan, Oleksander Yemets, Volodymyr Muliava and Bohdan Horyn.

The next morning, the Congress approved the following declaration on the formation of the Democratic Congress:

"We, representatives of the parties, organisations and movements listed below, realising the necessity for the consolidation of efforts of the democratic forces for the peaceful liquidation of the totalitarian regime, the establishment of sovereign states and the dismantling of imperialist, unitary structures, have established the Democratic Congress of independent parties, movements of social-democratic, liberal, general-democratic and national-democratic orientation.

The founding parties, organisations and movements intend to resolve the following tasks within the framework of the Democratic Congress: agreement of positions, organisation of common political actions and other forms of common activity in the resolution of general tasks for the democratic movement: opposition to the policy of *diktat* regarding the republics, the organisation of peaceful forms of resistance to attempts to use military force, economic suffocation, ideological terror; the formation of public thought in defence of democracy, independence and public peace, against the incitement of inter-ethnic hostility, the provocation of chaos, and the incitement of civil war within society

The participants of the Democratic Congress are actively engaged in the defence of human rights, recognised by the world community".

CHERNIVTSI RUKH DEMANDS DISMISSAL OF SOVIET OFFICIALS

JANUARY 26 — The local Rukh People's Movement of Ukraine) branch organised a rally here in support of Lithuania. Regardless of the city council's ban on the rally, some 500 people gathered on the central Radyanska Square. A resolution expressing support for the parliaments of the three Baltic republics, condemning the activity of the pro-Communist committees of national salvation, calling for the dismissal of Soviet Defence Minister Dmitri Yazov and Interior Minister Boris Pugo, and protesting against the signing of a new union treaty was approved by the participants of the rally.

GREENS HOLD CONFERENCE IN CHERNIVTSI

JANUARY 27 — The Green movement of the Bukovyna region of Ukraine held its fifth conference in this city. The participants approved a resolution condemning Moscow's imperialist policy in the Near East and the military aggression in Lithuania, and expressing their protest against the signing of a new union treaty.

TERNOPIL DEMOCRATS PROTEST AGAINST PARTY CONTROL

JANUARY 26 — Representatives of the city and provincial democratic parties and intelligentsia held a rally in the textile workers' palace of culture. The speakers underscored the importance of not dispersing the pro-democracy forces, of rising above party interests, and of abandoning inter-confessional conflict.

A resolution calling for the the elimination of Communist Party control of soviets on all levels, security services and armed forces was approved, and protests were made against the signing of a new union treaty. A telegram to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet condemning the military intervention in the Baltic republics was also approved.

The chairman of the provincial soviet, Vasyl Oliynyk, and his deputies, Bohdan Boyko and Yaroslav Karpiak, attended the rally, together with representatives of the Ukrainian Republican Party, the Democratic Party of Ukraine, the Ukrainian National Party, the Ukrainian Peasant-Democratic Party and the Memorial Society.

KRUTY MASSACRE REMEMBERED

IVANO-FRANKIVSK, January 29 — Many thousands of people marched through the centre of the city to the memorial cemetery of the Sich Riflemen (a military unit, which fought for Ukrainian independence in 1917-1921), carrying church banners, national flags and lit candles. At the cemetery Rev. Symkailo of the Ukrainian Catholic Church conducted a memorial service. This was followed by a rally, addressed by Yevhen Chaykivskyi, whose relative was killed at Kruty, near Kyiv, on January 29, 1918, while defending the capital of the Ukrainian National Republic from the invading Red Army.

Similar events were held in many other towns and villages throughout the Ivano-Frankivsk province.

DONETSK, January 29 — A public commemoration of the 300 Ukrainian students, who died in battle at Kruty in 1918 defending the Ukrainian National Republic against the advancing Red Army, was held here on the central city square.

The event was organised by the Donetsk regional branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party and the "Democratic Movement" association. The participants gathered with lit candles and Ukrainian national flags decorated with black ribbons, beside the city's monument to Lenin, who ordered the occupation of Ukraine.

CONFERENCE ON THE FORMATION OF A UKRAINIAN ARMY HELD IN KYIV

KYIV, February 2 — A Conference on the formation of a Ukrainian army was held in this capital city's Writers' Union building. The Conference was organised by Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine), the Narodna Rada (the democratic opposition bloc in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR), the Committee for the Formation of Ukrainian Armed Forces and the Association of Democratic Councils and Democratic Blocs of Ukraine.

The participants included staff officers from the Kyiv Military District and former servicemen.

The speakers included: Yuriy Shukhevych, former long-term political prisoner and chairman of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly; Col. Volodymyr Bryntsev, a lecturer at the Vasilevskiy Military Academy; Captain Antonenko, a lecturer at the Kyiv Naval Political School; and an officer from the General Staff of the Soviet armed forces, who informed the delegates about the plans for a Ukrainian national army drawn up by a group of young General Staff officers; Deputies Larysa Skoryk, Ihor Derkach, Lev Lukyanenko, and Volodymyr Hryniov, as well as Fatima Batynska from the Soldiers' Mothers Committee.

At the meeting, a Rukh Military Committee was set up, chaired by Captain Vitaliy Chechylo (Ret.).

The delegates ratified an appeal to servicemen stationed in Ukraine, calling on them to support the formation of a professional Ukrainian national army.

RUKH COORDINATING COUNCIL HOLDS MEETING

KYIV, February 2 — The Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine) Coordinating Council met in this capital city's Polytechnic Institute to discuss the present political situation in Ukraine and to determine joint action of the republic's democratic forces in opposition to the proposed referendum regarding a new union treaty that is to be held on March 17, 1991. The referendum is to take place in the 27 electoral districts of Ukraine, that is in all the provinces, including the Crimea, and Kyiv, where a separate electoral district has been created.

The Council members decided to take part in the referendum as a means of influencing the Ukrainian population to vote against the signing of a new union treaty. Propaganda activity and the Rukh newspaper were also discussed.

The next day, February 3, the Coordinating Council ratified a proposition to

hold a national Kozak (Cossack) Commemoration on 23-24 February, which would include memorial services for Kozak colonel Ivan Bohun (d. 1664), one of the most important leaders of the Khmelnytskyi period, and discussed ways of marking this event throughout the towns and villages of Ukraine.

Volodymyr Muliava, the Council's vice-chairman, informed the participants about the conference on the formation of a national Ukrainian army.

RUKH COUNCIL OF NATIONALITIES HOLDS SESSION

KYIV, February 2 — Representatives of 15 nationalities from 9 regional Rukh organisations gathered in the Ukr.SSR Academy of Sciences to attend the second session of the Rukh Council of Nationalities. The delegates elected Voleslav Heychenko, a physicist, as chairman of the Council, and Oleksander Burakivskyi (representing the Jewish community), and Karel Vasin — a Slovak — as vice-chairmen. An 11-member presidium was also elected. Following the elections, the participants approved a programme of action.

An appeal to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet to declare September 29, the beginning of executions in Babyn Yar by the Nazis, as a day of mourning, a resolution on the Crimea, and an appeal calling on the Ukrainian people to vote against a new union treaty during the March 17 referendum were also ratified.

UMA PRESS CONFERENCE IN KYIV

KYIV, February 1 — The chairman of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) held a press-conference in the building of the Writers' Union of Ukraine. The UMA chairman, Yuriy Shukhevych, pointed out that today the most pressing task facing the Ukrainian liberation movement is the formation of national Ukrainian armed forces. The chairman of the UMA Political Committee, Anatoliy Lupynis, underlined that recent events, particularly in Georgia and Lithuania, are an indication that the UMA's position that a Constituent Assembly must be convened to replace the existing Soviet state institutions is fundamentally correct. The UMA is registering citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic who will elect the Constituent Assembly. He also pointed out the need to revive the activity of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.

Serhiy Nechytailo, defence attorney of arrested labour leader Mykhailo Ratushnyi, announced that investigations concerning the case of Deputy Stepan Khmara, arrested in the Supreme Soviet on November 17, 1990, and other activists ended on December 15 of last year, and that the defendants are presently familiarising themselves with the large volume of documents relating to the case. They have until February 10, 1991. Nechytaylo believes, however, that the trial may not be held until the beginning of March. Petro Kahuy — the chairman of UMA's Executive Committee — announced that a rally will be staged on February

9 in relation to the so called "Khmara case". The rally will commence at 2:00 p.m. (Kyiv time) on the central October Revolution (Independence) Square.

REPUBLICAN YOUTH REPRESENTATIVES MEET IN MINSK

FEBRUARY 2 — A meeting of representatives of youth organisations of the various republics of the USSR was held here. Representatives from 12 organisations from Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Azerbaijan, Ukraine and Moscow took part. Members of the Ukrainian Students' Association and the Student Brotherhood represented Ukraine. A resolution concerning the recent events in the Baltic republics and the referendum on a new union treaty was approved.

UZHGOROD RUKH CONDEMNS COMMUNIST BACKLASH

FEBRUARY 3 — A rally was held in this western Ukrainian city in support of democracy and against the assault of the reactionaries. The rally was organised by the Uzhhorod Rukh organisation. The speakers explained the attempts by the local Communist Party officials and KGB to create a rift in the democratic forces of the Transcarpathian region, and urged Ukrainians, Hungarians, Russians, Rumanians and all democratic forces of the region to consolidate in the struggle against totalitarianism.

KHMARA DEFENCE RALLY HELD IN LVIV

LVIV, February 3 — This western Ukrainian city's Committee to Defend Citizens' Rights (Strike Committee) organised a public rally in defence of imprisoned People's Deputy, Stepan Khmara. Khmara was arrested in the chamber of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet on trumped-up charges on November 17, 1990.

Viktor Furmanov, the Committee's chairman, opened the rally with an address, following which he read out a letter from Stepan Khmara, written on January 22, 1991, in the Kyiv Lukyaniv prison where Mr. Khmara is being held.

Mr. Furmanov pointed out that recent events have convincingly shown that the parliamentary road to independence is inviable as a means by which to secure Ukrainian independence. The majority of Supreme Soviet deputies, he went on, have sought various compromises with the communists, and do not wish to take more radical steps.

Furmanov further stated that only decisive action can halt the reactionary assault of the Communist Party against Ukrainian national rights activists and bring about changes.

In support of Mr. Khmara's appeal, Mr. Furmanov urged the participants of the rally to prepare for a political strike throughout the Lviv region. If Lviv begins a strike in defence of Khmara, he said, the rest of Ukraine will follow suit.

The editor of the SNUM (Independent Ukrainian Youth Association) journal "Napriam", Volodymyr Yavorskyi, spoke in support of Mr. Furmanov and Mr. Khmara.

He condemned those political activists who do not wish to irritate the Communists, and pointed out that only a general political strike can change the situation.

LVIV URP DISCUSSES PARTY STRATEGY AND TACTICS

LVIV, February 3 — The provincial branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) held a conference to discuss the party's future strategy and tactics. Branch members, as well as people from all over Ukraine, a URP delegation from Leningrad and representatives from abroad, attended the conference. The chairman of the Lviv branch, People's Deputy Bohdan Horyn, Oleh Pavlyshyn — the chairman of the Secretariat, and Yevhen Bolterovych — the chairman of the ideological department, addressed the participants, stressing that the URP is a national-democratic parliamentary party whose goal is the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state through peaceful means.

DNIPROPETROVSK COMMUNISTS LASH OUT AT DEMOCRATIC ACTIVISTS

DNIPROPETROVSK — The CPSU committee of Dnipropetrovsk State University decreed that all lecturers of social sciences must spread propaganda in favour of maintaining the USSR during their lectures and seminars. A large number of lecturers are indignant at the pressure from the Party. Local democratic activists have said that even Party members, who are not openly speaking out against this decision, will not carry out the instructions.

February 8 — The October district administration in the city refused to include local Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine) representatives in electoral commissions, set up for the March 17 referendum on the new union treaty. The authorities claim that the district's Rukh organisation is not registered with the local authorities and that its stamp and seal are unlawful.

Previously, Rukh candidates from the district were prohibited from registering for election as deputies to the district council because the district organisation did not have a seal.

On another occasion, when Rukh asked to be registered at the October district council, the presidium of the council would not register the organisation because it was already registered with the regional council.

The presidium also announced that it would allocate premises for Rukh. Six months have passed and the local Rukh branch remains without any premises. The chairman of the branch, Leonid Talko, believes that the authorities are conducting an anti-Rukh policy.

February 9 — The Dnipropetrovsk radio and television committee is continuing to discriminate against Ukrainian-language television broadcasts. At 2:40 p.m. a propaganda broadcast was aired, in which recent events in western Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were presented in a negative light. Commentators openly spoke out against the formation of a Ukrainian national army, Vyacheslav Chornovil, the chairman of the Lviv provincial council, was personally singled out for an attack, and the newly-formed democratic political parties in Ukraine were the subject of a disinformation campaign. No air time was allotted for a rebuttal.

This broadcast, organised by the Dnipropetrovsk provincial Party committee, was designed to intimidate the population of the region and to create the spectre of an internal enemy. A representative of the committee also stated on the air that future broadcasts will be in Russian.

DSU HOLDS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

IVANO-FRANKIVSK, February 11 — The nationalist political association — State Independence of Ukraine (DSU) — held a General Meeting in this western Ukrainian city.

The meeting was led by the chairman of the provincial DSU, Mykhailo Zelenchuk. He talked about his visit to Kyiv to attend the conference on the formation of a Ukrainian army. The conference was attended by a number of Ukrainian army officers, particularly members of the Soviet General Staff, who outlined their plan for the formation of a Ukrainian army, which they drew up after the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet Declaration of Sovereignty on July 16, 1990.

The DSU meeting was also addressed by the chairman of the Ivano-Frankivsk municipal branch of the DSU — Volodymyr Klenyk. He spoke primarily on ecological issues. Mr. Klenyk informed the participants about the general meeting of the association "Green World", at which the establishment of an ecological institute in Ivano-Frankivsk was raised.

Another DSU member informed the participants about the formation of an alternative people's municipal police in the city of Ivano-Frankivsk.

Vasyl Malaniuk, a veteran of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists, spoke about a village meeting in Horokholyna, Ivano-Frankivsk province, at which the referendum on the new Union Treaty was discussed. The Fourth Universal of the Central Rada and various documents of the Western Ukrainian National Republic were also read out and discussed at this meeting.

Mykhailo Nahorniak, a member of the provincial branch of the DSU, informed the participants of the meeting about the third conference of the district Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine) organisation, held in Nadvira on February 9.

Volodymyr Hrytsak reported on a meeting of the DSU provincial council in the village of Tyaziv, many of whose residents were present at this meeting. The DSU

representatives informed the people about the activity of the recently-established Carpathian Brotherhood of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and the DSU, and discussed with them the referendum on the new union treaty. An initiative group to form a branch of the Brotherhood in the village was also established.

Mykhailo Zelenchuk closed the DSU General Meeting, announcing that the provincial council of the DSU will hold a meeting on February 18 in the provincial council, where premises have been allocated for the association.

IVANO-FRANKIVSK RUKH LEADERS HOLD CONFERENCE

NADVIRNA, Ivano-Frankivsk province — On February 9, leaders of the Nadvirna branch of the People's Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) held a conference. The questions that were raised during the conference included: the referendum on a new union treaty and the nomination of candidates to electoral commissions throughout the district.

The conference was opened by the chairman of the district branch, Bohdan Berezytskyi. Among the speakers addressing the meeting were the following individuals: Daria Detsyk — secretary of the regional Rukh organisation; Maria Kolub — the chairman of the Nadvirna passport department; Fedir Kovtun — the secretary of the district Rukh leadership and a provincial council deputy; Bohdan Oliynyk — the chairman of the district branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party; Fedir Karchevskyi — a Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) veteran; Bohdan Kashivskyi — a representative of "Green World".

The participants ratified an appeal to residents of the district regarding the referendum, and sent a telegram to the chairman of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet, Leonid Kravchuk, on this issue.

RALLY OPPOSES NEW UNION TREATY

KRYVYI RIH, February 3 — The Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) and Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine) organised a public rally outside the central bus station at which they urged citizens to vote against the new union treaty in the March 17 referendum. Some 500 people attended the rally.

A pro-communist "Interfront" has appeared in the city. In January an organisation calling itself "Yednist" (Unity) was formed. Its 73 members are mostly former members of the CPSU.

RUKH ACTIVIST ARRESTED IN UKRAINE'S CAPITAL

KYIV, February 5 — Viktor Andzhakidze, the chairman of the Makariv district Rukh organisation, was arrested for participating in the protest actions in Kyiv last October.

Mr. Andzhakidze, together with other activists, had taken part in a week-long hunger strike outside the Makariv district administration. This action led to the

dismissal of CPSU district first secretary, Vitaliy Kostroma, from the post of district council chairman.

Mr. Andzhakidze was summoned to Kyiv for questioning and did not return home. The following day, news reached Makariv that Mr. Andzhakidze had been arrested. The chairman of the Makariv URP branch, Ivan Ternovyi, went to Kyiv, where he was informed by the Interior Ministry's senior investigator, Volodymyr Shevchenko, that Mr. Andzhakidze is now in the Lukyaniv prison in Kyiv. Ternovyi pleaded for Mr. Andzhakidze's release, claiming that he had taken part in clean-up operations in the Chornobyl zone, and that he is the sole provider for his family (his wife receives only 35 roubles). Mr. Shevchenko replied that the decision rests with the public prosecutor. He further stated that after October 2, the CPSU in Makariv flooded him with demands for the arrest of Mr. Andzhakidze.

KYIV RALLY IN DEFENCE OF POLITICAL PRISONERS

KYIV, February 9 — The Ukrainian capital was the scene of a public rally to demand the release of Ukraine's new political prisoners. Some 4,000 Kyiv residents and visitors to the city answered the call of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) and gathered on October Revolution (Independence) Square in protest against the imprisonment of People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, Yaroslav Demydas — chairman of the Ternopil Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Mykhailo Ratushnyi — chairman of the Kyiv strike committee, and other pro-democracy activists.

A large delegation from Ternopil travelled to Kyiv in support of imprisoned activist Demydas (his trial opened on February 12), who stands accused of public disorder outside the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet, an incident provoked by the authorities on October 2, 1990.

The rally was led by the chairman of the Executive Council of the UMA, Kuzma Fedchenko, and the chairman of the Coordinating Council of Public Committees of Ukraine, Yevhen Chemyshov.

The participants were addressed by People's Deputies Levko Lukyanenko and Oles Shevchenko, the chairman of the Political Committee of the UMA — Anatoliy Lupynis, the coordinator of the republican strike committees — Viktor Furmanov, as well as a number of other speakers.

A resolution was unanimously accepted by the rally participants, condemning the Communist regime's brutal suppression of the independence aspirations of the Ukrainian people, the underhanded methods used to arrest and incriminate Demydas and Khmara, calling on Kyivites to picket the court throughout the trial of Yaroslav Demydas, and to stage a two-hour political strike on the opening day of Khmara's trial, and demanding live radio and television coverage of the trials.

Before the rally, Kyiv's deputy militia chief, V. Shaposhnyk, and the chief of the Lenin district militia, B. Kondratiuk, warned the participants that the event was unsanctioned and that those who took part would suffer the consequences. For their part in the rally, Viktor Furmanov and Yevhen Chernyshov were arrested and sentenced to 8 and 9 days of imprisonment respectively. Militia officials have threatened similar proceedings against Mr. Lukyanenko and Mr. Shevchenko.

LVIV LABOUR LEADER ARRESTED

KYIV, February 9 — The militia arrested Viktor Furmanov, the chairman of the Lviv Committee in Defence of Human Rights (Strike Committee), after a URP-organised rally in support of arrested activists Yaroslav Demydas and Stepan Khmara. Mr. Furmanov was sentenced to 8 days of imprisonment for "insulting" President Mikhail Gorbachev in a speech he delivered during the rally.

CITY COUNCIL TO RENAME STREETS

FEBRUARY 9 — The fourth session of the Ivano-Frankivsk city council decided to rename a number of the city's streets. The changes were proposed by people's deputies from the commission on culture and national revival. The proposed changes are: Muraviov Lane will be renamed Ivan Mykolaichuk Lane (a notable actor and director, who was in Ivano-Frankivsk in 1978); Vasiliev St. — Pylyp Orlyk St. (chancellor to Hetman Ivan Mazepa; following Mazepa's death in 1709, Orlyk became Hetman; Orlyk's family lived in this western Ukrainian city); Engels St. — Levko Bachynskyi St. (lawyer from the village of Serafyntsi, activist of the Radical Party, vice-president of the government of the Western Ukrainian National Republic); Kuybyshev St. — Stepan Bandera St. (leader of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists, 1940-1959, who came from the village of Stryi Uhryniv, Ivano-Frankivsk province); Lenin St. — Bohdan Lepkyi St. (a notable writer, who often visited Ivano-Frankivsk); Saveliev St. — Vasyl Symonenko St. (Ukrainian writer); Chapaev St. — Sich Riflemen St. (military formation which fought for Ukrainian independence, 1917-1921); Shchors St. — Dmytro Vitovskyi St. (colonel, secretary of military affairs of the Western Ukrainian National Republic).

UNP DISCUSSES STANCE ON UNION TREATY REFERENDUM

CHERKASY, February 9 — Ukrainian National Party (UNP) leaders met here to discuss the UNP stance on the March 17 referendum on a new union treaty; the need to coordinate tactics with leaders of the political association State Independence of Ukraine (DSU), the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party (UCDP), the Ukrainian Peasant Association (USO), the Ukrainian Youth Association (SUM), and the Ukrainian Nationalist Association (UNS); as well as various internal matters.

The following documents were ratified: 1. The UNP statement on the referendum; 2. An appeal to the leaders of the DSU, UCDF, USO, SUM and UNS.

TRIAL OF YAROSLAV DEMYDAS

KYIV — The trial of Yaroslav Demydas, chairman of the Ternopil Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, opened here on February 12. He is accused under Arts. 187/1-3, 187/1-4, 188 and 189 of the Ukr.SSR Criminal Code. Demydas was arrested on November 6, 1990.

On the first day of the trial, only 30 persons, including 18 members of the special detachment troops whom Demydas allegedly assaulted, were permitted to attend the proceedings.

Approximately 300 people from Ternopil arrived in the Ukrainian capital to support Demydas. They are demanding that representatives of the democratic movement be permitted to attend the trial. On February 10, public protest actions in defence of Yaroslav Demydas and imprisoned People's Deputy Stepan Khmara were staged throughout the whole province. So far, more than 50,000 people have signed petitions demanding the release of the two activists. These were delivered to court officials. The provincial URP (Ukrainian Republican Party) branch is planning further mass protest actions in support of Mr. Demydas and Mr. Khmara.

YEVHEN CHERNYSHOV IMPRISONED

KYIV, February 16 — At 5:30 p.m., by the ticket office at the capital city's "Novo Bilychi" train station, four men approached Yevhen Chernyshov, joint chairman of the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party and chairman of the Inter-Party Assembly's Coordinating Council of Public Committees, and without uttering a word twisted his arms behind his back and began to take him away. Chernyshov's pregnant wife, who was accompanying her husband, grabbed his arm and began to call for help. She also had her arms twisted behind her back and was pushed away with threats that she too could come along if she wanted.

Chernyshov was pushed into a car without number plates and driven away. At 9:30 p.m., the duty officer of the Lenin district militia — Mr. Pilhun — stated in a telephone conversation that Chernyshov would be in an investigation cell until Monday, February 18, when his case would be heard in the Lenin district court. Mr. Chernyshov was accused of organising an unsanctioned rally in Kyiv on February 9.

At the trial, Chernyshov's defence attorney — Anatoliy Khaperskyi — pointed out that the arrest was unlawful and ungrounded. Khaperskyi's statement was substantiated by the fact that a video film of the rally, submitted as evidence by the prosecution, did not contain a single shot of his client.

Regardless of the facts, Lt. Col. Borys Kondratiuk — chief of the Lenin district militia and the sole witness at the trial — testified that Mr. Chernyshov's voice could be heard in the background. On this basis, presiding judge Holychenko sentenced Yevhen Chernyshov to 9 days of imprisonment.

On hearing the sentence, Mr. Chernyshov condemned his arrest and sentence as an unlawful breach of his human rights and declared a hunger strike in protest against the decision of the court.

During the trial, Lt. Col. Kondratiuk pointed out that in addition to Mr. Chernyshov and Mr. Furmanov, who had already served 8 days of arrest for his part in the February 9 rally, People's Deputies Levko Lukyanenko and Oles Shevchenko, both of whom delivered addresses at the rally, would face similar charges.

"DEMOCRATIC ODESSA" BLOC OPPOSES UNION TREATY

ODESSA, February 13 — The council of the Odessa regional branch of Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine) held a meeting, during which the proposed creation of a "Democratic Odessa" bloc was discussed. Rukh, the Ukrainian Language Society, the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP), Memorial, the Green Party, the Party for the Democratic Rebirth of Ukraine, the Democratic Party of Ukraine, and other civic organisations joined the bloc. At the meeting, "Democratic Odessa" called on citizens to vote against a new union treaty in the upcoming referendum on March 17.

RUKH LEADERS MEET AIR FORCE OFFICERS

ODESSA, February 14 — A meeting between the joint chairmen of the regional Rukh branch — Viktor Tsybaliuk and Yevhen Yakymovych, and staff officers of the regional air forces was held in the air force headquarters. The Rukh leaders informed the military about Rukh activity and answered numerous questions.

According to the Rukh leaders, the commanders of the Odessa military district received two orders from the general staff: one forbidding them to provide people's deputies with information on the life and activity of the troops, and the second containing practical recommendations on how to prevent meetings between

democratic activists and the military, in light of the negative influence of the democrats on the military.

SOMATIC ILLNESSES INCREASE IN ODESSA

ODESSA — Somatic illnesses among the residents of the province have increased through inadequate supplies of drinking water. The situation in the Bolhrad district is particularly alarming. According to the newspaper "Vechirnia Odessa" (February 15), last year the number of cases of hepatitis in the Bolhrad area increased by 1.5 per cent. Eighty per cent of the cases are children. None of Odessa's 26 district centres meet required medical standards on drinking water.

DEMOCRATIC ORGANISATIONS HOLD ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION IN KYIV

KYIV, February 16 — "National Revival — the Ukrainian Perspective" was the theme of a round-table discussion organised by the republican association of Ukrainianists and the Democratic Party of Ukraine. The URP, the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party, the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party, Ukrainian Peasant-Democratic Party, the Democratic Party of Ukraine, Rukh, the Ukrainian Language Society, the association Green World, Memorial, as well as representatives of 9 national-cultural societies, committees and centres, 6 academic institutes and approximately 30 organisations and institutions took part in the discussions.

Ivan Dziuba and Yuriy Badzio chaired the proceedings. This round-table discussion is the first in a series of discussions between all pro-independence political and civic forces.

KRYVYI RIH ACTIVISTS RALLY AGAINST UNION TREATY

KRYVYI RIH, February 16 — URP and Rukh members staged a rally in the city centre to protest against the signing of a new union treaty. People's Deputy Ivan Naidenko from the Kryvyi Rih city council addressed the rally, during which independent publications and leaflets urging people to vote against the union treaty on March 17 were handed out.

The city branch of the URP has been officially registered. This is the first time a political party has been officially registered in the Kryvyi Rih region. The URP members are now awaiting a reply to their enquiry about premises for their newly-registered party.

MINERS WANT TO FORM SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC UNION

DONETSK, February 16 — The regional organisation of the Social-Democratic Party of Ukraine held its founding conference in this mining city. Among other issues reviewed was the formation of a Social-Democratic Union of Donbas (Donetsk Basin

— coal-mining region). Following a vote to establish the union, the conference participants elected their leaders. A resolution was approved urging people to vote against the union treaty during the referendum.

DEMOCRATIC COUNCILS AGREE ON COOPERATION AT JOINT SESSION

LVIV, February 16 — The Halychyna Assembly — a joint session of the councils of people's deputies of the Ivano-Frankivsk, Lviv and Ternopil provinces — met in the Lviv Opera house.

The agenda included: economic cooperation, the present political situation in Ukraine and the question of maintaining unity of all Ukrainian territories.

Among the guests present at the joint session were: the first deputy chairman of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet — Ivan Pliushch; the leader of the parliamentary opposition — Ihor Yukhnovskiy; People's Deputies Mykhailo Horyn, Dmytro Pavlychko, Roman Ivanychuk and Mykhailo Kosiv; and representatives of various parties, deputies from other provincial councils, and the head of the International Institute of Management in Geneva — Dr. Bohdan Havrylyshyn.

The delegates agreed on a platform of economic, cultural, educational and other forms of cooperation and approved a resolution on the unity of Ukrainian territories, based on the Act of Union of the Ukrainian National Republic and the Western Ukrainian National Republic of January 22, 1919. This resolution also called on the councils of the Volyn, Rivne and Bukovyna regions to join the Halychyna Assembly in solidarity.

The delegates accepted a resolution on the March 17 referendum. In the event that the Supreme Soviet approves voting cards which the session will find unacceptable, provincial referendums are to be held alongside the official all-Union referendum, during which citizens will vote on the issue of whether they want Ukraine to become an independent state. The participants of this joint session also appealed to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR to hold a similar referendum on the question of Ukrainian independence throughout all of Ukraine.

UKRAINIAN PEOPLE'S DEPUTY: "REFERENDUM IS ILLEGAL"

KYIV, February 19 — The upcoming March referendum on a new union treaty for the USSR is "illegal" in the estimation of Serhiy Holovaty, a People's Deputy of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet and legal scholar.

In an article in the "Vechirniy Kyiv" newspaper here, Holovaty writes: "In accordance with several international human rights covenants to which Ukraine is a signatory, each nation has the right to freely decide its legal status. In this case, several nations are deciding for each other... Perhaps, one should first ask one's own nation if it wants its fate decided outside its national borders".

He further makes the point that the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet obliged itself in October 1990 to draft a new constitution for the republic as a prerequisite to participation in any referendums on a new union treaty. Ukraine's new constitution is as yet undone. In this respect, Holovatyι condemns the support given to the referendum by Supreme Soviet Chairman Leonid Kravchuk — a Gorbachev ally — whom he accuses of “not defending the state sovereignty of Ukraine”, which was proclaimed by the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet in July 1990.

Holovatyι concludes his article with a call to suspend the holding of the referendum on Ukrainian territory. He is a member of the pro-independence, pro-democracy minority bloc (Narodna Rada) in the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet.

KYIV NEWSPAPER: UKRAINE IS PRODUCTION LEADER

KYIV, February 19 — The “Vechirniy Kyiv” newspaper here reported that Ukraine ranks among Europe's most productive countries. Based on 1989 official Soviet governmental statistics that compare Ukraine with Britain, Italy, France, and West Germany, the newspaper reported that Ukraine ranks first in the production of coal, iron ore, steel, potatoes, and sugar. With regard to natural gas and oil, Ukraine ranks second behind Britain; with regard to grain, milk, and butter, Ukraine ranks second behind France.

“Vechirniy Kyiv” made the disclosure in the context of the current debate on whether Ukraine should oppose or support a new union treaty for the USSR.

NATIONALIST YOUTH UNITE IN EAST UKRAINIAN PROVINCE

KHARKIV, February 23 — Following a founding conference, Ukrainian nationalist youth groups in this highly-Russified region united to form a “Youth League”. The new coalition's charter states: “Youth League members can be any youth organisations in the Kharkiv province whose activity is based on a platform of Ukrainian nationalism”. Current “Youth League” members are the Ukrainian Youth Association (SUM), the Ukrainian Student Association of Mykola Mikhnovskyι (TUSM) and the “Sokil” youth organisation.

“The very fact that the ‘Youth League’ has been created is a major development for Kharkiv province”, said Kost Cheremskyι, chairman of “Sokil”. Cheremskyι also reported that following its founding conference, the “Youth League” held a public demonstration in memory of persons who died in the struggle for an independent Ukraine.

INDEPENDENT LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION FORMED

KYIV — The Association of Ukrainian Attorneys, the first non-Party organisation for the legal profession in Ukraine, was recently formed here.

Among its leading members are People's Deputies of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Serhiy Holovaty, Levko Lukyanenko and Oleksander Yemets. Other members of the organisation include the defence lawyers of People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, who has been incarcerated by Communist authorities since November 1990.

In a news release, the lawyers set themselves the following goals: a) reestablishment of a Ukrainian school of law; b) establishment of international contacts in order to reap the benefits of contemporary, international legal developments; c) raising the legal consciousness of Ukraine's population, including promoting the role of Ukraine's legislative parliament; d) improving the legal knowledge of Ukraine's parliamentarians.

PRO-INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENTS MEET IN GEORGIA: Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Estonia, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland Delegations Present

TBILISI, Georgia, February 23-24 — With pro-independence groups from 7 nations in attendance, the tenth Congress of Subjugated Nations was held here. Despite taking place amid a continuing crackdown on nationalist activity by Ministry of Interior troops, the conference made moves towards creating a formal common front devoted to toppling Moscow's rule of the USSR.

In the days before the conference of allied anti-centre groupings, members of the Georgian nationalist paramilitary group "Mhedrioni" ("Saviours") were arrested by pro-centre security forces. Indeed, the conference opened with many delegates attending a public demonstration calling for the removal of Soviet armed forces from Georgia. The rally was sponsored by the National Congress of Georgia, an "opposition parliament", that views the Supreme Soviet of Georgia as a colonial institution.

Conference deliberations began with reports from each of the nations — Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Estonia, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania — on their respective current situations. Poland was also represented. A clear pattern emerged in the reports. Almost all the speakers were critical of the "parliamentary path" to national independence, wherein nationalist groups would vie with the Communist Party for seats in their respective republican Supreme Soviets. Hence, they urged the formation of independent, alternative legislative and administrative bodies and national armed forces.

Vasyl Barladianu, a delegate of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA), recommended that the pro-independence movements formally unite and coordinate their activities within a common front. He suggested the model of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), which was initially created in 1943 by several nationalist partisan formations, and remains active to the present time in the West. The ABN's long-time chairman was Yaroslav Stetsko, the former Prime Minister of Ukraine, who died in 1986. The organisation is now headed by his widow, Slava Stetsko.

"On the one hand, the national liberation movements of the subjugated nations are gaining strength and, on the other, the pressure from Moscow to sign a 'new union treaty' is growing. As never before, it is necessary to coordinate the activities of all the subjugated peoples", said Barladianu.

Many of the national representations present announced their support in principle for Barladianu's concept. Thus, on the formal proposition of the Ukrainian delegation, the conference resolved to meet next in Ukraine on April 13-14 and, at that time, to move to officially restore the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN) on the territory of the USSR.

Among the conference participants were the following organisations: Party of National Independence of Georgia; National-Democratic Party of Georgia; Citizens' League of Georgia; "Ilya the Righteous" Society of Georgia; Latvian National Congress; Latvian National Committee; Union of Nationalist Youth "Young Lithuania"; League for the Freedom of Lithuania; United Republican Party of Estonia; Party of National Independence of Estonia; Anti-Bolshevik Faction of the Byelorussian National Front; Union for the National Self-Determination of Armenia; "Musavat" Party of Azerbaijan; Azerbaijani National Front; "Free Solidarity" of Poland; Forum "Warsaw 90"; Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA); Ukrainian Nationalist Association (UNS); "State Independence of Ukraine" Association (DSU); Ukrainian Independent Youth Association (SNUM); Committee in Defence of Human Rights in Ukraine; Committee for the Creation of Ukrainian Armed Forces.

UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST LEADER SPEAKS OUT ON CRISIS IN USSR

LVIV — "The Soviet Russian empire is moving towards collapse", said Yuriy Shukhevych, chairman of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA), a militant nationalist coalition, which is gaining popular support amongst Ukrainians eager to achieve political independence.

Political statesmanship is new to Shukhevych. For more than 25 years before his 1990 release, Shukhevych was not a politician, but a prisoner of conscience. He is

blind as a result of his imprisonment. His "crime": refusal to denounce his father, who commanded the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which fought the Nazi and Soviet occupational forces.

In a recent interview, Shukhevych focused on the March 17 Gorbachev-sponsored referendum on a "new union treaty" for the USSR.

Shukhevych said: "Ukrainians at the end of the 20th century need not have to vote in favour of their right to independence. In our time, we have already 'cast our votes' for independence with our blood... I feel that it is insulting to take part in this voting... In any event, the question is already answered. Even if 100% vote against a 'new union treaty', our fate will not be decided by the referendum, but by the powers that be in Moscow".

Shukhevych's UMA has condemned the referendum, stating on February 1 that a fair staging is impossible "under a colonial administration and an army of occupation". In a position that reflects that of 7 USSR republics that are boycotting the plebiscite, the UMA further pledged to "not recognise the results of the referendum".

When asked to analyse the current situation in Ukraine, Shukhevych replied that pro-reform groups, such as the People's Movement of Ukraine — Rukh, are "collapsing and becoming ineffectual". He noted that "a new wave, a third force" is coming onto the political scene: the nationalist parties brought together by the UMA, which refuse to take part in parliamentary politics or enter into any dialogues with the ruling Communists.

"We occupy the extreme position on the political spectrum, directly juxtaposed to the Communist Party. In time, the Inter-Party Assembly shall unite all forces, which truly stand for national independence and not federation or confederacy. Nor, can we accept some pseudo-independence, in which we will be formally given our own President and our own flag and then be like some South American 'banana republic' dependent on our neighbour to the North", Shukhevych said.

In terms of its pro-independence strategy, Shukhevych's UMA is organising an "alternative parliament" based on the model of the Central Rada that ruled an independent Ukraine in 1918-1920. Millions of residents of Ukraine have been registered by the UMA as "constituents" of the new body, which is slated to meet for the first time in the coming months.

"Ukraine is an occupied territory, a colony and, therefore, we cannot take part in any occupational institutions, even multi-party ones [such as the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR — ed.]", said Shukhevych.

POLITICAL TRIALS AND PERSECUTION IN UKRAINE

KYIV, March 2 — In late February and early March, one Ukrainian nationalist activist continued to stand trial, a second was beaten in prison, and a third was physically abused by KGB officers during an interrogation; reported the independent "Respublika" news service. In what opposition spokesmen have termed the first political trial of the Gorbachev era, Yaroslav Demydas — chairman of the Ternopil Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church — continued to stand trial for allegedly assaulting 18 militia troops in front of the building of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet in Kyiv on October 2, 1990.

People's Deputies from the pro-independence "Narodna Rada" minority in the Supreme Soviet — including Mykhailo and Bohdan Horyn, Yaroslav Kendzior and Leopold Taburyanskyi — have testified in Demydas' defence. On February 28, they submitted a videotape of the October 2 incident to the Kyiv court, which illustrates their contention that Demydas is being framed; they called the trial a "conscious provocation on the part of the authorities against democratic forces in Ukraine". The opposition has also stated that the Demydas trial is being used by the Communist regime "to test the waters" before the expected trial of prominent opposition People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, who has been held since late November for allegedly assaulting an armed militia officer. Amnesty International and dozens of Western parliamentarians have expressed their concerns on the Khmara case.

Meanwhile, a defence attorney for Leonid Berezanskyi, a nationalist labour leader incarcerated since late November in conjunction with the Khmara case, announced that his client was beaten in prison in late February. Mykhailo Krulka said that three prisoners held on criminal charges were put into Berezanskyi's cell and proceeded to assault him. "This was done to make Berezanskyi change his behaviour and begin to give evidence against Khmara", said the lawyer.

Additionally, it was announced by his defence lawyer that Mykola Holovach — a Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly leader who is also being held in relation to the Khmara affair — has been on a hunger strike since February 18 because prison authorities will not let him meet with a priest. On February 23, Oleksander Snizhko — a local student who had escorted a shipment of medical aid to Lithuania in late January — was apprehended by unidentified men apparently from the Kyiv KGB. Close to midnight, Snizhko was assaulted by two plainclothes men in the street, who twisted his arm behind his back and forced him into a waiting sedan. For several hours, Snizhko was questioned by three plainclothes men who did not identify themselves. They demanded that he sign a confession stating that he travelled to Lithuania to take part in an armed rebellion against "military and Soviet organs". Snizhko refused to sign and was subsequently beaten about the

head, picked up by his hair, and had his throat stepped on repeatedly. At 5:00 a.m., a handcuffed Snizhko was driven to a forest outside Kyiv and dumped in the snow.

UKRAINE AGAINST NEW UNION TREATY

KYIV, March 3 — Across Ukraine, pro-independence organisations have been staging demonstrations calling for a “no” vote to March 17’s Gorbachev-sponsored referendum on a “new union treaty” for the USSR, reported the independent “Respublika” news service.

In late February and early March, massive anti-treaty rallies were held in the eastern and central provinces of Dnipropetrovsk, Chernihiv and Luhansk, as well as throughout the highly politicised western regions of Ukraine. In Luhansk, local militia troops attempted to disrupt peaceful anti-treaty pickets. Suspect tactics were evident elsewhere, as Communist media authorities in the Chernivtsi province on February 20 refused to grant representatives of the People’s Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) local television or radio time to express their views on the upcoming referendum.

On February 21, People’s Deputy Levko Lukyanenko — one of the leading members of the “Narodna Rada” pro-independence minority in the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet — unsuccessfully proposed that a question regarding the creation of an independent, democratic Ukrainian state be attached to the referendum. Several democratic groups, such as the Ukrainian Republican Party and Rukh, are also calling for a “no” vote to an additional question attached to the referendum by the Communist-controlled Supreme Soviet. The additional question states: “Do you agree that Ukraine should enter a union of sovereign states based on the principles of its Declaration of State Sovereignty?” The democratic opposition unanimously condemned the Communist regime for not acting to realise any of the tenets of the Declaration, passed in July 1990.

Militant nationalist groups, led by the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, reject the referendum as “illegal and illegitimate” and are calling for a total boycott. Support for the militants has increased markedly in recent months, as Ukraine faces a worsening economic situation and a renewed crackdown on pro-independence activism by Communist authorities.

DOCUMENTS & REPORTS

THE STEPAN KHMARA CASE	80
LABOUR LEADER ISSUES STATEMENT FROM PRISON	88
AFL-CIO PRESIDENT INTERVENES ON BEHALF OF ARRESTED ACTIVISTS	90
DEMOCRATIC FORCES ISSUE APPEAL TO UKRAINIAN SOLDIERS	91
SURVEY INDICATES OVERWHELMING OPPOSITION TO UNION TREATY	92
TOP OFFICIAL: UKRAINE'S HEALTH IN CRITICAL CONDITION	
<i>Peter Shmigel, UCIS-Australia</i>	93
INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY ISSUES APPEAL TO UKRAINIAN SOLDIERS	94
INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY REJECTS REFERENDUM	96

THE STEPAN KHMARA CASE *Khmara Evicted From Supreme Soviet*

KYIV, November 14 — The hard-line, Communist majority in the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet voted at its evening meeting to deprive Deputy Stepan Khmara of parliamentary immunity and to initiate criminal proceedings against him, reported the Information Department of the Lviv branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP).

The Communist reactionaries accepted the proposition of the republic's Procurator-General, Mykhailo Potebenko (a people's deputy from the Mykolayiv oblast), and the chairman of the permanent parliamentary commission on legality, Yaroslav Kondratiev (a people's deputy from Kyiv, and head of criminal investigations at the Ministry of Internal Affairs).

This decision was made in connection with an incident involving Colonel Ihor Hryhoriev from the criminal investigations branch of the militia, which occurred on November 7 in an underground passage on Kyiv's central Khreshchatyk boulevard.

On November 7, an unknown individual in civilian dress, who later turned out to be none other than Colonel Hryhoriev, assaulted a woman who was taking part in the protest action to prevent the military parade marking the anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution from taking place. Deputy Khmara, who witnessed the incident, asked the woman whether she could identify her assailant. Hryhoriev was recognised at the other end of the passage and when Khmara demanded to see his identity papers, Hryhoriev refused to show them. Passers-by who observed what was going on, then took it upon themselves to confiscate his papers.

Unless otherwise stated, all the material in this section was provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service

As it later became clear, this was a provocation against the Narodna Rada (People's Council — democratic opposition bloc in the Supreme Soviet) staged by the organs of internal security, who filmed the entire incident. Their video recording was shown on Ukrainian television, without presenting the views of those who suffered at the hands of the militia on November 7.

On November 12, when the Supreme Soviet reconvened after a week's recess, some 500 militia officers staged an officially-sanctioned demonstration outside the Supreme Soviet building, demanding the immediate enactment of a law on the militia, a parliamentary commission to review Khmara's case, and criminal charges against him. They also demanded protection for those who suffered on November 7, although from the placards they were holding it was clear that citizens need protection from the Narodna Rada (People's Council — the democratic opposition in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR).

A sanctioned demonstration was also held that morning by Communists from the Odessa and Mykolayiv oblasts. They accused the Narodna Rada of nationalism and anti-Communism, and called for the dismissal of the Democratic Bloc deputies.

The morning session began with the reading of a statement of the militia officials, containing the following demands:

- the immediate enactment of a law on the militia;
- riot police is to take responsibility for maintaining order during public rallies;
- Stepan Khmara, Mykhailo Horyn and Serhiy Holovaty are to be deprived of deputy status and criminal charges are to be brought against them.

During that day's session, the Procurator-General of the republic, Potebenko, accused Democratic Bloc deputies of unlawful actions, which included calling on television for a campaign of civil disobedience and attempts to obstruct the military parade in Kyiv. He described the incident with Colonel Hryhoriev as a "malicious act" against an officer of the militia and an attempt to discredit the law enforcement agencies in general. Potebenko accused all those responsible for the conflict on November 7 of "physically dealing with a militia officer and the theft of his personal possessions and papers". He also read out a statement from the parliamentary majority demanding that criminal charges be brought against Stepan Khmara.

The Procurator-General's statement was followed by an attack against the Narodna Rada by the "group of 239" (the hard-line Communist deputies). Characteristically, their attacks failed to mention the dozens of people who were hurt in clashes with riot police on October 2 and 27 and November 7.

Towards the end of the morning session, Narodna Rada deputies Mykhailo Horyn, Stepan Khmara and Oleksander Yemets were allowed to address the members of the Supreme Soviet.

Mykhailo Horyn declared that as long as militia officers have control over people's deputies, a democratic Ukrainian state is impossible. He described the

militia demonstration as an attempt to disrupt the work of the Supreme Soviet and stated that the Narodna Rada will be forced to call for another mass political strike.

In his address to the Supreme Soviet Stepan Khmara charged that a campaign of slander and defamation has been launched against him and his colleagues from the democratic opposition in connection with the events of November 6-7. When he attempted to explain the incident with Colonel Hryhoriev from his point of view, and to bring up several facts which were not mentioned in the other addresses, the Communist majority shouted Khmara down forcing him to leave the podium.

At this time, the majority of deputies from the Narodna Rada received threatening letters, written in Russian, stating that the time to deal with them is drawing near.

After such preparations, the reactionaries demonstrated their strength. On November 14, half an hour before the end of the evening session, Procurator Potebenko notified the deputies that he had received authorisation to deal with the Stepan Khmara case. He further pointed out that, although he regards Khmara guilty of a crime, parliamentary consent would be required to bring him to justice.

Potebenko's statement was followed by addresses from the majority and from the Democratic Bloc. Larysa Skoryk said that the incident on November 7 was a definite provocation. Oleksander Hudyma pointed out that, after he was beaten up by the militia in the Cherkasy oblast, he wrote to the Procurator-General but to date has not received a reply. Other democratic deputies who tried to speak were heckled by the hard-liners.

Kondratiev was allowed to speak and stated that he had a draft decree declaring Stepan Khmara guilty of violating the criminal code and demanding that he be brought to justice.

Ihor Yukhnovskiy's proposal that the case be reviewed by a separate commission and Ivan Makar's statement that the Procurator had himself violated the law on numerous occasions were ignored.

The chairman of the Supreme Soviet, Leonid Kravchuk, put Kondratiev and Potebenko's proposition to the vote. At that point the Narodna Rada deputies left the hall. The remaining 301 deputies then voted in favour of depriving Khmara of deputy status and opening criminal proceedings against him.

Since the broadcast of the video about the November 7 incident, the people of Kyiv have been coming forward with testimonies about the transgressions by Colonel Hryhoriev, who is notorious for his dispersal of public meetings in the capital city. Immediately after the end of that evening's session, a spontaneous public rally was held to discuss Stepan Khmara's defence.

The next day, November 15, in Ivano-Frankivsk, the Council of the city's branch of the People's Movement of Ukraine (Rukh), began to collect petitions in defence of Khmara. At 6:00 p.m., a rally in support of Stepan Khmara was held on the

square in front of the provincial council. During lunch break that day, the city's businesses etc. held meetings in support of Khmara.

A month and a half into its second session, the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet was no closer to taking any constructive steps towards genuine democratisation in the spirit of the adopted Declaration on Sovereignty. This latest campaign against the democratic opposition shows very clearly that Declaration or no Declaration, it is business as usual at the Supreme Soviet.

Nationalist Deputy Arrested in Legislative Chamber

Stepan Khmara, an opposition parliamentarian, was forcibly arrested on November 17 in the chamber of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine. The arrest was ordered by the legislature's Communist majority on November 14 and stems from an earlier incident in which Mr. Khmara protected an anti-Communist demonstrator who was being physically assaulted by a militia officer.

Opposition parliamentarians and other nationalist leaders condemned the arrest as illegal. Following the November 14 vote to arrest Mr. Khmara, a group of 14 opposition deputies proclaimed a protest hunger strike inside the Supreme Soviet chamber. They also vowed to physically protect Mr. Khmara, who remained with them, from arrest.

"The vote to arrest Khmara breaks all parliamentary rules. No quorum was established. No mandatory committee work took place beforehand. The official procedure for dismissing a parliamentarian was totally ignored", said the statement of the group of protesting deputies from the Democratic Bloc opposition coalition.

At 10:15 a.m. on November 17, however, 10 plainclothes militiamen entered the chamber, broke through the cordon of opposition deputies, and abducted Mr. Khmara. Democratic Bloc deputies report that Mr. Khmara was being held in the Lukyaniv prison.

Stepan Khmara, a political prisoner for more than 10 years during the Brezhnev era, is vice-chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP), one of the strongest partners in the Democratic Bloc opposition in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR. Mr. Khmara's popularity recently soared when he took a leading role in supporting nationalist student hunger strikes in Kyiv in October. Mr. Khmara helped the students to force Ukraine's Communists to make several concessions with regard to pro-independence reform.

On November 7, Mr. Khmara was also in the forefront, when he led demonstrators in a protest against the Bolshevik Revolution military parade. While the demonstrators' procession moved along, Mr. Khmara saw a man in civilian dress beating one of the demonstrators and proceeded to stand between the man and the woman under attack. Other demonstrators restrained the attacker. Upon being searched, the man was found carrying a concealed handgun and an ID card,

which indicated that he was a colonel in the militia — Ihor Hryhoriev. The authorities alleged that Mr. Khmara attacked Col. Hryhoriev.

Immediately following Mr. Khmara's arrest, protests began to take place in Kyiv and elsewhere. Reports indicated that buses attempting to reach Kyiv from other regions for the demonstrations were being stopped by militia units.

Two witnesses of the incident in Kyiv on November 7 — Mykola Holovach, chairman of the citizens' committee of Kyiv and the Kyiv province and a member of the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party (UNDP), and Leonid Berezanskyi, from the citizens' committee and a UNDP member, who took part in restraining Colonel Hryhoriev — were also arrested and are now in prison, according to reports from Ukraine.

Parliamentarian Held in Prison

Stepan Khmara, an anti-Communist MP in Ukraine's Supreme Soviet, is being held here in a local prison after his arrest on the orders of the country's conservative Communists.

Khmara — a leader of the nationalist, democratic opposition in Ukraine's Communist-controlled parliament — was forcibly taken into custody in the Supreme Soviet's chamber on November 17. As an act of protest, he had remained in the chamber with a group of fellow opposition MPs since the November 14 vote by the Communist majority to arrest him on criminal charges.

The arrest of Khmara — a former political prisoner under Brezhnev and current vice-chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party — stems from a November 7 incident when he was leading a protest against the military's commemoration of the Bolshevik Revolution anniversary. According to eyewitnesses, a militia colonel, Ihor Hryhoriev, provoked an altercation with Khmara.

Since Khmara's arrest, several people have come forward to allege that Hryhoriev has provoked similar incidents at past pro-democracy, pro-independence demonstrations in Ukraine. Olha Matusevych of Kyiv publicly claims to have been repeatedly struck in the stomach by the militia colonel at an April 1989 rally.

Marika Czyhryn, an Australian journalist, who is related to Khmara, said: "The Communists in the Supreme Soviet, who can thank vote tampering and fraud in the April 1990 elections for their majority, need to get rid of Khmara because he is one of the most popular opposition leaders in Ukraine today. The order to arrest Khmara was totally illegal. There was no quorum present and all the mandatory procedural rules were ignored".

According to Anatoliy Dotsenko of the independent "Respublika" Press Agency, mass demonstrations in protest against Khmara's arrest are taking place in Ukraine's major cities. However, opposition leaders are discouraging their supporters from confronting rank-and-file Communists who are being brought to

Kyiv by the regime for “spontaneous demonstrations” in support of pro-Moscow policies. Also, the Patriarch of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, who recently returned to Ukraine after 50 years in exile, condemned the Communist regime’s actions.

Stepan Khmara Declares a Hunger Strike

Stepan Khmara, generally recognised throughout all of Ukraine as the most militant people's deputy in the democratic opposition of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, declared a hunger strike against his arrest, following an incident which occurred during the October Day military parade in Kyiv on November 7, 1990. On that day Mr. Khmara tried to stop Col. Hryhoriev of the militia from physically assaulting a woman for no apparent reason. In turn, he was accused by Col. Hryhoriev of physical assault, subsequently denied immunity from arrest (which is the privilege of every people's deputy) and finally placed under arrest. It is becoming increasingly clear, from reports recently received from Ukraine, that the entire incident of November 7 involving Khmara was a surreptitious provocation, designed to discredit Mr. Khmara — a most outspoken opponent of the Communist, colonial regime in Kyiv.

Press Statement by Stepan Khmara

- The scandalous conduct of the office of prosecutor, notably the prosecutor of the republic, Potebenko, which are attempts to cover up lawlessness and the political bankruptcy of the partisan mafia of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Ukraine;
- The unceasing disinformation campaign by the Communist media outlets regarding the circumstances of the November 7 incident on Independence [October Revolution] Square. The speculations surrounding my name and the overt lies about the facts in the course of the investigation of this incident, in which member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, L. Kravchuk, is implicated;
- The adamant refusal of the office of prosecutor to bring to justice the provocateur-hooligan MVD colonel Hryhoriev;
- The spinelessness of the Supreme Soviet, which stems from the appeasement policies of its Communist leadership, inflames the aggressive Communist “group of 239” to pursue ever-increasing attacks against the democratic forces and blatant highhandedness. The Supreme Soviet is unable to defend its members — people’s deputies — from attacks against their honour, from physical and political repression;

leave me no other recourse but to state the following:

- 1) L. Kravchuk deliberately lied at the press conference on November 19, stating that prior to my arrest I categorically declined to testify to the prosecutor, and only did so after my arrest. In his traditional style, Kravchuk again lied. On November 7 I offered an explanation, and on November 13 I testified as a witness and victim, before the presiding prosecutor Kharchenko of the Kyiv prosecutor's office. After my arrest, I refused to testify and will continue to refuse to testify.
- 2) In protest against the fabrications against me I declare an indefinite hunger strike beginning on November 26, 1990.

My demands are the following:

- a. The firing of prosecutor Potebenko.
- b. The release of the persons who participated in detaining and disarming the provocateur, Colonel Hryhoriev.
- c. Criminal proceedings and the arrest of Hryhoriev.
- d. My release and recognition as a victim (Hryhoriev physically and verbally accosted me, leading to psychological and physical suffering, which can be attested to by eyewitnesses).

During my hunger strike I will not allow doctors to see me or interfere in any way, nor will I offer any information about my state of health.

People's Deputy Stepan Khmara
November 22, 1990

Ukrainian Priest Denied Access to Khmara

DECEMBER 12 — People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, who was arrested on trumped-up charges in the debating chamber of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet on November 17, asked Yaroslav Lesiv, a Ukrainian Catholic priest, to visit him in the Lukyaniv prison, where he is being held, in order to hear his confession and so that he could receive communion.

Upon arriving at the prison, Rev. Lesiv went to see the warden, Petro Konarchuk, who did not allow him to meet Stepan Khmara, claiming that the doctors had made a decision that Khmara was not to receive visitors.

Rev. Lesiv persisted and was allowed to meet the doctors from the General Military Hospital of the Ukr.SSR Interior Ministry, Anatoliy Treshchynskyi, Serhiy Mihotin, Leonid Avilov, Serhiy Lavryk, and Olha Antonenko, who informed him that Stepan Khmara is already in a critical condition, in connection with which he was placed on life support systems in order to save his life.

According to the doctors, Stepan Khmara was going to be transferred from the Lukyaniv prison to the General Military Hospital as the prison hospital is insufficiently equipped.

Mykhailo Ratushnyi, the chairman of the Kyiv strike committee, who is also imprisoned in the Lukyaniv prison, was also holding a hunger strike in protest against his unlawful arrest and that of Stepan Khmara and the other activists, arrested in connection with what has now come to be known as the "Hryhoriev incident". According to his defence lawyer, Serhiy Nechytailo, Ratushnyi's health has also greatly deteriorated. Prison warden Konarchuk pointed out that Ratushnyi was placed in solitary confinement because hunger strikes are a violation of prison regulations. According to the doctors, Ratushnyi was to be force-fed from December 14 on.

Rev. Lesiv said that religious services were being held in all Ukrainian Catholic churches to pray for Stepan Khmara.

Khmara Ends Hunger Strike

According to Bohdan Horyn, a People's Deputy to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet and a leading activist in the democratic, national-liberation movement, Stepan Khmara decided to end his 17-day hunger strike after Metropolitan Volodymyr Sterniuk of the Ukrainian Catholic Church visited him in prison on December 13. Metropolitan Sterniuk, Horyn stated, pleaded with Khmara to terminate his protest action.

Deputies Appeal to Democratic Parliaments

The Deputies from the Narodna Rada (People's Council), which constitutes the democratic opposition in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, have issued the following appeal to all parliamentarians of the free and democratic countries of the world to intercede on behalf of Stepan Khmara, a People's Deputy and a leading figure in the Ukrainian national-liberation movement. Khmara was illegally arrested on trumped-up charges in what was obviously an attempt to discredit him. The full text of the appeal is printed below.

APPEAL

TO THE PARLIAMENTS OF THE WORLD

The Narodna Rada (People's Council), the opposition in the Parliament of the sovereign Republic of Ukraine, appeals to all the Parliaments of the world to help us in our striving to secure the release from prison of Stepan Khmara — a human rights activist, a former prisoner of conscience, and an initiator of the Helsinki Human Rights Movement, who has been imprisoned as a result of an illegal decision of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine.

We view the unprecedented arrest of this parliamentary deputy within the walls of Parliament as a return to neo-Stalinism, to the infamous trials of Daniel and

Sinyavsky, Bukovsky and Yuri Orlov, Dzhemilev and Vasyl Stus, Mirab Kostava and Zviad Gamsakhodia, and the trampling of Andriy Sakharov's testament.

We ask you to help save the life of this individual who declared a political hunger strike on November 26, 1990, and is now close to death.

Democracy in Ukraine is in peril!

Help defend human rights!

Narodna Rada

Kyiv

5 December 1990

LABOUR LEADER ISSUES STATEMENT FROM PRISON

KYIV — Mykhailo Ratushnyi, the chairman of the Kyiv Strike Committee, who is presently under arrest in connection with the now infamous "Hryhoriev incident", has issued an open letter/Declaration, addressed to the officer in charge of Lukyaniv Prison, where Ratushnyi is being held. Ratushnyi began a hunger strike on December 2 in protest against his illegal arrest. The full text of this Declaration is printed below.

*To: The officer in charge of the Mykhailo Ratushnyi case,
prisoner held in solitary confinement in Lukyaniv Prison*

DECLARATION

TODAY MARKS THE TENTH DAY OF MY HUNGER STRIKE

From the very beginning of my hunger strike, my defenders, colleagues, friends, acquaintances and those who remained on the other side of the prison walls earnestly appealed to me to cease my protest. Their arguments regarding the impracticability of this action were well founded and convincing. Nonetheless, I continued my hunger strike.

Unexpectedly, on the ninth day of my hunger strike, I was permitted to see my mother, despite the fact that all of her numerous, previous attempts to see me were refused. My mother appealed to me and delivered appeals to me to end my hunger strike from my father, my family, my loved ones. She demanded that I end my hunger strike, for certainly only a mother may demand such a thing. I concurred with her and attempted to console her, as much as is possible for a son who is imprisoned to console his mother. Nonetheless, I continued my hunger strike.

I have dealt with the numerous demands of the administration, their "friendly conversations" with me, in which they so convincingly discussed the futility, ineffectuality and even the ridiculousness of my hunger strike that I could not bring myself to argue with them. Nonetheless, I continued my hunger strike.

And thus, after all the arguments have been exhausted and a complete analysis of the situation has been presented, I am now being force-fed.

I am not writing this letter in order to elicit pity from anyone, or to justify my actions. I am writing to those people who have sincerely implored that I end my hunger strike; to those people whose moral and spiritual support I have felt throughout this ordeal. It is because of their support that I have the strength to continue my hunger strike.

My intention is not to convince anyone of anything. All individuals choose their own path. Although at times it is difficult to judge whether we choose the path, or whether the path chooses us.

I will not reiterate my reasons for the hunger strike, nor my demands. They have already been communicated in my declaration dated December 2. However, to this day, not one of my demands has been met: the illegal arrest of Stepan Khmara continues; Mykola Holovach, Leonid Berezanskyi and others have not been released; the hooligan and provocateur Hryhoriev remains at liberty, no doubt continuing in his "law enforcement" capacity; and I am still denied the possibility of the sacrament of confession with my priest.

My demands not only remain unsatisfied, they are totally ignored.

Under these circumstances, how can I possibly end my hunger strike?

Somewhere, within these walls, Stepan Khmara, who's health is in critical condition, is continuing his hunger strike. And beyond these prison walls, the campaign of lies and attempts to discredit his good name specifically and that of the national-liberation movement in general, is also continuing.

Within the next few days, the Communists of the Ukrainian SSR will gather in Kyiv. It is thanks to the members of this organisation that Ukraine has been denied her right to independence and statehood. In the name of this organisation, my nation has been plundered, its land and culture, stolen. . .

The path to Ukrainian statehood and independence is a long one. We are not the first to travel upon it. Before us, millions of innocents were martyred and exterminated. Before us thousands of people fought for their rights to be masters of their own land.

I have not written this in order to distinguish myself with a heroic act. But in everything I have done and everywhere I have been, I have always remembered them and strove to be worthy of those who went before me along the path to Ukrainian independence.

We are not the first and we will not be the last to travel this path. And if my example serves someone who will come after me, then what I am doing, will not be in vain.

I am writing this for those like-minded people who have not yet translated their thoughts into action.

Because the choice means of resistance and struggle available to me is limited and because I understand that time is of the essence and action is required now — I am continuing my hunger strike.

Glory to Ukraine!

Lukyaniv Prison 12.12.9

M. Ratushnyi

AFL-CIO PRESIDENT INTERVENES ON BEHALF OF ARRESTED ACTIVISTS

WASHINGTON, D.C. — Lane Kirkland, the President of the largest American trade union — the AFL-CIO — has written a letter, dated December 4, 1990, to Leonid Kravchuk, the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, urging him to secure the immediate release of People's Deputy Stepan Khmara and Mykhailo Ratushnyi. In the letter, Mr. Kirkland states that he is writing on behalf of "14 million American workers of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations to express concern at the arrest and detention on November 19 of Mykhaylo Ratushny, a leader of the Coordinating Council of the Strike Committee of the Ukraine".

"An AFL-CIO delegation", Mr. Kirkland continues, "that visited the Ukraine in October 1990 had the occasion to hold a long discussion with Mykhaylo Ratushny. It came away convinced that he is a leader with a steadfast commitment to democratic change and peaceful worker protest". Mr. Kirkland further states that Ratushnyi "made clear his devotion to non-violent pressure on behalf of worker interests. We, therefore, are shocked to learn that this important worker activist is being held on false charges and that he was arrested and manhandled in brutal fashion by unidentified men in an unmarked car on November 19th".

"The AFL-CIO regards the arrest of Mykhaylo Ratushny and Ukrainian People's Deputy Stepan Khmara", the letter continues, "as well as evidence of harassment of other Ukrainian workers to be a violation of basic workers rights...". Mr. Kirkland concludes by writing: "I, therefore, urge you to act quickly to secure the immediate release of Mykhaylo Ratushny and People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, a former political prisoner... I call on the Ukrainian KGB to drop trumped-up charges against these two important democratic leaders. The AFL-CIO stands in solidarity with Brothers Ratushny and Khmara and with the Strike Committee of the Ukraine. I can assure you that we will do everything within our means to assure that justice is done in their cases and those guilty of this provocation against democracy are exposed".

DEMOCRATIC FORCES ISSUE APPEAL TO UKRAINIAN SOLDIERS

The following appeal to the soldiers of Ukraine, signed by the Ukrainian Republican Party, the Military-Sport Society "Sich", and the Soldiers' Mothers Committee, is presently being circulated throughout Ukraine. The full text of this appeal is printed below.

APPEAL

To Soldiers, Sergeants and Officers of the Soviet Army — Ukrainian Citizens

The peoples of the Communist empire have begun to liberate themselves. The struggle for liberation from totalitarianism and the imperial yoke, from the misery of "Communist paradise", is entering its decisive stage. Communist ideology and socialist development have exhausted and discredited themselves. The administrative-command leviathan, which defends the privileged position of the Party mafia and the sharks of the military-industrial complex, is based solely on the force of the bayonet and is prepared to use military force in order to save itself from destruction.

There is no need to explain to you that in an attempt to preserve their power the partocrats are prepared for everything, even for mass bloodshed. And they are going to spill the people's blood by your hands. Tbilisi, Baku and Karabakh testify to this. Attempts to prepare the ground for a confrontation between the army and the people of Ukraine are well known.

Gentlemen! You, soldiers, understand better than anyone else that when the shooting starts, bloodshed becomes uncontrollable and cannot be halted by an order from above. Surely, you will not agree to turn our country into a new Lebanon for the sake of the comfortable life of the Communist Party mafia? Surely, we will not allow ourselves to be dragged into endless and limitless bloodshed?

Soldiers! Consider whether the cynical rule of a group of modern-day exploiters, who find the little story about the "bright future" — Communism — so convenient, who have indiscriminately robbed everyone for 70 years, hiding behind words about the people's happiness — is worth the blood of the people? This new "dream of Communist bliss" does not justify new suffering.

Soldiers and sergeants! Join the awakened democratic forces, support the liberation of peoples, who are building independent states.

The recruits drafted in the autumn of 1990 and the spring of 1991 have to return to Ukraine for their military service. Soldiers from construction battalions have to return to Ukraine at the same time!

Officers! You are future citizens of a free Ukraine. Demand military service in Ukraine and use your professional knowledge to help your own people; build a new Ukrainian army!

National armed forces for independent states
Glory to Ukraine

*Ukrainian Republican Party
Military-Sport Society "Sich"
Soldiers' Mothers Committee*

SURVEY INDICATES OVERWHELMING OPPOSITION TO UNION TREATY

LUTSK — The Association for the Defence of Human Rights — one of the city's newly-formed independent organisations — recently carried out a sociological survey among the population of this city. The purpose of the survey was to gauge public opinion on the present socio-political processes in Ukraine.

The questionnaires were primarily distributed among the people who do not actively participate in public life or support any of the pro-democracy organisations or political parties. Sixty-eight% of those polled were workers; 31% white-collar workers; and 1% from other groups of the population. The survey revealed the following statistics:

1. 91% of the people are opposed to a new union treaty and 5% in favour; 4% did not reply.
2. 81% of the people regard the work of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet as ineffective, for which they blame the Communist majority in the Soviet; 11% blame the Narodna Rada (People's Council — the democratic opposition).
3. 75% condemn the arrest of People's Deputy Stepan Khmara; 13% approve of his arrest.
4. 73% oppose military service outside Ukraine, 13% are in favour; 87% are in favour of the establishment of a professional Ukrainian army, 4% disapprove.
5. 84% blame the Communists for the ecological crisis in Ukraine, 6% blame Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine).

TOP OFFICIAL: UKRAINE'S HEALTH IN CRITICAL CONDITION

By Peter Shmigel
UCIS-Australia

KYIV — Ukraine is experiencing severe health consequences because of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster and industrial pollution, according to a top health official in the 50-million-strong republic.

In a December 6, 1990, interview with the prominent weekly "Literaturna Ukrayina", Dr. Andriy M. Serdyuk — then deputy minister of health of the Ukrainian SSR — broke official silence and stated that Ukrainians' health was in "critical condition".

"Blatant mismanagement, criminal irresponsibility, and primitive understanding of technology are crucial factors in the destruction of our environment and, consequently, the individual person... Life expectancy in the republic is now 7.5 years lower for men and five years lower for women than in the developed countries. We sadly occupy first place in the world in terms of heart disease, allergies, bronchial asthma and diabetes... But the most tragic part is that we are doing irreparable harm not only to the health of those presently alive, but to future generations as well", said Dr. Serdyuk.

When asked to describe Ukraine's deteriorating health situation, the official listed a series of statistics recently compiled by his department.

"In the first half of 1989, the death rate jumped by 6.8% in comparison with the previous year. The rate was even higher in industrial centres. For example, in Kyiv, there was an 8.1% jump, which has no precedent in peace time. As a result of the increase in the death rate in the last year, average life expectancy in the republic has dropped by some five years", said Dr. Serdyuk.

The marked increase in deaths is coupled with a severe drop in births in the republic, which have fallen off by 13% since 1986, according to Dr. Serdyuk.

Additionally, he reported, the rate of still births and premature births has quintupled since 1980; the rate of children born with deformities has doubled since 1975; 25% of all infants are diagnosed as "ill", and 80% of school children have some health problem listed on their official records.

The statistics would be even worse if not "for the tragic fact that Ukraine is first in the world in abortions per capita as a result of a lack of contraceptives", said Dr. Serdyuk.

In Dr. Serdyuk's view, poor health in the republic is linked to industrial processes. He reported that 30% of all reported illnesses are related to workplaces, mainly the chemical, manufacturing and agriculture sectors. Furthermore, he stated that in most regions of Ukraine, air pollution is from five to 20 times above a

sustainable limit and that "overly aggressive" agrotechnology has led to contamination of almost all food products by pesticides and nitrates.

A study conducted by Dr. Serdyuk's department shows that atmospheric pollution in the Zaporizhia chemical-industrial region of southern Ukraine is so bad that if it continues at the same rate, the region will be uninhabitable for humans within 150 years.

Dr. Serdyuk also commented on the Chernobyl situation, revealing that approximately 1.8 million people still live on "radiated" territory and that more than 150,000 people, including 60,000 children, suffer from symptoms related to radiation poisoning.

When asked what has been done to deal with the crisis in Ukraine's national health, particularly with regard to Chernobyl's impact, Dr. Serdyuk replied that Western governments, capable of providing aid, rightly have little faith in USSR health officials and claimed that authorities in Moscow have previously misdirected funds and supplies intended for Chernobyl relief. He urged republican authorities to take more resolute action on their own initiative.

Commenting on why none of the above information had previously been talked about, Dr. Serdyuk replied: "Yes, we talked about it. But, unfortunately, not to journalists".

In unclear circumstances, Dr. Serdyuk is reported to have left the Ministry of Health following his disclosures in order to take up a public health research position.

INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY ISSUES APPEAL TO UKRAINIAN SOLDIERS

UCIS recently received the following Appeal to Ukrainian Soldiers, signed by Anatoliy Lupynis — the chairman of the Political Committee of the Inter-Party Assembly. We are printing the Appeal in full.

To Ukrainian Soldiers and Officers in military units on the territory of Ukraine

Dear Fellow Countrymen!

On behalf of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, which unites the radical political forces aspiring towards the independence of our native land, I appeal to you, whom the fate of a soldier of the imperial army has brought to far-off Georgia, bravely struggling for freedom and territorial integrity — to the ancient land of these friendly people — not as welcome guests, but as an occupying force, with arms to block this people's road to freedom.

The Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR passed a declaration on Ukrainian sovereignty, which the new president of the USSR treated so brutally. The Supreme

Soviet of the Ukr.SSR also adopted a decree on the return of all servicemen, drafted in Ukraine, to carry out military service in Ukraine — in their native land. But the Russian generals proved more powerful than the Ukrainian parliament.

To weaken the Ukrainian people, to incite hostility — to keep this people subjugated — the Kremlin and its agents in Ukraine are trying to partition Ukraine — by separating from it the Crimea, and the so called Donetsk-Kryvyi Rih and Novorosiysk republics — hoping thereby to incite hostility between Ukrainians and the Russians who live in the east and south of Ukraine, as they did before (in 1922) with the Georgians and Ossetians.

Tomorrow Georgian youths who are serving in Ukraine will be issued ammunition and will be sent into the streets of our towns and villages, where your relatives and friends, who remain at home and are joining the Ukrainian national-liberation movement on a mass scale, will become their victims. The Georgian youths-occupants will behave on your land just as you behave on theirs.

Think, young man! You are a slave yourself — do not enforce slavery on others!

Do not lose your conscience in a foreign land and your own land will be more fortunate!

The front of the struggle against the Communist mafia in the red empire knows no borders. The smallest loss suffered by the national-liberation movement of Georgia, or Azerbaijan, or Lithuania, weakens our Ukrainian national-liberation movement; and their smallest achievement brings closer the day when our people will be free. The time is coming when each of you must decide who he is: a patriot, or the scourge of a foreign land — a janissary as regards his own people.

Ukraine, as the most populous of the subjugated peoples, is particularly responsible for the fact that we are all still in imperialist bondage. As a son of a nation of 50 million, a soldier of an occupational army in the land of the Georgian people, think about how you can help Georgia. You are in the same unit as youths from other nations, so think about the common fate of all the subjugated peoples, about the need for a joint struggle for freedom, if not now, then in the future — for the need to prepare for this struggle. Presently, the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly and the radical political organisations of the national-liberation movements of other peoples are forming a Coalition of Anti-Imperial Forces (KAS).

In the face of the false claims of Communist propaganda that the national-liberation movements are inciting hostility between the peoples, think how international friendship and unity can be achieved in the struggle for freedom, and form a group in support of the KAS.

You can put all your questions to the Party of the National Independence of Georgia (Tbilisi, Sh. Rustaveli Prospect, 29), and the National-Democratic Party of Georgia (Tbilisi, Sh. Rustaveli Prospect, 21).

Chairman of the UMA Political Committee

A. Lupynis

Kyiv, 16.1.1991

INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY REJECTS REFERENDUM

UCIS recently received the following Statement of the Executive Council of the Inter-Party Assembly, in which this coalition of national-liberation parties, groups and organisations rejects the results of the upcoming Referendum on Gorbachev's proposed "union treaty". The Referendum is scheduled to be held on March 17, 1991, in Ukraine's 27 electoral districts. These include the republic's 25 provinces, the Crimea, and the separate electoral district created in Kyiv. This statement is printed below.

Statement of the UMA Executive Council

To Citizens of Ukraine and the Ukrainian People

The Russian empire, reestablished as the USSR by the imperialist armed forces, the deceptive idea of proletarian internationalism and the establishment of Communist parties of the so called republics in order to politically conceal the policy of aggression and annexation, is striving to attain legitimacy through a Referendum. Preparations for this Referendum are already underway: the mechanism to impose martial law has been in force since February 1. This is a clear affirmation of the true nature of this Referendum, which is going to be held under a colonial administration and an army of occupation.

Any Referendum on this issue is an insult to our people. The Ukrainian people has a long-standing and perpetual right to a free and independent existence in an independent state. Now, as we near the end of the 20th century, it is amoral and against all established norms to ask whether the Ukrainian people is ready to exercise this right, inasmuch as even the whole people, subjugated during one generation, cannot bequeath such a fate to future generations.

We declare that we will not recognise the results of the Referendum, and will continue to wage the struggle for full independence through means which we regard as the most acceptable and expedient.

Kyiv, February 1, 1991

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A quarterly journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

Summer, 1991

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A Quarterly Journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

EDITORIAL BOARD

Slava Stetsko <i>Editor</i>	Roman Zwarycz <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Borys Potapenko <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Lev Shankovsky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Dr. Oleh S. Romanyshyn <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Volodymyr Zarycky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Stephen Oleskiw <i>Associate Editor</i>

**Price: £5.00 or \$10.00 a single copy,
Annual Subscription: £20.00 or \$40.00**

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.

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

Vol. XXXIX, No. 2

A Quarterly Journal

Summer, 1991

CONTENTS

Editorial: SPECTRE OF STALINISM	2
CHORNOBYL REPORT	
<i>The Chornobyl Committee, London</i>	3
CURRENT TRENDS IN UKRAINE: A BRIEF ANALYSIS AND PROJECTION	<i>Ivan Lozowy</i> 23
UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE: THE PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT	
<i>Eugene Kachmarsky</i>	26
ENGLAND, RUSSIA AND THE UKRAINIAN QUESTION DURING THE GREAT NORTHERN WAR (PART 2)	<i>Theodore Mackiw</i> 29
NEWS FROM UKRAINE	42
DOCUMENTS & REPORTS	78

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

Spectre of Stalinism

In May the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and Mikhail Gorbachev approved a series of repressive laws, which are an obvious throwback to the days of Stalin.

The laws can hardly be considered in the spirit of democratic reform, which Gorbachev insists he introduced during his five-year reign.

One of the laws bans strikes across the USSR in order to stem economic chaos and the rising industrial militancy in all of the republics. Organisers of work stoppages can be prosecuted under this law.

Furthermore, the Supreme Soviet adopted a law enshrining the KGB's existence and detailing the scope of its powers. This law is not merely kudos for the secret police because the people's deputies endorsed the KGB's activities far beyond intelligence and counter-intelligence operations. According to newspaper reports, the measures include protection of the economic, technological, territorial and constitutional integrity of the state, fighting crime, guarding state borders and political leaders. The law also allows KGB officers to enter homes and commandeer cars and telephones, to tap telephones, intercept mail and use any other necessary means of surveillance.

Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the KGB, glibly commented, "We will try to justify the great confidence expressed in us by the Supreme Soviet to the happiness of our friends and the unhappiness of others".

These laws, coupled with the obvious forms of repression currently under way in Ukraine and the other subjugated nations, do not bode well for the national independence movements that are spreading across the Soviet empire. In Ukraine, the arrest and trial of Stepan Khmara and the other members of the "Kyiv 7", arrests, intimidations and harassment of national activists, demonstrate that Moscow and its colonial administration in Kyiv intend to decimate the independence movement and preserve the union no matter what the cost. The secret police — as it has had throughout Soviet Russian and tsarist Russian history — has been given carte blanche authority to bring opposition groups to their knees. This smacks of the same draconian lawlessness as did the tsarist regime's prohibition on publishing or writing in the Ukrainian language, which was authorised on May 30, 1878.

On the one hand, these repressive edicts mean that the opposition groups in Ukraine, those that are truly founded on the idea of restoring independence and Ukrainian statehood not merely self-proclaimed democratic sovereign Communists, will have to endure difficult times and work harder with the people to attain their goals. Indeed, these laws signal that more leaders and rank-and-file activists of the independence movement will suffer. However, on the other hand, these laws also show that the Soviet empire is irreversibly decaying. When Gorbachev reverts to legalised lawlessness, it is obvious that his days and that of the empire's are numbered because, regardless of how repression will be implemented, the people have gone too far down the path of liberation for them to be turned back.

Western governments, too, should take a close look at these measures and realise that they are siding with the wrong team. By financially and politically supporting Moscow, they are tacitly approving these repressions and prolonging the death throes of the empire. The subjugated nations, will sooner or later, with or without Western help, be free and independent countries and will remember who was and who wasn't their friend.

CHORNOBYL REPORT

Prepared by The Chernobyl Committee, London

1. The Chernobyl Reactor and the Accident

The nuclear reactors at Chernobyl are the RBMK-1000 water-cooled design and were riddled with such major design flaws that they should never have been allowed beyond the drawing board. They are known to be one of the most dangerous types of nuclear reactor, yet were approved by the former head of the Soviet Academy of Science, Alexandrov.

In 1986, the Soviet Communist Party passed a resolution calling for more intensive production of electricity and increased productivity from all sources of electricity generation, including nuclear reactors. This was one of the reasons for the experiment at the Chernobyl reactor which went so horribly wrong.

The experiment and explosion

At 1:23 a.m. on April 26, 1986, technicians at Chernobyl's No. 4 reactor dropped reactor power to a very low level. To allow the experiment to continue, several major safety systems were disabled so that the reactor would not be shut down automatically. Deactivation of the safety systems was illegal, but the technicians were under pressure to fulfil the planned experiment.

As the cooling system was being tested, operators allowed the uranium fuel to superheat to 3,000 degrees by withdrawing the control rods. The reactor computers showed that the reactor was becoming unstable, but the operators attempted to control the reactor manually to continue the experiment.

Four seconds before the explosion, the operators realised the mistakes they had made. They were 36 seconds too late to prevent a catastrophe. The operators tried to stop the chain reaction manually by activating the control rods, but it would have taken ten seconds for them to be dropped into the core by gravity — much longer than in any Western reactors. It was too late. Most of the control rods had been withdrawn completely from the core. The rods ruptured and uranium spurted into the cooling water. The mixture instantly produced steam and caused two or three explosions, the second probably steam, and the third hydrogen.

The explosions were so powerful they blew off the reactor's 1,000 tonne concrete ceiling. Air rushed in and mixed with the reactor gases, causing a further explosion and triggering a graphite fire at the core. This shattered the reactor and hurled almost nine tonnes of radioactive debris — including lumps of uranium and graphite — into the night sky. This was about 90 times more than the radioactivity released by the atomic bomb on Hiroshima.

The staff on duty barely knew what was going on. Junior staff were sent to investigate. Senior staff refused to believe that the reactor ceiling had been blown off and that they were faced with a major nuclear disaster.

Radioactive fallout

The damaged reactor continued to release highly radioactive smoke and materials into the atmosphere for 10 days. The radioactive cloud blew northwest over Ukraine, Byelorussia, Latvia and Lithuania. It then passed over Scandinavia and Poland. Ultimately, the accident caused raised levels of radioactivity more than 2,000 kilometres from the source and in more than 20 countries.

The start of the cover-up

Prompt notification about the accident, as well as immediate medical attention and evacuation of the local population were vital. Instead, the Soviet authorities resorted to secrecy, and for several days refused to admit to the world that there had been any serious accident. The Ukrainian and Byelorussian people most affected received no information at all. The official cover-up had begun.

2. The Cover-Up

The Kremlin's immediate reaction to the Chornobyl accident was to hide it from the world. Initially, Moscow insisted that the Chornobyl explosion was an ordinary industrial accident with no major foreseeable health or environmental problems. They claimed that the main lesson to be learnt was that nuclear power personnel needed better safety training. Only when confronted with irrefutable evidence from monitoring stations in other countries did the Kremlin admit to the explosion and release of radioactivity.

In spite of intense pressure from the West, and particularly Sweden, which had monitored increased levels of radiation and had located the site of the fire, it was not until 9:02 p.m. on Monday — three days after the explosion — that the Soviet TV news programme "Vremya" (Time) announced:

"An accident has occurred at the Chornobyl Nuclear Power Plant because one of the reactors was damaged. Measures are being taken to eliminate the consequences of the accident. Aid is being given to those affected. A Government Commission has been set up".

No other information was given: nothing on casualties, nothing on the scale of the disaster or how it was being dealt with. When Swedish diplomats continued to press for information, they were referred to an official communique given by foreign ministry official, Yevgeny Rovko, where he stated: "I have no further information to give".

Public statements

On Tuesday, the Soviets released a little more information. They said that two people had been killed during the accident and added that the "radiation situation... has now been stabilised".

By Tuesday morning, US Intelligence was able to use its military reconnaissance satellite, and was astonished to see that the roof of the reactor had been blown off and the walls pushed out. The pictures showed that there had been a very fierce fire. What startled the analysts most was that on some pictures, a barge could be seen sailing peacefully down the river Prypiat and that less than a mile from the reactor, men were playing football. It was clear that the area had not been evacuated.

On Wednesday, the Soviets said that, "no chain reaction or fission of nuclear fuel is taking place. The reactor is in a smothered state". They also said that the radiation situation was "improving" and that, "the state of the air basin over the city of Kyiv is causing no concern. The quality of the drinking water, as well as of the water in rivers and water reservoirs, corresponds to normal".

Soviet TV showed a black and white photograph of the damaged reactor. The commentator said, "As you can see for yourself, there is no gigantic destruction or fire". US Intelligence sources said that the photograph was accurate, except that the Soviets had brushed out a plume of smoke and heat haze rising from the reactor.

The official reaction

The Kremlin's only official statement was to accuse the Western media of creating a phoney crisis in Ukraine, by concocting lies about the accident at Chernobyl. It was not until three weeks later that President Gorbachev, the architect of "glasnost", made any comment and, in the meantime, no scientific information was released to neighbouring countries.

If Western countries had little information, those immediately affected in Ukraine and Byelorussia had even less, which amounted to a criminal disregard for the health and safety of the population. Families in Prypiat, the now deserted town just by the reactor, watched the fire in reactor No. 4 from their bedroom windows. Few suspected how serious the situation was. They were given no information. The next day, people went out as usual and children played in the streets.

Thirty-six hours after the disaster, everyone in Prypiat was instructed to collect important documents, one set of spare clothes and one or two photographs, and to prepare for immediate evacuation. They were told there was no cause for alarm and that they would soon be allowed back to their homes. The evacuation took several hours to complete and, in the meantime, everyone waited in the open air for their place in the convoy of vehicles. The evacuation from villages around Chernobyl did not take place until 10 days after the accident.

Safety advice

As news of the accident was gradually released, the population was told by the then Health Minister, Anatoliy Romanenko, to stay calm because there was no danger. Soviet authorities said that levels of radiation were low and that everything was under control. People in the worst contaminated areas were merely instructed not to open their windows and doors, to wash their floors with a general cleaning fluid, to keep their heads covered, and to wash their hair twice a day.

Because of the lack of information and the Kremlin's reluctance to admit anything was wrong, millions of people in contaminated areas carried on life as normal, while farmers continued sowing their fields.

Radiation mapped

The Soviet meteorologist, Yuriy Israel, has said that, within a week of the explosion, a map of the most affected areas had been drawn up and presented to Prime Minister Ryzhkov. This would have shown that radiation levels in Kyiv, with its population of 2.6 million, had risen to 100 times the level considered safe. Radiation levels were even higher in Narodichi, 70 km west of Chornobyl, and these areas were outside the 30 km exclusion zone set up around Chornobyl, and the authorities insisted that there was no problem.

May Day

The people of Kyiv, Narodichi and many other places highly contaminated by radiation were instructed to attend May Day parades as normal, and television pictures of those parades were shown all round the world as proof that everything was under control and that there was no reason why life should not continue as normal.

Ukrainians in Kyiv began to suspect the truth when they noticed that the children of the "nomenklatura" (senior Communist Party officials) had not been seen for several days. These children have at least received some protection from their influential parents. Ordinary children were not so lucky. Children in the Narodichi area began to be evacuated only at the end of May, when the damage to their health had already been done.

Medics silenced

The biggest peacetime nuclear disaster was accompanied by the biggest ever official cover-up. This was just the beginning. A decision by the Communist Party, passed on May 15, 1986, classifies all information about radioactive contamination as secret. This was extended to doctors on June 27. They received instructions to

"lose" Chornobyl-related illnesses and to classify them under other headings without any mention of radiation. Little wonder that the Ukrainian people now no longer trust any official Soviet information about the Chornobyl accident and its effects.

Rejection of international aid

Perhaps the most cynical part of the cover-up was the Kremlin's rejection of aid from the West, apart from advice on how to attack a graphite fire. President Reagan directed the US Department of Energy to supply a list of possibilities for humanitarian and technical aid. Moscow was offered the use of a highly sophisticated computer that uses wind and terrain data to predict the path of radioactivity; a helicopter-borne system that measures and maps the speed of radioactive contamination; a team of health physicists and others to examine air, water and soil; medical specialists on radiation exposure and technical experts on decontamination. The list was rejected by Moscow within 24 hours. The only help accepted was an offer from their old friend, Armand Hammer, of the services of a specialist in bone-marrow transplants.

At a plenary sitting of the UN, Yuriy Dubinin, the USSR's permanent representative expressed gratitude for other countries' sympathy, but declined any foreign assistance. It is impossible to escape the conclusion that the Kremlin did not want Western eyewitnesses to see the full horrors of both the accident and their own negligence in dealing with its effects.

3. The Children of Chornobyl

The main victims of the Chornobyl disaster are children. This is because radiation is ten times more harmful to children than adults. In addition, because children drink more milk and spend more time outdoors, their accumulated dose of radiation is likely to be much higher than in adults.

No preventative medicine

In the immediate aftermath of the Chornobyl accident, there was a significant delay in providing children with any preventative medication. Radioactive iodine-131 fastens on to the cells of the thyroid gland replacing mineral iodine and preventing the gland from functioning properly. Mineral iodine is needed to form the thyroid hormone molecule which is vital to the development of the brain, particularly in the later stages of pregnancy and the early stages of life. A shortage of mineral iodine can therefore affect mental development or, in extreme cases, lead to a complete absence of mental function. Children should have been provided with neutral iodine immediately to help block the intake of radioactive iodine into

the thyroid. Children in Ukraine and Byelorussia only received neutral iodine a week after the explosion. By then, it was too late to do any good. In some Russian provinces seriously affected by radioactive fallout, there was a delay of 2 months before children received iodine. By contrast, in Poland just as soon as the authorities knew the cloud was heading their way, every child was given neutral iodine as a precaution

Radiophobia

In the first three years after the disaster, all Soviet Government sources — including the USSR Health Minister, Yevgeny Yazov, and the Ukrainian Health Minister, Anatoliy Romanenko — said that there were no significant ill effects from Chornobyl, and that there were unlikely to be any in the future. Reports of illnesses from contaminated regions were due to “radiophobia” (fear of radiation) and stress from living near the 30 km exclusion zone, rather than the effects of radiation.

This was a criminal lie. In the weeks and months after the disaster, at least 600,000 people, including 125,000 children, were “significantly exposed” to radiation. Soviet doctors and the Ukrainian Green Party now estimate that approximately 160,000 children under the age of 7 in the most contaminated areas received levels of radiation high enough to result in cancer of the thyroid. At least another 12,000 children were exposed to very high levels of thyroid irradiation from drinking contaminated milk and breathing polluted air.

In Kyiv, a number of children have already died of cancer, while there is a general and significant increase in the number of children suffering baldness, blood disorders and leukemia.

Children outside the exclusion zone

Until October 1989, the Ukrainian Ministry of Health denied that there was any problem in the Narodichi area, which is to the west of the 30 km exclusion zone. However, a trip by Soviet experts found that more than 4,500 children had thyroid glands damaged by radiation, including 1,000 cases where the dose exceeded 20 rems — where 35 rems is considered the safety limit for lifetime exposure to radiation.

One of the gravest health crises in Ukraine exists in the agricultural district of Poliske — between Narodichi and the western barbed wire boundary of the 30 km Chornobyl exclusion zone. The Poliske Communist Party, led by USSR People's Deputy M.I. Primachenko, systematically covered up all information about radiation readings and the health of the local people. A secret document dated March 1990 shows that 1,200 children aged 2-16 in 3 nurseries and 6 schools have serious blood disorders brought about by radiation.

In Poliske's School No. 1, many of the 1,200 children are suffering from thyroid gland abnormalities, anaemia, nose bleeds, weakened eyesight and persistent headaches. The schoolchildren spend from early morning until evening at school so that they can eat three "clean" meals a day. They are limited in the time they can spend outdoors, and are only allowed to play on the new asphalt in front of the school. They are not allowed into the woods, to the river or into the town's park. The health authorities have refused to acknowledge that radiation is causing any problems. Teachers and parents say that they are not getting the medical help their children need.

Numbers of children affected and illnesses

It is still not known how many children have been affected by radiation. The information, if it exists, is secret. Unofficial estimates suggest that between 800,000-900,000 could have received significant doses of radiation. Illnesses suffered by children include heart disease, weakening of the nervous and immune systems, diabetes, asthma, mental and physical handicaps, eye defects and anaemia.

Thyroid cancers in children are generally extremely rare, while radiation is the only known cause of multiple myeloma and childhood leukemia. In Ukraine, there has been a 92 per cent increase in children's cancers generally, with an 82 per cent increase in thyroid cancer. Congenital birth defects have more than doubled. Disorders of the nervous system have increased from 310.9 per 10,000 in 1988 to 619.6 in 1989. In the same period, blood disorders have increased from 99.3 per 10,000 to 260, and psychiatric illnesses have more than quadrupled, from 20.1 per 10,000 to 89.9.

Children's thyroid cancers take between 5-7 years to develop. They will therefore peak between 1991-1993. Other cancers take longer to develop, and the effect is expected to peak in about 30 years' time.

The seriousness of the situation is made worse by the lack of proper health resources. Up to the end of 1990, only 173,000 full medical checks had been carried out, of which only 37,000 were on children. At least 2 million more are needed urgently. There is a grave shortage of equipment and drugs. In Britain, 7-8 children out of 10 are cured from childhood leukemia. In the Soviet Union, the survival rate is less than 1 in 10.

Altogether, as many as 300,000 of today's children are likely to die from the effects of the Chernobyl disaster.

4. The Story of Narodichi

Narodichi is a small town 60 km west of Chornobyl. It was one of the places that suffered most heavily from the radioactive fallout from the Chornobyl disaster. It also suffered from official secrecy and disinformation.

Here is how one eyewitness — a Ukrainian doctor from the regional hospital in Narodichi — described the days and weeks after the accident.

"Everyone had a strange taste in their mouth, and everyone's throat was dry. The Head of Civilian Defence said that there were no dosimeters, that they had all been taken away, but that the radiation level was only 3 roentgens per hour. This was hard to believe. Sick people were being brought into the hospital from early in the day to 2:00 a.m. the following morning.

"On the first of May, the people of Narodichi were ordered to go out for the May Day parade. Everyone had a metallic taste in their mouth. On May 9, everyone was again called together for a meeting. But at no time did anyone in authority mention the Chornobyl accident.

"On May 15, we found out from the regional Communist Party secretary that the situation was serious; that a reactor was still burning and throwing out radioactivity. It surprised us that people from the Chornobyl area and from Prypiat has begun to be evacuated at the end of April. Although Narodichi is only 60 km from Chornobyl, we had no information about what was happening.

"After May 15, a brigade of doctors from Kyiv arrived in Narodichi to examine the children. People were feeling ill. They complained of sore throats and burning eyes. Many had breathing difficulties.

"On May 20, the Minister of Health, Romanenko, arrived in Narodichi. He was asked for permission to evacuate all children from the area. Romanenko said that if orders to evacuate came from higher authorities, it would be done. He did not make such decisions. But Moscow did not hurry to give those orders. Why should they worry about children in their Ukrainian colony?

"Some children were finally evacuated a month after the accident, between May 28 and June 10, but not older schoolchildren because they were supposed to be sitting school examinations at that time.

"Afterwards, doctors from Moscow arrived. They were frightened. They did not give out any of the results of their medical examinations. They kept telling people to keep their distance because they were all contaminated, and pushed away mothers and babies. They treated the people worse than animals. The Ukrainian doctors could not stand this and tried to defend the people.

"When we asked them what we should do and what advice we should give, the Moscow doctors just told us not to drink milk from local farms. They did not provide any advice or any medicines, so everyone just had to do the best they could.

"When the children were being examined, it was very bad. Many fainted and had to be carried out, but the doctors did nothing to make it easier for those who were already ill.

"The Moscow doctors said that everything was all right; that the dose of radiation received was so minimal that there was no reason for any illness. The people became angry. Even after taking iodine, the older schoolchildren in the village of Khrestynivtsi had such high doses that our machines could not measure them.

"Just then, Yuriy Spizhenko (now Ukrainian Minister for Health, but then Regional Health Minister for Zhytomyr), arrived in Khrestynivtsi. Our doctors sat with him and wept over what the machines were showing for the schoolchildren".

This is just one account from one small area of Ukraine, but the same story can be told of many other towns and villages: the lack of information, the secrecy, the delay in setting up medical examinations, the patchy and badly-organised programme of evacuation. This is the main reason why Ukrainians now refuse to believe anything they hear from official sources and why they have turned to unofficial and community groups for help.

5. The Effects of the Chernobyl Disaster on Emergency Workers

600,000 workers, including young conscripts, spent time in the 30 km Chernobyl exclusion zone during the cleaning up process and subsequently. One doctor, Andrei Arkhipov, who worked at the site, claimed that decontamination was carried out in such a way that it caused more damage to health than the initial fallout. Neutral iodine was given, but too late. The fire fighters, who were drafted in from all areas of the Soviet Union, were not provided with even basic protective clothing or boots. One commented that they were given 100 grammes of alcohol for courage.

Death toll

The official death toll amongst those who worked to put out the fire and clean-up remained at 31 for several years. The Moscow Evening News has recently released a figure of 252. Yuriy Shcherbak, Ukrainian deputy to the Supreme Soviet and head of the Ukrainian Green Party, says that the total stands at 5,000 dead. The Chernobyl Union, an unofficial organisation of the veterans from the clean-up operation, adds that around 35,000 could now be suffering with radiation-related illnesses. Rukh sources say they know of 300 young men who were sent into the exclusion zone without any protective clothing other than gloves and that all are now ill with radiation burns and cataracts.

Accurate information is difficult to determine. None of the 600,000 who worked

within the exclusion zone has ever been diagnosed as suffering from radiation sickness. Those who have fallen ill have been dispersed to hospitals throughout the Soviet Union and their medical records do not even state that they were involved in the cleaning up process. A French doctor who visited one of the clinics said that patients received only rudimentary examinations; few dosimeters were available, and that there was not even any paper to record the results of examinations.

In 1990, some ill Chornobyl workers staged a hunger strike for better compensation. Their demands have been ignored.

Since August 1986, the Soviet Ministry of Health has forbidden the release of any information about the effects of the Chornobyl disaster on Chornobyl workers.

Rukh sources say that young conscripts are now being sent into the exclusion zone to work as a punishment for misdemeanours.

6. Radiation Safety Limits

From the drawing up of the perfectly circular 30 km "exclusion zone" around the Chornobyl plant it can only be assumed that Soviet scientists had calculated that radiation falls in a perfectly contained area. Areas which fell outside this area were not considered in any evacuation or clean-up plans, even though winds carried radioactive fall-out to areas well outside the zone.

"Safe" levels of radiation dosage were set by central scientists, who stated that the fallout of radiation from Chornobyl fell into "acceptable norms of pollution". These scientists had not even visited the area, let alone conducted tests yet sent an open letter to Gorbachev reassuring him that all was well and under control.

These "norms" and "safe" levels, however, are periodically revised and new standards set, as happened at the end of 1988, when it was announced that 0.35 sieverts was the limit which any individual should receive in his lifetime.

Unsurprisingly, Ukrainian, Byelorussian and central scientists differ over the definitions of a "safe" dosage of radiation for an individual. Ukrainian scientists claim the rate of 5 rems accumulation per year per square km, set by central scientists, is at least twice as high as it should be, and ten times greater than the rate deemed safe in the West.

Ukrainian and Byelorussian scientists also believe the level of caesium contamination tolerated in soil, set at 15 curies by central scientists, should be lowered to 5 curies.

Cumulative effects of low dosages of radiation

In addition, central scientists claim that low dosages of radiation are "safe". However, little is known about the cumulative effects of such small dosages over an individual's life span. And it is clear that there is no such thing as a "safe"

minimum dose. A Byelorussian study in September 1990 stated:

"Today one can say with confidence that small dosages of radiation cause many infectious diseases which previously were never connected with radiation — influenza and pneumonia, as well as chronic conditions of the heart and lungs. The paradox is that the more slowly the dosage is accumulated, the greater may be the damage".

The other effects are cancer leukemia, genetic damage to unborn children and damage to the body's immune system, leading to Chornobyl Aids. Little is also known about the take-up of radioactive isotopes by plants and hence the food-chain into humans, or about the rate at which such isotopes are eliminated from the body.

7. The General Health Situation in Ukraine

Average life span

As a result of both economic and environmental factors, the average male life span in Ukraine has fallen from 67 years in 1964 to 63 years in the mid-1980s. This is between 7-8 years less than in all other developed countries.

Since 1986, the average male lifespan has fallen still further. In Kyiv, the fall was 8.1 per cent in the first seven months of 1990 compared with 1989: i.e., in the space of just one year, the average life span fell by 5 years.

Birthrate and birth abnormalities

The current birthrate in Ukraine is 14.6-15 births per thousand of the population. This is three times lower than in the rest of the USSR, and for the last 20 years has been insufficient to maintain a constant population.

Twelve per cent of marriages are childless.

Miscarriages are 4-6 times more likely than in the rest of the USSR.

Over the last 10 years, the number of abnormally small babies (less than 1,500 grammes birth weight), has increased 5 times.

In environmentally contaminated areas (Zaporizhia, Dniprodzerzhynsk, Rubizhe, Kremenchuk, Mariupol), hereditary diseases in children have decreased 2-4 times, while blood diseases in children have increased 5-8 times.

The number of disabled children born has increased from 6 to 13 per thousand.

After Mauritius and Barbados, Ukraine has the highest child death rate in the world. In the first 9 months of 1990, the death rate amongst new-born babies was 12.4 per thousand live births — twice as high as in Japan or Sweden and 1.5 times higher than in the USA.

Contraceptives are virtually unobtainable in Ukraine. Abortion is the accepted method of contraception. More abortions are performed each year in Ukraine than anywhere else in the world.

Cancers and other illnesses

In the last 5-6 years, the incidence of cancers in Ukraine has increased by 16 per cent overall, while cancer of the stomach has increased by 32 per cent.

Ukraine has the highest rate of blood cancers per thousand of population of any country in the world.

Ukraine has the highest rate of heart disease, bronchial disorder and diabetes of anywhere in the USSR.

Illnesses and cancers in children

In the last 5 years, the incidence of childhood cancers generally in Ukraine has increased by 92 per cent, while thyroid cancers have increased by 82 per cent.

Congenital birth defects have doubled. Between 1988 and 1989, disorders of the nervous system increased from 310.9 per 10,000 to 619.6; blood disorders more than doubled, from 99.3 per 10,000 to 260; and psychiatric illnesses more than quadrupled, from 20.1 per 10,000 to 89.9.

Heart disease, allergies, diabetes, asthma, eye defects, anaemia, physical handicaps, bone cancers and weakening of the nervous and immune systems, have all increased in areas contaminated by radiation.

8. Resources for Health Care

Expenditure per person

In Ukraine, 80 roubles per person per year is allocated to health care, (about £1.60 at the new official resident and tourist exchange rate declared on April 3). In the USA, the equivalent figure is \$1,350 (£760).

* Three per cent of Ukraine's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) goes on health care. The USA equivalent is 11.9 per cent of the GDP.

Ukrainian health experts believe that the amount per person needs to be increased to 280-300 roubles as an absolute minimum.

Shortages

There is also an acute shortage of equipment, particularly disposable syringes. In 1988, the central planners set a target of 100 million syringes to be produced, but only 7.8 million came out of Soviet factories, with 30 million imported. In 1989, the target was 500 million, with the same number imported, but only 192 million were produced, with 300 million imported. Health experts estimate that the Soviet Union needs between 3-9 billion disposable syringes each year.

Food provided for sick children in hospitals supplies only between 30-60 per

cent of their nutritional needs. Parents must supply the rest.

With the current level of resources, there is no possibility of any improvement in the general level of health, let alone the proper treatment of those affected by catastrophes such as Chornobyl.

9. The Effects on Land and Agriculture

The Chornobyl accident released at least 20 times more radiation than the Soviet authorities admitted. It was claimed that between 50-80 million curies were released, but Ukrainian and Soviet scientists now say that it was closer to 1 billion curies.

Contaminated land

Initial statements said that only 11 areas in the Soviet Union had been affected. This was then updated to 68, then 180, then 275.

In Ukraine, some 1.4 million people still inhabit 1,600 towns and villages in highly contaminated areas. Overall, 4 million people are living in contaminated zones. In Byelorussia, 127 towns and 2,697 villages, with a total population of 2.2 million, are highly contaminated.

Five million hectares of Ukrainian farmland and 1.5 million hectares of forest land are contaminated. Some areas are considered to be unsafe for the next 1,000 years, while most will be uninhabitable for at least 100 years. In Byelorussia, 20 per cent of agricultural land and 15 per cent of forest land is contaminated.

Some of this land is still being farmed by its inhabitants because they have no other source of clean food. More worrying is the fact that some food from contaminated land is still being distributed to other regions.

Soviet sources repeatedly stated that there was no danger from radiation outside the 30 km Chornobyl exclusion zone. But over the last five years, this has been exposed as a lie. Abnormalities have been recorded in as much as 80 per cent of wheat grown while animal abnormalities are increasing.

Deformities in livestock

The Petrovskiyi collective farm is in the Narodichi region, about 60 km to the west of Chornobyl. It is a small farm, with 350 cows and 87 pigs. In the five years before the Chornobyl disaster, only 3 cases of abnormal pig births were recorded, with no recorded abnormalities among calves. In the year after the accident (April 26, 1986 - April 26, 1987) 64 abnormal animals were born: 37 pigs and 27 calves. In the first 9 months of 1988, the figure of abnormal births was 76: 41 pigs and 35 calves. The calves were most often born without heads and butts, or without eyes and ribs. The pigs had bulging eyes and deformed skulls.

The newly-formed Kyiv Institute of Agricultural Radiology has said that the

abnormalities could be caused by hundreds of factors which have nothing to do with radiation. But farmers believe firmly that Chornobyl is the cause, particularly since the only livestock feed they have is grown on contaminated land.

Between 1987-1990, a total of 194 deformed farm animals was recorded in the Narodichi district.

Radiation in this district has been shown to be 148 times the normal background level. In spite of this, the area was not evacuated.

The Soviet government has now decided to extend the exclusion zone from 30 km to 80 km west of Chornobyl. In April 1990, the USSR Supreme Soviet decided that this area would be evacuated when funds became available, but the Ukrainian people doubt that the money will ever be found.

10. Remedial Measures: The Policy and the Cost

The cost of cleaning up after the Chornobyl accident has so far amounted to some 8.5 billion roubles, of which the Ukrainian national budget has borne about 2 billion. By comparison, the USA spent 130 billion dollars on the cleaning up operation after the Three Mile Island nuclear accident. The Chornobyl accident was very much worse: the release of radioactive iodine-131 alone was 8 million times higher than at Three Mile Island. Though the amounts spent so far are a heavy burden on Ukrainian resources, they are a drop in the ocean compared to what is needed.

The sarcophagus

The cost of building the concrete sarcophagus which surrounds the damaged reactor No. 4 was 70 billion roubles in 1988 and a further 40 billion in 1989. The sarcophagus is a primitive structure and already needs significant repairs, which are estimated to be at least another billion roubles.

Compensation

The USSR Council of Ministers has allocated 66 billion roubles from Account Number 904, which is a Chornobyl charity account, to the Ministry of Atomic Energy to compensate them for losses arising from the non-functioning of reactor No. 4. At the same time, the town of Slavutych, built to house the power station workers evacuated from Prypiat, has no medical laboratory and no dosimeters, even though radiation levels are almost as high as in the 30 km exclusion zone.

No compensation has been paid to those who took part in the clean-up operation — 200,000 of whom are living in Ukraine. Those living in five of the regions worst affected by radiation have received miserable levels of additional benefits to compensate. Instead of being guaranteed uncontaminated food, each person is to receive between 15-30 roubles extra a month; four days' extra holiday a year; and a

reduction in the pensionable age to 55 for men and 50 for women. However, all these benefits are only payable on condition that men continue to live in contaminated areas for 12.5 years, and women for 10 years.

Clean food

Ukraine asked the Soviet authorities for a special dispensation to reduce the amount of meat it had to send to central Soviet stores, so that more could be sent to inhabitants of contaminated areas. Instead of the 100,000 tonnes Ukraine asked for, Moscow allowed it to keep only an additional 30 tonnes.

Total costs

In 1989, the USSR Council of Ministers allocated a further 16 billion roubles to be used for further evacuation and resettlement. This is grossly inadequate.

Yuriy Shcherbak, deputy to the Supreme Soviet and leader of the Ukrainian Green Party, estimates that over the next 10 years, between 380-420 billion dollars will be needed to evacuate and resettle all those still living in areas of dangerously high contamination, and to deal with the environmental and health effects of the disaster.

11. The Soviet Nuclear Industry and Safety

Construction programme

In order to avert an energy crisis, rapid expansion to develop nuclear energy in Ukraine and to double the amount of nuclear generated electricity by 1990 was started in the Brezhnev years in the 1970s.

The Chornobyl plant was already the largest in Ukraine, and it was planned that it should become the largest in the Soviet Union. There were also plans to develop other nuclear power stations in Ukraine, although almost 90 per cent of Ukraine's territory is not suitable for the construction of nuclear reactors due to geological, hydrogeological or other reasons. The Chornobyl plant is itself built on soft soil. In addition, the nuclear sites tend mainly to be located in densely populated areas.

The plan to expand nuclear energy so rapidly, and on schedule within the five-year plans highlights just one of the reasons for the safety problems encountered by the Soviet nuclear industry. With the construction of the Chornobyl plant, one official stated that they were lagging behind the plan by one year. Thus efforts were made to raise the pace of construction by inducing workers to greater output and even to compete with other sites.

Another problem lay in the construction personnel themselves. For many years, students have been used in this type of work during their vacations. According to "Komsomolskoye Znamia" (a Ukrainian newspaper for young Communists) bands

of students were working at the Odessa, Rivne, Chornobyl, South Ukraine and Zaporizhia nuclear power plants in Ukraine in the summer of 1985. At the Chornobyl plant, Komsomol youth brigades were reported as working at 150 per cent of the normal rates at the end of 1985 — without proper training, with shortages of equipment and poor medical and recreational facilities.

The infrastructure for Soviet nuclear industry was barely in place when plans for its rapid expansion began. The Soviets have admitted that they have a serious shortage of specialists. The training of such specialists is only in its infancy: a faculty for nuclear energy, the first in the Soviet Union, was opened in Odessa in 1975. A second was opened in Kyiv in 1985 and an institute was opened in Moscow in the same year.

Safety in Soviet nuclear plants

On March 27, 1986, just one month before the Chornobyl disaster, "Literaturna Ukraina", a Ukrainian weekly newspaper, carried an article in which conditions at the Chornobyl plant were severely criticised. These included chronic shortages of necessary materials, a demoralised workforce, and appalling organisation and management. The Soviet nuclear power industry ignored the article.

Since the 1986 accident, safety procedures throughout Soviet industry have once again been questioned. Reliable statistics are next to impossible to come by, but in 1988, for example, "Izvestia" reported approximately 200,000 industrial accidents, and the Soviet media continuously reports thousands of work place injuries due to careless practices, ancient equipment, and a lack of safety procedures when dealing with toxic materials. In the Soviet Union there is a general lack of comprehensive occupational safety laws or regulations.

After the Chornobyl disaster, Western reports raised serious doubts not only about the design faults in the Chornobyl reactor, and the Soviet Union's emergency procedures but they also noted consistent violation of safety procedures by Soviet operators.

Shoddy repairs, sloppy maintenance, drunkenness, nepotism, low worker morale, total mismanagement at the Chornobyl plant were noted. Similar reports of low standards are echoed throughout the Soviet Union's nuclear and other industries.

Safety hazards

The major shortcomings, which were reported to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) include:

- Some of the older reactors do not have key safety systems, which include emergency cooling systems, containment structures — the concrete and steel reactor domes that prevent radiation leaks that are almost a universal feature in the Western world: Chornobyl's dome was built of concrete.

- Due to inadequate analysis, Moscow does not know precisely how safe or unsafe its reactors are: in the West lengthy computer simulations of possible accidents are conducted. Few Soviet computers can handle such calculations. Even fewer Soviet engineers care.
- Many Soviet reactors have broken parts and suffer from careless workers. Because of frequent equipment failures, Soviet safety relies heavily on reactor staff to spot problems. However, many errors slip past.
- The Soviets admitted that the experiment which caused the Chornobyl disaster had undergone only a superficial safety review and had not received the full requisite approval to proceed
- The hall containing the reactor was not built to withstand severe explosions.
- There is no continuous emergency cooling system, so if there should be a problem with the primary cooling system, the core can overheat.
- The zirconium tube, which separates the “red hot” graphite from the steam, is dangerously thin according to Western experts.

After the accident, standards were improved, but studies of Soviet nuclear plant installations show they still have a long way to go before reaching Western standards.

A plant foreman from the Ignalia plant in Lithuania, another RBMK reactor, on a novel exchange visit to a British plant in 1990, commented how much he liked the checklists used by British workers so they wouldn't forget the procedures in delicate operations. He also liked the fact that the British maintenance crews were on duty 24 hours a day. “It was all very interesting”, he said, “maybe we will start doing that here too”.

Leaks at Chornobyl

Due to the great secrecy practised by the Soviet central government, little is known about previous leaks at Chornobyl and other plants. However, the few reports that have come through illustrate the Kremlin's past and current blithe attitude to safety — both of its own people, and the rest of the world.

- In February 1991, the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet was informed about a disaster which took place in Chornobyl in 1982, four years before the world's worst nuclear disaster took place. At the time, the accident was completely covered up. All that is known is that 1.5 million curies of radiation were probably released.
- In mid-April 1990, one of the Chornobyl reactors was closed down after another emergency released a cloud of radioactive vapour into the air.
- Some three weeks earlier, reactor No. 1 was shut down. No details were announced.

- Early in August 1990, one of the remaining three reactors at Chornobyl was shut down when its control systems failed. The Deputy Chairman of the Committee for Nuclear Safety reported that an automatic safety device failed and that the operators shut down the reactor. He claimed there was no danger of a radiation leak.

In addition, the entombed reactor is still emitting radiation, at a level higher than anticipated, but there is no publicly available information on current radiation emissions or the risk to health.

12. Prospects for the Future

The history of the Chornobyl accident and its aftermath provides an unrelieved picture of human suffering and misery caused largely by unofficial negligence and incompetence. No one knows what the long-term effects will be, but the scale of the disaster is clear. It is equally clear that the Soviet authorities are unable or unwilling to find answers to the urgent medical and environmental issues facing the Ukrainian nation and all those who continue to suffer from the Chornobyl disaster, for whom there is little hope.

The Chornobyl Plant

One of the most immediate problems is what to do with the damaged No. 4 reactor itself. In 1986, the Soviet authorities vowed to keep the Chornobyl power plant open for ever. The two undamaged reactors were reconnected to the national grid at the end of 1986, and the third was back in action in 1987. A second power station, with two of the same RBMK water-cooled reactors, was under construction at the same site. Following mass protests, organised by the Ukrainian Greens, construction of the second station was halted. At the beginning of 1990, following further mass protests, the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR (controlled at that time by the Communists) decided to close the Chornobyl plant completely within 5-7 years. It was no coincidence that this decision came on the eve of the first free election to the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet in March 1990.

The Sarcophagus

But this does not solve the problem. The damaged reactor was encased in a concrete sarcophagus which the designers claimed would last for generations. But the walls of the sarcophagus are already beginning to crack. Ukrainian experts say that one of the causes is shoddy materials and workmanship.

A further problem is that the debris inside the reactor is unstable. There are plans to build a second casing of concrete around the sarcophagus at a cost of about 1 billion roubles, but Ukrainians say that the marshy ground is too soft to bear the weight.

There are real fears that there could be another accident.

Radioactive dumps

Within the 30 km exclusion zone, the clean-up operation resulted in the creation of 800 temporary radioactive dumps. There are no firm plans for dealing with this accumulation of highly contaminated waste. One possibility is that a factory could be built near Prypiat to process the waste and remove the radionuclides. But the Soviet safety record does not inspire confidence in their ability to safeguard the health of workers at any such reprocessing plant; and there will still be the problem of what to do with the resulting radioactive waste.

Exclusion zone

Outside the 30 km exclusion zone, Moscow admitted only in 1989 that several districts were so contaminated that the inhabitants will receive up to the "safe" lifetime dose of radiation. The exclusion zone has now been extended to 80 km west of Chornobyl.

This raises several issues. The first is whether the funds will be made available to evacuate and resettle those at most risk. Sixteen billion roubles have been allocated so far, but this will not be enough.

"Safe" radiation doses

Then, there is the question of what is a "safe" lifetime dose of radiation.

Many Western experts believe that 35 rems is ridiculously high. It was set by the USSR Minister of Health and Nobel Peace Prize holder, Evgeny Chasov, who said in 1988 that the Chornobyl disaster would have no major effects on the health of the population. The data from areas such as Poliske and Narodichi proves this to be a lie, so there can be no confidence in his assertion that 35 rems is in any way "safe".

The Soviet authorities still refuse to acknowledge that people outside the 30 km exclusion zone are at any risk. They say that the main problem is stress from living near the closed zone. Yet women in the area have been told not to have children, and some have been asked to sign declarations to the effect. The suspicion amongst Ukrainians is that the "safe" limit was set at a level which would lead to the minimum area of land being declared closed and the minimum of resources to be spent on resettlement.

Health studies

Accurate figures for the numbers exposed to dangerous levels of radiation are hard to come by, and it will be equally difficult to assess fully the health effects of continuous exposure to lower levels of radiation.

One of the biggest health problems now surfacing is that of "Chornobyl AIDS" caused by radiation damage to the body's immune system. One-and-a-half million people are estimated to be suffering from Chornobyl AIDS, but any studies so far

undertaken have only taken into account illnesses directly attributable to exposure to high radiation doses.

Proposals to conduct comprehensive studies and to monitor the effects of radiation were rejected by Moscow as "of insufficient scientific interest". It is doubtful whether true statistics will ever be known.

But the lack of systematic monitoring and scientific studies will enable the Soviet authorities to continue to deny that radiation is a problem, even while cancers and genetic defects in children increase at rates never seen before.

Resources

The resources needed to deal with the health and environmental effects of the Chernobyl disaster are beyond the means of a Soviet economy and health service already stretched to breaking point. Western aid is equally desperately needed, but Ukrainians believe any aid should be given direct to Ukraine and should not be channelled through Moscow.

The political effects

An entirely unexpected effect of the Chernobyl disaster has been to politicise vast numbers of Ukrainians and to give a new impetus to the demands for sovereignty and independence. The Ukrainian people are discovering political power. Already mass protests have led to decisions to halt construction or expansion of at least nine nuclear reactors. And calls are increasing for further criminal trials of those responsible for the cover-up.

Three of the Chernobyl plant's top officials have already been tried and sentenced for criminal negligence, but the Ukrainian democratic opposition movement, Rukh, and numerous other groups believe that the politicians who organised and authorised the cover-up should also be charged, including Valentyna Shevchenko, who was the Communist Ukrainian President at the time.

Striking factory workers in Kyiv have gone even further, demanding the immediate conversion of party dachas and hotels into temporary accommodation and schools for families with children from the 30 km exclusion zone; they demanded that a nuclear reactor located in a Kyiv research institute be removed; compensation for families living in contaminated zones; the establishment of citizen committees to monitor the clean-up of the immediate danger zone.

Whether these moves succeed or not, Ukrainians have lost what little faith they ever had in Moscow. Chernobyl has helped to convince millions that Ukraine's only chance of economic, environmental and personal salvation lies in gaining control of their own lives and their own country.

CURRENT TRENDS IN UKRAINE: A BRIEF ANALYSIS AND PROJECTION

By Ivan Lozowy

The "Evil Empire" is in a state of crisis. This crisis arose thanks to Mikhail Gorbachev's attempts to introduce relatively minor alterations in the totalitarian structure that is the Soviet Union. This structure, predicated on the Communist Party's tight control over the everyday lives of the citizens of the USSR, does not allow for modifications or transformations. Efforts in these directions are taken as a signal, by those who consider their subordination to the structure as unjust or undesirable, for higher expectations and increased demands. Even the slightest relaxation brings an outpouring of new trends, activities and forces. The most important of the forces that have risen in response to the policies of *perestroika* and *glasnost* is nationalism. As KGB chief Kryuchkov and then Gorbachev noted in November 1990, nationalism is the greatest threat facing the Union.

The Current Situation in Ukraine

Declining Communism and rising nationalism are the two trends which characterise the political situation in Ukraine today. The ideological foundation of the USSR, Communism, is facing virtual extinction in Ukraine, in a manner similar to the fate of Communist parties in central Europe, the Baltic states, and Georgia, for example. Ukrainian society views Communism very unfavourably, and as a result its authority is on shaky ground. According to *Pravda Ukrainy* (March 30, 1991), the Communist Party of Ukraine lost 11 per cent of its members, and the number of lower level party secretaries in the republic fell from 8,945 to 3,522 in 1990.¹

Nationalism in Ukraine on the other hand, as elsewhere in the Soviet Union, is increasing rapidly. This process is being driven by the rise in various other trends in society: public debate, political activity, cultural renaissance, etc. During the March 1990 elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, a candidate opposing the Communist Party candidate was present in only 40 per cent of the electoral districts. Yet non-Communists won 27 per cent of the seats in the Supreme Soviet, achieving a success rate of 67 per cent. Since its founding in

Ivan Lozowy is a policy analyst currently residing in Kyiv. He is a former Research Associate at the Foreign Policy Department of the Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C.

¹The figures given are for Party secretaries on the lowest organisational level, who are not otherwise employed.

September 1989, the pro-independence movement "Rukh" has won the support of five million members.²

The growth of nationalism in Ukraine, however, is not serving as the base on which new structures of authority are formed as Communism recedes. A political vacuum is being created. There are three principal reasons for this. First, although undergoing a decline, the Party is still by far the most powerful political force in Ukraine and remains in control of wide strata of society. This is a result of: 1) a prolonged policy of russification, beginning in tsarist times, which is hindering the spread of nationalism; and 2) the particularly severe regime that has existed in Ukraine under Soviet rule. Some say, for instance, that Ukraine is the forge in which party *apparatchiks* and military personnel are traditionally hardened. The Party continues to retain enormous resources for keeping nationalism at a distance.

The second reason why the Party is losing power faster than the forces of nationalism can replace it is the ongoing attempt by the Party to "restructure" itself. More or less aware of the processes which are taking place in Ukraine and generally in the USSR, many Communists are seeking to create positions for themselves which will preserve their privileged status but will allow them to exist in a new social context, whose essence is not that of a severe totalitarian regime. Communists are trying to become businessmen, to adhere to the requirements of justice, to conduct debate in some small measure in competition with other political forces, etc.

By seeking to transform their power base in accordance with new circumstances, Communists are accelerating the process by which their authority, as Communists, is falling. By allowing the possibility of some forms of private enterprise, they encourage many to seek capitalist ventures. By implementing rule of law principles, Communists increase expectations of justice in society. By permitting more open public debate, Communists create greater demands that the print media, even television, should reflect more than one point of view. While these efforts accelerate the rate of Communism's decline, they also render the replacement of Communist structures by national ones more difficult.

The third reason why a political vacuum is being created in Ukraine is that nationalist forces are not advancing as quickly as Communism is retreating, due primarily to a lack of organisation. There are very few examples where Rukh, a loose coalition of personalities and political groupings, has set for itself a tactical objective, outlined the steps for achieving this objective, and then implemented its plan. Obviously, Rukh functions as a catalyst for the various processes which are fuelling the increase in nationalism in Ukraine. There exists, however, a lack of forces, within or outside Rukh, capable of taking over the authority which is being lost by the Party. The boundaries of what is permissible are receding faster than pro-independence forces can press against them.

² *Izvestia*, October 29, 1990.

The Continuation of Current Processes

Reform Communism in the Soviet Union is doomed, because it ignores the essence of Soviet Communism — the Party's harsh control over society. The decline and virtual disappearance of Communism in Ukraine is preordained. In order to reverse the current trends of declining Communism and rising nationalism, a Great Terror similar to that of the 1930s would be necessary. Following NEP and "Ukrainisation" in the 1920s, Stalin realised that harsh measures would be needed in order to stop and reverse the rise of nationalism. Such measures are unlikely today, given that: 1) the Soviet Union is in a state of crisis at its very centre; and 2) unlike Stalin, none of the USSR's current leaders seem to realise the extreme measures necessary if the Union is to be preserved or be willing to take them.

Communism in Ukraine, however, has never been the single, or even primary, reason why Ukraine has been brought to its current state. An imperial policy of colonisation has been conducted towards Ukraine, in various guises, for hundreds of years. Communism is merely its most recent form. That this ideology is in decline does not mean that Ukraine is on the threshold of a period of relatively free political growth, just as the decline and fall of the tsarist ideology did not mean this. Although the imperial structure is tied to the ideology of Communism, and is suffering a decline along with it, this does not signify that the empire is doomed.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE: THE PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT

By Eugene Kachmarsky •

There is an erroneous assumption in the West that the democratic-nationalist movement in Ukraine, which has set for itself the goal of complete independence from Moscow (and anyone else), a democratic state and a free market economic infrastructure, is a minority movement of certain politicians, economists, poets, writers and fringe extremists. This assumption is mainly derived from the fact that the elections of March 1990 saw only 100 or so democratic deputies emerge in the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet. Furthermore, many Western political pundits point out that in the March 17 referendum this year an overwhelming majority of Ukrainians voted in support of the idea of Ukraine remaining in some form of renewed union with Moscow, whatever such a union might be.

Such an assumption, based on these facts, is the result either of superficial analysis (belying ignorance) or purposeful disregard of the existing realities in Ukraine (indicating blatant disinformation) on the part of Western academics, journalists and other commentators on the USSR. The assumption ignores the abundantly substantiated evidence that wholesale violations of electoral procedures in both instances took place. Estimates indicated that approximately 20,000 polling stations in Ukraine alone were not monitored, thus explaining both the Communist majority in the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, and the outcome of the referendum.

What this has led Western analysts to believe is that the Ukrainian people are content with remaining within a system that has exploited them in every sense of the word for over 70 years. Such a conclusion borders on the absurd, and it is a credit to the Soviet disinformation network that much of the West has fallen for this Soviet disinformation campaign. Reality, however, would indicate that the situation is the exact opposite of that presented in the West.

The democratic-nationalist movement in Ukraine has, since the First World War, always been a popular movement. It was always the people that constituted the leading force, even though it was only natural that intellectuals or other exceptional individuals should guide the movement, trying to coordinate some sort of effective action. However, the true impact of the extent of the popular nature of the movement has not come to the fore until these past two years.

The author is a graduate of the University of Toronto, with a Master's degree in political science, specialising in the USSR and Eastern Europe. He has lived and studied in the USSR for five months.

It cannot be disputed that the first impetus to the Ukrainian democratic-nationalist rebirth of 1989 was given by the Popular Movement of Ukraine for Reconstruction (Rukh — later to be renamed the Popular Movement of Ukraine). Rukh activists began to say and do what had for so long been forbidden and punishable by imprisonment or death. In comparison to the harsh repression of such manifestations of popular will in the past, the response of the authorities seemed somewhat measured. They were reluctant to overtly suppress the new movement, since *glasnost* permitted the eyes and ears of the world to focus on the USSR. Nevertheless, as the people began to lose their fear of the past and to gain resolve, the movement began to widen in scope quite quickly, and, faced with the prospect of a national revolution, the authorities were forced to protect their interests. (This, of course, resulted in continued repression, arrests and deaths). The more force the Communist authorities used, the wider the movement grew and the more radical the people's demands became. Demonstrations once attended by hundreds, were now attended by hundreds of thousands. From the largest urban centres to the smallest and most secluded hamlets, the Ukrainian people voiced their opposition to decades of oppression.

While the election of 100 democratic deputies to the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet in Kyiv was a monumental feat in itself, for some, it served as the culmination, rather than the starting point of the movement. This became the case with the elected deputies themselves. While those elected to the Supreme Soviet were individuals who had initiated the present rebirth in 1989, once they were elected, their radicalism dissolved and they became (at least in the people's eyes) more the establishment than the opposition. By advocating a policy of compromise with the authorities, the *Narodna Rada* (initially the Democratic Bloc — the coalition of democratic-nationalist deputies in the Supreme Soviet) was seen as suspect by the people, who could not understand why these elected officials, chosen to represent the interests of the people against an imperial centre, were now cooperating with the representatives of that imperial centre.

It is not intended here to judge the efficacy or wisdom of the policy advocated by the *Narodna Rada* and its adherents. Suffice it to say that the "parliamentary path" to independence is possible only when faced with a governing authority that is willing to allow such a process in the first place. The Czechoslovakian and Polish paradigms are inapplicable in Ukraine. Furthermore, the Communist authorities in Ukraine are using the *Narodna Rada's* pacifist policy to undermine the gains of the democratic-nationalist rebirth with lies, doublespeak and infiltration of democratic-nationalist and other independence-minded organisations.

It can be safely stated that the *Narodna Rada* and Rukh have fallen behind the movement of the people. While the momentum of the popular movement has gained, that of Rukh and the *Narodna Rada* has sputtered. What is more, the

Narodna Rada and Rukh, by their inefficacy in curbing the Communist reaction to the popular movement and in pursuing a policy of cooperation with the representatives of the colonial regime in the Supreme Soviet, have at the same time completely isolated and removed themselves from the people.

It was the student strike in October of last year that first drove this point home. The students, and the millions that supported them, demonstrated both to the authorities and to the *Narodna Rada* that popular will was dissatisfied with the pace of change and the lack of results in the parliamentary drive towards independence. Next, the *Narodna Rada's* ineptitude in handling the "Khmara affair" further lowered its esteem in the eyes of the people. Finally, the *Narodna Rada's* calls to end the miners' strike seemed to indicate to the people of Ukraine that the *Narodna Rada* had, indeed, forged a common position with the Communists. It was no wonder that after nine weeks the miners returned to work, having seen that the only people who could have represented their interests with the authorities, failed and/or refused to do so. The only deputy who made any real effort to side with the miners rather than mediate on behalf of the authorities, Stepan Khmara, conducted his policy from a prison cell, and when he went to meet the miners in Donetsk during his six days of freedom, he was immediately re-arrested. If the student strikes were insufficient in convincing the *Narodna Rada* that the people have overtaken them in the drive for independence, then the miners' strike should serve as the clearest evidence to date.

The problem, it seems, is that the *Narodna Rada* wants to do it all at once — achieve independence and at the same time create a socio-political and economic infrastructure for an independent Ukraine, while still existing within a system to which such structures are anathema. Change means change, and the eradication of a criminal and exploitative system cannot logically (not to mention morally) be achieved within that system and with the participation of the colonial regime in that system. The Ukrainian people have understood this. They have banded together to create a mass movement that now demands no less than immediate independence, and this with the overwhelming support of non-Ukrainian citizens of Ukraine. This should indicate to the *Narodna Rada* that the people have made their choice, and were the *Narodna Rada* representative of truly democratic principles, it would consider the will of the people in formulating its strategy. It is the first step on the road to dictatorship (or the last step on the road to independence) when a group of people deems itself to know better what is good for the people, than the people themselves. Only the people, for better or for worse, have the right to choose how their future is to look. To attempt to do this for them is a gross misinterpretation of democracy and a violation of the freedom to choose. And the freedom to choose is the most profound and basic principle of democracy.

ENGLAND, RUSSIA AND THE UKRAINIAN QUESTION DURING THE GREAT NORTHERN WAR

(Part 2)

By Theodore Mackiw
The University of Akron

Ukrainian-Swedish Alliance of 1708

At the outset of the Great Northern War relations between Peter I and Mazepa were cordial. It was, after all, on the Tsar's recommendation that Emperor Joseph I granted Mazepa the title of Prince of the Holy Roman Empire on September 1, 1707.⁴⁶

Although Ukrainian interests were very remote from those of Russia, Mazepa was loyal to the Tsar and carried out his orders faithfully. The Hetman considered himself a loyal vassal and expected to be treated as such. However, when the Tsar bluntly refused to come to his aid, and made clear his intention to abolish the autonomy of Ukraine, Mazepa realised that his master was breaking their agreement (the Kolomak articles). Consequently, this agreement could not be binding, which gave him the right (*jus resistendi*) to turn against the Tsar in order to protect the interests of the Ukrainian Hetmanate, of which he (Mazepa) was the chief executive — Hetman. Unfortunately, Mazepa lost his gamble and was condemned as a traitor by the Tsar.⁴⁷

As a loyal subject, Mazepa sent his Kozaks wherever the Tsar demanded. Peter also insisted that the Kozaks build fortresses at their own expense. In return for their services they received little gratitude, no pay, and were beaten, insulted, and mistreated in various other ways.⁴⁸ English historian L. R. Lewitter observed in his essay "Mazepa" that "the treatment meted out to the civilian population of the Ukraine by the Russian army, with its daily routine of plunder, arson, murder, and rape, was more reminiscent of a punitive expedition than of allied troop

⁴⁶ The granting of the title of Prince of the Holy Roman Empire to Mazepa is recorded in an official register under "M", Vol. XII. It also appears on the last page of Mazepa's letter to the Emperor. The letter is located in *Reichsadelsamt*, Vienna. For details see: T. Mackiw, "Mazepa's Fürstentitel im Lichte seines Briefes an Kaiser Josef I", *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, Vol. 44, No. 3, (1962), pp. 350-56.

⁴⁷ Subtelny, *The Mazepists* (New York, 1981), pp. 25-26.

⁴⁸ N. Kostomarov, *Mazepa i mazepintsy. Polnoye Sobranye Sochineniy* (St. Petersburg, 1905), pp. 476-77, 489-90, 524, 530, 551-54. S. M. Solovyev, *Istoria Rosii s drevneishikh vremey* (Moscow, 1962), Vol. XV, p. 216.

movements".⁴⁹ American historian Robert K. Massie also remarked that "there were constant protests that Russians were pillaging Cossack homes, stealing provisions, raping wives and daughters".⁵⁰

Such Russian conduct must have brought Mazepa much grief. What is more, rumours were circulating around military circles that the Tsar intended to abolish the autonomy of Ukraine and annex it to the Russian Empire. Moreover, it was rumoured that the Tsar did not conceal his intention to entrust the office of Hetman of Ukraine to his favourite, A. Menshikov. These rumours were confirmed in a letter Mazepa received from his friend Countess Anna Dolska. In her letter, the Countess described a conversation with two Russian Generals, Sheremetyev and Renne, during which her friendly remarks about the Hetman evoked the following reaction from Renne:

"O Lord, have pity on that good and clever man. The poor man does not know that the Count Alexander Danilovich [Menshikov] digs a grave for him, and after he is rid of him [Mazepa], then he himself will become the Hetman of the Ukraine". Sheremetyev confirmed Renne's words. When Dolska said that Mazepa's friends were not prepared to warn him, Sheremetyev replied, "We must not say anything. We suffer ourselves, but we are forced to stay silent".⁵¹

When the Chancellor, Pylyp Orlyk, finished reading the Countess's letter, Mazepa said,

"I know well what they want to do with me and all of you. They want to satisfy me with the title of Prince of the Holy Roman Empire. They want the officer corps annihilated, our cities turned over to their administration, and their own governors appointed. If our people should oppose them, they would send them beyond the Volga, and Ukraine will be settled by their own people".⁵²

Almost all historians agree that Mazepa was ambitious and independently-minded, but, nevertheless, loyal to the Tsar. The Hetman had, in fact, rejected several favourable offers from the Polish King, Stanislaw Leszczynski. As Whitworth remarked in his report of January 11, 1708:

"... General Mazeppa has again given notice of the Turk's designing to break with this country and at the same time acquainted His Majesty that King Stanislaus was using all endeavours to draw the Cossacks on his side by great promises and several messengers, one whereof was fallen into the General's hands, that by this

⁴⁹L. R. Lewitter, "Mazeppa", *History Today* (London, 1957), Vol. VII, No. 9, pp. 593-94.

⁵⁰R. Massie, *Peter the Great. His Life and World* (New York, 1980), pp. 350-56.

⁵¹Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, p. 550; Solovyev, *op. cit.*, Vol. XV, p. 215. See also: O. Pritsak, "Ivan Mazepa i Kniahynia Dolska", *Pratsi Ukrainskoho Naukovoho Instytutu* (hereafter PUNI) (Warsaw, 1939), Vol. 47, pp. 102-117.

⁵²Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, p. 550; Solovyev, *op. cit.*, Vol. XV, p. 215.

intrigue the chief officers of the Cossacks had been entirely gained... However, he would do his best to regain them by fair means and to keep all the rest firm in their duty".⁵³

Soon, however, Mazepa found good reason to mistrust the Tsar. In 1707 the Tsar ordered Mazepa to surrender right-bank Ukraine (the lands to the west of the Dnipro [Dnieper] River) to those Polish magnates, who supported his ally King Augustus II.⁵⁴

Moreover, Mazepa learned from the Tsar himself of his intention to abolish the autonomy of the remaining Ukrainian territories and to absorb the Kozaks into the Russian army.⁵⁵ Furthermore, the Tsar declined Mazepa's request for military aid against a possible Swedish invasion of Ukraine. At the War Council in Zhovkva (near Lviv), in April 1707, the Tsar said: "... I can give you neither ten thousand nor even ten men. Defend yourself as best you can...".⁵⁶

At that time, many of Mazepa's regiments were engaged in the Tsar's service elsewhere and the remainder were insufficient to defend Ukraine. According to Ukrainian historian Orest Subtelny, the Hetman considered himself a vassal of the Tsar and expected protection from him in times of emergency. Since the Tsar refused to provide Mazepa with military aid against a Swedish invasion, the Hetman had no alternative but to negotiate for Swedish protection in order to avoid an invasion by the Swedes.⁵⁷ According to another Ukrainian historian, Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, it was *dura necessitas* for Mazepa to conclude an alliance with the Swedish King.⁵⁸ Justifying his alliance with Stanislaw Leszczynski Mazepa said: "God himself and the whole world will know that necessity has forced us to this since we, a free and unconquered nation, are seeking the means to save ourselves".⁵⁹

Despite all precautions, in the spring of 1708, two of Mazepa's staff officers, General Judge Vasyl Kochubey and Colonel Ivan Iskra, informed the Tsar of the Hetman's secret negotiations with the Swedish King. The Tsar, however, ignored this denunciation and condemned both officers to death.⁶⁰

⁵³PRO, SP 91, Vol. 5.

⁵⁴Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, pp. 560-61.

⁵⁵Philip Johann von Strahlenberg, *Das Nord-und Oestliche Theil von Europa und Asia* (Stockholm, 1730), pp. 251-52; Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, p. 550

⁵⁶Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, p. 567; Solovyev, *op. cit.*, Vol. XV, p. 1494.

⁵⁷Subtelny, "Mazepa, Peter I and the Question of Treason", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. II, No. 2 (1978) pp. 158-59.

⁵⁸Hrushevskyi, "Shvedsko-ukrainskyi soyuz z 1708 r.", *Zapysy Naukovoho Товариства im. Shevchenka*, (hereafter ZNTS), (1909), Vol XCII, p. 12.

⁵⁹Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, p. 567.

⁶⁰For details see: Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, pp. 587-88, 592-97; Ohloblyn, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yoho doba* (New York-Paris-Toronto: ZNTS, 1960), Vol. 170, pp. 192-98.

Through a refugee Serbian or Bulgarian Archbishop, Mazepa concluded a secret alliance with Charles XII, either in the city of Smorgon between February 11 and March 18, 1708, or in Radoszkowiczi between March 27 and June 17, 1708.⁶¹ (The original document has not survived, because, as Ragnhild M. Hatton remarked in her excellent biography of Charles XII, after the battle of Poltava, the Swedish King ordered all archives to be "burnt or sunk in the Dnieper".⁶² However, the terms of the Mazepa-Leszczyński-Charles XII alliance were mentioned in the memoirs of an anonymous Swedish major, which were printed in Gustave Adlerfelt's "Histoire Militaire de Charles XII, roi de Suède"⁶³).

The alliance of 1708 gives rise to controversy: did Mazepa invite the Swedish King into Ukraine and fail to provide him with the help he expected. Some historians blame Mazepa for this even today.⁶⁴

As the English envoy at the Swedish Field Headquarters, Captain James Jefferyes, remarked in his report of September 18, 1708, Charles XII "turned his march to the right, with intention, as is supposed, to make an incursion into Ukrain;... The invasion of this country will not only furnish His Majesty provision for his army, but give him occasion of bringing Gen:ll Mazeppa, who commands the ennemyes Cossacks, and who has his estate in this country, to some reason".⁶⁵ In a subsequent report (October 7, 1708), Jefferyes mentioned that the Swedish King sent a messenger to Mazepa at his residence in Baturyn to announce his desire for winter quarters in Ukraine. Thus the Swedes hoped, wrote Jefferyes, "of coming into a country flowing with milk and honey; that Count Lewenhaupt will soon reinforce our army with the addition of 11 or 12:m men and that General Mazeppa will declare for us".⁶⁶ Moreover, Mazepa's positive response to Charles XII's request was taken for granted.

⁶¹For details see: M. Andrusiak, "Zviazky Mazepy z Stanislavom Leszczynskym i Karlom XII", *ZNTS* (1939) Vol. CLII, pp. 35-61; B. Krupnytsky, "The Swedish-Ukrainian Treaties of Alliance 1708-1709", *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. XII, No. 1, (1956), pp. 47-57; C. J. Nordmann, *Charles XII et l'Ukraine de Mazepa*, (Dissertation) (Paris, 1958), p. 28; Ohloblyn, *op. cit.*, p. 283-85.

⁶²R. M. Hatton, *Charles XII of Sweden*, (New York: Weybright and Talley, 1968), p. 238.

⁶³G. Adlerfelt, *The Military History of Charles XII, King of Sweden* (London, 1740), Vol. III, pp. 193-94; Nordmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-32.

⁶⁴Hans von Rimscha, *Geschichte Russlands* (Darmstadt, 1979), p. 289, ("... Am Anfang des Jahres 1708 stand Karl — wie 100 Jahre später Napoleon — zum Marsch auf Moskau bereit in Wilna. Zum zweitenmal verzichtete er darauf, den direkten Weg nach Moskau — wie Napoleon über Smolensk — zu gehen, und bog, von Mazepa dazu bewogen, nach Süden in die Ukraine ab").

⁶⁵PRO, SP 95, Vol. 17; Hatton, *Historisk Magasin*, Vol. 35, No. 1, (1953), p. 62.

⁶⁶PRO, SP 95, Vol. 17: ("... certain it is that His Ma:ty has sent an express with letters to Battaryn that Gen:lls residence, to invite him to take own party and disire winter quarters in

Mazepa did not expect the Swedish King to enter Ukraine, and when he learnt of this, he angrily remarked to his Chancellor Pylyp Orlyk: "...it is the devil who sends them here. He is going to ruin all my plans and bring in his wake the Russian troops. Now our Ukraine will be devastated and lost".⁶⁷ According to the secret agreement with Charles XII, Mazepa was to provide the Swedish army with the fortresses in Severia and with food, and to join the Swedish King on his "march directly to Moscow".⁶⁸

Charles XII was warned by his advisor, Count Carl Piper, not to go into Ukraine. Piper urged the King to retreat in order to secure necessary military equipment and food for General Lewenhaupt's Corps, which was on its way from Riga to join the Swedish army.⁶⁹

Charles XII had already drawn up his plan for the campaign against Moscow in Saxony. According to this plan, the Swedish army would proceed as follows: from the north, General Lybecker would march in the direction of Ingria and Petersburg to pin down the Russian troops, while Charles XII together with the main Swedish army would push along the Smolensk-Moscow route. At the same time, from the south, the Polish King, Stanislaw Leszczynski, with his army and a Swedish corps under the command of General Crassau, would cut off the Russian army from Ukraine.⁷⁰

There is some controversy regarding the Swedish King's plan. Without Swedish military documents from 1707-1709, which were destroyed on the orders of Charles XII after the defeat at Poltava, it is difficult to establish with absolute certainty whether or not the Swedish King deviated from the "master plan". However, the disclosure by Soviet Russian historian Emile V. Tarle that Swedish propaganda leaflets, printed in Danzig, were distributed outside the city of Smolensk, which the Swedish army never reached,⁷¹ clearly indicates that Charles XII had, indeed, selected the shortest route to Moscow — through Smolensk.⁷²

Ukrainia, but I am not yet assur'd whether he has compl'd"). cf., Hatton, *Historiskt Magasin*, p. 63; Kentrschynskyi, *Mazepa*, p. 325. Jefferyes obtained this information from his friend, Josias Cederhielm, secretary of the Field Chancery, R. M. Hatton, *Charles XII of Sweden*, p. 275. Jefferyes's report of October 7, 1708, see: T. Mackiw, *English Reports on Mazepa, 1687-1709* (New York-Munich-Toronto: Ukrainian Historical Association, 1983) pp. 130-31.

⁶⁷ Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, p. 615; Solovyev, *op. cit.*, Vol. XV, p. 1496.

⁶⁸ Adlerfelt, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 194; Nordmann, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

⁶⁹ G. A. Nordberg, *Konung Karl XII's Historia* (Stockholm, 1740), 3 Vols. I used the German translation: *Leben und Thaten Carl des XII. Koenigs von Schweden* (Hamburg, 1745-46), Vol. II, pp. 87-88.

⁷⁰ For details see: Hatton, *Charles XII*, pp. 244-54, 250; Nordmann, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

⁷¹ E. Tarle, *Severnaya voyna i shvedskoye nashestviye na Rossiyu* (Moscow, 1958), p. 169.

⁷² Hatton, *Charles XII*, p. 242.

Furthermore, it is unlikely that Charles XII altered his plan to go into Ukraine on account of his agreement with Mazepa. According to Bohdan Kentrschynskyi, the Swedish King did not conclude any specific agreements with the Hetman prior to the commencement of operations against the Tsar.⁷³ The lack of planning and the hasty improvisation of Swedish propaganda material in Ukraine⁷⁴ also indicates that Charles XII was determined to proceed on the Smolensk-Moscow route.

Although there are some "military historians of calibre", writes Hatton, who still emphasise "that the move to Severia to use the Kaluga road, or to Ukraine to reach the same road over Novgorod Seversk, was, in all probability, a calculated move to the south to steal a march on the Tsar Peter after a feint directed towards Moscow".⁷⁵ In view of what has been said above, however, their arguments are not convincing.

The real reason why Charles XII gave the order (on September 14, 1708) to march into Ukraine was to save his army from famine. In September 1708 the Swedish army was beginning to face a very grim situation. Food supplies were running low; the Russians had burnt all the villages in the country; and it was unlikely that Lewenhaupt would reach the main army with his supply train for several weeks. Jefferyes described the situation in his report of September 1, 1708:

the Russians "endeavour by surprises and by cutting of our provisions to moulder away our army, which is very practicable in this country, where the inhabitants having burried their provisions quitt their houses and the enemy burn whatever they come over. As yet we are in a tollerable condition as to necessaries, but if the enemy pursues the same methods in his own country which he has begun in this, I verily believe he needs make use of no weapon against us, but that hunger and want will drive us out".⁷⁶

In another report (September 12, 1708) Jefferyes wrote:

"... the great vigilance of our enemys, who use all the methods of the most experienc'd soldiers to allarm us, and keep us for the most part both day and night with one foot in the stirup, these continual fatigues and the want of provision which begins more and more to press us has already occasion'd murmuring in the army, and will be of worse consequence if shortly there be not some alteration for the better: we are now forc'd to live of what we find burried under ground and this is the way we propose to maintain in for a while, but should a suddain frost come and

⁷³B. Kentrschynskyi, *Mazepa* (Stockholm, 1962), pp. 287-89; cf., Hatton, *Charles XII*, p. 239.

⁷⁴B. Kentrschynskyi, "Propagandakrieket i Ukraine", *Karolinska Forbundets Arsbok*, (1958), pp. 102-103; cf., Hatton, *Charles XII*, p. 242.

⁷⁵Hatton; *Charles XII*, p. 242.

⁷⁶PRO, SP 95, Vol. 17; cf., Hatton, *Historiskt Magasin*, p. 59.

deprive us of that expedient, instead of a formidable army, I fear his Majesty would bring into Russia a parcell of starv'd beggars".⁷⁷

On the Russian border, between Tatarsk and Smolensk, the situation grew worse. In his report of September 18, 1708 (old style), Jefferyes wrote:

"... we have been in a very desolate country sinse that time, half a mile from the boarders of Muscovy, where we found nothing but what was burnt and destroyed, and of large villages little left but the bare names, we had also news of the like destruction as far as Smolensk".⁷⁸

Smolensk was only seven Swedish miles away; Moscow — forty. The Swedish eyewitness, G. Adlerfelt, described the situation in the following words: "The Russians laid all the towns and villages in ashes, destroying everything within a circumference of ten or twelve miles: so that nothing but fire was seen anywhere, and the air was so darkend with smoke that we could hardly see the sun".⁷⁹

In his memoirs the German eyewitness, Johann Wendel Bardili, gave a similar description of the situation.⁸⁰

As the Swedish army neared the Russian border, Mazepa ran into serious difficulties. The Tsar may have been aware of his contacts with the enemy. There is reason to believe, writes Ohloblyn, that Russian Field Marshal Vasilii Sheremetyev, a close friend of Mazepa, warned the Hetman, in the autumn of 1708, that the Tsar suspected his negotiations with the Swedish King.⁸¹

Moreover, the secretary of the French Embassy in Warsaw, Jean C. de Baluze, wrote in his report to Paris on August 19, 1708, that "rumours of contacts between the Kozak Hetman and the Swedes have made their way here".⁸²

These rumours were known to the Commander-in-Chief of the Polish army, Adam Sieniawski, who was under the close surveillance of the Russian resident in Poland, A. I. Dashkov. The latter reported this news to the Russian Chancellor, G. I. Golovkin, and later, in December 1708, complained: "I warned about this sufficiently, but they did not want to believe me at that time".⁸³ According to Subtelny, Mazepa made attempts to persuade Sieniawski to join the Swedes.⁸⁴

⁷⁷ PRO, SP 95, Vol. 17; cf., Hatton, *Historiskt Magasin*, p. 61.

⁷⁸ Ibid.; cf, Hatton, *Historiskt Magasin*, p. 62.

⁷⁹ Adlerfelt, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 44-45.

⁸⁰ Bardili, *Des Weyland Durchl. Printzens Maximilian Emanuels... Reisen und Campagnen...* (Stuttgart, 1730), p. 401, (... Der Feind continuirte noch immer... hinter sich alles abzubrennen, und nichts als blatte Land nbrig zu lassen, wodurch dann der Mangel bey der schwedischen Armee immer vergrössert wurde").

⁸¹ Ohloblyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 281-82.

⁸² Ibid., p. 283.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 283.

⁸⁴ Subtelny, *On the Eve of Poltava*, pp. 24-25

Rumours about Mazepa's contacts with the enemy were also circulating in Moscow. The Austrian envoy, for instance remarked in his report of November 28, 1707:

"they say here that Sweden, through the Polish King [Stanislaw Leszczynski], made the following offer to the Ukrainian Kozaks: If they break with Moscow, return to Poland, and fight against Moscow, the privileges they previously enjoyed under Polish rule will be restored. This is causing great anxiety because the Kozaks are deprived of many of their rights, and there is thus good reason to believe that they may accept this offer".⁸⁵

The Tsar's suspicions grew when a Polish nobleman, Jacob Ulashin, was captured by Russian General Nicholas Inffland. Ulashin was carrying a letter to Mazepa from Polish General Stanislaw Poniatowski, Poland's representative at the Swedish headquarters. Although in the letter Poniatowski was asking the Hetman to release his brother, under torture Ulashin admitted that his real mission was to deliver Poniatowski's request for Mazepa to join the Swedish King as soon as Charles entered Ukraine.⁸⁶

Golovkin sent Mazepa a copy of Ulashin's confession (October 10, 1708), which greatly disturbed the Hetman.⁸⁷ Mazepa claimed that serious illness had compelled him to remain on the left bank of the Desna River in the vicinity of Borzna, near his residence, but his excuses became difficult to sustain at the Tsar's headquarters.

When Mazepa learnt that Charles XII was in Ukraine, he crossed the Desna (on October 15, 1708) to join him, forced to take this step by news that Menshikov was on his way to Baturyn.⁸⁸ The Hetman took with him around 4,000 men,⁸⁹ leaving 3,000 troops to defend his residence, the city of Baturyn, where a considerable amount of food, ammunition, and artillery were stored. Mazepa gave orders to the commander of Baturyn, Colonel Dmytriy Chechel, to wait until he returned with the Swedes before defending the city against the Russian attack.

Leaving Baturyn, the Kozaks were under the impression that the Hetman was leading them against the Swedes. Before crossing the Desna, however, Mazepa addressed his troops, explaining that:

"The only solution for us is to rely on the compassion of the Swedish king. He has promised to respect our rights and liberties and to protect them from all those who would threaten them now or in the future. Brothers! Our time has come! Let

⁸⁵ Ohloblyn, *op. cit.*, p. 361.

⁸⁶ Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, pp. 618-19; Ohloblyn, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

⁸⁷ Ohloblyn, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

⁸⁸ Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, p. 627; Ohloblyn, *op. cit.*, pp 316-320; Hatton, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-73.

⁸⁹ The number of troops Mazepa took to the Swedish camp is disputable. The Swedish eyewitness J. Cederhielm, an official in the Field Chancery, estimated the number as 4,000. For details see: Ohloblyn, *op. cit.*, p. 328, Kentrschynskyi, *Mazepa*, p. 328; Hatton, *Charles XII*, p. 277.

us use this opportunity to avenge ourselves on the Muscovites for their longstanding oppression, for all injustices and cruelties they inflicted. Let us preserve for the future our liberty and our Cossack rights from their incursions".⁹⁰

The Ukrainian troops were not prepared for such a radical change, and, like the rest of the Ukrainian people, were confused. Until then Mazepa had ordered the Ukrainian Church to pray for a Russian victory, and now, suddenly, he advocated turning against the Tsar and defecting to the Swedes.

At the Swedish headquarters Mazepa and his senior officers impressed the King and his generals. "He speaks very properly and there is much sense in all he says; he hath studied formerly and speaks the Latin tongue very well", remarked a Swedish eyewitness.⁹¹

Although Mazepa's defection was a great shock to the Tsar, he quickly recovered and, on October 27, 1708, issued a manifesto to the effect that "Hetman Mazepa is lost and nobody knows his whereabouts".⁹² The following day, when it had become clear that Mazepa had, indeed, gone over to the Swedes, the Tsar issued a second manifesto in which he informed the *starshyna* and the Ukrainian people that Mazepa had committed treason by joining the Swedish King in order "to force Ukrainians to become Catholics and return the Ukraine under Polish rule". He also appealed to the Ukrainian people to remain loyal to him, promising them "rights and liberties such as no other nation in the world had ever possessed".⁹³

At the same time, the Tsar ordered Menshikov to capture and destroy Mazepa's residence, which he stormed on November 3, 1708. As Whitworth noted in his memoirs, "the residence Town of Baturin was immediately taken and burnt, and above six thousand Persons put to the sword without Distinction of age or sex".⁹⁴

The destruction of Baturyn and the slaughter of its population had a fatal effect on the whole Ukrainian nation. It was a great misfortune for the Swedish army because Menshikov destroyed food and ammunition supplies and captured large numbers of artillery.

In addition, the Tsar sent ten regiments into Ukraine, which terrorised the population through interrogations, confiscations of property, exile, and executions. While punishing Mazepa's supporters, the Tsar claimed that he had no intention of abolishing the Hetmanate. He gave orders "to summon courteously as many Kozak

⁹⁰ Subtelny, *The Mazepists*, p. 36; Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, 627.

⁹¹ Adlerfelt, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 66-67; cf., Nordberg, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 93; Bardili, *op. cit.*, p. 418, ("... Die Sprache, darinnen er ganz fertig war").

⁹² Ohloblyn, *op. cit.*, p. 320.

⁹³ Doroshenko, *A Survey of Ukrainian History*, p. 376; Ohloblyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 320-21.

⁹⁴ Whitworth, *An Account of Russia as it was in the Year 1710* (Strawberry Hill, 1758), p. 6.

Colonels and *starshyna* as possible... for the completely free election of a new hetman, which will be conducted according to their ancient rights and privileges".⁹⁵

Only four out of sixteen colonels and several officers arrived in the city of Hlukhiv at the beginning of November to elect a new hetman. Prior to the election, on November 5, 1708, an effigy of Mazepa was dragged to a scaffold, where, after Menshikov had read out the Hetman's "crimes" and tore off the sash of the Order of St. Andrew, the effigy was hanged. The purpose of this execution *in absentia* was to emphasise the severity of Mazepa's "crime" against the Tsar.

On November 11, 1708, the *starshyna* elected Ivan Skoropadskyi, Colonel of Starodub, as Hetman. Immediately after the election, on the Tsar's orders, Ukrainian bishops excommunicated Mazepa in the church in Hlukhiv, in Moscow and in other major churches throughout Ukraine.⁹⁶ In this way, the Tsar wanted to show the people that Mazepa had not only committed a "crime", but had also "sinned" against God. This excommunication, which was repeated every Lent until 1917,⁹⁷ had a profound impact on the religious Ukrainian masses.

By the destruction of Baturyn and the cruel mass reprisals, the Tsar intended to prevent further defections and to crush the opposition. At his headquarters in the city of Lebedyn he ordered the interrogation of known or suspected supporters of Mazepa. A contemporary chronicler described these interrogations:

"Many Cossack officers and common Cossacks, suspected of being Mazepa's followers, or solely on account of not having appeared at the new hetman's election in Hlukhiv, were hunted down, brought into the Muscovite camp and tortured, broken on the wheel, quartered, or impaled. Plain hanging and simple beheading were mild punishment in comparison. People were forced under torture to confess to anything and were then punished for it".⁹⁸

The chronicler names 900 Kozak officers who were tortured to death in Lebedyn.

Mazepa was unable to mobilise the support of the Ukrainian masses. The fall of Baturyn and the executions in Hlukhiv and Lebedyn terrified the people. This

⁹⁵ *Pisma i bumagi*, Vol. VIII, part 1, p. 237.

⁹⁶ The election of Skoropadskyi as the new hetman, the hanging of Mazepa's effigy, and the excommunication were reported in the West European press, e.g., the London *Daily Courant*, December 19, 1708, No. 2235, (on the first page); *Wienerisches Diarium*, December 25, 1708, No. 563; *Europäische Fama*, Vol. 93, pp. 727-31; Adlerfelt, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 75; Nordberg, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 94-94.

⁹⁷ Concerning the legality of Mazepa's excommunication see: O. Lototskyi, "Sprava pravosynnosti anatemuvannia hetmana Ivana Mazepy", *PUNI*, Vol. 47, pp. 57-68.

⁹⁸ Doroshenko, *A Survey*, p. 377. For details about the interrogations and torture of Ukrainians in Lebedyn see: Hrushevskyi, "Hlukhiv i Lebedyn, 1708-1709", *ZNTS*, (1909), Vol. 92, pp. 21-55.

resulted in a split between supporters of Mazepa and those who swore allegiance to Skoropadskyi. Moreover, Mazepa had never been popular among the common Kozaks and the peasants. Rewards offered to loyalists demoralised the Ukrainian population and had negative effects for many years to come.

"Before, during and after the events in Hlukhiv, Peter I issued a series of manifestos denouncing Mazepa and his Swedish and Polish allies", writes Subtelny, and they answered accordingly.⁹⁹ The "manifesto war" served to publicise the values that each side contended it stood for. However, since almost the whole of Ukraine was occupied by Russian troops, the Ukrainians had no choice but to support the status quo. Terrorised by the Russian troops, Ukraine was mostly passive towards the Swedish army. However, Mazepa succeeded in persuading the Zaporozhian Kozaks to join the Swedish King. On April 6, 1709 (new style), the leader (*koshovyi*) of the Zaporozhian Kozaks, Konstantyn Hordienko, joined Mazepa with 8,000 men.¹⁰⁰ They were a substantial asset to the Swedish army because the Swedes had suffered great losses during the winter of 1708-1709, which was extraordinarily severe. "The weather proved a more determined enemy than the Russians", remarked Hatton in her work.¹⁰¹ As a result, several thousand Swedish soldiers perished from the harsh winter, diminishing Charles XII's already weakened forces.

The Zaporozhian Kozaks concluded two agreements: one with Mazepa, acknowledging him as their Hetman, and one with the Swedish King, in the village of Budyshchi in April 1709 (new style), in which the goals and terms of the war against Russia were drawn up.¹⁰² According to this treaty, the Swedish King promised not to make peace with the Tsar until Ukraine and the Zaporozhian Kozaks had attained full independence.

With the participation of the Zaporozhian Kozaks Mazepa's position changed from vassalage to equality among allies. The Hetman became "Charles's banker: sixty thousand *Thaler* needed to pay the Valloche regiment and for other expenses were handed over against a Swedish bill", noted Hatton.¹⁰³

⁹⁹For details see: Subtelny, *The Mazepists*, pp. 40-43; Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, pp. 650-651; Kentrschynskyi, "The political struggle of Mazepa and Charles XII for Ukrainian Independence", *The Ukra'nian Quarterly*, Vol. XV, No. 3, (1959), pp. 241-259. Kentrschynskyi published the Tsar's manifesto of October 29, 1708, in his biography of Mazepa, pp. 368-69, and the first page of Mazepa's manifesto of 1709. Claude I. Nordmann published Mazepa's manifesto of 1709 in full with the French translation in his dissertation *Charles XII et l'Ukraine de Mazeppa*, pp. 64-71.

¹⁰⁰Adlerfelt, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 104-105; Bardili, *op. cit.*, p. 130; Nordberg, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 130. (He mentioned 15,000 men, but in actual fact there were 8,000).

¹⁰¹Hatton, *Charles XII*, p. 280.

¹⁰²Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, p. 672; Adlerfelt, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 105-106. For details see: "The Swedish-Ukrainian Treaties of Alliance, 1708-1709", *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. XII, No. 1, (1959), pp. 47-57.

¹⁰³Hatton, *Charles XII*, p. 284.

The Zaporozhian contingent was of great strategic and diplomatic significance. The Kozaks possessed a large flotilla of boats, capable of transporting 3,000 men at a time across broad rivers. The Swedish King needed to transport Leszczynski's army, Crassau's corps and Swedish recruits across the Dnipro at a location the Russians would not expect. Furthermore, the Zaporozhians secured not only postal communications with Poland, the Crimea and Turkey, but also opened the door for an alliance with the Ottomans. However, negotiations with the Turks developed at a slow pace; only the Crimean Khan was willing to join the Swedes against Russia. Realising the danger from the Tatars, the Tsar sent his troops to the rear of the Zaporozhians. This manoeuvre enabled him to destroy the Zaporozhian flotilla at Perevolochna, on the Dnipro, and at the mouth of the Vorskla River. Like the destruction of Baturyn, this was to have fatal consequences later.

The Swedish King's objective was to force the Tsar to accept a decisive battle and thereby to destroy his main force. Early in May 1709, Charles moved southwards with his army and besieged the city of Poltava on the Vorskla. His plan was to use the siege of Poltava to induce the Tsar to offer the decisive battle. The battle took place on June 27, (July 9, new style) 1709. Mazepa and his men did not actively participate in the battle. They remained in the allied camp at the village of Pushkarivka, where they guarded the baggage.¹⁰⁴

Several hours after the battle, Charles XII, Mazepa, 1,000 Swedes, and 2,000 Kozaks managed to escape and flee to Bendery. During the flight, "our Cossacks conducted us like Pilots in an open sea, and knew all the vales and rivulets, and all the morasse which lay in our way. Mazepa himself was not ignorant of any part of this desert".¹⁰⁵ Subtelny rightly remarked that "had it not been for the aid of Mazepa and the Zaporozhians, the Swedish king would probably have been captured" by the Russians.¹⁰⁶ After arriving at Bendery, the aging Mazepa (70 years old) became gravely ill and died in Varnytsia, a suburb of Bendery, on October 2 (new style), 1709.¹⁰⁷ On March 18, 1710, his body was transferred to the city of Galatz, where it was buried at the Cathedral of St. George.¹⁰⁸

Today it is no longer necessary to defend Mazepa's actions and his alliance with the Swedish King. Credible contemporary eyewitnesses already regarded the Hetman as a Ukrainian patriot and hero. Although Kostomarov branded Mazepa a traitor,¹⁰⁹ Hungarian-German historian Johann Christian von Engel, in his "History of Ukraine", doubted that Mazepa should be condemned.¹¹⁰ In his work "Hetman

¹⁰⁴ S. Tomashivskyi, "Iz zapysok Karolintiv pro 1708-9 r.", *ZNTS*, Vol. 92, (1909), pp. 87-88.

¹⁰⁵ Adlerfelt, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 247; cf., Bardili, *op. cit.*, pp. 486-87; Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, pp. 702-703; Hatton, *Charles XII*, pp. 309-10.

¹⁰⁶ Subtelny, *The Mazepists*, p. 52.

¹⁰⁷ Krupnytskyi, "Miscellanea Mazepiana", *PUNI*, Vol. 47, pp. 90-92.

¹⁰⁸ Vozniak, "Bendersaka Komisiya po smerty Mazepy", *PUNI*, Vol. 46, p. 107.

¹⁰⁹ Kostomarov, *op. cit.*, p. 706

¹¹⁰ von Engel, *Geschichte der Ukraine und der ukrainischen Kosaken* (Halle, 1796), pp. 322.

Mazepa" (St. Petersburg, 1897), Ukrainian historian Fedir Umanets concluded that Mazepa should not be condemned as a traitor. Russian historian Alexander Brückner not only justified Mazepa's course of action, but even regarded it as a masterpiece ("ein Meisterstück") and his attempt to liberate Ukraine as a heroic act ("ein heroischer Akt").¹¹¹ German historian Otto Haintz remarked that "it would be a contradiction in itself to see the almost seventy-year-old, childless Hetman as a characterless adventurer and traitor".¹¹² English historian R. M. Hatton mentioned that it was "in the ambition of Mazepa to free the Ukraine from the Russian overlordship".¹¹³ Massie remarked in his work that Mazepa's "secret desire was that of his people: Ukrainian independence".¹¹⁴

In general, all pre-Revolutionary (1917) Russian historians, as well as Soviet historians E. V. Tarle,¹¹⁵ V. E. Sukhoy,¹¹⁶ B. G. Beskrovnyi, A. I. Kozachenko, V. A. Romanovskiy¹¹⁷ and others condemn Mazepa and regard him as a "traitor". Several expatriate Russian historians, such as G. Vernadsky, S. Pushkarev, A. Belopol'skiy and others also call Mazepa a "traitor" in their works.¹¹⁸ Recently, Soviet Ukrainian historian Vasyly Marochkin not only justified Mazepa's course of action, but also praised him.¹¹⁹

Mazepa was not alone in trying to protect the rights and privileges of his country. Johann Reinhold Patkul from Livonia rebelled against the Swedish King (1697); the Transylvanian Prince Ferenc Rakoczi II led an uprising against the Habsburgs (1703-1711); Stanislaw Leszczynski, representing the republican traditions of Poland, aided by the Swedes, fought against the autocratic Polish King Augustus II; Demetrius Kantemir, Hospodar of Moldavia, aided by the Tsar, rebelled against the Turkish Sultan (1711).¹²⁰ Yet none of them were branded a "traitor", but Mazepa was.

To be continued

¹¹¹ Brückner, *Peter der Grosse. Onckens Allgemeine Geschichte* (Berlin, 1879), Vol. VI, p. 405.

¹¹² Haintz, *König Karl XII von Schweden* (Berlin, 1936), Vol. I, pp. 247-48 (Es ist aber nicht angängig und ein Widerspruch in sich, in dem damals wahrscheinlich bald siebzehnjährigen kinderlosen Hetman einen charakterlosen Abenteuer und Verräter zu sehen").

¹¹³ Hatton, *Charles XII*, p. 240.

¹¹⁴ Massie, *Peter the Great*, p. 459.

¹¹⁵ E. V. Tarle, *Severnaya voyna i shvedskoye nashestviye na Rossiyu* (Moscow, 1958), pp. 146, 222; cf., "Karl XII v 1708-1709 godakh", *Voprosy istorii* (1950), No. 6, pp. 22-56.

¹¹⁶ V. E. Sukhoy, *Borba narodnykh mass protiv nashestviya armii Karla XII* (Moscow, 1958), pp. 66, 292; cf., "Ismena Mazepy", *Istoricheskiye zapiski* (1950), Vol. XXXI, pp. 154-90.

¹¹⁷ See their essays in *Poltava* (A collection of articles and essays, published by the Soviet Academy of Arts and Sciences [Moscow, 1959], pp. 60, 303-305, 322, 350).

¹¹⁸ G. Vernadsky, *A History of Russia* (New Haven, 1961), pp. 154-56; S. G. Pushkarev, *Obsor russkoi istorii* (New York, 1953), pp. 292-93; A. Belopol'skiy, *SSSR na fone proshlogo Rossii* (Washington, 1973), pp. 213-14.

¹¹⁹ V. Marochkin, "Hirka chasha Ivana Mazepy", *Ukraina*, No. 25, June 1989, pp. 14-15.

¹²⁰ Subtelny, *The Mazepists*, p. 3.

NEWS FROM UKRAINE

RENOWNED US LAW EXPERT DENIED ACCESS TO IMPRISONED DEPUTY BACK IN US, STANTON SEES A SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION TO THE UKRAINIAN REVOLUTION	Ihor Dlaboha	43
50,000 ATTEND UNSANCTIONED ANTI-UNION RALLY IN KYIV		46
REFERENDUM RESULTS DIFFER RADICALLY ACROSS UKRAINE		47
KHARKIV STUDENTS STAGE HUNGER STRIKE		48
REACTION VERSUS REFORM IN ODESSA		49
CLAMPDOWN IN UKRAINE: PATTERN CLEAR		50
UKRAINIAN COAL-MINERS CONTINUE REVOLT		51
PROTEST ACTIONS IN UKRAINIAN CAPITAL INTENSIFYING		52
ECOLOGICAL HUNGER STRIKE STAGED IN KHMELNYTSKYI		53
GREEN PARTY HOLDS RECRUITMENT RALLY IN CAPITAL.		54
DONBAS — AN ECOLOGICAL DISASTER ZONE		54
UKRAINIAN STUDENTS HOLD CONGRESS		54
FOURTH SESSION OF THE INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY HELD IN KYIV		55
STEPAN KHMARA RELEASED FROM JAIL		56
KHARKIV SUPPORTS STRIKING MINERS		57
EASTER LITURGIES IN KYIV.		58
STEPAN KHMARA ARRESTED AGAIN		58
RALLY IN LVIV DEMANDS KHMARA'S RELEASE		59
MASS RALLY HELD IN LVIV.		60
REVIVAL OF KOZAK BROTHERHOOD		61
LVIV HOSTS CONGRESS OF UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS		63
CHAIRMEN OF PUBLIC COMMITTEES MEET IN KYIV		64
VETERANS FORM ALL-UKRAINIAN ORGANISATION IN LVIV		65
SOLDIERS' MOTHERS HOLD CONFERENCE IN LVIV		66
MAY 1 DEMONSTRATION IN KYIV ENDS IN BLOODSHED		66
KYIV PROTESTS AGAINST MAY 1 BEATINGS		67
YOUTH COMMEMORATE KHARKIV'S NATIONALISTS OF THE PAST		69
UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX PATRIARCH VISITS KHARKIV		69
DONETSK MINERS DEFY DECISION TO END TWO-MONTH STRIKE		70
KHARKIV YOUTHS DETAINED DURING POLTAVA VISIT		71
CONFERENCE DISCUSSES FUTURE OF WORKERS' MOVEMENT		72
50,000 RALLY IN KYIV IN SUPPORT OF KHMARA		73
UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX PATRIARCH PLANS TO RESTORE ANCIENT MONASTERY		75
HIS HOLINESS MSTYSLAV MARKS 49 YEARS AS BISHOP		75
COAL-MINERS HOLD MEETING IN DONETSK		76
UKRAINIANS OPPOSED TO MOSCOW AS VENUE FOR CSCE CONFERENCE AFL-CIO LEADER MEETS STEPAN KHMARA		76 77

Unless otherwise stated, all the material in this section was provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service

RENOWNED US LAW EXPERT DENIED ACCESS TO IMPRISONED DEPUTY

KYIV, March 14 — Gregory Stanton, a world-renowned authority on international law and a member of the American Bar Association (ABA), arrived here on the invitation of the defence lawyers of imprisoned People's Deputy Stepan Khmara to assist them during Khmara's trial.

Mr. Stanton visited the Lukyaniv prison, where Khmara is being held. He was accompanied by Deputies Oles Shevchenko, Levko Lukyanenko and Ihor Derkach, and Rev. Yaroslav Lesiv of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. A number of foreign correspondents also accompanied Mr. Stanton.

Upon arriving at the prison, Mr. Stanton spoke with the warden who directed him to Semen Kharchenko — the chairman of the investigations group dealing with Khmara's case. In a telephone conversation, Mr. Kharchenko categorically refused to grant permission to Mr. Stanton and his delegation to visit Mr. Khmara.

Earlier the Kyiv prosecutor — Anatoliy Shevchenko, had also refused Mr. Stanton permission to see Mr. Khmara.

BACK IN US, STANTON SEES A SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION TO THE UKRAINIAN REVOLUTION

By Ihor Dlaboha

NEW YORK — Ten days in the capital of Ukraine have convinced Prof. Gregory H. Stanton that the righteousness and indomitable spirit of the leaders of the Ukrainian independence movement and the masses will undoubtedly lead to the fulfilment of the nation's dream — the restoration of independent Ukrainian statehood. Unabashedly categorising the events in Ukraine today as a revolution, Stanton said in a recent interview with "The National Tribune" that he believes it will succeed.

"The revolutionary independence movement of Ukraine is well under way", Stanton declared. "There is no doubt in my mind that the Ukrainian people want freedom. Those who see most clearly realise that freedom can only come through independence. It is only through genuine self-determination that Ukraine can become free", he said.

Stanton, an internationally renowned jurist and professor of law at Virginia's Washington and Lee University, flew to Ukraine in March to assist in the defence of Stepan Khmara, the Ukrainian people's deputy who was arrested under false

pretences in November of last year and imprisoned.

Stanton not only witnessed first hand the extent of Soviet justice — or injustice, as he prefers to call it — but saw the people's unshakable support for its democratic, opposition leadership.

Despite empty food stores and a broken down economy, Stanton said he did not see despair or frustration in the people. "I was inspired by the indomitable spirit of the Ukrainian people in the face of catastrophic difficulties". On the one hand, Stanton said, the opposition activists were upbeat and "sense that they're on the winning side". However, on the other hand, "ordinary citizens are more cautious, perhaps because they've been disappointed too often. Still, I was impressed by the deep, basic will of the ordinary people to be free", he explained. "I was impressed by the willingness of the extraordinary people to risk their careers to appear at public rallies, to go to the [Lukyaniv] prison, risking arrest, to become activists".

Stanton hopes that the authorities will allow this Ukrainian revolution to remain non-violent, pointing out that violence will surface only if the government moves against the people. Drawing from his own experiences as a civil-rights activist in the American South during the 1960s, Stanton said that "forces of oppression defeat themselves through violence".

After reviewing Khmara's case, Stanton's belief in his innocence intensified, along with his respect for the Ukrainian independence leader. "I have become convinced that Khmara is a truly great man. This is a man of the moral stature of Martin Luther King. It's an honour to be asked to help in his defence", said the American jurist.

Stanton painted a personal portrait of Khmara and depicted his profound Christian faith "that has deepened and matured to the level that he is able to express the meaning of the Christian Gospel through his life, his commitment to non-violence and justice". By reading his statements and investigating his case, Stanton discovered that Khmara has "extraordinary vision and intellectual power", and is a rare individual with clarity of vision. "His vision is of a free people. He sees that the Soviet empire continues to shackle the people of Ukraine", Stanton observed. "Through the Communist Party, the empire uses Ukrainians to enslave the people. His implacable opposition to the Soviet empire and Communism has given him a vision of a truly independent Ukraine". Comparing Khmara to Thomas Jefferson and George Washington, Stanton said those characteristics make him a perceived threat to Moscow. Khmara is such an important leader because he and people's deputies such as Larysa Skoryk and Levko Lukyanenko understand the importance of this vision.

After 10 days Stanton returned to the United States without ever seeing Khmara. He was invited to join the Khmara defence team by Rukh through the assistance of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Despite having been denied permission to meet with Khmara, Stanton would not say his trip was a failure. "I accomplished more than I thought possible", he stated. Stanton said he was able to conduct an independent, objective investigation of the Khmara case, which he labels a political one. For that reason, he noted, his defence must simultaneously argue legally and politically, something his lawyers were originally reluctant to do. The authorities' denial of his right to counsel, the right to free public assembly and the stripping of his parliamentary immunity, Stanton categorically said, violates international laws.

Stanton also managed to enlist the direct support of democratic opposition deputies, such as Oles Shevchenko, Ihor Derkach and Levko Lukyanenko, who accompanied him to the Lukyaniv prison and demanded to see Khmara. "Mobilising support from the [Ukrainian Republican] Party had a useful effect. In addition, "by speaking at public rallies, the Ukrainian people knew that the outside world was concerned and the Soviet authorities also saw that the world was watching".

Stanton found widespread knowledge of the Khmara case and support for him among the people. At one rally outside the prison, Stanton and the others were joined by 30 Ukrainian coal-miners. With this being a political trial, Stanton readily admits his fear that the outcome has been determined. "The Soviets know how big this case is and that the world is watching. They will probably reduce the charges against him because two of the three charges against him are so patently baseless", he said. However, he declined to predict the sentence. "The two theft charges cannot possibly be pinned on Khmara. The one accusing him of exceeding authority for demanding to see the plainclothes officer's ID card is ironic because that statute in the Criminal Code protects people against abuse by the police. There is no precedent for arresting a national deputy", Stanton explained. "I expect he will receive a light sentence, considering Soviet justice, or rather injustice", he added.

While in Kyiv, Stanton spoke at a Rukh-organised rally and one called by the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly. At one of them, the deputy prosecutor of Kyiv, Shevchenko, who is handling Khmara's case, threatened Stanton with imprisonment for reading the American Declaration of Independence. To Shevchenko's threat that he could face up to five years in prison, Stanton replied: "I would gladly suffer any penalty in order to read those words to the people of Ukraine". Stanton described this rally as one of his most moving experiences in Ukraine: "I concluded reading the Declaration of Independence with the words: 'Free Stepan Khmara; Free Ukraine', to which the crowd responded with cheers and chants of 'Freedom! Freedom!' Those 200-year-old revolutionary words are still revolutionary today".

The Rev. Yaroslav Lesiv, who has seen Khmara four times during one week in March, told Stanton that the Ukrainian activist's heart is showing signs of

problems. "Father Lesiv is worried about a heart attack and Khmara needs care but he isn't receiving it. Khmara is not sick, but for a man with a heart condition, keeping a steady diet is important", Stanton said. Khmara is imprisoned along with five new Ukrainian political prisoners, none of whom Stanton saw, except for Yaroslav Demydas, chairman of the Ternopil Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, whom Stanton saw briefly during his trial. One of the others, Oleksiy Kovalchuk, Stanton said, has been subjected to injections of psychotropic drugs, "which absolutely qualifies as torture under the International Convention on Torture".

The official investigation of the case has been concluded and the matter has been turned over to the courts, which must assign a trial date within 20 days, Stanton noted. However, he added, "The judge also has the power to send it back for further investigation, so we don't know when the trial will begin".

In the meantime, Stanton will not sit idly waiting to return to Ukraine for the start of the trial. He expects to be making people aware of the cases of Khmara and the others and to mobilise support for them among human rights groups, lawyers, congressmen, senators, parliamentarians, and the US government.

Stanton expressed hope that Washington will respond positively to his request for help because "the best US traditions are those in support of human rights". There is no doubt that the freedom trail is long and arduous, but Stanton's hopefulness in its humanitarian and successful conclusion is reflected in the final paragraph of his statement, read at a press conference in Kyiv on March 16: "The time will come when historians will write of these days as the beginning of the Ukrainian revolution. These men today, in prison, will become leaders of a new and independent Ukraine. The day will come when patriots will gather beneath their statues. But more importantly, the children of Ukraine will play in the fields of this land, free to be Ukrainian, free to sing the song of freedom in a free Ukraine".

50,000 ATTEND UNSANCTIONED ANTI-UNION RALLY IN KYIV

KYIV, March 17 — An unsanctioned rally was held on the central October Revolution (Independence) Square on the initiative of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA). The theme of the rally was: "Ukraine against the empire!"

Two hours prior to the start of the rally, one of the deputy chiefs of the Pecherskyi district of the Kyiv militia came to the headquarters of the Assembly, accompanied by two people in plain clothes. They warned the organisers of the rally that if the rally was held, they would be arrested and the participants dispersed with physical force. The organisers pointed out that they took the warning into consideration.

Despite the threat, the rally began at 2:00 p.m. By then nearly 50,000 people had assembled on the square. Once the rally began, a truck with loudspeakers arrived at

the scene with Lt. Col. Shaposhnik — the deputy chairman of the Kyiv MVD (internal security forces). Loud Russian music was played over the loudspeakers in an attempt to disrupt the rally, to which the rally participants began shouting out “Shame! Shame!”, eventually compelling the security forces to halt their disruption attempt.

The rally was addressed by Yevhen Chernyshov — the chairman of the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party; Yuriy Mykolskyi — the deputy chairman of the UMA; Gregory Stanton — US attorney; Anatoliy Lupynis — the chairman of the UMA Political Committee; Yuriy Shukhevych — UMA chairman; Viktor Furmanov — the chairman of the Lviv strike committee; Dmytro Ivashchykhin — a representative of the Ukrainian Student Association; Volodymyr Vyazivskyi — the deputy chairman of the Chervonohrad strike committee.

Volodymyr Filanovskiy, who presided over the rally, read out a resolution, which was approved by the participants. The resolution condemned Gorbachev’s union referendum as an attempt to legitimise Moscow’s colonial domination of the subjugated nations in the USSR. The rally participants also voiced their support for the striking coal-miners and expressed their protest against the new wave of repression in Ukraine.

After the rally, Yevhen Chernyshov, Serhiy Zadko from the UMA Executive Council, and Volodymyr Filanovskiy were arrested. Gregory Stanton stated his intention to act in their defence.

REFERENDUM RESULTS DIFFER RADICALLY ACROSS UKRAINE

LVIV, western Ukraine — The results of the March 17 referendum in Ukraine markedly differed according to geographical region, reported Halia Levytska, a spokeswoman for the Ukrainian Republican Party.

In the three western Ukrainian provinces of Lviv, Ternopil, and Ivano-Frankivsk, between 81-85% of voters cast their ballots against a Gorbachev-proposed “new union treaty” for the USSR. In Kyiv, the nation’s capital, the “new union treaty” was also turned back with 56% of participating voters opposed.

Moreover, in a second question attached to the referendum by the Ukrainian SSR’s Supreme Soviet, the majority of residents of Ukraine voted in favour of increased political autonomy for the republic. In yet a third question attached to the referendum by the Lviv provincial soviet, 89.6% of voters in the highly politicised

province expressed their support for a "free and independent Ukraine".

Nevertheless, on a nation-wide basis, a majority of residents of Ukraine voted "yes" to the vaguely and misleadingly worded referendum question that called for a "new union treaty", which would essentially keep Ukraine part of the USSR. In some provinces, such as Zaporizhia and Chernihiv, the "new union treaty" was apparently approved by upwards of 85%, according to the URP spokeswoman.

Several explanations were forwarded by Ms. Levytska to explain the seemingly contradictory results. "Many in the population, particularly in eastern Ukraine where political consciousness is low, simply did not understand the questions", said Ms. Levytska. "The Communist regime's propaganda confused them to the extent that they voted 'yes' to both remaining in the union and increasing Ukraine's sovereignty". There were also reports of widespread "electoral" fraud on the part of Communist officials. In the Zakarpattia province, leaflets asserting that voting against the "union treaty" was tantamount to civil war were distributed by local Party authorities. Even in Lviv, military districts would not admit observers, including people's deputies and the provincial chairman, to their polling stations. Ballot falsification and box stuffing allegedly widely occurred in Dnipropetrovsk, according to the spokeswoman.

Orest Deychakivskiy, a member of a US Congress observer team, reported similar tampering in Kyiv.

Nationalist forces are treating the results as a victory. "The bottom line is that the majority of people in Ukraine voted for greater political independence, as described by the second question. Now, the nationalist members of the Supreme Soviet have a true empirical mandate to press for independence", said Ihor Hutnyk, another URP activist in Lviv.

KHARKIV STUDENTS STAGE HUNGER STRIKE

KHARKIV, March 16 — A one-day warning hunger strike was held in this eastern Ukrainian city on Dzerzhinsky Square. The strike was staged by the Kharkiv branch of the Ukrainian Student Association (USS) and supported by the city's Youth League.

The principal demands of the protest action were the implementation of the decisions of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, accepted after the student hunger strike in Kyiv last October, which led to the resignation of the Prime Minister of the Ukr.SSR — Leonid Masol.

Following the warning hunger strike, Yuriy Dreval — the chairman of the Kharkiv USS branch and the joint chairman of the republican USS — received notification to appear at the militia headquarters to testify as a witness before the deputy chief of the Dzerzhinsky district militia department — Mr. Shevchenko.

The following day, when Dreval arrived at the militia headquarters, he was already a defendant and not a witness. The investigation lasted 20 minutes. He was accused of "insubordination to a militiaman" (art. 185/15 of the Ukr.SSR criminal code). Afterwards, Mr. Dreval was taken to the district court under the supervision of a militia lieutenant, where he was fined 300 roubles.

The chief of the Dzerzhinsky district militia — Lt. Col. Kyrychuk — then informed Mr. Dreval about a directive from the minister of higher and secondary education of the USSR, which states that Mr. Dreval will be automatically expelled from university should he be brought to "administrative responsibility".

The trial lasted half an hour. Mr. Dreval was not informed that he was to stand trial and thus did not have a defence lawyer with him. According to the student activists, the court action against Mr. Dreval is a clear indication that the Communist authorities intend to escalate their campaign against the student organisations and the national rights movement.

REACTION VERSUS REFORM IN ODESSA

ODESSA — Local Communist authorities and national-democratic activists clashed in a series of episodes in this southern Ukrainian port city during mid-March.

On March 13, Valeriy Miachinskyi — chairman of the local branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party, was attacked while handing out pro-independence leaflets in the city's central square by two plainclothes KGB men. When other activists arrived on the scene to intercede, they too were attacked. An independent journalist, Ihor Stoliarov, who was at the square, had his accreditation papers destroyed.

"We've already beaten the Lithuanians", said a KGB man during the incident. "Now, it's the turn of the Ukrainians".

On that same day, the Odessa provincial committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine released a statement on the activity of local opposition. "The leaders of these political groups justify their actions by saying that the provincial Party organisation seeks to monopolise power and rejects any cooperation. To this, we say that the provincial Party organisation will continue to decisively act against destructive forces and expose examples of political extremism, civic irresponsibility, and attempts to interrupt the process of perestroika", said the Communists' statement.

On the following day, three musical ensembles which had arrived from Ivano-Frankivsk province to commemorate Taras Shevchenko, a 19th century Ukrainian poet and national hero, were prevented from putting on their concert. On the orders of

the local Communist authorities, all the available venues in the province denied them access and they were forced to return home. Indeed, a ban on any commemoration of Shevchenko, whose birthday falls in March, was enacted.

Also in mid-March, the local Communist press featured an interview with Bishop Lazar of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, which until last year was named the Russian Orthodox Church and had a close working relationship with internal security organs. In the interview, the hierarch labelled the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Catholic Church "illegal" and observed that "only in Odessa do I feel myself to be a bishop". He had previously lived in Ternopil, western Ukraine, where the independent churches have overwhelming popular support.

CLAMPDOWN IN UKRAINE: PATTERN CLEAR

LVIV — Incidents across Ukraine on March 13-14 illustrate that republican internal security forces have apparently been given a free hand in dealing with their pro-independence, pro-democracy opponents, reported the press service of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) here.

On March 13, in Donetsk, heart of the southern Donbas region in which coal-miners were on strike, 5 activists of the Democratic Party of Ukraine, People's Movement of Ukraine (Rukh), and the URP were arrested at the main train terminal by the deputy commander of the local militia, who said they were suspected of trafficking narcotics. They were held for two hours while their personal effects were searched, after which they were released in the city's central square.

There, the activists were summarily attacked by men in plain clothes and 30,000 pro-independence leaflets were confiscated. Among the attackers, the activists recognised "bystanders" from the earlier train station confrontation.

On the following day, a party led by opposition People's Deputy Ihor Derkach arrived in Donetsk and was met at the train station by 20 men in plain clothes who proceeded to take away 15 boxes of leaflets against a "new union treaty" for the USSR.

Also on March 14, in Kharkiv, eastern Ukraine, unidentified men in civilian dress attacked Rukh activist Borys Zdorovets, as he was handing out leaflets against a "new union treaty". The attackers attempted to destroy the activist's megaphone and leaflets. In an unprecedented move, uniformed militia men intervened on Zdorovets' behalf and returned his leaflets.

Meanwhile, in Obukhiv in the central Kyiv province, a crucifix erected by national-democratic activists to commemorate the 500th anniversary of the formation of the Ukrainian Kozaks (Cossacks) was vandalised. The local militia refused to investigate the incident.

Finally, in Lutsk, northern Ukraine, Communist prosecutors initiated a criminal investigation against local students who staged anti-regime hunger strikes in

October 1990. The provincial Communist Party committee also issued the following instruction to its political workers: "At polling stations where there are no observers present, act on your own initiative to insure the attainment of the desired outcome in the March 17 referendum".

UKRAINIAN COAL-MINERS CONTINUE REVOLT

CHERVONOHRAH, March 18 — According to reports from Ukraine, the coal-miners' strike has not diminished at all, despite various threats on the part of the Communist authorities, but has in fact grown in magnitude since it began. According to Vasyl Rozvirskyi, chairman of this city's People's Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) and a member of the strike committee, the coal-miners' strike is primarily for political aims. One of the foremost demands forwarded by the miners, for instance, is for the immediate and unconditional release of imprisoned People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, who represents a district of Chervonohrad in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR.

Regarding the attitude of the miners, Mr. Rozvirskyi said, they are decisive and will not desist until all their demands are met. The miners are particularly adamant regarding the release of Stepan Khmara, said Mr. Rozvirskyi.

Apart from their political demands, the Chervonohrad miners said their strike is also in solidarity with striking miners in Donbas.

Rozvirskyi further stated that on Friday, March 22, a three-man delegation left for Kyiv for negotiations with representatives of the Ukrainian SSR government.

According to the newspaper "Za Vilnu Ukrainu" (March 20, no. 46), on March 17, a group of striking Donbas businesses held a meeting, during which they decided to forward the following demands:

- a) resignation of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev
- b) dissolution of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR
- c) the Ukrainian SSR Declaration on Sovereignty is to become the basis of Ukraine's Constitution
- d) the formation of a Council of Confederation of Sovereign States

DONETSK, March 23 — Nearly 15,000 people gathered in this mining city to attend a public rally, organised by the Donetsk strike committee.

The rally was precipitated by the intractable position of the Council of Ministers and Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR regarding the coal-miners' strike in Ukraine.

Since the colonial authorities in Ukraine refused to implement the demands of the miners and to take part in negotiations with their representatives, the rally adopted a resolution put forward by the strike committee to continue the strike. The rally participants were also demanding the release of Stepan Khmara and other imprisoned activists.

Another resolution was passed, demanding the halt of the informational blockade of the striking mining regions.

PROTEST ACTIONS IN UKRAINIAN CAPITAL INTENSIFYING

KYIV, March 23 — Mass actions in support of the striking miners began in this capital city, reports Mykola Kuntsevych of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) press centre.

That day a group of representatives of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) from Lviv began picketing on the central October Revolution Square. The pickets were demanding the immediate release of arrested activists People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, Mykhailo Ratushnyi — the coordinator of the Ukrainian Strike Committees, Mykola Holovach — the chairman of the strike committees of the Kyiv region, and Inter-Party Assembly activists Leonid Berezanskyi, Oleh Batovkin and Oleksander Kovalchuk.

The picket action continued the following day, Sunday, March 24. Representatives from the southern port city of Odessa and Uzhhorod in the Zakarpattia province, who arrived in Kyiv to take part in the protest action, joined the protesters on the square.

At 12:00, militia officers from the Lenin district arrested seven of the pickets — Mykola Baranych, Volodymyr Yarema, Oleh Chuliy, Ihor Huta from Lviv, Mykola Mazur, Serhiy Ryapolov from Odessa, and Edward Shufrych from Uzhhorod. Although the militiamen, particularly their commander — Lt. Col. Kondratiuk, chief of the Lenin district militia — tried to convince the protesters that the arrested pickets would be released in a short while, they were held until the next morning, when they were each fined 200 roubles by the Lenin district court.

In the meantime, more and more people, including delegations from Donetsk, Luhansk and Chervonohrad, and supporters of the striking coal-miners from Ternopil, Odessa, Lviv and other cities, have been flocking to Kyiv to take part in the protest.

On March 25, a large group of representatives of Ukraine's civic organisations and strike committees began a hunger strike outside the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet.

In a separate statement to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, representatives of the Donetsk and Chervonohrad strike committees expressed their demands, both economic and political: the immediate release of Mr. Khmara and the other activists, arrested in connection with the so called "Khmara affair", which occurred last November. The statement was delivered by People's Deputy Larysa Skoryk.

The political situation in the Ukrainian capital is becoming increasingly tense, says Kuntsevych. In this regard, the city court is trying to hurry through the trial of arrested URP activist Yaroslav Demydas, chairman of the Ternopil Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, imprisoned last November.

On the morning of March 26, a group of hunger-striking coal-miners moved off to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, where they intended to stage a picket. As they approached the building, they were attacked by special detachments of the militia. Employing physical force, the riot police arrested six of the group. They were taken down to the Pecherskyi district militia. The arrested demonstrators included two representatives of the Donetsk strike committee, Serhiy Fomin and Oleksander Nahorny, who two days previously had signed the miners' statement to the Supreme Soviet, as well as Donbas representative — Serhiy Mekilyov, Odessa URP member — Hryhorii Kolenda, and Andriy Poliatskyi and Yaroslav Moroza.

Major-General Nedryhailo, chief of the Kyiv city militia, informed them that such actions could not be staged closer than 1,000 metres around the Supreme Soviet building. They were released at 4:10 p.m.

That afternoon, at 1:00 p.m., the chairman of the UMA Executive Council — Petro Kahuy — was arrested in the street and brought to the prosecutor's office of the Shevchenko district in Kyiv. Kahuy was accused under art. 187-3 of the Ukr.SSR criminal code (repeated organisation of unsanctioned public measures in the span of a year). Mr. Kahuy requested lawyers Yuriy Ayvazyan or Viktor Nikazakov to act on his behalf. Both attorneys also represent Stepan Khmara.

ECOLOGICAL HUNGER STRIKE STAGED IN KHMELNYTSKYI

KHMELNYTSKYI — On March 20, Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) and Green Party activists — Volodymyr Petrov, Viktor Klishch, Oleksander Kokhryatskyi, and Serhiy Kokhryatskyi — began a hunger strike in protest against a provincial soviet decision to proceed with the construction of the second reactor at the Khmelnytskyi nuclear power station. This decision was in breach of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet moratorium on the construction of nuclear power plants.

The hunger strikers were demanding that an independent commission examine the first and second reactors at the power station, and a plebiscite on the future of the plant. Khmelnytskyi residents have drawn up a petition with 400,000 signatures, protesting against the construction of the power station.

A week later, on March 26, the hunger strike was brought to a close. The provincial council acceded to the protesters' demands. The deputies agreed to renew work on safety measures on the second Khmelnytskyi reactor only after the management of the plant had shown them the plans. Control over the implementation of the decision is to rest with the chairmen of permanent commissions and Viktor Klishch — one of the demonstrators and a radiophysicist by profession.

The provincial soviet also moved to form an independent commission and to inform citizens of its findings.

During the week-long protest, the militia removed the demonstrators eight times from the square, where their protest was taking place. According to Serhiy Ishchuk,

five of the protesters were fined, three were admitted to a hospital.

The hunger strikers ratified a resolution in which they stated that the Khmelnytskyi provincial red cross had refused to help them. The red cross officials, states the resolution, declared that the International Red Cross does not support hunger strike actions.

GREEN PARTY HOLDS RECRUITMENT RALLY IN CAPITAL

KYIV, March 21 — The Green Party held its first mass recruitment rally on the Ukrainian capital's October Revolution (Independence) Square.

Since the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet has refused to register the Green Party on the grounds that it lacks the necessary 3,000 members for registration, the party turned to all citizens of Ukraine to support it in the struggle for the future of Ukraine, calling upon all Ukrainians to join its ranks. In the space of two hours, some 50 people joined the party.

The principal points in the Green Party's platform are: democracy, social justice, non-violence, and pacifism.

DONBAS — AN ECOLOGICAL DISASTER ZONE

DONBAS — On March 22, in Horlivka, Donetsk province, the municipal soviet was in session to discuss the city's ecological problems.

The decision ratified by the session states that the ecological situation in the city remains grave. The average concentration of harmful substances has grown by one-and-a-half to two times. Last year, for every resident there were 240 kilograms of harmful substances. Thirty per cent of all adults in the area suffer from various respiratory problems. The figures among children, 70.2%, are alarmingly high. The session decided to appeal to the Supreme Soviets of Ukraine and the USSR, demanding that Horlivka and the whole of central Donbas be declared an ecological disaster zone.

According to the vice-chairman of the Horlivka municipal soviet — Viktor Lange, all-union ministries, which control most of the city's industries, not only do not use any means to improve the ecological situation, but are planning more ecologically-dangerous construction projects for Horlivka.

UKRAINIAN STUDENTS HOLD CONGRESS

KYIV — On March 30-31, a congress of Ukrainian students was held in this capital city. After lengthy discussions, the students decided to form a single organisation, which would unite all Ukrainian students. The student delegates decided to name this new organisation — the Association of Ukrainian Students (SUS). Volodymyr Chemerys of Kyiv University was elected chairman of SUS.

The Ukrainian Students' Association (Kyiv) and the Student Brotherhood (Lviv) became the two fundamental, skeletal bodies of SUS.

The representatives of these organisations, in projecting the future fate of the Ukrainian student movement, decided that at this particular juncture, when the Communist forces have intensified their anti-democratic, anti-independence campaign, it is imperative to forge a greater semblance of unity of all democratic forces. Only joint action of an organised student movement can bring discipline into the movement and raise it to a new level.

Many delegates to the congress stated that after the student strikes last October, the Ukrainian student movement was almost inactive on the political scene of Ukraine, which was particularly poignant following the mass student rebellion that rocked this capital city in October 1991. (In October 1991 a group of several hundred students staged a two-week hunger strike and a series of mass protests that led to the immediate resignation of V. Masol, then Prime Minister of the Ukr.SSR).

Presently the general Ukrainian liberation movement faces a difficult period and the Ukrainian students should stand alongside all the other forces fighting for Ukrainian independence and statehood, stated the student leaders.

SUS will "develop the finer traditions of its two forefathers", said Volodymyr Chemerys at the end of the congress.

FOURTH SESSION OF THE INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY HELD IN KYIV

KYIV — On March 30, 167 delegates and 41 guests gathered in the Ukrainian capital for the Fourth Session of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA), reports Mykola Kuntsevych of the UMA press centre.

The delegates represented: the Ukrainian Committee of Catholic Youth, the nationalist SNUM (Independent Ukrainian Youth Association), the Ukrainian National-Radical Party, the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party, the Dmytro Dontsov Ukrainian Nationalist Club, the Ukrainian Committee for the Formation of National Armed Forces, the Ukrainian National Party, as well as public committees from 17 provinces throughout Ukraine.

The proceedings were opened with a religious service conducted jointly by Revs. Ihor-Illia Onyshkevych and Yuriy Boyko of the Ukrainian Catholic and Autocephalous Orthodox Churches respectively.

The participants then paid respect to the philosopher of Ukrainian nationalism Dmytro Dontsov, on the 18th anniversary of his death, and greeted UMA chairman Yuriy Shukhevych on his birthday.

After the opening ceremony, the delegates elected the Session secretariat and editorial, auditing, and verification commissions, and ratified the agenda.

Following the initial proceedings, the participants heard reports by the UMA leaders.

First to speak was UMA chairman — Yuriy Shukhevych, who reported on the work of the Assembly and analysed the internal situation of the UMA. Next to speak was the chairman of the Executive Council — Petro Kahuy. He reported on the practical activities of the executive branch of the Assembly. (Kahuy was arrested on March 26 and indicted on criminal charges of repeated organisation of banned public rallies and demonstrations. He was released from imprisonment a day before the Session began). Vasyl Melnyk, chairman of the auditing commission, then presented his report.

After the reports, Yuriy Shvets, a member of the Chervonohrad strike committee, addressed the Session. He greeted the participants and informed them of the progress of the strike by western Ukrainian miners. The strike would go on until arrested People's Deputy — Stepan Khmara, who represents a district in Chervonohrad, and other political prisoners are released, Shvets pointed out.

Among the other speakers addressing the delegates were the following: the secretary of the Ukrainian Republican Party — Roman Koval, the co-chairman of the Lviv strike committee — Viktor Furmanov, the chairman of UMA's political committee — Anatoliy Lupynis, and Dmytro Korchynskyi, a delegate to the Session.

The application of the Lviv regional leadership of SNUM to join the UMA was publicly announced.

The Session also discussed and ratified a Statement of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, and elected the UMA's leading bodies. Yuriy Shukhevych was re-elected as UMA chairman, and Yuriy Mykolskyi as UMA vice-chairman; Vasyl Melnyk was elected chairman of the Executive Council, and Petro Kahuy as his vice-chairman; Kuzma Fedchenko was elected secretary of the Executive Council. An auditing commission was also elected.

Separate Statements on the status of the citizens committees, on the Inter-Party Assembly, on the UMA Executive Council, and on the Auditing Commission were discussed and ratified, as were appeals to the Ukrainian people, miners and students.

During the Session, Yuriy Shukhevych met with the vice-premier of Belgium — M. Philippe Moureaux, the Belgian Ambassador to the USSR, and other officials accompanying M. Moureaux on his visit. Mr. Shukhevych also gave a press conference to Belgian journalists.

STEPAN KHMARA RELEASED FROM JAIL

KYIV, April 5 — Stepan Khmara, a militant nationalist deputy to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet, who was arrested on November 17, 1990, on bogus charges, was released from Lukyaniv Prison in Kyiv at approximately 6:30 p.m. local time. Khmara's release is only temporary pending his trial, the date for which has yet to be set. Striking coal-miners from the Donetsk region of Ukraine and elsewhere had made Mr. Khmara's release one of their primary demands.

Prior to Khmara's release, a series of mass protest actions and hunger strikes were staged in this capital city by miners from his hometown of Chervonohrad and the city's residents, which he represents in the Supreme Soviet. Over 600 striking miners had camped for three days outside the prison where Khmara was being held since his arrest. Mr. Khmara was released in the custody of his attorneys — Yuriy Ayvazyan and Viktor Nikazakov, who escorted him out of the prison. Mr. Khmara's lawyers also said that their client was planning to resume a hunger strike on Easter Sunday, April 7. (Ukrainians celebrate Easter according to the old, Julian calendar). Mr. Khmara staged a thirteen-day hunger strike in December 1990 in protest against his arrest.

Following a short address to those gathered outside the prison, Mr. Khmara, the miners and a growing number of Kyiv residents marched through the streets of the capital to October Revolution Square, where a large crowd had gathered as news of Mr. Khmara's release spread throughout Kyiv. Mr. Khmara addressed the large spontaneous rally, calling on all Ukrainians to continue fighting for Ukraine's independence. He also vowed to fight against any new union treaty, stating that such a treaty would only reinforce Ukraine's colonial status within the empire. Khmara stated that he would work towards the dissolution of the Ukr.SSR's "undemocratic parliament — among the most reactionary in the entire USSR — and hold new, multi-party elections", according to a statement released by the Press Centre of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly. "Ukraine must not enter into any treaties until it has established its own independence and statehood", Mr. Khmara was quoted as saying. He also praised the striking coal-miners, saying that they "have done more for Ukraine than all of the deputies in the Supreme Soviet put together".

After the rally at October Revolution Square, Mr. Khmara was taken to Hotel Ukraina where he held a press conference before a considerable number of Western journalists and correspondents. Afterwards, Mr. Khmara boarded a bus to return to his home in Chervonohrad to celebrate Easter. He was accompanied by a large contingent of miners.

According to the Ukrainian Jurists group, based in Kyiv, Mr. Khmara formally requested the reinstatement of his Deputy's immunity status prior to leaving the prison.

KHARKIV SUPPORTS STRIKING MINERS

KHARKIV — This city's committee in defence of democracy organised a collection of money and food for the striking coal-miners.

Stands urging people to help the strikers and their families were erected throughout this eastern Ukrainian city. Ukrainian songs were played through loudspeakers.

The people responded positively. Every day contributions amounted to approximately 2,000-3,000 roubles. At public rallies that were held here recently,

as much as 5,000 roubles were collected. In the span of one week some 25,000 roubles had been raised in the drive.

Aware that in the present situation in the USSR, the Soviet rouble has little value, the people also brought supplies of food: canned food, fruit, coffee, chocolate, condensed milk, tea and the like. Several tons of food supplies were stockpiled.

Upon receiving the food aid, the miners handed it over to schools and kindergartens.

One of the committee's activists, Leonid Synitsyn, was warned many times by the Kharkiv authorities about the unacceptability of collecting money and food for the strikers.

EASTER LITURGIES IN KYIV

On Easter Sunday, April 7, Divine Liturgies were celebrated in all functioning churches of the capital, reports Mykola Kuntsevych of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) press centre. The churches that are affiliated with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) were attended by the largest crowds of worshippers.

Mass was held in the Church of Mykola Prytysko, the Pokrovska and the Church of St. Michael, which recently passed under the jurisdiction of the UAOC.

On Easter Sunday itself, the Church of St. Andrew also passed under the jurisdiction of the UAOC. In this church Easter Mass was celebrated by the Patriarch of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church — Mstyslav.

Services were also held by the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the branch of the official Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine, but with a markedly lower attendance.

Furthermore, several of Kyiv's churches passed over to the Roman Catholic Church, the Baptists and the Pentacostalists.

STEPAN KHMARA ARRESTED AGAIN

DONETSK-KYIV—APRIL 12, 1990 — Stepan Khmara, a militant nationalist deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the UkrSSR, was again arrested today at around 11:00 a.m. (local time), after having been released on Friday, April 5. Mr. Khmara was arrested at the airport upon his arrival in Donetsk, reported the Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) press agency.

The passengers on the plane were under the impression that the security forces were arresting a would-be terrorist, since Mr. Khmara was physically manhandled, brutally assaulted and taken away very quickly in handcuffs by a substantial group of security forces. Eyewitnesses stated that Mr. Khmara offered no resistance.

Mr. Khmara was in Donetsk, a major industrial and coal-mining centre, to attend a rally of striking coal-miners, who view Mr. Khmara as one of their political leaders.

A spokesman for the Donetsk KGB branch indicated in a telephone conversation that the decision to have Mr. Khmara re-arrested was taken by the Supreme Court of the Ukr.SSR on April 11. The KGB spokesman stated that the Court had rescinded its earlier decision to allow Mr. Khmara to remain at large pending his trial.

Rukh representatives in Kyiv stated that all their attempts to obtain more information from the Procurator's office and from the Supreme Court regarding the particulars of Mr. Khmara's arrest have been unsuccessful. The Procurator's Office has, however, announced that the trial of Mr. Khmara will begin in Kyiv on Monday, April 29, 1991.

RALLY IN LVIV DEMANDS KHMARA'S RELEASE

LVIV, April 14 — A mass rally was held in this western Ukrainian city today by the monument of Ivan Franko (19th century Ukrainian poet) in protest against the re-arrest of Stepan Khmara and against rising prices. The rally was organised by the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) and the city's strike committee.

Several speakers addressed the rally participants. Among those speaking was Lubomyr Senyk, chairman of the Lviv Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) Council, who pointed out that only in an independent Ukrainian state can the various economic problems facing Ukraine be resolved. Mr. Senyk also stated that Rukh will hold an all-union political strike on April 17, and will picket the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet in connection with the recent arrest of Stepan Khmara (re-arrested on April 12).

Afterwards, Yaroslav Kendzior, a people's deputy to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet, stated his position that, given the present situation, and given the great work that has been done by the Supreme Soviet, in particular those deputies from the democratic opposition — Narodna Rada (People's Council), it would be imprudent to hold strikes at this time. Mr. Kendzior continued to point out that the Narodna Rada is securing Ukraine's sovereignty, but through peaceful means.

Mr. Kendzior then criticised Stepan Khmara, claiming that his release was secured only after several democratic deputies gave their guarantees to the authorities that Mr. Khmara will conduct himself in a non-confrontational manner. "But Khmara did not heed this good council", Mr. Kendzior continued, "and immediately took up the struggle again, which precipitated his second arrest". "There are many paths that lead to sovereignty", stated Kendzior, "and we have to choose the one which is best at the given time. Khmara is confrontational and he wants to defeat the empire by himself. He has chosen the wrong path. He is against everyone", Mr. Kendzior continued, "and no one in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR can cooperate with him. He speaks out against our leader, Chornovil [the chairman of the provincial Lviv soviet], without whom we cannot establish an

independent and sovereign Ukrainian state”.

Given the fact that Stepan Khmara has become probably the most popular figure in Ukrainian politics today, because of his uncompromising stand with regard to Ukrainian independence, the rally participants voiced their protest against what Mr. Kendzior said with shouts of “Shame! Shame!”

Mr. Fomin, a miner from Donetsk, representing the regional strike committee, speaking in Russian, stated that only in an independent Ukrainian state can political and economic problems be solved. “Deputies are calling on us not to strike but to work”, said Mr. Fomin, “because supposedly the time is not yet right. But we have been waiting for 73 years for this time, and where were the deputies then, why were they silent? We are waiting for the political parties, let them come to us and fight alongside us. And those who do not come to us now will end up outside history. People of Lviv, support us, support Ukraine. Donetsk, Kyiv are awakening; rallies and strikes are being held”, concluded Mr. Fomin.

Yuriy Shukhevych, the chairman of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, spoke next. He pointed out that although the miner spoke in Russian, his heart is Ukrainian. “But no one knows what heart is in Kendzior”, stated Mr. Shukhevych.

“The deputies want everything to be quiet, peaceful. In the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet there no longer exists a group of 239 + 1 [a reference to 239 hard-core Communist deputies in the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet], but 450 - 1. Our deputies embrace with Kravchuk, they travel to America and Canada, but there is no one to go to Donbas. Ukraine is rising up and will sweep the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR and them away with it. We will not win Ukraine through referendums or declarations, but only through struggle. Only through struggle, unity in the struggle, and not various combinations and compromises. The province of Halychyna [western Ukraine] was once the Ukrainian Piedmont, and now it has become the political tail of Ukraine. We must fight for Ukraine because no one will give her to us”, concluded Mr Shukhevych.

After the speeches, the participants of the rally ratified a resolution and the rally ended with the singing of the national anthem of an independent Ukraine.

MASS RALLY HELD IN LVIV

LVIV — On Sunday, April 21, a rally was held outside the opera house in Lviv. It was co-organised by radical People’s Deputy Oleh Petryk, the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) and Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine).

Several speakers addressed the participants. Lubomyr Senyk, chairman of the Lviv Rukh organisation, spoke about the complicated political situation and the continuing strikes. He pointed out that Rukh is calling on all businesses which are subordinate to

all-union agencies (as opposed to republican agencies) to strike. The strikes will take place in the form of a chain: one ends and then another takes over. In this manner, according to Senyk, the economy of the Lviv province would not be overly disrupted.

Ihor Kulyk, the Lviv URP secretary, called for strikes and the release of imprisoned People's Deputy — Stepan Khmara.

Ludmyla Trukhmanova, the chairwoman of the Soldiers' Mothers Committee of Ukraine (Zaporizhia), informed the participants of her committee's work to secure for young Ukrainians military service in Ukraine, the need for the organisation of national armed forces, and the need to continue the struggle for an independent Ukrainian state, in which all of Ukraine's problems would be resolved.

Roman Pankevych spoke on behalf of the Veterans' Brotherhood. He called on Ukrainian leaders to work out a comprehensive and concrete programme for the national-liberation struggle for independence. He added that, unfortunately, the leaders are not acting in defence of their colleague Stepan Khmara. An independent Ukrainian state can only be established on the basis of the ideology of Ukrainian nationalism, which has always prescribed an uncompromising struggle for Ukraine's independence.

Yuriy Shukhevych, the chairman of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA), pointed out in his address that it is wrong to believe that Ukraine's economy will be ruined by strikes. "What economy", Shukhevych asked, "to whom does it belong? We are working for Moscow and Ukraine gets nothing from our work. Is it worth carrying on working? Perhaps it is better to strike to crush the Russian economy and the empire along with it", Shukhevych continued. "Strikes are a powerful weapon and our sole weapon in the struggle for the destruction of the empire and the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state". Shukhevych also criticised the leaders who are not working towards Khmara's release.

Viktor Furmanov from the Lviv strike committee said that Khmara was incarcerated in Sumy, which is totally under Communist control. But Sumy woke up and began to demand Khmara's release, as a result of which he was transferred to Kyiv. "And we, the people of Lviv", stated Furmanov, "should not sleep, we should fight".

Serhiy Fomin from the Donetsk strike committee said that his delegation came to Lviv not for material support, but in seeking to secure support for their efforts in the struggle for an independent Ukrainian state.

REVIVAL OF KOZAK BROTHERHOOD

KYIV, April 20 — The founding Council of the "Kozak Society of the Kyiv Oblast" was held in the building of the "Association for the Preservation of Old Artifacts", housed in the Pecherska Lavra — Kyiv Monastery of the Caves.

Twelve branches from the Ukrainian capital attended the event: the Minskyi *kurin* (battalion), Information *kurin*, the Free Kozaks, the Kozak Academy, the "Khortytsia" *zahir* (squadron), the "Free" *kurin* of the "Homin" choir, the Student *kurin*, the Kozak College, the Youth *kurin*, the Kyiv Plast *kurin*, the Kyiv "Prosvita" Society, and the "Surma" *kurin*.

Eight branches from the Kyiv oblast: Vyshhorod *kurin*, Irpinskyi *kurin*, the "Kozak Brotherhood" of the Pereyaslav *polk* (regiment), the Berezanska *sotnia* (company), the Fastivskyi *kurin*, the Vyshnevyi *kurin*, and the Obukhivska *sotnia* also attended.

Among the guest brotherhoods attending the Council were: the "Kozak Brotherhood" (Dnipropetrovsk), the "Ukrainian Black Sea Kozaks" (Odessa city and oblast), the independent Berdychiv *kurin*, the Ivano-Frankivsk Sich, and the independent Chernihiv *sotnia*.

The Archbishop of Bila Tserkva and Vyshhorod — Vicar of the Kyiv eparchy of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church — Volodymyr, addressed the Kozaks. A moleben service was held, after which the Kozaks sang the Ukrainian national anthem.

I. Honchar (an artist) and the vice-chairman of the "Society for the Preservation of Old Artifacts" — Zarembo, greeted the participants and gave an account of ancient Kozak traditions and of their system of organisation.

Afterwards, the Statutory by-laws and Programme of the "Kozak Society of the Kyiv Oblast" were discussed. Nominations were forwarded for candidates for the Kozak *starshyna* (officer corps).

After lunch, the Kozaks gathered on a clearing beside the walls of the Pecherska Lavra on the bank of the Dnipro river, where, according to Kozak tradition, the *starshyna* were elected:

Otaman (commander) — Oleksander Hudyma (People's Deputy of Ukraine);

Nakaznyi (assigned) *Otaman* — Oleksander Petrenko (historian, Institute of History);

Pysar (scribe) — Oleksander Overko;

Osavul (deputy commander) — Oleksander Bedzay;

Bunchuzhnyi (standard-bearer) — Oleksander Kovalenko;

Oboznyi (quartermaster) — Volodymyr Pekarskyi.

The *starshyna* received commemorative medallions; the Kozaks swore an oath of loyalty to the cause of Ukrainian independence on the Bible; the *Otaman*y (pl. of *Otaman*) of the Society and the *kuren*i (pl. of *kurin*) signed the minutes of the Council session.

The Society is striving to revive the spirit of the Kozak epoch of Ukrainian history — national statehood, military power, and a humanitarian and just social order based on a high level of spirituality and morals, and on the fundamental values of human dignity and brotherhood.

The principal aim of the Kozak Society is the revival, development and defence of the spiritual potential of the Ukrainian nation and a revival of the Kozak spirit. The society will strive to revive the love of freedom, national and individual dignity and honour; will develop national consciousness, love for Ukrainian culture, language and spirituality; and will also strive to develop the spiritual, moral and physical health of the people, recreate the traditional Kozak economy, trade, crafts, and revive national holidays, rites and customs.

The principal task of the Society is to continue the struggle for a sovereign and independent Ukrainian state.

The Kozak Society is a spiritual civic-patriotic organisation, which unites on a voluntary basis all citizens, who aspire towards the revival of the Kozak spirit and Kozak historic traditions and customs, the preservation of Kozak relics, history, culture, and the upbringing of children and youth in the spirit of chivalry.

The leaders of the Society stated that they are willing to work with any state or civic organisations and movements, whose aim is Ukrainian independence and who carry out their work on the basis of humanitarianism, democracy and enlightenment.

The organisational structure of the Kozak Society is in accordance with the traditional Kozak spirit.

LVIV HOSTS CONGRESS OF UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS

LVIV, April 20-21 — Over one thousand former Ukrainian political prisoners from all over Ukraine gathered in the Polytechnic Institute of this western Ukrainian city for the founding Congress of the “Association of Ukrainian Political Prisoners”.

The 1,135 former political prisoners attending the congress represented three generations of freedom fighters — from the 1930s, 40s, 50s, 60s and 70s.

Also present at the Congress were: Metropolitan Volodymyr Sterniuk of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, representatives of existing regional associations of political prisoners from the Lviv, Ternopil and Ivano-Frankivsk oblasts, the Kyiv-based Society of the Repressed, and former political prisoners from Vorkuta, Dzhezkazhan, Karaganda, and other camps.

Among the invited guests were: the Lithuanian Association of Political Prisoners, as well as former political prisoners from Byelorussia, Moldavia, Moscow and Riga.

More than 50 speakers addressed the participants. First to speak was Metropolitan Sterniuk, who greeted the delegates. He was followed by People's Deputies Mykhailo Horyn and Iryna Kalynets, Ivan Hel — the vice-chairman of the Lviv oblast council, all former political prisoners, as well as People's Deputy Rostyslav Bratun, the chairman of the “Memorial” society — Yevhen Hryniv, and representatives of the city and provincial soviets and various national-democratic organisations.

The speakers talked about the goals and tasks of the new organisation, and described their part in the struggle for Ukrainian independence, life in prisons and concentration camps, and the difficult material situation of many former political prisoners, who lost not only their health but also all their possessions, and are now without a pension, or any other means of livelihood. For this reason, the speakers demanded the full rehabilitation of all Ukrainian political prisoners and the return of all of their rights.

The delegates adopted the Statutory by-laws of the Association and elected a Great Council: Chairman — Ivan Hubka, a former longstanding political prisoner; Secretary — Hanna Ivanytska.

The Congress ended with a concert at which a choir of political prisoners and the "Antey" choir performed.

An exhibition of photographs and materials documenting the Communist terror, the national-liberation struggle, and the Gulag was set up in the foyer outside the congress hall.

The participants each wore a tag with the name of the concentration camp in which they were imprisoned, some of the older delegates wearing two or three. Many met former colleagues whom they had not seen for several decades.

CHAIRMEN OF PUBLIC COMMITTEES MEET IN KYIV

KYIV, April 27, 1991 — The chairmen of the Public Committees met today in this capital city in the offices of the Writers' Union, reports the Press Centre of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA). All the chairmen attended the meeting, with the exception of the heads of the Odessa and Poltava Public Committees.

The primary task of the Public Committees, which work outside the official state structures of the Ukr.SSR, since they do not recognise the legitimacy of that system and government, has been the gathering of signatures of citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic, as a prelude to the convocation of an all-Ukrainian Constitutional Assembly, during which an independent Ukrainian state will be declared. The Public Committees, instead, work within the structure of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, which also does not recognise the legitimacy of Soviet rule in Ukraine. The Assembly took a radical position on the recently held referendum of March 17 on a union treaty, calling on all Ukrainians not to participate in what it considered to be yet another colonial mechanism, designed to legitimise Moscow's imperialist policies and system in Ukraine.

The chairmen discussed the present status of the Public Committees, their effectiveness to date, the present situation in Ukraine, a programme of action for the future and how this programme may be coordinated with the Executive Council of the Inter-Party Assembly.

Most of the chairmen reported that despite a marked lull in the activities of the

respective committees, recently the signature-gathering campaign has intensified. An oft-repeated complaint was that the committees do not have the necessary manpower and technical and material means to continue their activity in the most effective manner.

The meeting's participants, while discussing the present situation in Ukraine, were often very critical of Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) and at times of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) for their less than principled positions and willingness to compromise with the Communist authorities in Ukraine. It is because of this, stated many of the chairmen and participants, that the Ukrainian people are now so disoriented and apathetic towards the national-liberation struggle.

After a lengthy and constructive discussion, the chairman of the UMA Executive Committee — V. Melnyk, and the vice-chairman — P. Kahuy, presented a detailed programme of action for the Public Committees, which was thoroughly discussed by the participants of this meeting. Mr. Melnyk also spoke of the need to establish a wider UMA network, which would begin preparing the documents and other constitutional acts for the National Constitutional Assembly. The participants of the meeting decided to establish a Committee of Citizens of Ukraine in preparation of such an assembly. Mr. H. Musienko was chosen to head this committee.

LIBERATION STRUGGLE VETERANS FORM ALL-UKRAINIAN ORGANISATION IN LVIV

LVIV, April 27-28 — An all-Ukrainian assembly of participants of the national-liberation struggle of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), and the Ukrainian National Army was held in this western Ukrainian city. The event began with a march through the city centre. Participating in the march and subsequent assembly were the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) and the Ukrainian Nationalist Association (UNS). The youth pledged loyalty to Ukraine beside the Shevchenko stone.

During the assembly the participants resolved to establish the "All-Ukrainian Brotherhood of UPA Soldiers", for which Statutory by-laws were adopted and an executive body elected.

Mykhailo Zelenchuk from Ivano-Frankivsk was elected as Chairman of the Brotherhood; Meletiy Semeniuk from Lutsk and Serhiy Pashchuk from Lviv were elected vice-Chairmen, and Roman Pankevych from Lviv — Secretary.

The participants ratified a Statement, as well as an appeal to the youth and to religious believers.

The assembly ended with a rally outside the Lviv opera house in the centre of the city.

The participants of the assembly primarily represented the Ukrainian provinces of Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ternopil and Volyn. Also present were representatives from Dnipropetrovsk and other Ukrainian cities.

SOLDIERS' MOTHERS HOLD CONFERENCE IN LVIV

LVIV, April 28 — The Coordinating Council of Soldiers' Mothers held a conference in this city, which was attended by delegates representing mothers' committees from Lviv, Ternopil, Ivano-Frankivsk, Transcarpathia, Rivne and Chernivtsi provinces. Other participants included representatives of political parties and organisations, and democratic councils.

The participants discussed the spring draft into the Soviet armed forces, expressing their demands for the disbanding of the draft commissions in view of their violation of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet and government declarations on military service in Ukraine by conscripts.

The mothers adopted a resolution calling for a suspension of the draft until the Ukr.SSR government gives firm guarantees that conscripts will serve in Ukraine only and will defend the deserters, having established an appropriate mechanism to do this.

The participants resolved to send the resolution to Ukraine's provincial soviets and to the Supreme Soviet. They will also appeal to the provincial soviets of all of Ukraine to support the resolution to suspend the draft commissions until their demands are met.

MAY 1 DEMONSTRATION IN KYIV ENDS IN BLOODSHED

KYIV, May 1 — The Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) and Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) organised an alternative demonstration to the official May Day Parade, to demonstrate once again the will of the Ukrainian people for freedom and independence, reports the Kyiv-based "Vita Nova" press agency.

The demonstration began at 10:00 a.m. The columns of demonstrators, which included representatives of the striking miners and of other political parties and organisations, marched down the capital's central Khreshchatyk boulevard in the direction of the Lukyaniv prison, where People's Deputy Stepan Khmara is being held, pending his trial. (Khmara was arrested on November 17, 1990, on trumped-up charges of assault. He was released on April 5, 1991, and re-arrested on April 12 at Donetsk airport, where he had arrived on the invitation of the striking coal-miners to address a public rally. Khmara's trial, scheduled for April 29, has now been postponed until May 14. On April 12, Khmara declared a hunger-strike. According to the "Vita Nova" press agency, Khmara's health has deteriorated and prison authorities have begun to force-feed him).

Outside the Lukyaniv prison the demonstrators were met by a cordon of internal

ministry troops and vehicles. (At 4:00 a.m., reports "Vita Nova", a colonel of interior ministry troops from Kharkiv, notorious from the Nagorno-Karabakh massacre, and units of interior ministry troops from Mykolayiv and Kyiv were deployed in the capital. All approaches to the prison were sealed off).

Up to 3,000 militia and soldiers were on duty, reports "Vita Nova". The demonstrators numbered nearly 20,000 people, including women and children.

The Narodna Rada (People's Council — parliamentary opposition group) deputies, who led the demonstration, began negotiations with the commanders of the militia and troops. A delegation consisting of Deputies Larysa Skoryk, Ivan Drach, Mykhailo Horyn and seven representatives of the striking miners was permitted to enter the prison. Dmytro Pavlychko and Mr. Mosiuk went to find Judge Fedchenko and other members of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Court, in order to persuade them to pass a decision to release Stepan Khmara. Larysa Skoryk was permitted to see Mr. Khmara.

At approximately 2:00 p.m., the demonstrators blocked off Artem Street, where additional units of militia and interior ministry troops were dispatched.

Once it began to rain the crowds started to disperse. At approximately 6:30 p.m., 1,000 demonstrators remained outside the prison. At 6:50 p.m., the people were instructed through loudspeakers to clear the road for traffic. Although the demonstrators cleared the road, the militia and troops attacked them, beating them brutally. Many demonstrators were brutally dragged along the road. According to eyewitness accounts, reports "Vita Nova", the soldiers appeared in a drugged state, similar to the paratroopers in Vilnius. Eighteen miners and 12 demonstrators were arrested. Many people were injured. When the beating ended, Deputies Larysa Skoryk, Dmytro Pavlychko, Ivan Drach, Mykhailo Horyn and others were allowed out of the prison.

KYIV PROTESTS AGAINST MAY 1 BEATINGS

KYIV, May 2 — The events of the previous day did not deter the people of Kyiv and representatives of the striking miners of Donbas, Luhansk and Chervonohrad from again coming out into the streets of the Ukrainian capital, reports the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) press centre. On May 1 approximately 60 people were injured and 21 people were arrested during a militia attack on an unarmed crowd of protesters outside the Lukyaniv prison. They were demanding the release of People's Deputy Stepan Khmara.

The next morning (May 2) the arrested individuals appeared for a hearing at the Shevchenko district court. The secretary of the Kyiv Ukrainian Republican Party branch — Yuriy Murashov, was fined 200 roubles.

A public rally was held at 11:00 a.m. beside the Republican stadium, which was attended by 1,000 people. People's Deputies Larysa Skoryk, Dmytro Pavlychko,

Oleksander Yemets, Ivan Drach and Yuriy Hnatkevych addressed the rally. The vice-chairman of the UMA Executive Council — Petro Kahuy, described the brutal militia attack the previous day and the ensuing arrests, and urged the people of Kyiv to undertake decisive action in defence of political prisoners: People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, Mykhailo Ratushnyi, Leonid Berezanskyi, Oleh Batovkin, Mykola Holovach and Oleksander Kovalchuk.

Those who were injured in or witnessed the attack on May 1 gave their statements and depositions, which are going to be used as evidence in criminal proceedings against the organisers and perpetrators of the incident.

During the meeting Larysa Skoryk read out the resolution of the participants of the May 1 rally, addressed to the chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet — Leonid Kravchuk. Afterwards, the deputies left the square to deliver the resolution to Mr. Kravchuk.

The participants of the rally then marched to the central October Revolution Square, where another rally was held. At this rally representatives of Kyiv's workers' collectives expressed support for the demands of the striking miners.

Despite the presence of a contingent of militiamen, the security forces did not interfere with the proceedings.

At 7:00 p.m., one of the leaders of the rally — Anatolii Lupynis, the secretary of the UMA Advisory Council, announced that four tents would be erected on the square for three hours as a warning to the authorities. He pointed out that the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet has been warned on many occasions that if Stepan Khmara and the other political prisoners are not released the people of Kyiv would resort to more radical measures. Because the leaders of the Ukr.SSR ignored all these warnings, Lupynis said, the tents would be erected to demonstrate that if the six men are not released, Kyiv would once again be transformed into a "tent city" (reference to the student strikes of last October) of protest and civil disobedience.

A few minutes after the first tent had been erected a unit of "black berets" (special riot troops) appeared on the scene and forced its way through the crowd, beating people, in order to tear down the tent. The tent was knocked down and seized by the troops. Lt. Col. Kondratiuk — militia chief of Kyiv's Lenin district, warned Lupynis that he would be arrested and thrown into prison. With the help of the miners, who formed a cordon between the soldiers and the demonstrators, Lupynis and the other organisers of the action managed to gradually placate the crowd.

The rally lasted well into the night, ending with the singing of the Ukrainian national anthem and various patriotic songs.

YOUTH COMMEMORATE KHARKIV'S NATIONALISTS OF THE PAST

KHARKIV, May 4 — The Youth League of the Kharkiv region held a series of events to commemorate and honour Ukrainian nationalist leaders and organisations that were at one time based in this major eastern Ukrainian city, reports Kost Cheremskyi, chairman of the Kharkiv "Sokil" youth organisation. The day's events were held under the general theme — "Kharkiv — Cradle of Ukrainian Nationalism". (On February 23, 1991, Kharkiv's Ukrainian Youth Association (SUM), Ukrainian Student Association of Mykola Mikhnovskyi (TUSM) and the "Sokil" youth organisation united to form the Youth League).

The commemoration was held to honour the activists of the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (RUP) and Ukrainian People's Party (UNP), which actively promoted Ukrainian nationalist ideas in this eastern Ukrainian region at the beginning of the 20th century. These political parties were the first in Ukraine to openly adopt and propagate the platform of Ukrainian nationalism.

A memorial service for the father of Ukrainian nationalism — Mykola Mikhnovskyi, whose life was closely connected with Kharkiv, and activists of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (SVU) and the Ukrainian Youth Association (SUM) was held at the former city cemetery (now a playground), beside a cross erected in memory of the victims of the forced famine of 1932-33. The service was conducted by Rev. Valeriy Shkarubskyi, a Ukrainian Catholic priest from Kyiv.

The service was followed by a public rally to mark the fact that it was in this city that Mikhnovskyi wrote his seminal work "Samostiyna Ukraina" (Independent Ukraine), which to this day is considered to be one of the major treatises of modern Ukrainian nationalism. The rally organisers pointed out that the RUP and UNP first began to operate in the spirit of Mikhnovskyi's ideals in Kharkiv.

The second part of the rally was dedicated to the trial of SVU and SUM members, which was held in Kharkiv in the spring of 1929.

UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX PATRIARCH VISITS KHARKIV

KHARKIV — The Patriarch of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) — His Holiness Mstyslav, met with the residents of Kharkiv on May 5.

Despite lengthy negotiations with the municipal authorities, who did all they could to prevent the event from taking place, the meeting was held all the same, although not in the church, as originally planned, but in the city's opera house.

His Holiness Mstyslav celebrated a Divine Liturgy, following which he spoke to the people that had come to greet him.

The choir of the Kharkiv UAOC community and the "Slobodiany" choir performed various religious hymns in honour of the Patriarch.

DONETSK MINERS DEFY DECISION TO END TWO-MONTH STRIKE

DONETSK — The Donetsk regional strike committee held a meeting here on April 30, at which, after long debate, it was resolved to end the strike by July 16, reports the Lviv branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP).

On May 3 representatives of strike committees of coal mines and other enterprises, which oppose the regional committee's decision to end the strike, met at the "Oktiabrskaya" coal mine in Donetsk. The participants expressed their non-confidence in the regional strike committee for ending the strike without securing an acceptance on the part of the Communist regime of any of the coal miners' demands. The miners' representatives expressed indignation that the strike committee has decided to end the strike, begun on March 1, under pressure of the reactionary establishment.

The miners and other workers who gathered at the "Oktiabrskaya" coal mine formed an initiative committee to coordinate the activities of those enterprises, which have decided not to call off the strike. The meeting of miners' and workers' representatives concluded with a decision to cancel the mandate and plenary powers extended to the regional strike committee and to hold a conference.

The striking miners and workers again reissued their demands, which include the following:

1. the immediate and unconditional release of People's Deputy Stepan Khmara and other political prisoners;
2. implementation of the Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine;
3. a cessation of all payments and other forms of monetary contributions to the central budget in Moscow;
4. transfer of all businesses and enterprises under all-union jurisdiction to republican control;
5. Ukrainian conscripts are to serve exclusively within Ukraine;
6. a new union treaty is not to be signed until a Constitution of a sovereign Ukraine has been ratified;
7. introduction of private ownership of land;
8. privatisation of industry, trade and social services;
9. nationalisation of Communist Party property, which is to be used to pay for the clean-up of the effects of the Chornobyl disaster and other environmental damage.

The meeting lasted for some six hours. At approximately 12:30 a group of militia arrived at the coal mine, to whom the miners pointed out that they will continue the strike.

Following the meeting, a delegation was dispatched to Kyiv for a meeting with oppositional deputies.

Narodna Rada (People's Council) deputies met in Kyiv on May 5 to discuss the

political strike of Ukraine's south-eastern industrial basin. The deputies pointed out that an improvement in the standard of living can only be achieved through radical political changes and only within an independent Ukrainian state. Because the Communists would not accede to realistic reforms without continuous pressure from the work-force, the deputies stressed the need to organise a general strike throughout all of Ukraine. With this aim in mind a committee was established to organise an effective all-Ukrainian strike committee. This committee is composed of Larysa Skoryk, Ivan Drach and other people's deputies, as well as representatives of the striking workers, who were invited to the meeting.

The Narodna Rada also adopted an appeal to the people of Ukraine, in which it declared its support for the miners who are continuing the strike, urged the population to give the strikers moral and material support, and asked the democratic organisations to organise collections to help the strikers of Donbas.

A republican conference of strike committees will be held in Pavlohrad on May 9-11 in preparation for a general strike throughout Ukraine.

KHARKIV YOUTHS DETAINED DURING POLTAVA VISIT

On May 10-12 — The Kharkiv region Youth League organised an educational trip to Poltava to acquaint the Kharkiv youth with places connected with the life of Symon Petlura (head of the independent Ukrainian government and commander-in-chief of Ukraine's military forces, 1918), reports Les Bondarenko, chairman of the Kharkiv Ukrainian Youth Association (SUM). The Youth League is composed of SUM, the "Sokil" youth organisation and the Association of Ukrainian Students of Mykola Mikhnovskyi (TUSM).

The principal event was held at the Youth League camp, situated on the banks of the river Vorskla.

That day members of the Youth League organised a trip to Poltava to visit the house where Petlura lived, to lay flowers beside the city's Taras Shevchenko monument and on the graves of Ukrainian and Swedish soldiers, who died during the fateful battle of Poltava (1709).

After laying flowers at the Shevchenko monument, the young Kharkivites began to sing various national and Ukrainian Insurgent Army songs. They were then approached by militia, who accused them of staging an unsanctioned demonstration and rally and ordered them to follow the officers to the station. When the youths resisted, they were detained and a short while later forced onto a bus, where they were interrogated and had their papers checked. The militia officers accused the detained persons of displaying national symbols, distributing "subversive literature" in the form of newspapers "Za Vilnu Ukrainu", "Poklyk sumlinnia" and "Ratusha" (which are officially registered publications in the Ukr.SSR), and also leaflets with the Programme of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists. The officers then confiscated any film used to take pictures of this Youth League event

and of the militia's treatment of the organisers.

During the interrogation the deputy chief of the October district militia of Poltava — V. Kalhushkin, and Major Skoryk behaved brutally towards the youths.

Afterwards, under police escort, the youth activists were driven to the train station, where they were forced onto a train for Kharkiv under the supervision of the militia and KGB.

CONFERENCE DISCUSSES FUTURE OF WORKERS' MOVEMENT

DONETSK, May 9-11 — A conference of representatives of workers' and strike committees, public organisations and democratic political parties was held in Pavlohrad, Donetsk region. Sixteen deputies from the Narodna Rada (parliamentary opposition group) and representatives of labour movements from all oblasts (provinces) of Ukraine attended this conference, which was held in the very heart of Ukraine's industrial and mining area. The largest representations were from the Dnipropetrovsk region and Kyiv.

Two separate proposals regarding the future of the workers' movement in Ukraine were discussed at the conference: the first — that political parties become an integral part of the workers' strike movement, assuming a leading role; the second — to leave the strike committees as they are, but to form an advisory centre based on the existing democratic parties and local Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) branches. The majority of the participants supported the second proposition.

An advisory centre was, indeed, established, comprising Mykola Porovskyy from Rukh, Maria Oliynyk from the Ukrainian Republican Party and Yevhenia Ratnikova from the Democratic movement of the Donetsk region.

An attempt was made to transform the strike committees into trade unions along the lines of the Polish "Solidarity" and the formation of a Ukrainian Workers' Party. But in the opinion of the majority of participants, such changes are dangerous in the face of the threat of a new union treaty.

The conference adopted a statement and an appeal to the Supreme Soviet and the Ukrainian electorate in connection with the arrest of Stepan Khmara. The statement pointed out that the conference participants intend to take part in the formation of an all-Ukrainian political coalition of political and civic organisations, political parties, alternative trade unions, workers' and strike committees and mass movements, whose aim would be the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state based on democratic principles.

50,000 RALLY IN KYIV IN SUPPORT OF KHMARA

KYIV, May 13 — 50,000 people attended a mass rally in support of Stepan Khmara that was held in this capital city, reports the Lviv branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party. Khmara was released the previous day on the demand of the parliamentary opposition, pending his trial, which was due to open on May 14, but which has twice been postponed.

A number of people's deputies and other activists of the national-democratic movement addressed the crowds of people.

Deputy Larysa Skoryk pointed out that Khmara was not released, but merely let out a day before his trial. The courtroom that has been chosen for the trial can only fit some 60 people, apparently so as to prevent a mass demonstration of support for the national rights activist. In her opinion, Ukraine can only be free when the Communist regime has been completely dismantled.

Deputy Fedir Sviderskyi said that the Communist deputies are equally to blame for the political farce that this trial is turning into and also for the Chornobyl disaster. The miners' strike showed how to unite western and eastern Ukraine, Mr. Sviderskyi stated.

Stepan Khmara addressed the rally, thanking the people for their support. Today's government, he said, is incapable of standing in defence of its people and instead the people must defend themselves from the government. Leonid Kravchuk is primarily responsible for the political farce that is presently being staged, continued Mr. Khmara. Could he, after such a crime, build a Ukrainian state, Khmara asked? He called on the people to form a network of strike committees and to make preparations for a political strike to oppose the union treaty.

People's Deputy Mykhailo Horyn, in his address, also called for the creation of strike committees.

American jurist Gregory Stanton said that, from the point of view of the law, Khmara is innocent and has been unlawfully imprisoned since last November.

Also speaking before the crowds of people at this rally were a number of representatives of the striking Ukrainian coal miners, for whom Stepan Khmara, with his radical, nationalist programme, has become a political leader.

MAY 14 — Protesting the conditions in which the Communist authorities want to proceed with his trial, Stepan Khmara refused to enter the courtroom, prompting the judge to postpone the trial to another date. Mr. Khmara stated that the authorities have made a mockery of this trial by scheduling it in a hall that can only seat around 60 people and then packing it with representatives from the prosecutor's office and uniformed militiamen, thereby denying access to any representatives from the national-democratic opposition. The building is cordoned off by special units of

black-beret militia — the OMON, which is known for its brutality in dealing with peaceful demonstrators. Such brazen intimidation tactics are designed to secure the conviction of Mr. Khmara and the co-defendants in this case.

Thousands of people from various regions of Ukraine arrived in this capital city to manifest their support for Stepan Khmara, reports the Lviv URP. At 10:00 a.m., 15,000 people gathered outside the courthouse, where Khmara was to stand trial. When the trial began, the hall was fully packed with representatives of the prosecutor's office. After long negotiations with the militia, people's deputies Bohdan Horyn, Ivan Drach, Levko Horokhivskyi, Orest Vlokh, Mykhailo Shvaika, Maria Kuzemko and Mykhailo Horyn were permitted to enter the hall.

Following the judge's speech, Khmara's lawyers pointed out that judicial procedures had been violated and the trial cannot continue under such circumstances.

Afterwards, Stepan Khmara addressed his supporters.

A column of hundreds of people, led by people's deputies, then headed off to the Supreme Soviet building. Near the October Revolution Square they were halted by a cordon of riot troops. When the column refused to stop, the troops attacked the protesters, beating people over the head with their rubber truncheons. According to eyewitnesses, dozens of people were hurt, many of them seriously.

Following the incident, a rally was held on the square. Rukh activist Dmytro Poyezd pointed out that the Communists in the Supreme Soviet are capable of any crime. In this situation, he stated, Ukraine needs its own army.

The protesters adopted a resolution, which included the following points:

- the immediate release from under prison guard of all political prisoners;
- an immediate end to the trial, fabricated by the Communist Party;
- live TV coverage of the trial and related events;
- the exclusion from the courtroom of all members of the Communist Party;
- a detailed investigation of the beating of people by the militia;
- for the Kyiv city and oblast (provincial) soviets to enact legislation requiring the immediate deportation from the city of all militia and military units brought into the capital from other regions of Ukraine.

On May 14 the Kyiv municipal soviet forwarded a statement to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR demanding the removal of the troops from the city.

Several city deputies also stated that a separate statement protesting against the militia's recent brutal behaviour will soon be published.

UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX PATRIARCH ANNOUNCES PLANS TO RESTORE 12TH CENTURY MONASTERY

KYIV, May 12 — After this visit to the eastern cities of Kharkiv and Poltava, His Holiness Mstyslav — Patriarch of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC), held a service to bless a cross on the site of the former St. Michael Monastery, destroyed by the Communist regime in 1934. Preparations are now being made to restore the 12th-century monastery.

Before the moleben (a religious service), the Patriarch addressed the congregation, outlining the history of this monastery.

UAOC bishops from all over Ukraine, summoned to the Ukrainian capital by the Patriarch for a meeting, participated in the service, as well as numerous clergy and several thousand faithful from Kyiv and other cities.

Following the religious service, People's Deputy Les Taniuk, who chairs the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Culture and Education, pointed out how, as a child, he had witnessed the removal of the remaining building materials from the site of the demolished monastery by Komsomol activists. The destruction of this ancient Ukrainian historical site, Taniuk said, was a great crime against the Ukrainian people.

Next to speak were the vice-chairman of the Kyiv city council — Oleksander Mosiuk, and the president of the capital's soccer team "Dynamo" Kyiv — Viktor Bezverkhyi. Mr. Bezverkhyi announced that his team is sponsoring the restoration of the monastery.

The curator of the St. Sophia museum in Kyiv also spoke on this occasion. She presented Patriarch Mstyslav with an engraving of the St. Michael Monastery and promised to make available all the original plans of the monastery, which have survived in her museum.

HIS HOLINESS MSTYSLAV MARKS 49 YEARS AS BISHOP

KYIV — On Tuesday, May 14, Patriarch Mstyslav celebrated Mass in a church at the demolished St. Michael Monastery in the Ukrainian capital to mark the 49th anniversary of his installation as bishop.

Patriarch Mstyslav was assisted by Revs. Volodymyr Yarema, Ivan Pashulia and Viktor Kuli.

After the service, the head of the UAOC recounted the circumstances in which, in 1942, his chirotony (a religious ceremony marking the installation of a bishop) was secretly held in the St. Andrew Church in Kyiv.

Archbishop Antony of Rivne and Ostrih greeted the Patriarch on behalf of the hierarchy, clergy and faithful of the UAOC.

COAL-MINERS HOLD MEETING IN DONETSK

DONETSK — The city's strike committee held a meeting on May 22, in the "Donetskuvhillia" factory. Representatives of several coal-mining enterprises participated in the meeting.

Those present discussed the results of the recent strike. One general observation shared by the meeting's participants was that the strike did generate support among workers' collectives that did not take an active part in it. Moreover, the general populace is now aware of the coal-miners' plight. It was also reported that the strike committee received financial support in the sum of 633,000 roubles.

The participants expressed differences regarding the distribution of the money. After some debate on the issue, it was decided that the money will be divided between the coal-mines.

Finally, June 21 to 23 were the dates set for a congress of an all-Ukrainian union of strike committees. The congress will be held in the Kyiv Polytechnic Institute.

UKRAINIANS OPPOSED TO MOSCOW AS VENUE FOR CSCE CONFERENCE

DONETSK — Signatures are being collected on a statement to the governments of the countries participating in the CSCE Human Rights Conference, scheduled to be held in Moscow in September 1991.

The statement notes: "The representatives of public organisations, residents of the city of Donetsk fully support the final resolution of the Fifth Independent International Conference on Human Rights — 'Vilnius-Leningrad-90', and are of the opinion that realistic changes in human rights in the country will not take place so long as power remains in the hands of the CPSU, a system set up by Communists. The citizens of the country have been transformed into means of production in order to assist the CPSU in the struggle for its ambitious political goals.

The political turmoil in the country, which is called 'perestroika' — work for the individual, material wealth for the producer — has brought nothing good. As long as the CPSU controls the economy, it is unrealistic to expect the improvement of rights and freedoms in the country. The people and the Party will never be one. In the eyes of the people, Communists are criminals. This is corroborated by their way of life, their actions, their denial of basic freedoms and rights, social security and a legal framework, and the crumbling economy.

Telephone rights — this is the seriously flawed, negative moral capital of the CPSU.

We ask the CSCE Conference on Human Rights to hold the Conference in any other country but not in Moscow".

According to Yevhen Azarov, delegate of the Fifth Conference on Human Rights, which was held in Leningrad last year, if the Conference will be held in Moscow, the whole world will get a false impression of the political situation in the USSR.

AFL-CIO LEADER MEETS STEPAN KHMARA

KYIV, May 20 — People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, presently awaiting trial on trumped-up charges, had a breakfast meeting with the leader of the American Federation of Labor-Conference of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) Lane Kirkland.

Mr. Khmara was instrumental in forging a coalition of independent Ukrainian trade unions — "Yednist" and was generally regarded as the political leader of the striking coal-miners.

The discussions revolved around the political situation in Ukraine, the development of the labour movement, as well as various political aspects of the "Khmara case". Mr. Kirkland expressed ideas concerning the possibility of cooperation between US trade unions and the Ukrainian labour movement.

Khmara's defence lawyers — Yuriy Ayvazyanyan and Viktor Nikazakov, and the vice-consul of the US in Kyiv — John Stepanchuk, were also present at the breakfast meeting.

(Rukh-Press)

DOCUMENTS & REPORTS

STATEMENT BY STEPAN KHMARA FOLLOWING HIS RE-ARREST	78
STEPAN KHMARA APPEALS TO THE PEOPLE OF UKRAINE	85
STEPAN KHMARA PRESS CONFERENCE IN KYIV.	88
TRIAL OF KYIV 7 — A MOCKERY OF JUSTICE	
Dr. Gregory Stanton	92

STATEMENT BY STEPAN KHMARA FOLLOWING HIS RE-ARREST

Below are excerpts from a statement issued by Stepan Khmara, following his re-arrest on April 12, 1991, only six days after his release from prison.

TO THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE

Six tense days of freedom. Many meetings with the people of Kyiv, Chervonohrad, Lviv, foreign and Soviet journalists, and representatives of socio-political organisations. This stormy time gives me no right to rest.

I was finally able to set out for Donbas, which has always had a special calling for me.

Everything happened so quickly... and once again, prison bars.

On April 12, at 11:45 a.m., near the ramp of the plane at the Donetsk airport, I am met by unidentified men in plain clothes. They "invite" me into a white Volga [Soviet make of car, used primarily by taxis and KGB], which is already waiting with the doors open.

I ask them what is the matter and who they are. They tell me they are members of the militia, but refuse to show me their identification. Likewise, I refuse to accept their invitation. Two of them then quickly grab me by the arms, twist them behind my back and brutally throw me into the car.

On the way I find out that the two were the Assistant Chief of the Donetsk militia, Colonel Mykola Kononchuk and an employee of the Operations Branch, Ivanchuk. They explain to me that they are executing the orders of the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR to arrest me, but they do not have any documents to attest to this.

Unless otherwise stated, all the material in this section was provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service

They take me to the militia post outside the city, where we wait for over two hours. Couriers bring a telegram, supposedly from the Supreme Court, but this is unsubstantiated. Finally, a copy of the order of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Court is delivered, but I am not allowed to acquaint myself with it.

During the long wait, I was able to hear the report over the police radio: "On the central square a mob is gathering with flags". (For the Communists, the people are always referred to as a "mob"). This was the meeting I was supposed to attend with the people of Donetsk and the striking coal miners, who themselves invited me to Donetsk — a meeting which now would not take place. The Communist authorities are as much afraid of my contact with the people as they are of fire, which is why they decided to hide me away behind bars. They were even afraid to take me to the militia station inside the city of Donetsk.

They put me in a van, where I am surrounded by six young men in plain clothes, obviously KGB. They act as if they are deaf and dumb, not only because they don't answer any of my questions, even the most banal, but they don't even talk to one another — this is a characteristic trait of the KGB.

Escorted by two other cars, we set out. The "operation" is led by Col. Kononchuk. When I ask where they are taking me, I get no reply. All together, 17 (!) members of the police apparat are escorting me. Besides that, while travelling through the Donetsk, Kharkiv and Sumy oblasts, we are joined by militia escorts from each respective province. They are there to "give the green light". It would be interesting to know how much this little expedition is costing our impoverished Ukrainian people?

We arrive at the prison in Sumy, and are met by a Sumy militia representative. I refuse to leave the van, and demand that I immediately be allowed to contact my lawyers and be taken to Kyiv.

It was later revealed that the Sumy militia refused to forcefully remove me from the van, and the Donetsk militia also refused to do this.

The militia chiefs then went to talk things over, or perhaps to seek counsel from their superiors. In about 40 minutes, Colonel Kononchuk returned and stated, "It has been decided to allow you to contact your lawyers". He then invites me to go with him, but this turned out to be a lie (this is natural for militiamen, especially those of higher rank). This is how they tricked me out of the van in a "civilised" manner, without having to twist my arms this time.

It was only in the Sumy prison that I was acquainted with the Order of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Court, dated 12.04.91, which was ratified on the authorisation of Supreme Court member Fedchenko. In it, it is stated that it was decided to put me under guard again, because, "having been freed, Khmara took part in public meetings, including unsanctioned ones". It was decided to postpone the trial from 29 April to 14 May. The motive for this was, evidently, so that more time could be given to prepare for the trial. It is interesting what those so-called democratic deputies (who have been calming the people of Ukraine for five months and have been advising everyone to await the trial calmly — thus encouraging not

only my punishment, but the increase of repression in Ukraine), will say now?

The Supreme Court showed itself to be the faithful puppet of Kravchuk's and Hurenko's Central Committee of the CPU.

It has clearly demonstrated before the whole world that, taking the example of the premier violator of the law, Leonid Kravchuk, and the Procurator of the Ukr.SSR, it blindly and obediently carries out the orders of the ruling CPSU apparat, attempting to create a semblance of legality for the political banditry of the Communist mafia, which has decided to get rid of a people's deputy, a true representative of the opposition, from the political arena in Ukraine.

I was never under the illusion that any justice could be expected in a Communist court, when the matter has a political nature. This so-called court is already stained by its shameful behaviour as a participant in a criminal political provocation by the CPSU.

If the matter ever gets to a trial, then it will be no more than a farce...

The CPSU apparat decided to neutralise me as a political opponent by putting me behind bars.

This was organised and executed in the Supreme Soviet, while brutally violating the Law and Rights, by one of the Communist servants in Ukraine, the collaborator, the shameless opportunist, a pitiful political pygmy — Leonid Kravchuk.

I would like to remind the Ukrainian people one more time that this act of lawlessness was made possible as a result of the unprincipled, compromising and amoral position of the Narodna Rada (People's Council) deputies.

Entering into a coalition with the Communists, today they are attempting to conceal their selfishness, political primitiveness and narrow-minded ambition.

They are encouraging the creation of the myth of Kravchuk as the defender of Ukrainian interests, thereby (knowingly or not — there are those who are one or the other) stepping onto the path of betraying the interests of Ukraine. This is supported by the objective assessment of the reactionary behaviour of the Supreme Soviet, which does not want, and is not able, in its present composition, to protect the political, economic and social rights of Ukrainian citizens.

These are not mere empty words. I have never allowed myself to slander anyone in my whole life, regardless of to what political group a person belongs, of whether I have any sympathies with that person or not. Yet is it not shameful that People's Deputy Yavorivskyi, while in Philadelphia, stated that Khmara was impeding the work of the Supreme Soviet? Is this not an apology for political repression?

This average writer was comfortably silent when the Communists were killing the pride of Ukraine — Vasyl Stus.

Having conquered a small section of our politically uninformed population with cheap demagoguery, this politician is unwilling to sacrifice a single hair for Ukraine...

Obviously, Mr. Yavorivskyi believes that we ratified the Declaration of Ukrainian State Sovereignty so that we could have a toy with which to collect autographs.

As one of the most active formulators of the Declaration — and it was formulated with the participation of only a few deputies — I must say that we created a serious political document, in order to begin building a state based on its principles; not to use it for cheap propaganda.

Are not these arrogant words an insult to our people: “There is no point in trying to dissolve the Supreme Soviet because the people cannot choose better representatives than us anyway”.

This primitive, “little Russian” thinking is not limited to Yavorivskyi alone.

About any others, I will remain silent, because I believe they will be able to conquer their slave complexes.

I do not cite these examples in order to offend anyone. If it is our desire to become a civilised nation, then we must learn to accept criticism as a normal course. The ones who should remember this most of all and formulate a new, justifiable way of thinking, are those elected by the people...

The reactionary Communist majority and the careless democratic minority in the Supreme Soviet, with their inactivity and anti-popular policies are pushing Ukraine towards destabilisation. The situation is becoming very dangerous. An uncontrolled social movement is rising.

Instead of protecting the people from enslavement, and the economy from final destruction by the imperialist centre, Kravchuk's and Hurenko's Supreme Soviet is hurrying to sign a new union treaty with this same barbarous centre, thereby, legitimising the colonial yoke around the neck of Ukraine. This is all taking place under hypnotising fairy tales propagated by Kravchuk.

There can be no mention of any union, until such a time when we have our own state.

But this great danger will become reality if the reactionary Supreme Soviet continues to exist. It should be dissolved. Its composition of 75% Communists in no way corresponds to the distribution of political forces in our society. The majority of the Communists in the Supreme Soviet got there through illegal means, as a result of trickery, falsification, a ruling position in the state structure; all of which is made possible by the CPSU's willingness to use repressive measures on the eve of and during the elections [last year in March].

It is absolutely necessary to hold new elections, under international scrutiny.

If the Ukrainian citizenry is successful in achieving a dissolution of the Supreme Soviet, then any new composition of the Supreme Soviet will in every case be better than the present one.

The situation can only be saved by organised pressure by democratic forces from below (and moreover, from the workers) on the Supreme Soviet and the puppet government. There will be no chaos in the wake of a dissolution of the Supreme Soviet. A government accountable to the people will be forced to work more effectively and to use all means to defend Ukraine from the lawlessness of the

imperial centre.

Following such elections, Ukraine will rid itself of the main braking force on the realisation of the Declaration — today's Supreme Soviet. We will emerge on a new level of creating fully appropriate laws and effective state structures.

In comparison with other republics of the empire, Ukraine is in a better economic position than most. We have a huge industrial potential.

We hold in our hands many strategic cards. Firstly and most importantly, the weapon of agricultural production. Secondly, our geostrategic and geographical position. Thirdly, main transportation lines cross Ukrainian territory: pipelines, railways, electric power lines, water transport and aviation.

We would, therefore, not be threatened by an economic blockade from Moscow...

The people of Ukraine today can live incomparably better; this is not even speaking of the future. But it is necessary to break away from the empire. The time for this is appropriate; not a moment should be wasted; sovereignty should be realised quickly, and not through any crazy blabbering about a "union of sovereign states".

Unfortunately, the Communists do not want to understand this, and this is why they should be set aside from the political and state structures, since they are the main obstacle to democracy and statehood.

Furthermore, there is no need to play games with the people, threatening them with tanks. Unfortunately, the Communists and the pseudo-democrats are falling for this. But what do tanks have to do with us wanting to realise our legal and completely natural rights in a civilised, peaceful manner? What are they going to do — crush us with tanks for this?

Why the Communists are using this tactic is plain to see. They want to keep the people enslaved in fear and give their lawlessness and rule a semblance of legitimacy, by making unjust, illegal laws. It is a shame that they are being aided in this by some democrats.

Then what will happen? They will fill the streets with tanks, even though this is highly unlikely in Ukraine. Only complete madmen would allow this, because this would mean the real end of the CPSU and the empire. Tanks will not mine coal, smelt steel, produce televisions or milk cows. Would there also be any water, electricity and so on for Hurenko's dachas and for those of the regional parties and the Central Committee? Would they be able to keep Ukraine at bay using such a tactic?

And who are the tank crews? [The question, a rhetorical one, is answered when one considers that the majority of Soviet tank crews are Ukrainian].

And what will the world say? The essence for many deputies and newly-converted democrats is not in tanks, but in a peaceful and satisfying life, a pleasant travel itinerary abroad...

In our Supreme Soviet, we even have a Commission on Human Rights, headed by a democrat, and filled with many democrats. It is unknown, exactly what this commission is engaged in, whose rights it is protecting. Our esteemed deputies could not even find the time to go to the scene and initiate a parliamentary investigation of the political banditry committed by the Communists against People's Deputy Oleksander Hudyma. Nor did they propose a resolution on the cessation of anti-constitutional and illegal acts carried out by the Communist princes that are ruling in Chernihiv, Poltava, Mykolayiv and so on.

The deputies have travelled the whole world, but in five months they could not even once find the time to visit a colleague of theirs in the Lukyaniv prison [where Khmara was held in Kyiv]...

It is high time the people stopped being enchanted with little Russian folk tales.

In protest against this Communist banditry, on April 12 in the Sumy Prison, I have renewed my hunger strike, as I have informed the police on April 13, 1991.

This extreme and life-threatening act of protest is not a manifestation of indifference or irresponsibility. I was forced to do this because of my conscience and my feeling of moral obligation to Ukraine at this time. Perhaps with the ultimate price I can turn the world's attention to what is happening in Ukraine. For of what kind of human rights can the ordinary citizen dream, when the Communist mafia carries out a bandit-like act against a people's deputy?

I wish to dedicate all my power, knowledge, political experience and energy to my impoverished people, without which my life loses all sense...

With full cognizance of what I say, I wish to state that I will not allow the Communists to transform me into a living political corpse, and thus, even behind bars, I will not suspend my hunger strike under any circumstances. I have taken this step in order to protect justice and honour for Ukraine.

Victory — or death.

My life is not important...

My Dear Fellow Citizens!

Remember, that at this time, the fate of Ukraine and the future of your children is being decided.

History has given us a real, final chance to realise our age-old dream.

There is no time to wait.

Only your will and civil activity will save Ukraine.

The attention of the smaller subjugated nations in the empire is on Ukraine.

Remember our moral obligation before these other nations. The fate of the last and most brutal empire on Earth is being decided now.

The victory of democratic and anti-imperialist forces in Ukraine will be the greatest aid we can give other nations in their liberation struggle against the empire.

I would like to address myself finally to the Ukrainian diaspora.

My Dear Brothers and Sisters.

You always carried our undying idea of freedom and independence into the world.

For decades, you were the defenders of a subjugated Ukraine.

Do not forget that the success of our state aspirations also depends in a large part on your position.

Do not let yourselves be fooled by the Communist traitors who have always been, are and always will be the enemies of democracy and state independence for Ukraine.

Demand from them respect for human rights in Ukraine.

Explain to the communities, states and political figures in democratic countries that there can never be peace and stability on Earth and in Europe until Ukraine breaks away from the imperial Communist yoke.

Explain to our deputies that now is not the time for political excursions.

The fate of Ukraine is being decided on the banks of the Dnipro River.

Time demands our maximum effort, work and sacrifice.

We need unity, but only on the principles of truth and democracy, not on the basis of unprincipled, little Russian bowing-down to imperialist Communist reaction.

We can and must take advantage of this unique historical chance to build an independent, democratic Ukrainian state.

Long live the peaceful democratic revolution!

Glory to Ukraine

April 14, 1991

Sumy Prison

People's Deputy Stepan Khmara

STEPAN KHMARA APPEALS TO THE PEOPLE OF UKRAINE

Stepan Khmara, who was again imprisoned on April 12, 1991, issued the following appeal to the Ukrainian people from the Lukyaniv prison in Kyiv. Mr. Khmara is presently conducting a hunger strike in protest against the illegal nature of his arrest. His trial is scheduled to begin on May 14, 1991.

Ukraine is today living through an extremely difficult and demanding time. The nation, driven to its wits' end by criminal imperial policies, does not want to live by old means because living that way is impossible. A great ecological catastrophe, which requires our immediate and decisive attention, is drawing near.

But let us look at the situation in our top positions, our superstructure. Do we have structures which are capable of defending the nation, its political, social and economic rights, against imperial lawlessness? No, and again no!

After a year's work, the Supreme Soviet has demonstrated its fruitlessness and its inability to accomplish the tasks which have been delegated to it. We see that by concealing itself behind the demagogic Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine, this puppet Supreme Soviet, which is filled with an absolute Communist majority and converted by it into an actual branch of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, is conducting an obvious pro-imperial programme. Not one of the gangster-type directives of the "president of the CPSU" Gorbachev were opposed. The Supreme Soviet did not even protest against the increase in prices; it is only concerned with quickly harnessing Ukraine to the new union treaty by means of deceiving slogans and malicious reference to the Declaration on State Sovereignty.

Even now the Supreme Soviet stubbornly refuses to grant the Declaration constitutional status and its leader, a member of the politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, Kravchuk, is doing everything possible to avoid bringing this question to a vote. In essence, Kravchuk and his colleagues in the politburo are well aware that if the Supreme Soviet votes against granting the Declaration constitutional status, they will set themselves against the will of the Ukrainian electorate, who voted in favour of the Declaration on State Sovereignty in the referendum. And this means that they favour, and this is clearly stipulated in the Declaration, that first you build a state and then and only then can you discuss entering a union. What kind of union can a disenfranchised colony discuss with its metropolitan see. This is absurd and ridiculous.

We see that the Supreme Soviet is not creating essential legitimate foundations for a transition to a real, free market economy. In political affairs it took a step backward even in comparison to the previous Supreme Soviet, headed by V.S. Shevchenko, by adopting an entire series of bills which infringe on human rights,

specifically the scandalous, pro-fascist so-called statement "On efforts to stabilise the political situation". The Supreme Soviet did nothing to annul the anti-civil rights rulings of many provincial soviets, which are led by Communists. One of these rulings was recently published in the press. It was the decision of the Chernihiv provincial and city soviets. As a matter of fact, similar rulings have been adopted in other provinces.

This demonstrates that, by hiding behind slogans about building a legitimate state, the Communist majority, contrarily, is doing everything to give its unlawful government a lawful status, to give it legitimacy.

In these very controversial times it is imperative to focus on our primary tasks. We see that if, first of all, we do not have a democratic political superstructure, that is a truly democratic legislative body in the form of the Supreme Soviet, then we will not have an effective government, or normal laws, or even other executive structures and the laws which will be adopted will never be put into effect. This is because the policy of the Communist Party of Ukraine, which is anti-democratic, pro-imperial, totalitarian, is being implemented by the Communists in the Supreme Soviet. The primary executor of this is Leonid Kravchuk.

I would like to dwell on this question because the KGB and the party propaganda have done everything to deceive the population of Ukraine, creating for Kravchuk an image of some sort of imagined sovereign Communist, a democrat, a person who apparently is attempting to defend the interests of Ukraine. No, this is not so.

There are no differences of opinion between the leadership of the CPSU-CPU in Ukraine and Kravchuk. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that this was clearly stated by Stanislav Ivanovych Hurenko [the CPU boss in Ukraine — ed.] during a recent meeting of the city and regional party councils. He openly stated, and I quote: "There are no differences in principles between me and Kravchuk". Consequently, everything remains demagoguery and propaganda because Kravchuk's actual behaviour shows that he is an extremely conservative puppet, who sees his role as assuring the longest possible existence of the reactionary Supreme Soviet as well as of creating such laws, anti-civil rights laws, which contradict international legal documents, contradict even our imperfect constitution, and to legitimise, even legalise, the Communist government in Ukraine.

Therefore, in conclusion, I want to state that our primary task is to grant the Declaration on State Sovereignty the status of a constitutional law, to annul the 5 per cent sales tax and to grant full compensation to all citizens of Ukraine in the wake of the price hikes. Next, to seek the immediate dismissal of Kravchuk because the presidium will continue to work between elections and it would be better if it were headed, for example, by vice-chairmen such as Volodymyr Hryniov, or better still, Ivan Pliushch, and then to demand a date for the next elections, which should not be put off any longer. Two-three months at the most.

After two-three months, to call new elections to the Supreme Soviet under international supervision. Only then will we have a true parliament, which will be able to adopt laws, which will create an effective government, which will be able to supervise the implementation of these laws; in essence, we will embark on the path of building an independent Ukrainian state, which is the hallmark of the Declaration on State Sovereignty of Ukraine.

It is also imperative that the Supreme Soviet immediately implement the agreement, which it reached last October with the student hunger strikers, and to forbid the delay which Kravchuk and his circle are striving for. We see that the primary reactionary force, which is conducting an anti-national and anti-Ukrainian programme in the republic, is the CPSU-CPU apparatus. Therefore, it would be proper if all workplaces demanded the immediate disbanding of party committees in places of work; they have no right being there and intruding in the work process. This must be demanded immediately, along with the confiscation of all CPU property in Ukraine.

If our leaders of the democratic organisations, deputies from the democratic bloc, realise and point in the correct direction the civic activity of our people, who have risen to fight for their rights, without a doubt, we will be able to accomplish a great deal. If we do not do this, we will lose our chance and this will lead to untold catastrophic consequences for Ukraine and its people.

Unfortunately, I am denied the right to participate in the political process of Ukraine because I am again behind bars due to the political banditry of the CPU apparatus. I want everyone to understand why I am in the 12th day of my renewed, indefinite hunger strike. I will never end it so long as I am behind bars, because if this banditry, this crime, which Kravchuk perpetrated on November 14, simultaneously violating several laws, violating rights, and cynically demonstrating that he can do these things even to a people's deputy of Ukraine, then what is to be said of defending the rights of common citizens, what is to be said of a future legal state. If the deputies do not understand this and will continue to maintain this scandalous, amoral position, then this leads me to many unpleasant thoughts. Because if they are unable to put a stop to this lawlessness, and, moreover, attempt to reward one of the leading violators of the law in the republic, a person of primary responsibilities, then I fear for their legal reasoning, for their moral positions. I want them to realise this, to take heed of their actions. If this does not happen, the nation and its future generations will never forgive them. Ukraine will never forgive this.

Glory to Ukraine!

April 22, 1991

Kyiv, Lukyaniv prison

People's Deputy of Ukraine Stepan Khmara

STEPAN KHMARA PRESS CONFERENCE IN KYIV

KYIV, April 10 — Stepan Khmara, who was released from prison on Friday, April 5, after being arrested on November 17, 1991, on bogus charges, held a press conference today, during which he read out a statement demanding the immediate and unconditional release from prison of those individuals that were arrested in connection with his case, reports the Press Centre of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly. The press conference was held in the building of the Ukrainian Writers' Union in this capital city.

Mr. Khmara was released on the recognizance of his attorneys pending his trial, a date for which has yet to be set by the Ukr.SSR Procurator General. His release followed a series of protest actions and a hunger strike by striking coal-miners, who made the release of this militant nationalist leader one of their primary demands.

Mr. Khmara was very instrumental in forging a coalition of independent trade unions into a separate coordinating body known as "Yednist" (Unity). Many of the striking coal-miners, particularly those from his constituency in his home town of Chervonohrad, view Mr. Khmara as their political leader. Because of his uncompromising stand advocating Ukrainian independence, Mr. Khmara is viewed as a leader of the Ukrainian national-liberation movement.

Other than Mr. Khmara, the following individuals were also present at this press conference: L. Lukyanenko — the chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party, of which Mr. Khmara is the first vice-chairman, Yu. Ayvazyan and V. Nikazakov — Mr. Khmara's defence attorneys, and Viktor Bed — a deputy to the Ukr.SSR's Supreme Soviet. The journalists attending the press conference were well acquainted with the particulars of the case and received statements from prison by Mr. Berezanskyi and Mr. Holovach, two of the five activists presently imprisoned in Kyiv's Lukyaniv prison. At the start of the press conference, Mr. Khmara read out his statement.

(The full text of Mr. Khmara's Statement and a partial transcript of the April 10 press conference are printed below).

Statement

On April 5, 1991, the Supreme Court of the Ukr.SSR decided to release me, Stepan Khmara, from prison, while maintaining without any change the imprisonment of M. Ratushnyi, M. Holovach, O. Kovalchuk, L. Berezanskyi and O. Batovkin.

The Court also decided to prosecute the said individuals and to further investigate their cases, basing its decision on the argument that the necessary proof of their guilt has already been established.

The executive meeting of the Supreme Court established the accusations, which qualify the actions of the accused, as well as the investigatory methods of the Procurator as being consistent with the laws.

My release from prison is justified not by an objective review of the materials of my case, but rather in terms of a concession to 169 deputies who protested against my arrest.

In this regard I would like to state the following:

1. The participants of the executive meeting of the Supreme Court, unfortunately, did not consider the Law, or the ideals of justice, but rather they acted in accordance with the traditional logic of the practice of a lawless totalitarian system.

2. The so-called criminal case that was initiated against me and six other individuals was grossly fabricated by the Procurator of the Ukr.SSR on the orders of the ruling apparatus of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU).

3. The primary and real organiser of the criminal action against me is L. Kravchuk [the chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR], who cynically and demonstratively trampled over the Law in the highest lawmaking chamber.

4. The incident which occurred on November 7 of last year, which is being utilised as the grounds for criminal prosecution against me, was a purposive provocation engineered against me, being that I am a political opponent of the Communist-colonial regime in Ukraine.

5. My release from imprisonment is not the result of some kind of progress of the judicial bodies with a view towards establishing the rule of law. Instead, my release was secured due to the mass campaign of protest against the lawlessness of the CPSU and its repressive apparatus, a campaign that was led by the international and Ukrainian communities and — in particular — the demands of the striking coal-miners.

I protest against the low and evil motivation on which the Supreme Court of the Ukr.SSR based its decision for releasing me from prison, while taking up the defence of the organisers and those who carried out the provocation against me.

I demand the immediate release of imprisoned Mykhailo Ratushnyi, Mykola Holovach, Leonid Berezanskyi, Oleksander Kovalchuk, Oleh Batovkin.

S. Khmara, People's Deputy of Ukraine

Stepan Khmara's Press Conference — April 10, 1991

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT

Khmara: "I wish to extend my sincerest thanks to the Ukrainian communities both here and in the diaspora, which played an active role in protesting against the lawlessness of the existing Communist dictatorship in Ukraine, and managed to secure my release, while continuing the struggle to secure the release of other Ukrainian patriots, who presently find themselves behind Communist prison bars.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank those journalists who expended much energy to shed some objective light on this case, stemming from the incident of November 7.

I would like to expect that our journalists will continue to always shed even more light on all the processes, presently unfolding in Ukraine, because the future fate of Ukraine in a large measure depends on journalists, on their civic position, their honesty. I am, therefore, calling upon our journalists, that until now have not always taken an objective position, to carefully consider the responsibility that the present era has placed upon them. Our present, our future, the future of our children and the fate of our Ukrainian nation depends on all of us.

I would ask that our entire democratic community unite with us and take a very active part in the struggle to secure the release of five of the most exemplary patriots of Ukraine, who are presently imprisoned in the Lukyaniv prison on bogus charges".

Question: "What is the position of the Lviv provincial soviet regarding your arrest? Why hasn't it effectuated more decisive measures in this regard?"

Khmara: "It is difficult for me to talk about this, since I myself am a deputy from the Lviv province. I can only speak on the position of individual deputies and of the leadership of the Lviv provincial soviet on this matter, since these positions are not alike. Regarding the strike of the Chervonohrad coal-miners, who issued as one of their primary demands the release of all political prisoners, the leadership of the provincial soviet took a negative position.

After several deputies spoke out on this issue, the position of the leadership changed somewhat, although to this very day my opinion is that it is not far-reaching enough. I would like to say that the coal-miners today are at the forefront of the struggle for the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state. If we now look at their demands, those of the Donbas miners, as well as those of the western coal basin, we will see that they place greatest significance not on economic demands; they are not begging for something for themselves, but rather they are primarily issuing political demands. Our miners understand very well that as long

as the old Communist system remains in force, then not only the economic situation of the miners, but of the entire Ukrainian nation will not improve. They state that they are demanding the elimination of the political system. The miners are doing this within the constitutional framework, basing themselves on the most radical forms of peaceful protest. At this time, I would like to focus our attention on the way the press treats the miners' demands, which is often done in a most unobjective fashion.

In my opinion, if the striking miners had from the start the mass support of other social groups from among Ukraine's population, of the people's deputies, then we would have been able to achieve much more on the road towards the effectuation of the miners' demands.

Everyone fully knows that the striking miners are demanding that the Declaration of State Sovereignty be enforced as constitutional law..."

Question: "Will you return to the session of the Supreme Soviet?"

Khmara: "I think that the activity of this Supreme Soviet is without any fruitful prospects, and for this reason I feel that it would be absurd to participate in it".

Question: "How do you view the activity of the Narodna Rada [the democratic opposition in the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet] particularly in light of the fact that after the ratification of the resolution regarding your arrest, the democratic deputies continued to work in the parliament?"

Khmara: "After the ratification of this infamous decision, those deputies who have at least a drop of dignity terminated their participation in the Supreme Soviet".

During the press conference, Volodymyr Ustynskyi, a representative of the Donbas coal-miners, stated that the striking miners have primarily issued political demands: the resignation of M. Gorbachev; the dissolution of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR; the effectuation into constitutional law of the Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine.

TRIAL OF KYIV 7 — A MOCKERY OF JUSTICE

By Dr. Gregory Stanton

The following is a briefing paper on the Khmara-Kyiv 7 trial for Dr. Wiaiuszawski, trial observer for Amnesty International. Dr. Stanton is a law professor at Washington and Lee University and an associate defence counsel for Khmara. He is attending the trial under the auspices of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Ukrainian People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, an elected member of the Ukraine parliament, was arrested on November 17, 1990.

Six others were arrested within the week of November 15 to 21, 1990, and are being tried with Khmara:

- Mykola Holovach, a leader of the Ukrainian National Democratic Party and chairman of the Citizens' Committee of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly;
- Leonid Berezanskyi, a member of the Ukrainian National Democratic Party and the Citizens' Committee of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly;
- Mykola Ratushnyi, Chairman of the Kyiv Strike Committee, Chairman of the Kyiv Human Rights Committee, a leader of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, and coordinator of the United Strike Committee of Ukraine;
- Oleksander Kovalchuk;
- Oleh Batovkin, an activist of the Inter-Party Assembly, a democratic independence group;
- Vitaliy Vorobyov.

All but Vorobyov have been held in the Lukyaniv Prison while awaiting trial.

Khmara was briefly released in April but was almost immediately reimprisoned when he went to speak to the Miners' Strike Committee in the Donetsk region. He was again released on May 12 just before trial. Five remain in the Lukyaniv Prison, where they have now been held for six months. They have engaged in a hunger strike, and have become pale and thin.

The trial of Khmara and the others of the Kyiv 7 began on May 14 in a small Kyiv courtroom. It is not an "open trial". To attend, one must obtain a pass available only to those on an approved list. Numerous relatives and members of the press have been kept out.

The entire front row is occupied by armed police, who also surround the box where the defendants are held. One of the accused, Oleksander Kovalchuk, says he has been drugged and his outbursts marked all three days. On May 14, the judge adjourned after ten minutes, and on May 15, after less than an hour. On May 16, the judge immediately announced that the trial is postponed until the picketing across

from the courtroom stops. (It could hardly be heard in the stifling courtroom).

Five of the defendants remain in prison. The judge has not announced the date the trial will resume. There are indications that the trial may resume on May 28, 1991.

For organising the peaceful picketing on May 14 and 15, Anatoliy Lupynis, a leader of the Kyiv Strike Committee with Ratushnyi, was also arrested and sentenced to five days imprisonment in accordance with a special "administrative" procedure. Repression of the independent labour movement continues.

The charges against Khmara and the other defendants:

Criminal Code Art. 86 (Part II): Assault with intent to steal state property.

Art. 193(3): Stealing or defacing of documents.

These charges arise out of the November 7 "Hryhoriev Incident". Khmara and Ratushnyi and striking students had organised a demonstration to protest against the November 7 Soviet military parade through central Kyiv. On that day, a woman ran up to Khmara, claiming she had been struck by Hryhoriev in the pedestrian tunnel beneath Khreshchatyk Avenue. Khmara went with her and she pointed out Hryhoriev. Khmara demanded to see Hryhoriev's identification card. Hryhoriev refused to identify himself and struck Khmara (Khmara never hit back. He kept his arms at his sides, as shown by a videotape recorded by police). Khmara then showed his own ID card as a Deputy of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine and demanded that Hryhoriev identify himself. Hryhoriev refused. Several of the defendants (but not Khmara) then held Hryhoriev to get his ID card out of his shirt pocket. Hryhoriev is a colonel in the police (MVD). Police packed the pedestrian tunnel. Khmara asked them to arrest Hryhoriev, but they would not. Several of the defendants (but not Khmara) frisked Hryhoriev and discovered his ID card and walkie-talkie. They held them up for all to see. The ID card and walkie-talkie were eventually turned over to the police. Khmara filed a formal complaint asking that Hryhoriev be arrested. He never was. Instead, the Communist Party bloc in the Supreme Soviet authorised Khmara's arrest and he was arrested on the premises of the Supreme Soviet building on the night of November 17 and taken to prison.

The defence: The charges are groundless because Criminal Code Arts. 86 and 193 require intent to steal. None of the defendants intended to steal anything. Indeed, they turned the items allegedly "stolen" over to the police.

Article 16 of the Criminal Code also provides a complete defence. It provides that intent to remove a danger to a citizen's rights or to restrain a law violator negates the intent element required to convict under other Code articles. Khmara and Ratushnyi explicitly identified Hryhoriev as a law violator who had assaulted a woman and they asked the police to arrest Hryhoriev.

Khmara (alone) is also charged with violating Criminal Code Art. 139: impeding religious services, unless the religious service violates the rights of the citizens.

The defence: Khmara publicly contended that the service would violate the rights of Ukrainian citizens because to hold it would manifest Russian Orthodox control over St. Sofia's Cathedral, which he claims is illegitimate. Khmara thus lacked the specific intent required by Art. 139.

Art. 187(3): Organising or taking active part in a group action that seriously undermines public order, or refusing to carry out orders or legal demands of the police.

The defence: The October 28, 1990, picketing was an exercise of the right of free public assembly guaranteed by Ukrainian (and international) law. Nedryhailo's orders to disperse were therefore illegal, and Khmara's refusal to obey was not a refusal to obey a legal demand of the police.

The political context: The arrest of Khmara and the Kyiv 7 are part of a larger effort to freeze the independence movement and the free labour movement in Ukraine. They are just the tip of the iceberg. Currently, Strike Committee leaders are being held in jails. Lots of others are being held on file. A Ukrainian youth organisation leader in Poltava, Andriy Hryn, will soon be tried because he participated in a picketing action when city residents were prevented by police from raising the Ukrainian blue-and-yellow flag in the city.

The leaders in Moscow know that Ukraine is the key to the Soviet empire. Just as the English resisted Irish independence and as the French tried to hold on to Algeria, the Russians want to keep control of Ukraine, which they have ruled since the 1600s.

But Ukraine speaks a separate language, as different from Russian as Italian is from French. And Ukraine has tried to assert its independence, many times, most recently in 1918, and in the 1940s when the Ukrainian Insurgent Army fought the Nazis and the Red Army. In international organisations, Ukraine is already recognised as a separate nation. It already has its own vote at the UN. The problem is that the Soviets are desperately trying to maintain Communist Party rule in Ukraine in order to keep Ukraine in the empire. They couldn't hang on to Poland and Czechoslovakia. But they hope to hang on to Ukraine.

Stepan Khmara and Mykhailo Ratushnyi are deeply committed to non-violent resistance. They are the Lech Walesa and Adam Michnik of Ukraine. (Independent polls have shown that Khmara is the most popular leader in Ukraine). They realise that their independence struggle may be long. They are committed to genuine Ukrainian independence. They are genuine republicans and democrats, and are opposed to all forms of discrimination, especially anti-Semitism. They want a constitution that will guarantee the rights of all minorities in Ukraine, including the large Russian minority.

That is why the Soviet police state is willing to risk the negative publicity generated by violating their basic rights to organise, to speak, and to have a fair trial.

Human rights violations: The arrest and trial of Stepan Khmara and the Kyiv 7 violates numerous norms of human rights law to which Ukraine is a party, in particular the following articles of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights:

Article 9: 3) "Anyone arrested or detained on a criminal charge... shall be entitled to trial within a reasonable time or to release. It shall not be the general rule that persons awaiting trial shall be detained in custody".

The defendants have been held in Lukyaniv Prison for over six months. Several Deputies of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet have given their guarantee that the defendants would appear for trial and should be released into their care. But their petitions for their release have been denied.

4) "Anyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention, shall be entitled to take proceedings before a court, in order that that court may decide without delay on the lawfulness of his detaining and order his release if the detention is not lawful".

The right of habeas corpus has not been allowed to the detainees during "investigation" of their cases, though such detention has lasted over six months.

Article 14: 1) "...Everyone should be entitled to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law".

The trial is not public. To enter, one must obtain a pass and must be on an approved list. The courtroom is too small to even hold many of the relatives of the defendants and members of the press who have passes to attend. The atmosphere in the courtroom is oppressive physically and morally. The entire front row is occupied by armed police and police surround the defendants.

The tribunal is not independent and impartial. The judges all come from lists drawn up and approved by the Communist Party, the same one whose deputies in the Supreme Soviet authorised Stepan Khmara's arrest; the same party that Khmara and the Kyiv 7 so implacably oppose.

2) "Everyone charged with a criminal offence shall have the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law".

The state procurator's Open Letter to Gregory Stanton published in the Kyiv newspaper demonstrates that the procurator's office presumes the defendants are guilty until they are proved innocent. Their present detention for six months in prison is further evidence that they are not presumed innocent. They should be immediately released.

3) "In the determination of any criminal charge, everyone should be entitled to the following guarantees:

c) To be tried without delay".

The defendants have been imprisoned for six months without a trial. Their trial has been repeatedly postponed. They are already in prison but have not been convicted.

Article 19: 1) "Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference".

2) "Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression".

Stepan Khmara and the other defendants are being tried for expressing their political opinions against Communism and for Ukrainian independence. Proof of the political nature of this case is found in the inclusion of Khmara's speeches and writings in the "evidence" compiled by the investigator.

Article 21: "The right of peaceful assembly shall be recognised".

The charges against Khmara arising out of his picketing of St. Sophia's Cathedral in October 1990 violate his right to free assembly to express his opinions of Russian Orthodoxy's control of the Church. The order by Vice-Minister of the Interior Nedryhailo to stop the demonstration was an illegal order in violation of the right to public assembly. Khmara had no duty to obey it.

Article 22: "Everyone shall have the right to free association with others, including the right to form and to join unions for the protection of his interests".

The arrest of Ratushnyi and Khmara is an attempt to intimidate the union strike committees they have organised. The arrest of Ratushnyi, Holovach, Berezhanskyi and Batovkin, (as well as Lupynis) attempts to silence the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly. The Party opposes these organisations and is attempting to repress them by arresting their leaders.

Article 25: "Every citizen shall have the right and opportunity ... (a) To take part in the conduct of public meetings directly or through freely chosen representatives".

The arrest of Stepan Khmara, an elected deputy of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, is a violation of his right to take part in the course of public affairs, as well as a violation of the right of those who elected him to be represented in the Supreme Soviet. This termination of his parliamentary immunity is also a direct attack on his right to freely express his views as a deputy.

These and other fundamental rights are currently being violated by the continuing detention and trial of the Kyiv 7. They should be immediately released and the charges against them should be dropped.

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A quarterly journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

Autumn, 1991

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A Quarterly Journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

EDITORIAL BOARD

Slava Stetsko <i>Editor</i>	Roman Zwarycz <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Borys Potapenko <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Lev Shankovsky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Dr. Oleh S. Romanyshyn <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Volodymyr Zarycky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Stephen Oleskiw <i>Associate Editor</i>

**Price: £5.00 or \$10.00 a single copy,
Annual Subscription: £20.00 or \$40.00**

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.

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

Vol. XXXIX, No. 3

A Quarterly Journal

Autumn, 1991

CONTENTS

Editorial: INDEPENDENCE—THE CORNERSTONE OF A FREE AND JUST, PEACEFUL WORLD ORDER.	2
“...KNOW YOUR ENEMY AND KNOW YOURSELF...” <i>Eugene Kachmarsky</i>	3
LEONID KRAVCHUK—OLD FASHIONED “LITTLE RUSSIAN” GOVERNOR OR NEW UKRAINIAN HETMAN? <i>Taras Kuzio</i>	7
GERMANY AND THE ACT OF JUNE 30, 1941 <i>Wolodymyr Kosyk</i>	14
ENGLAND, RUSSIA AND THE UKRAINIAN QUESTION DURING THE GREAT NORTHERN WAR (CONCLUSION) <i>Theodore Mackiw</i>	27
NEWS FROM UKRAINE	42
DOCUMENTS & REPORTS	79

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

Independence — the cornerstone of a free and just, peaceful world order

On August 24, 1991, Ukraine declared its independence, in accordance with which the former Ukrainian SSR — Moscow's colony — ceased to exist as a juridical entity in international law, being supplanted by a new sovereign political entity — UKRAINE. For this reason, any further discussion of Ukraine entering into a "new union" with or within the USSR (i.e., the Soviet Russian empire from which Ukraine declared its independence) is moot, despite what conclusions the recently held Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR may reach.

In this light, and in view of the need to effectuate a truly new, free and just world order of global security, the threats that were recently voiced by Boris Yeltsin and other leaders of the Russian SFSR regarding territorial claims to sovereign Ukrainian soil are highly incendiary and detrimental to the future stability of the geopolitical region. It is clear that the USSR, as the world has known it, has already ceased to exist. The Russian empire, however, continues to survive, as new, clearly imperialist forces are presently galvanising in the wake of the unsuccessful coup of August 19. If the Western Democracies are genuinely interested in promoting freedom, justice and peace, then it is incumbent upon their governments to accord Ukraine and the other formerly subjugated nations that have also declared their independence from the empire full political and diplomatic recognition. Such immediate recognition will be a powerful bulwark that will not only help promote stability in these former colonies, but may also help thwart any expansionist/adventurist ambitions on the part of the destabilising forces that are emerging in Russia under the guise of "democracy". Genuine democracy will take root in Russia only on the condition that the Russian people will discard their traditional, condescending "big brother" attitude by renouncing any latent imperialist ambitions towards the newly-independent states.

The events that are presently unfolding on the territories of the former Soviet Russian empire that is now being finally dismantled present all of freedom-loving humankind with a historic opportunity. Now, as the last empire in history is about to fall, together with its long and bloody legacy of military expansionism, artificial famines, concentration camps, psychiatric prisons, genocide, repression and torture, as the long-repressed national liberation aspirations of peoples that have been subjugated within the cruelest anti-human system the world has ever known are about to finally bear fruit, as these nations are about to prove to themselves and to the world that the many millions that have died in the name of freedom did not die in vain, how can there be any question of whether the newly-established independent states should be recognised?

As humankind stands on this historic crossroads, on the threshold of the dawn of a new era, the choice that needs to be made boils down to choosing between justice and injustice, between freedom and tyranny. The choice should be clear.

"...KNOW YOUR ENEMY AND KNOW YOURSELF..."

By Eugene Kachmarsky

The explosive velocity with which events are developing within the crumbling Soviet empire has caused a myriad of qualitatively suspect political soothsayers to surface all over the world. Each offers a "definitive" interpretation of the processes now occurring during the fall of the imperial Soviet structure, but not one has succeeded in accurately and completely encompassing the totality of what is truly under way. The danger of this is in the fact that these "experts" often influence the elements of Western governments that are responsible for formulating foreign policy.

The Persian Flaw of contemporary political analysis, interpretation and prediction lies in an overwhelming and incomprehensible proclivity to interpret events on the most superficial of levels and, moreover, to analyse them under the assumption that everything must be as it appears.

This becomes especially dangerous when one considers that the imperium with which the West is dealing (in the form of Soviet power) has, both in theory and practice, been definitive in the use of deception on such a scale that were the average citizen of the West to realise exactly to what extent, he would be mentally immobilised. (This is not to indicate that the "Mcdonaldisation" of Western culture has not already contributed to creating a nearly-complete intellectual wasteland and replaced it with the brain-deadening evil of mindless commercialism, resulting in a global generation that has forgotten how to think creatively for itself and which takes for Gospel the ideas transmitted by stuffed, painted mannequins propped up by the mass media, spewing nonsense that serves only their own interests. It seems that Lenin may have been correct in assessing Western society as replete with useful idiots).

The reason for the above allusion is that it is precisely this intellectual and spiritual decay that has led to a profound, mass misinterpretation of developments in the former USSR, by Western analysts, government representatives, and some Ukrainians in the diaspora as well.

One need go back no further than the junta of late August in Moscow to illustrate this point. There have been endless speculations on exactly what did happen on those three days in August, ranging from a genuine attempted overthrow to a staged event. The truth, should any of us ever live long enough to see it revealed, is most likely a medium between the two. There are too many missing pieces to the whole puzzle to definitively assess the attempted coup. However, subsequent developments would lend credence to the view that all was (and still is) not as it appeared to be.

Since the discussion here is focusing on the aftermath rather than on the attempted coup itself, all speculation on the coup is being deferred to scholars and academics who thrive for these sorts of intellectual exercises.

Whether or not the attempted coup was staged, the events following the collapse of the plotters' scheme indicate an emerging pattern. In what follows, the question will be approached from the premise that the failed coup has set into motion a sequence of events that are unequivocally leading to a restructuring and revitalisation of the imperial system that was once the USSR.

In the first place, it is obvious on the surface that the losers of the failed coup were the plotters themselves along with Mikhail Gorbachev (since his performance during the affair paled to that of Russian President Boris Yeltsin's). Yet it may be less apparent (for this must be defined by looking somewhat below the surface) that Gorbachev was not at all the loser that had at first been guessed. The undisputable winner after the failed overthrow has been Boris Yeltsin, but more importantly, and less often mentioned, Russia itself.

It had become painfully obvious to the imperium that it could no longer maintain its reins around the neck of former Soviet society. The incremental effects of Gorbachev's pseudo-democratisation had grown exponentially, and short of a total and brutal military crackdown (which, in the days of glasnost, and almost unrestricted Western media surveillance of the USSR, no longer remained an option), there was no way to save the empire.

Therefore, the coup, for both Gorbachev and Yeltsin, came at a suspiciously convenient moment, especially given Gorbachev's failure in London at the G-7 economic conference. In the coup's aftermath, the stature of Boris Yeltsin and Russia in general had skyrocketed. It was, as Yeltsin proclaimed, "Russia [that] saved the Union". Tsarist Russian flags immediately replaced Communist Russian flags. Russian pride was at its highest in the twentieth century (at least since the end of the war). Russia, subsequently, began very obviously acting like the new "Big Brother" on the laurels of this "victory".

This attitude became evident immediately in both Yeltsin's and Gorbachev's behaviour. Yeltsin was in essence dictating to Gorbachev, and the latter was (willingly or not) obeying orders. Imperial chauvinism (to call a spade a spade) very quickly began to rear its ugly head. Yeltsin saw it fit to send a mere delegation to sign an accord with the newly-independent Ukraine and the head of its government (which proclaimed independence in Kyiv on August 24), rather than make the journey himself. He also began raising questions of border disputes with Ukraine, which were both historically and legally inaccurate. Yeltsin and Gorbachev were very quick to ensure the maintenance of a central command system for the armed forces, raising the red herrings of a Ukrainian conventional and nuclear military threat to all of Europe.

In short, following the slew of independence declarations by former colonial vassals (on which only the Baltics took any substantive action), Russia began to draw in the nets and redraw the old colonial relationships under a new, nebulously-defined "union". It would seem that independence, as understood by the rest of the world does not have the same meaning in the Soviet-cum-Russian empire. There can be no other way to explain the new structures that have appeared in the wake of the failed overthrow, most of all, the committee which is comprised of the nine "republican" (it should be noted that never are any of the newly-independent entities referred to as "states") leaders along with Gorbachev. What independent state has a central authority directing its foreign policy? Making economic assessments and allocations? Has a common currency with other states? Yet, all these are fundamentals of the new "union" of "independent" states.

The salient point in all of this would appear to be the fact that after the dust had settled, among brilliant flashes of smoke and mirrors, the imperium was able to masterfully pull the wool over the eyes of the world and reestablish itself as strongly as it had ever been.

One may now ask the question, "What does all this mean for Ukraine?" The people of Ukraine at this juncture are faced by an historically crucial situation in terms of the Ukrainian struggle for independence and freedom. (President Bush, on his recent side-show in Kyiv, displayed his fundamental misconception of basic political and philosophical principles when he stated that freedom and independence are not synonymous. An even base understanding of political philosophy would indicate that independence is meaningless without freedom, and freedom cannot be guaranteed without independence. The two concepts, whether applied in an individual or collective understanding, are inseparable. To say that they are not the same thing would be akin to claiming that a being and a brain are not the same thing. But it requires no profound deliberation to note that neither could exist without the other).

The parliament of Ukraine (all debate of its characterisation aside) has declared Ukraine an independent state. Such an act, passed by the elected representatives of the people of Ukraine, juridically and by all rules of parliamentary legality, has immediate effect. However, Leonid Kravchuk is presently orchestrating all kinds of machinations and a superb propaganda campaign in support of an ill-defined "union". There also exists the real possibility that the referendum which is to ratify the declaration of independence (a totally irrelevant process, since the people of Ukraine have already spoken through their elected representatives in Kyiv) may not pass, due to this very effective campaign on the part of Kravchuk and his still-functioning apparat to sell the idea of a new union and downplay the merits of independence. Thus, the people of Ukraine must not be fooled again. Kravchuk and his supporters, in their whole approach, are acting based on the premise that the

people of Ukraine still possess the same peasant-slave mentality that the people of Russia have displayed for centuries. In this lies their fatal miscalculation. The people of Ukraine, having been presented with a declaration of independence will not be satisfied with anything short of the promise of freedom and subservience to no one. This must be the basis of a new campaign in Ukraine. Kravchuk is selling his idea (or at least his idea in a palatable guise), and the true proponents of independence and freedom must do likewise. They must not rest and believe that the people of Ukraine will spontaneously vote in favour of independence. The people of Ukraine are waiting for a leader, a true leader who, in the body of his individual can personify Ukrainian aspirations and at once unify the collective effort of the people of Ukraine. They seek wisdom, compassion, persistence, honesty, duty, honour, clear vision and above all, an ability to see through the haze of Kravchuk's perilous seduction and moreover, make the people aware of this. The essence of the democratic process is the free competition of ideas. Kravchuk and his clan are propagating their line. Thus far, he would seem to be uncontested. It is now time for independence and freedom seeking elements in Ukraine to vigorously propagate the truth.

Highly important for the people of Ukraine and the leaders of the independence and freedom movement is to realise that Kravchuk and his apparat are former communists, and as such, are well versed experts in the employment of deception and the use of contradiction, the concrete form of the abstract dialectic. The ancient Chinese philosopher, Sun Tzu, is required reading for all KGB and high imperial officials. Fundamental to his philosophy is the idea of deception. In his work "The Art of War", Sun Tzu writes, "If you are strong, appear to be weak. If you are going to attack, appear to be retreating". This sounds suspiciously familiar, especially when considering the events presently unfolding. Ukrainians, in our quest for freedom, independence and justice, when faced with such a ruthless and still dangerous enemy, one who is able to adapt and disguise himself so well, should also look to another of the basic ideas of Sun Tzu's writings as a guideline for our struggle: "Know your enemy and know yourself, and you shall always be victorious".

LEONID KRAVCHUK — OLD FASHIONED “LITTLE RUSSIAN” GOVERNOR OR NEW UKRAINIAN HETMAN?

By Taras Kuzio
Ukrainian Press Agency, London

At a press conference in Toronto Levko Lukyanenko, chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party, was reported as saying that he believes, “that Kravchuk is working towards Ukrainian independence...”¹ Since the end of last year the chairman of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, Leonid Kravchuk, has increasingly come to distance himself from the conservative, neo-Stalinist leadership of the Communist Party of Ukraine, led by Stanislav Hurenko. As Hurenko recently stated: “With us and Kravchuk there are different points of view on the realisation of sovereignty. Leonid Makarovych’s speech shocked many at the previous plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine”.² Kravchuk now claims that, “I am not a communist who became a nationalist, but a communist who became a democrat”.³

Kravchuk is increasingly described as a “national communist”, “sovereign communist” and the next “Ukrainian president”. Whereas in October he had only a 3% popularity rating by May of this year this had risen to 45% in Kyiv and 30% throughout Ukraine, according to a recent opinion poll by “Komsomolskaya Pravda”. This rise in popularity is also associated with Kravchuk’s appeal to the inherently more conservative lower classes (peasants, pensioners and unskilled workers) when he promoted “stability”. The differences between Kravchuk and Hurenko came to the fore in January when, for the first time in Soviet Ukraine’s history, the Supreme Soviet and the CPU held differing positions with regard to repression in the Baltic republics. But were these differing viewpoints sincere, or an example of traditional communist *dezinformatsia*?

How sincere in fact is Kravchuk in his new role as a budding “national communist” and to what degree are the CPU, on the one hand, and the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine-Council of Ministers different? Is Kravchuk fulfilling an historic role as a new “Little Russian” governor or could he become Ukraine’s first independent president and hetman? Consequently, should the democratic opposition cooperate with Kravchuk or oppose him in his ambitions? These questions are all being hotly debated today in Ukraine. After all, Kravchuk’s

¹ *Ukrainian Echo*, 19 May 1991

² *Molod Ukrainy*, 17 April 1991

³ *Moloda hvardia*, 27 April 1991

visit to Lviv in early March was described by one observer as the first round in the forthcoming presidential campaign, in which he would have to obtain the votes of western Ukraine to win.⁴

To answer this question is extremely difficult because one is faced not only with dealing with an astute and cunning politician, but also with a communist. On many occasions when I have asked visitors from Ukraine about whether they regard Kravchuk's new role as "genuine" they always replied unanimously (including a journalist from a Komsomol newspaper): "Never trust the communists". Kravchuk was, after all, still a communist; a member of the Central Committee and politburo of the CPU and its former ideological secretary.

He unleashed the media barrage against Rukh and the Ukrainian Helsinki Union between 1988-89. Kravchuk also failed to deliver on his promise at the inaugural congress of Rukh that it would be registered and be allowed to publish a newspaper. So what, in fact, happened? Rukh was deliberately not registered until mid-February 1990 in order to prevent it from registering candidates for the republican elections in the following month. The fact, therefore, that the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine now has a communist majority is partly attributable to Kravchuk. Whilst "Narodna Hazeta" has been refused any printing facilities in Kyiv, is unable to appear weekly (as it intended) and only 9 issues have appeared during the last twelve months. When Kravchuk was asked to help "Narodna Hazeta" with its problems he seemed unwilling to do so.⁵

Whether or not we can trust Kravchuk as a communist also rests upon our evidence of Volodymyr Ivashko's actions. Ivashko, then first secretary of the CPU, became chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine in April 1990. But in the summer of 1990 he defected to Moscow where he became deputy general secretary of the CPSU. For Ivashko, as for most (if not all?) communists the party was more important than patriotic interests. Yet, at the time when Ivashko took over from Shcherbytskyi, he was described, in contrast to his predecessor, as more of a "liberal" and "reformer".

But on August 29, 1990, the secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee issued a secret resolution on Lithuania, signed by Ivashko and others.⁶ The document called for support for Lithuania's beleaguered communists, suggesting even that a military unit under KGB command be established to defend the pro-Moscow CPSU of Lithuania. This violation of the USSR constitution, aimed at undermining democratically elected Soviet legal organs, instructed communists working in the USSR Prosecutor's Office, Ministry of Internal Affairs, KGB and the Supreme Court to, "organise the institution of legal proceedings against the leaders of

⁴ *Za vilnu Ukrainu*, 12 April 1991

⁵ *Literaturna Ukraina*, 21 February 1991

⁶ *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, 29 January 1991

various nationalist and anti-Soviet formations". Meanwhile at the January 1991 CPSU plenum Ivashko questioned Gorbachev's reforms which deprived the CPSU of the leading role in the formation of Soviet policies. It is, of course, only a short distance from here to the attempted coup d' états and repression in the Baltic republics later in that same month. In November Stepan Khmara, joint head of the Ukrainian Republican Party and people's deputy, was arrested on trumped-up charges after a provocation in Kyiv's metro. One of Khmara's greatest opponents was Kravchuk, whom Khmara does not trust and regards as no different from any other communist. In a letter from his Sumy prison in April Khmara criticised a section of the parliamentary opposition Narodna Rada, "Which has entered a coalition with the communists... promoting the mythical figure of Kravchuk as a defender of Ukrainian interests and, in this manner, knowingly or not have placed themselves on the path of betraying the interests of the Ukrainian people".⁷ Khmara's supporters on the radical (minority) wing of the Republican Party support his call for a refusal to cooperate in any manner whatsoever with any communists (including Kravchuk).

The main reason for Khmara's arrest was his draft bill presented to the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine calling for the dissolution of the CPU and the nationalisation of its assets. Imprisoned for nearly 6 months it is clear that if Kravchuk had wanted Khmara to be released he would have been. After all, Kravchuk did not prevent or protest at the change in the quorum proceedings in the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine from two thirds to half (which reduced the blocking power and influence of the opposition) and went along with the illegal vote to strip Khmara of his deputy immunity (when there was no quorum). In a reference to Khmara and his radical opponents, Kravchuk is convinced that, "certain people in the country very much would like to see it become worse for some, to inflame hostility and upon this wave come to political power".⁸

In an open letter to Kravchuk published in "Za vilnu Ukrainu" (5 May 1991) signed by opposition parties, Rukh and the strike committees, they refuse to believe that he knew nothing about what was going to happen to Khmara. In particular, they point out, he must have been aware that the CPU (of which he was then a member of the politburo) was pressuring the procurator in the Khmara case. "Your reply to our request to free from arrest the people's deputy, Stepan Khmara, and other political prisoners will reveal to us: who you, Leonid Makarovych, are with — the Ukrainian people or the elite of the CPU, and what kind of Ukraine you will be promoting — democratic and independent or communist and vassal".

The demands of the student hunger strikers in October were agreed to by the

⁷ *Za vilnu Ukrainu*, 24 April 1991

⁸ *Holos Ukrainy*, 9 March 1991

Supreme Soviet of Ukraine but were then quietly ignored and forgotten. Only after further miners and students strikes in March and April were these students demands again placed before the relevant commission of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine during May. Did Kravchuk drag his heels in implementing the student accords when he is a supposed "sovereign communist"? Kravchuk, after all, is the only person to have gained from the student hunger strikes by replacing Hurenko's prime minister with his own (V. Fokin).

In January of this year the Crimean branch of the CPU organised a referendum to re-institute an autonomous republic. This was undertaken in order that the Crimea remain in Russian hands (the majority of the inhabitants are Russians) and not be returned to the Crimean Tatars. The illegality of this referendum was publicised by the Writers Union and opposition groups, but endorsed by Kravchuk. The Crimea has since begun to draw up its own constitution and plans its own Supreme Soviet, whilst demanding to be allowed to sign any new union treaty independently of Ukraine. This, of course, could not be acceptable to any government in any other country. Why is it acceptable to Kravchuk?

But one of the most damaging aspects of Kravchuk's position as chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine is his refusal to condemn the "sabotaging" in eastern and southern Ukraine of the Law on Ukrainian as the State Language. It is a purely symbolic act. When on a visit to Germany in April, Kravchuk refused to speak Russian (something reminiscent of Mykola Skrypnyk when visiting Stalin in the late 1920s in Moscow). But silence on Kravchuk's part when Ukrainian-language newspapers were closed or turned into Russian-language ones, condemned by the Writers Union at its congress in April as an act directed against the Ukrainian national revival, is tantamount to sharing some of the guilt when one holds such a high position in society. After all, the Writers Union pointed out that it was members of his own CPU that were undertaking these anti-Ukrainian actions.⁹ In addition, whereas in western Ukraine the CPU openly supports the establishment of Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox parishes (to inflame Orthodox-Catholic relations), in eastern and southern Ukraine the CPU is blocking the spread of the UAOC, but promoting the Russian Orthodox Church. Surely Kravchuk is aware of this and, if so, why does he continue to remain silent?

In February Kravchuk suggested a compromise over the March 17 referendum. He proposed a second republican question which asked if Ukrainians would enter a new Soviet confederation upon the basis of the Declaration of Sovereignty? The results gave a republican average of approximately 70% for the (Gorbachev) "renewed federation" and 80% for the (Kravchuk) confederation. Although infringements were reported in every polling station, according to Rukh, there are no possibilities of conducting independent enquiries. But the results were a surprise

⁹ *Literaturna Ukraina*, 1 May 1991

because of their clear uniformity — as though they had been organised in some preordained manner? Did russified regions with conservative local CPU leaderships, such as Chernihiv, Odessa and the Crimea, really produce such high votes in favour of Ukrainian sovereignty? Or was there more to this than meets the eye? Did Chernihiv oblast really give the highest endorsement for Ukrainian sovereignty; the same oblast whose communist-controlled council voted to suspend even the current (Brezhnev) constitution.¹⁰

Will the high vote in favour of sovereignty make Kravchuk's (and thereby Gorbachev's) job of forcing Ukraine to sign a new union treaty easier because Kravchuk will be seen to promote “Ukrainian national interests”, arguing with Gorbachev over how much power the centre and the republics will each possess, after which Gorbachev will eventually tactically back down. Or will this be merely another example of the Leninist principle: “Two steps forward, one step back”?

Since the March 17 referendum Kravchuk has not held back in his drive to draw up a new union treaty with Gorbachev and on April 18 a consultative meeting in Kyiv discussed this very question. The Supreme Soviets of the RSFSR, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan attended to establish a common negotiating position. These republics see the future as a “union of states”, in contrast to a “union state” as proposed by Gorbachev. The Ukrainian parliamentary opposition, on the other hand, has presented a programme for the eventual demise of the centre and the USSR.

This then brings out the fundamental differences between Kravchuk and the democratic opposition. The Gorbachevian grand plan to save the union (or empire) rested upon the notion that power would be transferred from the CPSU to the Soviets, but that these Soviets would be, in turn, taken over by the CPSU. On the face of it this would be like a major transformation and “democratisation” of the Soviet system. But, in reality, little would change and power would remain with the CPSU and “the sword and shield of the party” — the KGB. Kravchuk's “centre position” therefore is nothing less than an attempt to save the CPSU, but by a different route to that of Hurenko. Centrism is quite natural in a normal democratic country, but in the USSR a struggle is under way between the democratic movement and the totalitarian state. In this situation everybody has to choose on which side of the barricades he resides.

In this respect Kravchuk is similar to Gorbachev, who also describes himself as a “centrist”. Kravchuk is always at pains to point out that he, unlike Yeltsin, does not want to worsen relations with Gorbachev and the USSR Supreme Soviet, even though he knows, “that ahead of us is a dogged struggle, conflicts...”.¹¹ But Gorbachev at the end of last year shifted to a “centre-right” position, and allied

¹⁰ *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, 23 March 1991

¹¹ *Holos Ukrainy*, 29 March 1991

himself, the USSR government and the USSR Congress of People's Deputies increasingly with the "Soyuz" group. Whilst the "Centrist Bloc of political parties and organisations" established in June 1990 in Moscow, enjoying the support of the CPU, KGB and the armed forces, has called consistently for the imposition of martial law in the USSR.

As Kravchuk stated on his visit to Germany in April: "Ukraine wanted to stabilise, and not destabilise, the union". In other words, he wanted to halt the disintegration of the Soviet empire. Commenting upon the miners, students and workers strikes in March and April Kravchuk said, "Just a few more days of strikes and one will not be able to even talk of sovereignty".¹² The union can be saved, Kravchuk insisted, but only, "if the central authorities accept the formula of a union of several sovereign states".¹³ Otherwise Ukraine will be forced to "break away from the centre". It is probably the case that Kravchuk may not be pleased with some of the policies of Gorbachev and the USSR government; but his threat may be merely to go it alone and maintain Ukraine under his (and therefore the CPU's) grip if the USSR collapses? The democratic opposition describe this variant as the "Albanisation" of Ukraine.

Kravchuk constantly refers to "sovereignty" as the cornerstone of his policy. Unfortunately, in the USSR the definition of "sovereignty" is manifold and is used by everybody; including Gorbachev, Hurenko, Kravchuk and the democratic opposition. But a western understanding of "sovereignty" though means "independence" — the complete control over one's own destiny. This then does not fit in with either Kravchuk's, Gorbachev's or Hurenko's understanding of that term. Kravchuk's and Hurenko's constant repetition of "sovereignty" has spread confusion among the population, which was seen during the March 17 referendum when many people voted for 2 mutually contradictory ballots ("renewed federation" and republican "confederation"). But in Kravchuk's view, "These bulletins compliment one another and do not contradict each other".¹⁴

Kravchuk would dearly like to become Ukraine's first president or hetman. But in reality he seems closer to an old fashioned "Little Russian" governor than a contemporary Bohdan Khmelnytskyi. Although in his dealings as chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine he seems at times closer to the Democratic Platform (former left-wing) of the CPU, in a time of crisis he would be more likely to move from the centre towards the right-wing of his party and align himself openly with Hurenko. Kravchuk, after all, is no Alexander Dubcek, Boris Yeltsin or even Brazauskas. And, in the event of new, free elections, would Kravchuk's role not then end as merely a transitionary figure on the long road towards independence

¹² *Radyanska Ukraina*, 23 April 1991

¹³ *Moscow News*, no. 16, 1991

¹⁴ *Holos Ukrainy*, 29 March 1991

and democracy? To move from being a “Little Russian” governor to Ukrainian hetman, Leonid Kravchuk would not only have to agree to hold new elections but also to resign from the Communist party, which he has now, of course, done.

Kravchuk is not a “national communist” in the manner of the Ukrainian national communists (“Borotbisty”) or those in the avantguard of Ukrainianisation during the 1920s. The true “national communists” are those that have followed their consciences, left the CPU and formed the Ukrainian Party of Democratic Revival (PDVU). And the PDVU do cooperate with the democratic opposition and have already begun negotiations for unification with other political parties on the democratic left. Yet, some are willing to go along with Kravchuk without delving deeper into whether his actions are indeed those of a sincere convert? The writer V. Shevchuk, for example, has even gone so far as to state that, “The National Programme of the Central Rada [of 1917] was somewhat more feeble than the programme today of Leonid Kravchuk”.¹⁵

But Kravchuk's game plan could be more cunning because his greatest success has been to divide the opposition to the CPU, in particular within the Narodna Rada, Rukh and the Ukrainian Republican Party. In this respect Kravchuk has been more successful than the KGB, Gorbachev and Hurenko in weakening and demoralising the democratic opposition in Ukraine. Maybe this is Kravchuk's greatest achievement?

The dithering of Kravchuk in not joining President Boris Yeltsin in outright condemnation of the coup immediately on that fateful Monday, and even coming out in support of the coup d'état on Monday evening on the television news programme “Vremya”, has given credence to the suspicions that exist about his true alignment. In pre-coup d'état days Kravchuk could afford to dither, saying the right things to the right audiences in Ukraine and Moscow. This made him possibly the most likely winner of the December 1 presidential elections. His refusal to call a special session of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, a demand made by the People's Council, and dithering until Wednesday (i.e. when the coup d'état had obviously failed) have reduced his popularity and made people rightly suspicious about his true loyalties (Ukrainian national interests or the CPU)? Therefore, the decision by Kravchuk and his group of so-called “sovereign communists” to vote for independence and maybe even leave the CPU should be seen only as a last ditch attempt to save the CPU from extinction, keep power in the hands of the CPU nomenklatura and repair some of his public standing. But the tide of history is moving both against the CPU and Ukrainians will not accept an independent, communist Ukraine.

¹⁵ *Vechirniy Kyiv*, 12 April 1991

GERMANY AND THE ACT OF JUNE 30, 1941

By Wolodymyr Kosyk

Before discussing the German Reich's position towards the proclamation of the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state on June 30, 1941, I would like to briefly describe the circumstances which led to this proclamation.

Units of the Wehrmacht's First Alpine Division and the first battalion of the "Brandenburg" special purpose regiment 800, together with the Ukrainian "Nachtigall" battalion entered Lviv unopposed at 4:20 am on June 30. On arrival the Germans immediately raised the Reich's flag on the citadel.¹

In the afternoon the expeditionary group (*pokhidna hrupa*) of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists-Bandera Group (OUN-Bandera) led by Yaroslav Stetsko arrived in Lviv. The mission of this expeditionary group was to proclaim the restoration of an independent Ukrainian state and appoint a Ukrainian government. Yaroslav Stetsko visited Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskyi, the head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, and contacted several prominent members of the community, particularly leading activists of the OUN-Bandera. A National Assembly was convened at 8:00 pm. In the meantime I. Ravlyk set about organising a Ukrainian police. The National Assembly, which was chaired by Yaroslav Stetsko, ratified the Act of the restoration of a Ukrainian state, drawn up by the OUN-Bandera, and the appointment of Yaroslav Stetsko as premier.² Two Abwehr (military intelligence) officers: Captain Prof. Hans Koch and Major zur Eickern, who were not invited, were also present at the Assembly. They learnt about the Assembly by accident at the Metropolitan's residence. Although Koch and zur Eickern arrived towards the end, they had sufficient time to realise what was going on. Captain Koch even asked permission to address the Assembly.

The presence of two Wehrmacht officers and the reservations and warning expressed by Koch created confusion and led to a misinterpretation of the situation, giving many people the impression that the German army was neutral or even supported Ukrainian statehood. This is clear from the "Report on the National Assembly of Ukrainians from Western Ukraine". Lviv radio reported twice about German support for the Ukrainian state, once on the evening of June 30 and again in the early hours of July 1.

¹ German Federal Archive. BA-MA RH 20-11/45, report from 08.55 on June 30, 1941.

² For more details on the National Assembly see: Ярослав Стецько, *30 червня 1941. Проголошення відновлення державности України*, Торонто-Нью Йорк-Лондон, 1967; Кость Панківський, *Віг держави до комітету*. 2-ге вид., Нью Йорк-Торонто, 1970.

The broadcasts were made without the knowledge or consent of the Germans. The Ukrainian "Nachtigall" battalion and several German units had been ordered by the German army high command to defend the key buildings and strategic points of the city, including the radio station. This way Ukrainians had access to the radio station for a short period of time, which gave them the opportunity to prepare a report about the proclamation of independence. In the first hours the local units of the Wehrmacht were not aware that the proclamation was taking place without the consent of the Germans, which greatly helped the Ukrainians. In all the confusion the commentator misinterpreted the events of June 30.

The Lviv broadcast was heard in Cracow and probably other places too, in Zhovkva for instance. In Cracow Ukrainians heard it at 11:00 am on July 1. The same day, on the basis of this report, the presidium of the Ukrainian National Committee, formed on June 22, 1941, on the initiative of the OUN-Bandera and composed of representatives of all political forces with the exception of the OUN-Melnyk, issued "Information Letter No. 1".

This "Information Letter" claimed that, according to a report by the "Ukrainian nationalist radio station of Colonel Yevhen Konovalets", a "national legislative assembly" was held in Lviv at which the "Act of the Restoration of a Ukrainian United State" was proclaimed. According to the broadcast the German armed forces were represented at the Assembly by "senior officers of the German army" and there were ovations "in honour of the leader of Germany, Adolf Hitler, the German people and the German armed forces". The "Information Letter" further stated that, according to the radio report from Lviv, the "representative of the German government, Dr. Koch, greeted the Ukrainian authorities and the Ukrainian leadership" and Metropolitan Sheptytskyi issued a statement of support for the Ukrainian authorities.³

The extent to which this report gave a misleading impression of the German position towards the Act of June 30 can be seen from the SD (SS security service) "Report from the Reich" written on July 3, 1941. This report described Ukrainian sentiments in the General Government in the following way:

"According to reports the outbreak of the war against the Soviet Union created great enthusiasm among the Ukrainians in the General Government. Everyone now generally believes that an independent Ukrainian state will finally be established. The Lviv radio report from 30.6.1941 on the establishment of a Ukrainian government for Western Ukraine and Archbishop Sheptytskyi's statement made a great impression. Generally, everyone believes that this government has been appointed by the Wehrmacht..."⁴

The situation was in fact completely different. There was no place for an

³ BA NS 26/1198.

⁴ *Meldungen aus dem Reich 1938-1945*, Band 7, Herrshing, 1984, S. 2486.

independent Ukrainian state in the secret plans of Hitler and Nazi Germany. In March 1939, for instance, Hitler opposed the independent Carpathian Ukraine and handed it over to Hungary. Furthermore, according to the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact of August 23, 1939, Germany agreed to hand over the western regions of Ukraine to Moscow after the partition of Poland. In June 1940 Hitler decided to attack the Soviet Union and told the army high command that, "After that, Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Baltic states are ours".⁵ Concrete plans for the occupation began in March 1941. According to these power in the occupied countries of Eastern Europe would lie firmly in the hands of the German "Reichskommissariats". Detailed plans for the division of the occupied territories into "Reichskommissariats", including the "Reichskommissariat Ukraine", were made in April and May.⁶ This was part of the general plan to conquer "lebensraum" for Germany.

On July 2, 1941, reports about the proclamation of an independent Ukrainian state reached Berlin, which decided to take immediate steps to quietly liquidate it. Berlin's information came from three sources: "Information Letter No. 1", which immediately fell into German hands, a letter written by OUN-Bandera official Volodymyr Stakhiv on July 2, which he delivered to the Reich Foreign Affairs Ministry in Berlin, and the reports from the Einsatzkommandos of the security police and the SD.

The Einsatzkommandos advanced immediately behind the front-line troops. Their task was to "clear up" the occupied areas and to inform the Reich Central Security Office (RSHA) in Berlin about the situation in the occupied territories. The Einsatzkommandos were authorised to deal with political matters on these territories. After the outbreak of the German-Soviet war the chief of the security police and the SD in Berlin began to prepare secret reports for government officials on the situation, events and popular morale in the East. These were based on the Einsatzkommando reports. Initially, 25 of these "Reports on Events in the USSR" were produced. The number was later increased to 65. These reports and the later "Activity and Situation Reports" and "Reports from the Occupied Eastern

⁵ Generaloberst Halder, *Kriegstagebuch*, Bande 2, Stuttgart, 1963, S. 49-50. According to General Halder's notes (some people regard them as official minutes), at the General Staff meeting on 22.7.1940 Hitler supposedly laid down the following political goal of the war against Russia: a "great Ukrainian state, a Baltic federation of states, Byelorussia, Finland...". On the basis of this numerous writers believed that Hitler's goal was the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state (Als politische Ziele des geplanten Feldzuges nannte Hitler: die Neubildung eines Ukrainischen Reiches, eines Baltischen Staatenbundes und Weissruslands...", Ibid., S. 33). However, these same writers forget that several days later, on 31.7.1940, Hitler talked very clearly about the annexation of these territories by the Reich.

⁶ Cf. W. Kosyk, *L'Allemagne national-socialiste et l'Ukraine*, Paris, 1986, pp. 84-87.

Regions” are particularly valuable for establishing how much the Germans knew about the situation in the East, including Ukraine.

Several hours after the arrival of the German troops in Lviv on June 30, an advance unit of Einsatzkommando 4b also arrived in the city. The following day, July 1, the remainder of Einsatzkommando 4b and the whole of Einsatzkommando 4a⁷ arrived in Lviv, in all some 200-300 personnel. (Both Einsatzkommandos were part of Einsatzgruppe B, which was renamed Einsatzgruppe C on July 11, 1941). They took over all security matters, which included political matters and repressions against the population, particularly against the Jews and Poles in Lviv. (Einsatzkommandos 5 and 6 also operated on Ukrainian territory. Einsatzkommandos 4a and 4b eventually became “Sonderkommandos” 4a and 4b).

“Report on Events in the USSR No. 10”, written in Berlin on July 2, informed the German government that, “Elements of the Bandera group under the leadership of Stetsko and Ravlyk have organised a militia and set up a municipal council [in Lviv]. A Ukrainian political administration of the city has been set up by the Einsatzgruppe to counteract the Bandera group. Further measures against the Bandera group, particularly against Bandera himself, are being planned. They will be implemented as soon as possible”.⁸

The first of these measures was the immediate detainment under house arrest of several Ukrainian activists, primarily Stepan Bandera.⁹ The following day, July 3, the investigatory committee headed by Under-Secretary of State Kundt, composed of Judge von Bülow, Dr. Föhl and later Colonel Bisantz, summoned members of the presidium of the Ukrainian National Committee in Cracow (Dr. Horbovyi, Prof. V. Andriyevskyi, V. Mudryi, Dr. Shukhevych) and Stepan Bandera for a hearing.

According to secret German archives, before Bandera arrived Kundt pointed out that the Germans did not recognise the Ukrainian National Committee and that he was speaking with the Ukrainians in question merely as ordinary citizens. Kundt further stated that the “Information Letter” did not reflect the true situation. Berlin knew nothing about a Ukrainian government, which was appointed without its knowledge. Kundt also expressed doubt as to whether Koch could have taken part in the National Assembly. Lviv was in the zone of military operations, where political activity was forbidden. Kundt further pointed out the possibility that a Russian radio station may have broadcast the report about a Ukrainian government in Lviv in order to create confusion.

The radio report from Lviv claimed that the Third Reich and the German army were allies of the Ukrainians. Kundt vehemently denied this and pointed out that,

⁷ Ereignismeldung UdSSR. Nr. 10, BA R 58/214 ff. 45, 54.

⁸ BA R 58/214 ff. 53-54.

⁹ BA R 58/214 f. 59.

“the Führer is the only one leading the struggle and there are no Ukrainian allies... we are not allies, we are conquerors of the Soviet Russian territories”.¹⁰

When Stepan Bandera arrived, Kundt asked him whether he had ordered the establishment of a Ukrainian government. Bandera confirmed this and pointed out that he had done so in the name of the OUN, which stood at the forefront of the Ukrainian people and was the only force leading an armed struggle for an independent Ukraine and thus had the right to form a Ukrainian government. Bandera added: “Giving the order I did not appeal to any German authorities or seek the approval of the German authorities, but relied solely on the mandate which I had received from the Ukrainian people”.¹¹

“Report on Events in the USSR No. 11”, written in Berlin on July 3, says: “On July 2 and 3, 41, Einsatzgruppe B reported about the attempts of the national Ukrainians led by Bandera to confront the German authorities with an accomplished fact by proclaiming a Ukrainian republic and organising a militia”.¹² The report also states that the “Bandera group” took this opportunity to spread a leaflet which claimed that the Ukrainian liberation movement, which was formerly suppressed by the Polish police, would from now on be suppressed by the German police.¹³

The government commission set up to investigate the events of June 30 clarified the matter of the alleged participation of the German officers in the National Assembly. On July 8, 1941, the commission questioned Major zur Eickern and SS Sturmbannführer Bajer; on July 9 — Major Bajner, on July 10 — Prof. Koch, and on July 11 — the Mayor of Lviv, Prof. Polanskyi.

Koch and zur Eickern arrived in Lviv on June 30 at around 7:20 pm. They went to the Metropolitan’s residence, where they learnt that an “important meeting” taking place in the “Prosvita” building.

They made their way to the meeting, but were unable to enter the hall as all the entrances were completely blocked by people. They entered through the stage door and thus ended up on the stage. When they noticed Stetsko zur Eickern and Koch immediately left the stage. Mayor Polanskyi then briefly informed them of the proceedings and pointed out that the Assembly had ratified the Act of the restoration of an independent Ukrainian state. Koch then asked to speak in order to explain the situation. He pointed out that the country had been occupied by the armies of Adolf Hitler. The task of Ukrainians, he said, was to maintain order and to carry on

¹⁰ Niederschrift über die Rücksprache mit Mitgliedern des ukrainischen Nationalkomitees und Stepan Bandera vom 3.7.1941, BA NS 26/1198, S. 1, 2.

¹¹ Ibid., S. 7-11, 14.

¹² BA R 58/214 f. 58.

¹³ Ibid., f. 59.

working. There was a war going on and all political activities were banned. The Ukrainians must only work and obey. Koch concluded his warning with the words "Heil Hitler". When he finished, according to his report, Stetsko jumped to his feet and cried out "Long live Bandera!" After that Koch and zur Eickern shook hands with the Ukrainian activists (but not with Stetsko) and left the hall.¹⁴

According to Prof. Koch, he began to inform prominent Ukrainians in Lviv about the German authorities' negative position towards Stetsko, trying to convince people that there was no Ukrainian government. He further stated that Stetsko tried to contact him, "in the name of the Ukrainian republic", but Koch only agreed to see him as a private citizen because there was no Ukrainian government.

While forming the government Yaroslav Stetsko was trying to win international recognition. On July 3 he sent a letter to Hitler in which he recognised the efforts of the German army in the struggle against Bolshevism and in the liberation of Lviv and expressed hopes that the reconstruction of Europe would also affect its eastern regions and that the Ukrainian people would be able to take part in this process as a fully-fledged and free member of the European family of nations.¹⁵ This letter, however, which arrived at the Reich Chancellery two weeks later, was never shown to Hitler and was obviously ignored by the German authorities.

The Germans decided to deal with the Act of June 30 with extreme delicacy to avoid arousing the hostility of the Ukrainian people. They were expecting a Ukrainian uprising behind the Soviet lines. For this reason "Report on Events in the USSR No. 12" from July 4, which pointed out that the Ukrainian government wished to be based at the university and gave the first composition of the government, stated that although "there was no de facto recognition" of this government by the Germans, they nevertheless had to avoid all severe measures "against the usurpers because of the military situation and morale in the region. The outbreak of the expected uprising around the Berdychiv and Zhytomyr-Kyiv areas is imminent".¹⁶

The July 5 report, however, informed the German authorities that the Ukrainian leaders had been placed under house arrest and that, "Bandera was taken to Berlin. His interrogation is in progress".¹⁷ Several other activists involved with the Ukrainian National Committee in Cracow, including Volodymyr Yaniv, were arrested the same day. The lawyer Volodymyr Horbovyi was arrested on July 7.

On Alfred Rosenberg's instructions Dr. G. Leibbrand, an influential member of the Nazi Party and the head of the political department of the Reich Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Regions (headed by Rosenberg) called a meeting on July 5.

¹⁴ BA R 6, ff. 5-6.

¹⁵ BA R 43 II/1500 f. 102.

¹⁶ BA R 58/214 f. 69.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 75.

This meeting was attended by Secretary of State Kundt, Lt. Col. Stolze (Abwehr) and Weinman (SD, later commander of Einsatzkommando 4a). As regards the situation in Ukraine, it was pointed out that the "blow" (Vorstoß) by the Bandera supporters, who proclaimed the government over the radio, led to "political anarchy". Rosenberg wanted to eliminate the people responsible for this situation, but the Wehrmacht required law and order behind its lines, and thus (particularly the Abwehr) was opposed to strict measures (other than house arrest) against the Ukrainians, particularly the Bandera group. Secretary of State Kundt would go to Lviv to appoint advisers from the General Government for military commanders in the city and the surrounding areas. These advisers would form administrative bodies out of the politically inactive Ukrainians and the "Ukrainian government formed in Lviv must be quietly observed".¹⁸

The same day Hitler received a report on events in the East which, "will be dangerous for the political formation of the Eastern lands". The report was primarily concerned with the situation in Lithuania, where a Lithuanian government was being formed. This government was to receive de facto recognition from local German authorities. Concerning Ukraine the report stated: "2) In contradiction to German plans a Western Ukrainian government was formed in Lviv. The Ukrainians who took part in this affair were arrested and imprisoned in Berlin".¹⁹

The report further stated that Secretary of State Kundt would take the necessary measures in Lviv to ensure that officials of the General Government occupied all key positions and pointed out the need to revive everyday life in Halychyna, including the school system. This was a long-term measure whose goal was the incorporation of Western Ukraine into the General Government. Towards the end the report pointed out that the above-mentioned arbitrariness created anarchy, which threatened to destroy the future domination of the Eastern regions by the Reich".²⁰ This formation of the Eastern regions would be implemented according to the imperialist interests of the German Reich and not the wishes of the peoples of the East.

Having finally formed the government on July 5, Yaroslav Stetsko issued a declaration on behalf of the "Ukrainian government" (and not the "government of Western Ukraine"). However, neither the declaration nor any other Ukrainian measures changed the situation. The Germans tried to force the government to dissolve itself through non-recognition and isolation. The military commander of Lviv Gen. Rock refused to see a Ukrainian delegation led by the head of the government.²¹

¹⁸ Grosskopf's note to the Reich Minister for Foreign Affairs from 5.7.41, AA All. Akten, Pol. XIIIIm 9.

¹⁹ IfZ ED 165.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Cf. R. Ilnytskyj, *Deutschland und die Ukraine 1934-1945*, Band 2, S. 186-187.

Prof. Koch played an important role in this. Privately he warned Stetsko to stop playing a “dangerous game” and thus avoid forcing him to “take notice” of his “government”. Officially, however, Koch told him: “there is no Ukrainian government. There is no Ukrainian legion either, because there is no Ukrainian state”.²² Koch mentioned the “legion” because Stetsko was trying (probably on July 6) to persuade the German commander to receive him together with a delegation from the legion. Regarding the presence of the “Nachtigall” battalion in Lviv politically inexpedient, the Germans ordered the battalion to leave the city immediately. “Nachtigall” left Lviv on July 7 and marched east in the direction of Proskuriv.

On July 6, on the initiative of the OUN-Bandera leadership, a public meeting was held in Lviv. It was attended by more than a hundred representatives of the community. The participants elected a Council of Seniors, “as an expression of the citizens’ will to unite the community and to maintain contact with the German military and civilian authorities in order to attain and realise the national ideal”.²³ The Council of Seniors held its first meeting on July 7. A majority of councillors were in favour of recognising the “situation created by the dep[uty] of the leader [of the OUN] Mr. Stetsko in Lviv”.²⁴ At the second meeting, on July 9, a decision was made to deliver a petition to the commanding general after reaching an understanding with Prof. Hans Koch. It was thus decided to contact the German authorities in order to clarify the situation. This was particularly important because Stetsko had been arrested and deported that same day.²⁵

The arrest of Yaroslav Stetsko and his colleague Roman Ilnytskyi was supervised by Alfred Kolf, a member of the SD staff. After being questioned by the police at the SD headquarters in Lviv, Stetsko and Ilnytskyi were deported first to Cracow, where the SD continued the interrogation, and then to Berlin. In Berlin they were interrogated by Abwehr Colonel Erwin Stolze.²⁶

In the meantime the proclamation of independence was publicly read out at meetings throughout Ukraine. This was taking place spontaneously on the initiative of the OUN-Bandera expeditionary groups. These groups did not always manage to maintain contact with Lviv as a result of which in many places people were not familiar with the text of the proclamation. For example, it was not published in the first issue of “Boievyk”, the organ of the OUN-Bandera in Ternopil, which appeared on July 7, 1941. The publication did, however, run detailed instructions on the organisation of a national militia throughout the villages.²⁷

²² Ibid., f. 7.

²³ Minutes from the meeting of the Council of Seniors, pp. 1-2.

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 3-4.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 8.

²⁶ R. Ilnytskyj, op. cit., S. 187.

²⁷ *Боевик*, organ of the OUN, Ternopil, July 7, 1941 (from the author’s archive).

On July 7 the commanders of the Wehrmacht 17th Army issued an order". Military authorities were forbidden to express any opinions regarding these matters to Ukrainians. The militia was not to be provided with firearms and could not have any jurisdiction outside their village. Numbers were to be proportional to the population on a basis of one militiaman to a every hundred residents.²⁸

On July 8 control of practically all of Halychyna and Volyn was transferred to the rear echelon command. The staff headquarters was located in Lviv. The staff diary confirms German intentions. The military commanders were to set up local civil authorities which would be under their control. These authorities were to revive the economy. As regards the political situation, the diary entry under 10.7.1941 reads as follows:

"From the political point of view the situation is not completely clear. Shortly after the occupation of the country by the 17th Army, the Ukrainians took arbitrary steps, proclaiming the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state, which pre-empted the political goals of the senior German leadership. This movement has to be guided along the correct lines. The Wehrmacht high command (OKW) assigned Captain Prof. Koch, the liaison officer of the Rosenberg government, to the zone commander's staff to carry out this task".²⁹

According to his instructions the commander of the rear administrative zone issued orders limiting Ukrainian activities to community matters. Particular attention was to be paid to the organisation of a Ukrainian militia, which was to be under the complete control of the Germans. The task of maintaining law and order in Lviv was delegated to the garrison commander. Most of his information was provided by Captain Koch, who was working with Secretary of State Kundt, a member of the General Government administration. The Wehrmacht knew nothing about the tasks which had been assigned to Kundt. It was generally believed that his task was to restore the political situation in Lviv, according to Rosenberg's directives. Privately, however, the military believed that Kundt hoped to be appointed "Generalkommissar of Lviv".³⁰

On July 11 the command of the rear administrative zone banned all Ukrainian public meetings at which the proclamation of independence was to be read out. An inspection and purge of the Ukrainian militia was also ordered.³¹ Despite these measures, however, public proclamations of Ukrainian independence continued.

German military archives contain numerous reports about deserters from the Soviet army. There were very many Ukrainians among them. The reports clearly

²⁸ BA-MA RH 20-17/276. Armeeoberkommando 17 Gruppe Ic/AO. A.Gef.Sdt., den 7.7.41.

²⁹ BA-MA RH 22/3 Kriegstagebuch Nr. 1.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ BA-MA RH 22/5. BfH.rückw.H/Geb.103. Abt. Ic 968/41 geh.

state that these soldiers crossed the front lines and surrendered voluntarily. Many of them had were carrying German leaflets and passes which were dropped from aircraft. I did not find a single German report which mentioned that the deserters were aware of the proclamation of an independent Ukrainian state in Lviv.³²

Sections of Europe's public opinion regarded the German-Soviet war as European struggle against Bolshevism. Volunteer legions began to be formed in Western Europe (a French volunteer legion was announced on July 7, 1941). Prior to his arrest the head of the Ukrainian government wrote that Ukrainians are prepared to take part in the war together with other states, but on the condition that Ukraine would be an independent and sovereign state.³³ On July 6, after Bandera's arrest, without referring to the question of Ukrainian independence, Colonel Andriy Melnyk, who was also residing in Cracow at that time, appealed to Hitler through the OKW to allow Ukrainians to take part in the crusade against "Bolshevik barbarism" together with the "legions of Europe", "shoulder to shoulder with the German Wehrmacht".³⁴ This petition was signed by six former Ukrainian officers. From the German side it had the support of Colonel A. Bisantz. In Berlin Hetman Skoropadskyi approached Hitler with a similar proposition on July 16.³⁵ These hopes were, however, fruitless. Hitler had other plans.

At a secret meeting on July 16 Hitler, who was certain that the war would soon be won, pointed out the need to prepare secret decisive plans for the occupation of the conquered territories. In order to rule, control and exploit these regions the occupation had to be particularly cruel. Hitler decided that the Crimea would be settled by Germans and that Halychyna would become a province of the Reich. Germany would not tolerate any other military power as far as the Urals, even if it had to fight the war for a hundred years. Hitler added that, "Only a German can carry arms, not a Slav, not a Czech, not a Kozak or a Ukrainian".³⁶

In Berlin, before demanding that Stetsko and Bandera revoke the proclamation of June 30, the Germans tried to ascertain who was responsible for this proclamation and whether any Germans were implicated. In response to this, on July 15, Stetsko wrote a statement which said:

"Because no Ukrainian patriot requires orders in the struggle for Ukrainian statehood, the proclamation of the restoration of a Ukrainian state the moment the occupying forces left Ukrainian territory was a demand of the moment for every

³² BA-MA RH 20-17/280 ff.

³³ BA R 43 II/1500 f. 103-105.

³⁴ BA R 58/214 f. 19.

³⁵ Ibid., f. 100-101.

³⁶ IMT 221-L, XXXVIII p. 86-94. On August 1, 1941, the German military inspectorate issued a "Map of the political division of the Great German Reich" for use by government officials, on which Halychyna was already incorporated in the Reich.

Ukrainian, a demand of national conscience and national honour... I, as the deputy leader of the OUN and head of the Ukrainian government, a post from which I have not resigned, take full responsibility for the proclamation of the restoration of the Ukrainian state and its consequences...

I did not arrange the proclamation of the Ukrainian government with any German authorities. I took over the government on the orders of the leader of the OUN.

I ordered the Lviv radio station to be put into operation and authorised the broadcast. In accordance with the contingency plan for the OUN's revolutionary activity in the event of war, the OUN leader gave the order to occupy the radio station before the outbreak of the war with the Soviet Union... The radio station was seized by OUN operatives before the occupation of Lviv by the German army..."³⁷

Having decided that it was time to establish a civilian administration in the occupied territories, on July 17 Hitler appointed Alfred Rosenberg Reich Minister for the Occupied Eastern Regions and established the Reichskommissariat Ostland. On July 20 he established the Reichskommissariat Ukraine, whose headquarters was in Rivne. On August 1 Halychyna was incorporated into the General Government, formed earlier out of parts of Polish territory. Northern Bukovyna and parts of southern Ukraine were handed over to Rumania.

On July 21, 1941, the Reich Ministry for Foreign Affairs finally established that the proclamation of a Ukrainian state in Lviv was an "arbitrary act of the notorious, ambitious and active Bandera group" and that the "Act staged in Lviv" "has no state-legal significance". In response the Political Bureau of the OUN-Bandera in Berlin issued a declaration entitled "On the situation in Lviv". This declaration pointed out that the proclamation in Lviv was already "an historic fact", like the Act of January 22, 1918, in Kyiv and the Act of November 1, 1918, in Lviv, and that it "will become a symbol of the present liberation struggle of the Ukrainian nation". Ukrainian statehood was proclaimed not only in Lviv, the declaration stated, but also spontaneously in other towns, villages and districts, where Ukrainians had taken over the administration and began to organise national and economic life. Although the government was formed by the OUN the majority of government posts were not occupied by OUN members. Germany should recognise the proclamation and if it is looking for allies Ukraine could be an ally, but only as an independent state.³⁸

The incorporation of Halychyna into the General Government and the partition of Ukraine led to protests from Ukrainians of various political views, including Stepan Bandera³⁹ and Yaroslav Stetsko,⁴⁰ who were under house arrest and strict

³⁷ AA Ukraine Pol. XIII, 24, Erklärung.

³⁸ Ibid. Zur Lage in Lwiw (Lemberg).

³⁹ BA R 43 II/1504b f. 23-24.

⁴⁰ BA R 43 II/1500 f. 108-109.

police surveillance in Berlin. Stetsko wrote a letter of protest to Hitler on August 3, on paper he had received from Lviv. The paper was headed "Ukrainian Government", written in German, and was dated "Lviv (temporarily Berlin), 3 August 1941". Next to Stetsko's signature was the Ukrainian government seal — "Ukrainian State" — which he also received from Lviv.

As a result the Germans decided to deliver the final blow. On August 6, in the presence of Prof. Dr. von Mende, Prof. Dr. Koch, the representative of Reich Minister Rosenberg, delivered an ultimatum to officials of the OUN-Bandera in Berlin. This ultimatum took the form of three conditions for cooperation: a) the OUN would renounce all party-political propaganda; b) the OUN would not conduct propaganda in support of any living Ukrainian; c) the OUN would pledge to dissolve the Ukrainian government.

In response, on August 14, 1941, Stepan Bandera wrote a letter to Rosenberg, informing him that although he did not see the expedience of the two first conditions, he could eventually come to terms with them. The third condition, however, he could not accept without a more serious discussion.⁴¹ He thus enclosed a OUN memorandum on the dissolution of the Ukrainian government, in which the OUN-Bandera declared that cooperation with the Germans would be possible only if Germany recognised the Ukrainian state and its government. The OUN could not revoke any decisions because it did not have a leading role in the Ukrainian state. "The OUN is subordinate to the state and not the contrary", the memorandum said.

Furthermore, the memorandum pointed out that if Germany's plans had included the reconstruction of Eastern Europe on the basis of national states there would be problem with the establishment of a Ukrainian state. The Act of 30 June was a spontaneous expression of the will of the Ukrainian people. The dissolution of the government in the present situation would show that Germany is opposed to the Ukrainian state. The OUN did not have the right to dissolve the government. "This can only be put into force by a national legislative assembly". The OUN and the government were two separate factors. The government was above political parties. It was founded on an all-Ukrainian basis, representing both Eastern and Western Ukraine. For these and other reasons, therefore, the OUN did not have the legal right to dissolve the Ukrainian government.⁴²

Despite increased pressure from the Germans, Bandera, Stetsko and the OUN did not alter their position. When, on September 15, 1941, the Germans began mass arrests of members of the OUN-Bandera in Ukraine and the diaspora, Bandera and Stetsko were transferred to the Berlin prison and several weeks later to the Sachsenhausen concentration camp, where they remained until September 1944, that is until almost the end of the German occupation of Ukraine.

⁴¹ AA Ukraine Pol. XIII, 24.

⁴² Ibid., Denkschrift.

At the same time, in July 1941, Stalin's Soviet government also launched a widespread propaganda campaign against the OUN-Bandera and the Act of June 30. On July 31, for instance, referring to the OUN members as "vile traitors", "Hitler's servants" and "faithful dogs" the newspaper "Za Radiansku Ukrainu", wrote that, "For all the lies, provocations and murders our freedom-loving Ukrainian people have only one answer to the blue-and-yellow gang and its leader Stepan Bandera: Death!" The August 9 edition described the Ukrainian government as "a small group of paid individuals, who are siding with Hitler's army".⁴³ The Soviet authorities knew that the Germans did not recognise the Ukrainian government and had ordered the armed forces to arrest OUN-Bandera members and prevent them from operating on the Ukrainian territories occupied by the German army. One such order, issued to the 296th Wehrmacht division, fell into Soviet hands and was mentioned in "Za Radiansku Ukrainu" on August 9. The order to arrest members of the Bandera group and hand them over to the Abwehr was issued on August 5. It was crucial for the Germans to prevent members of the OUN-Bandera from crossing the Zbruch river to spread their pro-independence propaganda in Eastern Ukraine.⁴⁴

The two totalitarian imperialist systems — Nazism and Stalinism — reacted to the restoration of an independent Ukrainian state in the same way.

A declaration by the Regional Leadership of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (probably for Germany), dated August 1941, pointed out that the OUN regarded the war as the final struggle against the occupiers of Ukraine. It therefore proclaimed the restoration of the Ukrainian state by the Act of June 30, thereby carrying out the wishes of all the Ukrainian people. The declaration further stated that this Act remained an historic document, which brought one period of the Ukrainian liberation struggle to a close.⁴⁵

Nazi Germany's suppression of the attempts to implement the Act of June 30 began a new period in the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people: the armed struggle against Nazi German occupation and Soviet Russian totalitarian rule for the freedom and independence of the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian state.

⁴³ For a German translation of the articles see: AA Ukraine Pol. XIII, 24. The article published on July 31, 1941, was signed by O. Kornychuk.

⁴⁴ BA-MA RH 20-17/276 Nr 2784/41.

⁴⁵ AA Ukraine Pol. XIII 24 Erklärung.

ENGLAND, RUSSIA AND THE UKRAINIAN QUESTION DURING THE GREAT NORTHERN WAR

(Conclusion)

By Theodore Mackiw
The University of Akron

Anglo-Russian Relations After the Victory of Poltava

The victory at Poltava brought fundamental and decisive changes in relations between Russia and Sweden, as well as between Russia and England and Western Europe in general. Louis XIV sent de Baluze to Moscow to seek a rapprochement. The elector of Hanover, the future King George I of England, concluded a twelve-year alliance with Russia (1710). Denmark renewed its 1699 alliance with Russia, and the Northern League (Russia, Poland, Saxony and Denmark) was revived. Provisions were also made to extend this alliance to Hanover and Prussia. England now desired to act as mediator between Russia and Sweden and even to accept Russia into the Grand Alliance.

Whitworth continued his attempts to negotiate a trade treaty. Anglo-Russian trade grew and individual English merchants were granted the right to establish various enterprises in Russia.¹²¹

On the other hand, England wanted the war against Russia to continue, and promised to help Sweden. At the end of October 1709 the Russian ambassador in Denmark, Vasiliy Lukich Dolgorukiy, reported from Copenhagen that, "England and Holland promise to restore, at a general peace, everything that the Swedish king loses during this war without the least trouble or loss"¹²². When the Tsar tried to crush the Swedes in Swedish Pomerania, where they had withdrawn from Poland and Lithuania after Poltava, the members of the Grand Alliance became anxious to prevent the war from spreading onto German soil. On March 31, 1710, representatives of the German Emperor, England and Holland signed a convention of neutrality at the Hague. Russian historians maintain that this convention not only preserved peace in the empire, but, because Russian troops were prevented from marching into the Swedish regions of Germany, thus giving the Swedes an opportunity to recover from their defeat.

¹²¹ For details see: Dietrich Gerhard, *England und der Aufstieg Russlands* (Munich-Berlin, 1922).

¹²² Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

Russian historians further claim that England tried its best to weaken Russia by contributing to the outbreak of war between Russia and Turkey in 1711. The earlier assumption that this war was the result of French intrigues, as Solovyev maintains, is outdated.¹²³

The Turkish declaration of war on Russia (at the end of 1710) came at a time when Russia was still at war with Sweden, placing the Tsar in a very difficult position. Even before the outbreak of hostilities (early in 1711), Peter requested the European powers to arrange a peace with Turkey. Thus Kurakin in London and Matveyev at the Hague proposed that England and Holland respectively arrange an armistice between Russia and Sweden and Russia and Turkey.

The Tsar wanted to make peace with Turkey as soon as possible in order to release troops for the struggle against Sweden and was prepared to make considerable concessions. Shafirov and Tolstoy negotiated with the Turks through the mediation of the English and Dutch ambassadors. Peace was concluded on July 12, 1711, but the English government was dissatisfied with the performance of its ambassador in Constantinople, Robert Sutton, because he had not blocked the peace settlement. The Secretary of State, Henry St. John, accused Sutton of acting contrary to instructions to prevent a settlement. Referring to this matter, Soviet historian L.N. Nikiforov noted that for his help Sutton had received 6,000 ducats from Shafirov, which persuaded him to temporarily disregard the orders of his government.¹²⁴

With the knowledge of the English government English diplomats, merchants and bankers helped the Swedish King with his financial troubles in Turkey. Moreover, Charles XII borrowed money from his ally, Ukrainian Hetman Mazepa, and his nephew Voynarovskiy.¹²⁵

It was clear to England that the prolongation of the Northern War would weaken Sweden and establish Russia as the leading power in the Baltic. Therefore, the English government not merely opposed the peace settlement between Russia and Turkey, but actively sought to plunge these two powers into a new war. According to St. John, "as long as we have not settled our great affair with France, it is in our interest to feed the flames in these territories".¹²⁶ The Russian ambassador in London, Albrecht von der Lieth, reported in 1711 that the English government had instructed its representative in Constantinople to persuade the Sultan to dissolve the

¹²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 86-87.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.* See also Ilse Jacob, *Beziehungen Englands zu Russland und zur Türkei, 1718-1727*, a dissertation, (Basel, 1945), p. 15.

¹²⁵ Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 85; Ragnhild M. Hatton, *Charles XII of Sweden* (New York, 1969), p. 323; Bohdan Kentrschynskyi, *Mazepa* (Stockholm, 1962), pp. 249, 466-67.

¹²⁶ J.F. Chance, *George I and the Northern War* (London, 1909), p. 27.

treaty with Russia and declare war on the Tsar.¹²⁷ In 1712, at England's instigation, the Sultan declared war on Russia. However, after the Swedish King left Turkey, and after the Sultan had won the desired concessions from the Tsar, a peace was concluded in the summer of 1713.

England wanted Turkey to declare war on Russia to force the Russian troops to withdrawal from Pomerania, where they had marched in pursuit of the withdrawing Swedes. With the renewed peace between Russia and Sweden, the English government increased its efforts to get the Russian troops out of Pomerania. At this time, England tried to split the Northern League and to persuade Denmark to defect from the anti-Swedish coalition. In consequence, relations between Russia and England became more strained. On December 1, 1712, Whitworth was recalled from Moscow after eight years. For the next two years London did not appoint a replacement. It was only when the situation grew markedly worse for the Swedes that the English government sent George Mackenzie (May 1714) to negotiate peace between Russia and Sweden.¹²⁸

Up to the Peace of Utrecht (April 1, 1713) England's policy was geared, on the one hand, towards preventing the Swedish King from becoming powerless, and on the other towards accommodating Russia to the extent convenient to English interests. London realised that the transportation of English goods in English ships through St. Petersburg had become much cheaper than through Archangelsk. In spite of worsening political relations the trade between England and Russia continued to grow. The economic relations between the two countries were mutually beneficial, reflecting the vital interests of Russia and to an even greater degree those of England.

The end of the War of Spanish Succession provided London with the opportunity, in the years 1713-14, to maintain a balance of power in the Baltic by using Sweden as a counterweight against Russia. Thus in 1713 the English Secretary of State informed Count Gyllenborg, the Swedish ambassador in London, that the English government would take appropriate measures to help Sweden. The same year the English ambassador in Paris assured the Swedish ambassador that England would send a naval squadron to Sweden.

London knew that the Tsar would respond to this move by ordering reprisals against English trade and feared that the trade with Russia would then pass to the Dutch merchants. Nevertheless, England was prepared to send a naval squadron to support Sweden in the struggle against Russia if France and Holland would also participate. However, since neither France nor Holland would become involved, the English government decided not to become Russia's enemy.

¹²⁷ Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

After the death of Queen Anne (1714), the Elector of Hanover succeeded to the English throne as King George I. With this change in government English and Hanoverian political interests coincided. Hanover had designs on Bremen and Verden, and George I included the acquisition of these duchies in English policy. Although relations with Sweden became strained, England did not declare war on Sweden. On the contrary the English continued to pursue "the balance of power in the North". It was not in England's interests to turn the Swedish defeat into a Russian advantage.

To consolidate the friendship with George I Kurakin suggested that Denmark should cede the duchies of Bremen and Verden to Hanover. Kurakin also proposed a trade and defence treaty with England and Holland. With this aim, Kurakin arrived in London on May 11, 1714, and proposed the idea to George I. George showed great interest in the plan and gave his support. The Tsar, on the other hand, was eager to end the war as soon as possible and expected England's support for the Northern League against Sweden, since, in February 1715, under pressure from London, the Danish King had decided to cede Bremen and Verden to Hanover in exchange for Stralsund and Rügen.¹²⁹

Peter I and George I signed an alliance on October 17, 1714, in Greifswald. According to this treaty George I recognised Russia's seizure of Swedish territories and Peter I consented to the annexation of Bremen and Verden by Hanover. However, since George had acted as Elector of Hanover and not as the King of England, the English cabinet did not ratify the treaty and so formally England remained neutral. Once he had acquired Bremen and Verden, George I was particularly concerned about ending the war quickly in order to secure his possession of the two duchies through a peace treaty. At the beginning of 1716 his minister Bernstorff conveyed the idea of a joint Russo-Danish invasion of Sweden at Schonen in the summer to the Russian ambassador in London. Furthermore, Bernstorff advised the Russian that London was ready to conclude a defence and trade pact, which greatly pleased the Tsar. At the beginning of 1716, relations between England and Russia were very good, while Anglo-Swedish relations had become strained.

Then something unforeseen occurred: George I and the Tsar fell out over the so-called "Mecklenburg Question". The Duchy of Mecklenburg was situated in a very strategic location and the Tsar wanted to build a canal through it to link the Baltic with the North Sea. Russian merchants would have greatly benefited from such a canal. Their ships could then avoid sailing through the Sound and paying the so-called "Sound Tax".¹³⁰ The Duke, Karl Leopold of Mecklenburg, who was

¹²⁹ Otto Haintz, *König Karl XII. von Schweden* (Berlin, 1958), Vol. III, p. 19; Hatton, *op. cit.*, p. 404.

¹³⁰ Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

involved in a quarrel with the local nobility, sought aid from the Tsar and decided to ally himself with the latter through marriage.

General Karl-Gustav Jordan, a former Swedish officer who left Augustus II for service with the Duke of Mecklenburg, asked the chief minister of Mecklenburg, Adolf von Petkum, to arrange the marriage of Karl Leopold with the niece of Peter I, the widowed Anna of Courland. Petkum convinced the Tsar that the Baltic possessions, Livonia and Estonia, would only acquire real value if Russia also controlled the ports and bases in the western parts of the Baltic, possession of which would be of the utmost importance if the Tsar wanted to divert the East-West trade between Europe and Persia, India and Asia through Russia. Petkum pointed out that a canal could be built through Mecklenburg and that Wismar was capable of accommodating and protecting merchant vessels and warships.¹³¹ He tried to convince the Tsar that he might then rule Wismar with its excellent harbour, if he would involve the Duke. Perhaps he hoped that by such a settlement the Duke might in the future acquire the hereditary governorship of Livonia, as the Duke of Courland.¹³²

The Duke was very pleased with Petkum's plan. The aim of the marriage between the Duke and the Russian princess was the recovery of Wismar, which was finally realised in October 1713. At the end of that year the Tsar gave his approval, hoping to make Mecklenburg the cornerstone of a Russian federal system in North Germany.¹³³

On February 2, 1716, a marriage contract was concluded, not, however, with the widowed Duchess of Courland, but with her elder sister, Katharina Ivanova, for the Duke wished to claim Courland for himself.

The wedding was celebrated in Danzig on April 19, 1716. The alliance between Russia and Mecklenburg was signed the same day. According to this treaty, as stipulated in the marriage contract of February 2, 1716, the Tsar gave his consent to the annexation of Wismar and Warnemünde by the Duchy of Mecklenburg and promised the Duke diplomatic support and a large contingent of Russian troops. The Duke, on his part, allowed Russian ships to harbour in Mecklenburg's ports and Russian troops to quarter in and march through the duchy.¹³⁴ Wismar was thus the real objective of the alliance for both the Duke and the Tsar.

¹³¹ Walter Mediger, *Mecklenburg, Russland und England-Hannover, 1706-1721* (Hildesheim, 1967), p. 205.

¹³² Hatton, *op. cit.*, pp. 423-24; Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

¹³³ Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 177. Another German historian, R. Wittram, disagrees with Mediger's assumption that the Tsar planned to establish a protectorate over Mecklenburg. Wittram believes that the Tsar concentrated his troops in Northern Germany in order to deliver a strong blow against Sweden with the help of his allies, Wittram, *Peter I Czar und Kaiser* (Göttingen, 1964), Vol. II, pp. 278-79; cf., Hatton, *op. cit.*, p. 605.

¹³⁴ Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 133; Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

At this time Wismar was still in Swedish hands and besieged by Hanoverian, Danish and Prussian troops. Initially, it was the allies' intention that Wismar should go to Mecklenburg (1714), but later, accommodating the wishes of Denmark, they decided that Wismar was to become an imperial city.

Because the siege of Wismar had become drawn out, the Prussian King decided to withdraw his troops, allowing them to be replaced by the Russians. To this Mediger remarked: "Frederick William's narrow egotism and anxious care to spare his costly army and save it from wear and tear gave the Tsar the desired excuse to march his army into Mecklenburg without interference".¹³⁵ Under this pretext, Russian troops under the command of General Repnin marched into Mecklenburg, near Güstrow, at the end of March 1716.

Although the allies were not opposed to Russian aid, when they learnt of the Duke's intention to marry Katharina Hanover and London became concerned. Bernstorff advised Kurakin on March 27, 1716, that the Russian princess should not marry the Duke because the divorce was not yet decided. He also requested in the King's name that Wismar should not be given to the Duke.

George I made arrangements for Wismar to be occupied by Danish and Hanoverian troops and to prevent the Russians from entering the fortress. Furthermore, Hanoverian privy councillors were informed that the Swedish commander, Major General Schoultz von Scheraden, would soon surrender the fortress,¹³⁶ in which case it was not to be occupied by Mecklenburg or Russian troops.

On March 17, 1716, the Hanoverian resident in Berlin, Johann Heusch, reported that thirty battalions including cavalry, numbering several thousand men and one hundred light galleys with one hundred and fifty men each, were moving towards Mecklenburg.

This news made a strong impression in London, which instructed the Hanoverian ambassadors in Denmark and Berlin and the Privy Councillor Ludwig von Fabricius at the Congress in Brunswick that,

"referring to the alarm in the Empire over the entry of the Russian army without the Empire's knowledge, will or permission, they should try to persuade the Prussian and Danish governments that the Russian troops already in Mecklenburg should be withdrawn as soon as possible; and that the others which were on the way, should have their marching orders quickly countermanded".¹³⁷

¹³⁵ Hatton, *op. cit.*, p. 420.

¹³⁶ Mediger, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-73.

¹³⁷ Otto Haintz, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 75-77; Wittram, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 278-79; Mediger, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-90; Hatton, *op. cit.*, p. 605.

The English-Hanoverian policy towards Russia changed. From then on George I demanded that the Tsar leave Mecklenburg and withdraw his troops from Germany.

Meanwhile, the Swedish fortress commander capitulated to Danish General von Dewitz on April 19, 1716, and, despite Prince Repnin's protests, the Russians were not allowed to enter the city.

With the surrender the Russian alliance with Mecklenburg ceased to have any real value for the Tsar. Peter I realised that his plan had failed. He put all the blame on Bernstorff, whom "he regarded as a bad and unscrupulous man".¹³⁸ The Tsar, however, did not give up. He protested to the Danish King and demanded that an equivalent number of Russian troops be allowed to enter the fortress. The allies, however, refused to allow the Russians to participate in the occupation of Wismar.

Although the Tsar succeeded in negotiating a recognition from the Danish and Prussian Kings that Wismar belonged to Mecklenburg, George I protested against any attempt to turn Wismar into a free imperial city.

In these circumstances, the Tsar decided not to become involved in a conflict with the English King. For him everything now depended on defeating the Swedish King and bringing the war to an end. Once he had defeated Sweden he could then decide the fate of Wismar.¹³⁹

The Tsar's convention with the Danish King on June 3, 1716, in Altona, formed the basis of the joint invasion of Sweden. According to this convention the Tsar agreed to supply 40 battalions and up to 3,000 horses and Denmark 20 battalions and 10,000 cavalry, as well as the war fleet. Since the Danish King lacked sufficient funds to build the required number of ships, Peter I asked the English King to cover the cost. At the same time, on June 24, 1716, the Tsar wrote to Kurakin to conclude a treaty with England.

Although George I would not send any money, he informed Kurakin through his ministers that England was prepared to assist Denmark with arms. The Tsar welcomed this proposal and instructed Kurakin to obtain a strong naval squadron from England and recognition of Russia's territorial conquests (Ingermanland, Estonia and Karelia) through a peace treaty. England found these conditions unacceptable, although London wanted an alliance with Russia.

The Swedish minister in London, Count Gyllenborg, pointed out that Sweden would agree to the annexation of Bremen and Verden by Hanover in return for England's help to regain its Baltic possessions.¹⁴⁰ London welcomed the proposal. This would prevent a Russian invasion of Sweden and force the Tsar to withdraw his troops from Mecklenburg. If, therefore, Hanover and Denmark kept the

¹³⁸ Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 291.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 296.

¹⁴⁰ Hatton, *op. cit.*, p. 453; Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

territories they had occupied, England would renew good relations with Sweden and restore the balance of power in the Baltic and Russia would be forced to relinquish its Baltic conquests.

Admiral Norris received orders to sail his squadron to the Sound. From there, according to his instructions of May 21, 1716, he was to send an emissary to demand reparations from the Swedish King for English merchants and guarantees for future trade. In addition, Charles XII was not to provide aid to the Jacobites and to cease military operations against Danish Norway. In return England promised to revive the alliance with Sweden. The instructions further stated that Norris should not undertake any actions against Sweden as long as there was no answer from Stockholm, and if the Tsar and the Danish King were planning to invade Schonen, to dissuade them as strongly as he could. If the Russians and Danes persisted Norris was to threaten to pull the English fleet out of the Sound, thereby giving the Swedish fleet freedom of action. Norris was also instructed to ask the Danish King to abandon the invasion and to explain to him that he had no orders to support a landing in Sweden.¹⁴¹ When Norris conveyed this message to the Danish King, the latter became incensed and tried to ally himself even more strongly with Russia in order to end the war once and for all.

On June 26, 1716, because of Charles XII's long silence, George I ordered Norris to deploy near Karlskrona and to observe the Swedish fleet.¹⁴² When the letter that Norris had sent to Charles XII came back unopened, George I gave his admiral a free hand to cooperate with the allies.¹⁴³

After this insulting rejection of the peace offer Stanhope and Bernstorff assured Kurakin that they wished "from the heart" that the operation would take place as soon as possible under the protection of the English fleet.¹⁴⁴ From the Anglo-Hanoverian point of view the landing in Schonen was an opportunity to force the Swedish King to make peace and to get the Russians out of Mecklenburg. Bernstorff dispelled his fears that if the invasion was successful and Sweden was defeated the Tsar would become even more dangerous and in effect master of the Baltic with speculations that Peter's son would destroy everything that his father had done once he was dead. Bernstorff believed that due to poor health Peter would soon die.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴¹ *British Diplomatic Instructions, 1689-1789*, (hereafter "BDI") ed. by T.F. Chance (London, 1922), Vol. I, pp. 82, 84; Mediger, *op. cit.*, pp. 301-3; Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-31.

¹⁴² *BDI*, Vol. I, p. 85.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 87-89.

¹⁴⁴ Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 305.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

Kurakin did not succeed in concluding an alliance with England. George I's position towards Russia had not changed.¹⁴⁶ The Tsar demanded that Mecklenburg should supply the entire 35,000 strong Russian invasion force and ignored protests from London and Vienna. Peter hated the Duke and had several of his nobles arrested, causing many to flee from Mecklenburg to Wismar, Hanover, Lübeck and Hamburg. The Russian violation of Mecklenburg's constitution resulted in a cold war between the Tsar and the English King for the direct control of Mecklenburg. In these circumstances it became of vital importance for Hanover to bring about a withdrawal of the Russian troops from Mecklenburg and to prevent the Russians from returning after the invasion of Sweden.

To get a clearer picture of the situation London sent Lieutenant General Friedrich Johann Bothmer to Copenhagen. Bothmer reported that the Tsar wanted to abandon the invasion because the landing was to take place in September not in the summer. To compel the Russian troops to leave Denmark and Mecklenburg, England tried unsuccessfully to persuade the Tsar to launch an invasion against Schonen or Karlskrona.¹⁴⁷ On the proposal of the Tsar the Russian war council decided to cancel the invasion and to reschedule it for the summer of 1717.¹⁴⁸ The cancellation of the landing in Sweden in 1716, rumours that the Duke of Mecklenburg was prepared to exchange his dukedom for Livonia and the Tsar's persistent refusal to withdraw his troops from Mecklenburg caused great animosity towards Russia on the part of England, Hanover and Denmark.

The Danish King protested vehemently against the quartering of the Russian army in Denmark, and together with George I, demanded that the Russian troops be moved from Mecklenburg to Poland. In Copenhagen special defence measures were taken, the citizens were armed and Danish cannon were trained on Russian troop transports.

Hanover's first minister, Andreas Bernstorff, asked the Secretary of State, James Stanhope, to order Admiral Norris to launch a sudden attack on the Tsar's fleet, to confiscate his ships and to seize the Tsar himself and hold him prisoner until the Russian troops had evacuated Danish and German territory.¹⁴⁹ Stanhope did not want to make such an important decision on his own and informed his colleague Charles Townshend of Bernstorff's request. Townshend was horrified by Hanover's request and rejected it. He was sure that such an action against Russia would lead to a Swedish-Russian alliance against England. Sweden could also provide support to the Jacobites. Furthermore, a break with the Tsar would end the supply of Russian raw materials. Stanhope, however, was not opposed to the Danes carrying out Bernstorff's plan,¹⁵⁰ but they turned down the idea.

¹⁴⁶ Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

¹⁴⁷ BDI, Vol. I, pp. 93-94; Chance, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-41.

¹⁴⁸ Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

¹⁴⁹ L. Mahon, *History of England, 1713-1789* (London, 1858), Vol. I, pp. 237-38.

¹⁵⁰ Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

After long negotiations the Danish government finally succeeded in persuading the Tsar to withdraw his troops from Denmark. However, he refused to withdraw them from Mecklenburg. He wanted them to remain there over winter at the expense of the Mecklenburg nobility and to persuade George I, through the occupation of Mecklenburg, to help him with his landing in Sweden, or, in any case, to guarantee his Baltic conquests.

In order to maintain his key position in Mecklenburg, the Tsar needed Prussian support. Although George I and Bernstorff were seeking to win the Prussian King over to their side, Frederick William believed that he could only maintain control of his Swedish possessions with Russia's help. Therefore, he did not oppose the presence of Russian troops in Mecklenburg. On the contrary, he advised the Tsar to maintain the occupation of Mecklenburg with strong forces,¹⁵¹ which would prevent Charles XII from acquiring a foothold in Germany and blocking Hanover's access to the Baltic.¹⁵²

When George I realised that he could not rely on Prussia he tried to negotiate an understanding with the Tsar. The English King proposed that the Tsar attack Sweden from the east and leave the landing in Schonen to the Danes. George I promised to send the English fleet to protect the joint Russian-Danish attack. In return, he demanded that the Russians withdrew from Mecklenburg and stopped supporting the Duke.¹⁵³

As previously the Tsar demanded that England should allocate a squadron to join the Russian fleet under his command, and guarantee the territories conquered from Sweden at the conclusion of a peace.¹⁵⁴

George I, however, insisted that the unconditional withdrawal of Russians troops from Mecklenburg must come first. For his part the Tsar was equally resolute not to give up this weapon without ensuring a treaty with England.

According to Nikiforov the principal reason for George's decline of the Russian offer was the conclusion of a triple alliance between France, England and Holland on January 4, 1717.¹⁵⁵

Although in 1717 relations between Russia and England had become particularly strained, a diplomatic scandal occurred, which gave the Tsar hope of renewing the alliance with England. On the night of February 10, 1717, the Swedish ambassador, Gyllenborg, was arrested. His papers revealed that he was negotiating with the Jacobites, particularly the landing of 10,000 Swedish soldiers

¹⁵¹ Solovyev, *op. cit.*, Vol. IX, p. 56.

¹⁵² Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 332.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 336.

¹⁵⁴ Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 144; Mediger, *op. cit.*, pp. 336-37.

¹⁵⁵ Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

in England.¹⁵⁶ The Tsar was also implicated in this plot. He had connections with the Jacobites through his Scottish physician, Erskine.¹⁵⁷ In any case, the Tsar ordered his ambassador in London to congratulate the King on the discovery of the plot and to ask him whether he would now declare war on Sweden.¹⁵⁸ The Tsar disclaimed all knowledge of his own connections with the Jacobites.

Despite Gyllenborg's arrest the English would not declare war on Sweden. The Gyllenborg scandal did, however, lead to strained relations between England and Sweden and the dispatch of a squadron to the Baltic under the command of Admiral George Byng. This force was intended, however, not merely as a weapon against Sweden, but also as a counterweight against the Russians should the need arise. At the beginning of May 1717 Byng received orders to prevent any attempt by the Tsar to occupy Wismar.¹⁵⁹

Charles XII ordered the arrest of the English ambassador, Jackson, whereupon, in March 1717, George I forbade trade with Sweden. Since Gyllenborg's papers had made a reference to a grain shortage in Sweden this trade embargo appeared a particularly effective measure to the English government.¹⁶⁰ The measure, however, proved completely useless. The Dutch supplied the Swedes and took over the sale of Swedish goods. The English traders soon found that they had to pay more for Swedish goods, especially for Swedish steel, supplied the Dutch.¹⁶¹

Contrary to the Tsar's expectations the Gyllenborg case did not lead to a new Anglo-Russian alliance against Sweden and Peter's attempt to force the English fleet to come to his aid by occupying Mecklenburg had failed.

When, at the beginning of 1717, the Tsar realised that there was no hope of an alliance with England he decided to conclude an alliance with France. After successful negotiations a treaty was concluded on August 5, 1717, in Amsterdam between Russia, France and Prussia. This was an alliance and a defence treaty which guaranteed the signatories' territorial possessions after the war against Sweden.

This treaty compelled the Swedish King to begin direct negotiations with Russia in the spring of 1718.

The Amsterdam treaty caused great unrest in London. When, however, the Tsar informed the English ambassador in Paris that the Russian troops would be withdrawn from Mecklenburg, London decided to resume negotiations with the Tsar. When Peter came to Amsterdam George I sent Norris and Whitworth to the negotiations, which ended without success.

¹⁵⁶ Chance, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-84; Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 358.

¹⁵⁷ Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 359.

¹⁵⁸ Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

¹⁵⁹ *BDI*, Vol. I, pp. 96-98.

¹⁶⁰ Chance, *op. cit.*, p. 210; Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 358.

¹⁶¹ Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

Peace negotiations between Russia and Swedish were not in England's interest and so London sought a way to sabotage the conference. The English ambassador in Russia, Captain James Jeffereyes, made the following proposition in his report of March 16, 1719:

"...The Czar and the ministers are so fond of their congress at Aland that nothing can divert them from continuing it. I am told that Mr. Osterman and Mr. Mardefeld are to set out from hence towards that place some time this week; they both seem confident of success; but, should His Majesty think fit to interrupt their negotiations, I have thought of a project, which (if duely put in execution) will not fail of doing it effectually at least for some time: it is nothing but to send a frigate or two to the place of congress, and bring the Swedish plenipotentiary away by force. The Danes being in open war with Sweden and then the Swedish plenipotentiary having passports from the Danes these in my opinion will be the people most proper to put this in execution. The Swedish and Moscovite plenipotentiaries have each one hundred grenadiers for their guard, the Prussian has none (as far as I can hear), and let there be a hundred more, reckoning the five plenipotentiaries with their retinue, six hundred resolute men will be more than sufficient to execute the design. To carry it on more securely the vessel employed for this service may make use of Moscovite colours. The Czar has 3 squadrons, but I shall only describe to you the colours of the blew squadron, which the paper here inclosed will demonstrate to you. Mr. Weber, His Majesty's resident here, has sent some time ago a very good plan of the whole island to Mr. Bernstorff, in which is described (as he tells me) all the land-in places in the island. Should His Majesty think fit to interrupt this negotiation more effectually, the Moscovite plenipotentiary may likewise be carried away and afterwards be set on shore either in Danzig, Koenigsberg or Riga, and some cause may be invented to colour this enterprize, for, as to the attempt on the Swedish plenipotentiary, I do not see there need any be made, especially if done by the Danes".¹⁶²

The English government, however, rejected this proposal and tried to make peace with Sweden. In March 1718 the English King sent his representative, Ludwig V. Fabricius, to Stockholm with peace proposals. As the principal condition for peace George I demanded the cession of the Duchies of Bremen and Verden to Hanover. In return he promised the Swedes the renewal of the English-Swedish alliance of 1700.¹⁶³

Charles XII, however, rejected the demand to recognise the annexation of Bremen and Verden and insisted that England should help him meet the financial obligations of the 1700 treaty. He also demanded that England should send a naval

¹⁶² *Sbornik*, Vol. 61, pp. 506-7; Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

¹⁶³ Hatton, *op. cit.*, p. 455.

squadron every year to the Baltic to support Sweden and should stop trading with all ports controlled by Russia.

When Fabricius returned to London empty-handed Bernstorff urged the Tsar to leave Mecklenburg and to conclude an alliance with England.¹⁶⁴ He hoped in this way to prevent Russia from reaching an agreement with Sweden, but without success. In addition to peace the Tsar wanted an alliance with Sweden as a defensive measure against England. Perhaps Peter I would have realised his plans if Charles XII had not been killed on November 30, 1718. His death brought great changes in the diplomatic and military situation.

In the spring of 1719 Lord Carteret was sent to London to negotiate with Sweden. He was to persuade the Swedes to enter into friendly relations with Denmark, Poland and Prussia and to offer Sweden England's assistance against Russia if the Tsar rejected peace negotiations on the basis of the status quo.¹⁶⁵ An Anglo-Swedish treaty was signed on November 20, 1719. English diplomacy, however, failed in its objective — a great anti-Russian coalition and the destruction of the Russian navy. Its only success was that through the support of England Sweden did not surrender unconditionally to the Tsar.

Subsequently, England tried to organise a two-front war against Russia. Stanhope considered establishing cooperation between Sweden and Poland. He sent James Scott with a considerable sum of money to Warsaw to persuade Poland to fight against Russia. In return Poland would receive Smolensk and Kyiv.¹⁶⁶ The Poles took the money but refused to fight Russia.

England also considered a simultaneous attack on Russia by the Turks and Tatars¹⁶⁷ and made attempts to form an anti-Russian coalition out of Prussia, France and Turkey. All these plans failed.

In the summer of 1720 the new Swedish King (Charles of Hesse-Cassel, the husband of the Swedish Queen, Ulrike) explained to the English ambassador in Stockholm, William Finch, that he would be forced into peace negotiations with Russia if England or other countries did not help Sweden. As in the years 1719-1720, in 1721 Norris did not succeed in destroying the Russian fleet.

In the meantime, despite the presence of Norris' squadron in the Baltic, the Russian fleet carried out a landing in Sweden inflicting serious damage. Since no help came, the Swedes sued for peace, which was signed in Nystadt on September 10, 1721. According to the terms of this treaty Russia received Ingermanland, Estonia, Latvia and a part of Karelia with Wyborg, as well as the islands of Oesel and Dagoe. Russian influence had never reached so deeply into Western Europe. Through

¹⁶⁴ Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 401.

¹⁶⁵ BDI, Vol. I, p. 112.

¹⁶⁶ Chance, *op. cit.*, p. 403.

¹⁶⁷ PRO, SP 78, Vol. 65. Also see Jacob's dissertation.

negotiations with the Tsar Prussia received Stettin and most of Western Swedish Pomerania. The Treaty of Nystadt ended Sweden's imperial status in Europe.

Having excluded England from the negotiations at Nystadt, the Tsar concluded the peace treaty on his own terms and set the stage for bitter Anglo-Russian relations. Strained relations between Peter I and George I led to the recall of the Russian envoy from London and the English envoy from St. Petersburg. After delivering a diplomatic note to Whitehall the Russian resident in London, M.P. Bestuzhev, secretly distributed copies of the document to all accredited diplomats in England. As a result he was asked to leave England in November 1720.¹⁶⁸

Due to the strained relations between England and Russia, the English envoy, James Jeffereyes, was forced to leave St. Petersburg in October 1719 (he arrived there in January 1719). Jeffereyes settled in Danzig, where he remained as the English resident until 1725.¹⁶⁹ The Hanoverian resident in Russia, Frederick Christian Weber, also left St. Petersburg. All English citizens living in Russia were recalled. Diplomatic relations between England and Russia were not reestablished until 1731.

Conclusion

German, Scandinavian and even Russian historians, Polievktov, Nikiforov, Sorina, Tarle, have expressed the opinion that Peter desired "to set a firm foot on German soil with his power".¹⁷⁰

Other Soviet historians are of a different opinion. A.V. Florovskiy, for instance, claims that Peter I wanted to establish a political and economic base in Mecklenburg, but not a military one.¹⁷¹ In 1950 L. Nikiforov wrote that the Tsar paid "special attention to the territory of Mecklenburg because he wanted to build a canal through it joining the North Sea and the Baltic".¹⁷² In a later work, however, he is convinced that the Tsar desired no territorial acquisitions other than his Baltic conquests.¹⁷³ On the basis of Russian and Hanoverian sources K.J. Hartmann wrote in his monograph (1887) that the Tsar decided to marry his niece to the Duke of Mecklenburg "in order to make possible the stationing of large numbers of troops

¹⁶⁸ Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, pp. 261-62.

¹⁶⁹ *Sbornik*, Vol. 61, pp. 584-86; Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 237. Hatton, "Captain James Jeffereyes's letters to the Secretary of State, Whitehall, from the Swedish Army, 1707-1709", *Historisk Magasin*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (1953), p. 26.

¹⁷⁰ E. Herrmann, *Geschichte des russischen Staates* (Hamburg, 1849), Vol. IV, p. 294.

¹⁷¹ A. Florovskiy, *Das Mecklenburgproblem in der Politik Peter des Grossen* (Greifswald, 1963), p. 132.

¹⁷² Nikiforov, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

¹⁷³ Nikiforov, *Vneshnaya politika Rossii v posledneye gody Severnoy Voyny* (Moscow, 1959), pp. 435-28.

there for a long time".¹⁷⁴ Therefore, the assertion of English historian B.H. Sumner that "what precise objects the Tsar had in mind in making this marriage remain still unknown",¹⁷⁵ appears doubtful.

Peter's contemporaries had no doubt that the Tsar sought a foothold on German soil (on the North Sea) with the help of the Mecklenburg alliance and to establish Wismar and Rostock as bases for Russian trade. Statesmen in Hanover, London and Vienna were thus convinced that the Tsar was trying to expand his conquests into the economically and politically strategic European heartland, forming a bridge between the two seas, at the cost of the Empire. Hanoverian privy councillors feared that the Tsar desired to make Mecklenburg a Russian province and to transfer the Duke, to whom he was now related by marriage, to Courland. The Russian historians praised the Tsar and the victories of the Russian army and sought to portray the English as treacherous and deceptive. English diplomats were accused of slander, extortion and the spread of false rumours and accusations against Russia.

Although English diplomacy and naval expeditions did not prevent Peter I from acquiring a firm foothold on the Baltic, they had not been entirely in vain either. Even though the English failed to drive Russia out of the Baltic, they had brought damage to the Russians, forced the Tsar to retreat on several occasions and prevented him from swallowing Sweden in one go.

¹⁷⁴ Mediger, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

¹⁷⁵ Sumner, *Peter the Great and the Emergence of Russia* (London, 1950), p. 93.

NEWS FROM UKRAINE

CONTENTS

CHERNIHIV FAITHFUL THREATEN HUNGER STRIKE	44
TARAS SHEVCHENKO COMMEMORATED IN UKRAINE	44
COMMUNIST MUSEUM FIREBOMBED IN LVIV	45
RELIGIOUS OPPRESSION PERSISTS IN UKRAINE	45
250 UKRAINIAN CHILDREN FROM CONTAMINATED ZONE	
TO SPEND SUMMER IN FRANCE	46
DEATH OF NATIONALIST LEADER COMMEMORATED	46
CONGRESS OF UKRAINIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS	
HELD IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK	47
LEADER OF UKRAINIAN GOVERNMENT FROM 1918	
COMMEMORATED IN POLTAVA	48
UAOC BISHOP ANTONIY VISITS DNIPROPETROVSK	48
RUKH DISPLAY ATTACKED IN UZHGOROD	48
STRIKE COMMITTEES MEET IN LVIV	48
TRANSCARPATHIAN STRIKE COMMITTEES RENEW ACTIVITY	49
KHMARA TRIAL ADJOURNED UNTIL JUNE 5	49
NKVD VICTIMS UNEARTHED	49
UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS PREVENTED FROM SEEING POPE	50
LVIV STRIKE COMMITTEE LEADER HARASSED	50
KHMARA CHAIRS URP MEETING IN TERNOPIL	50
UKRAINIAN REPUBLICAN PARTY HOLDS SECOND CONGRESS	50
11TH ANTI-BOLSHEVIK BLOC OF NATIONS CONFERENCE HELD IN KYIV	52
MEETING OF INDEPENDENT TRADE UNIONS BANNED IN PORT CITY	53
DEMOCRATS UNITE IN DONETSK REGION	53
CONFERENCE OF "DEMOCRATIC UKRAINIAN YOUTH"	53
RALLY IN DONETSK MARKS BLOODY INCIDENT IN 1962	54
TRANSCARPATHIAN STRIKE COMMITTEES HARASSED	54
WESTERN UKRAINIAN RUKH LEADERS MEET	54
KHMARA TRIAL ADJOURNED FOR ANOTHER WEEK	55
VOLYN DRAFT BOARD PRESSURISING RECRUITS	
INTO SERVICE OUTSIDE UKRAINE	56
JOINT MEETING OF RUKH LEADERS AND	
STRIKE COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES	56
REPRESSIONS AGAINST STRIKE ORGANISERS IN DONBAS	56
FRANCE OPENS CONSULATE IN UKRAINE	57
UKRAINIAN STRIKE COMMITTEE PROTESTS	
AGAINST AFL-CIO MEMORANDUM	57
MILITARY LEADERS VISIT UZHGOROD	58
"GREEN WORLD" CHAIRMAN CRITICISES IAEA	58
UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST LEADER COMMEMORATED	58
REMAINS OF NKVD VICTIMS UNEARTHED IN LVIV	59
SPECIAL CLASSES FOR RUSSIAN-SPEAKING STUDENTS	
ABOLISHED IN TERNOPIL	60
DEMOCRATIC ACTIVISTS PICKET CARPATHIAN MILITARY DISTRICT	60

LUTSK MILITARY AIRFIELD CLOSED	60
CHORNOBYL-RELATED DEATHS	61
DEMOCRATS HARASSED IN THE IVANO-FRANKIVSK OBLAST	61
UKRAINIAN PUBLIC COMMITTEES MEET IN KYIV	61
ALL-UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENT TRADE UNION ESTABLISHED IN KYIV	62
ANTI-UNION RALLY HELD IN LVIV	64
WORLD CONGRESS OF UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS HELD IN KYIV	65
VETERANS OF PAST LIBERATION STRUGGLE MEET IN LVIV	66
CARPATHIAN MILITARY DISTRICT PICKET CONTINUING	67
"DEMOCRATIC KHERSON" BLOC FORMED	67
FIFTH UMA SESSION HELD IN LVIV	68
LVIV MARKS 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF RESTORATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE	68
UMA's LUPYNIS ARRESTED	69
ACTS OF TERROR CONTINUE	70
UAOC HIERARCHY MEET IN KYIV	71
KHMARA, EIGHT ASSOCIATES ARRESTED	71
SNUM ACTIVIST BURNS DOWN SOVIET ARMY MONUMENT	71
DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS ADVISORY COUNCIL HOLDS CONFERENCE IN KYIV	72
KHMARA TRIAL CONTINUES	72
ARMY OFFICERS HOLD CONGRESS	73
UAOC TO OPEN SEMINARY IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK	74
STEPAN BANDERA REMEMBERED IN KOLOMYIA	74
REFINERY POLLUTES LVIV RIVER	74
LUPYNIS THREATENED WITH PSYCHIATRIC CONFINEMENT	75
UKRAINIAN YOUTH MEET IN KYIV FOR SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS	76
"MEMORIAL" CONTINUES TO EXPOSE HORRORS OF STALIN TERROR IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK OBLAST	77

CHERNIHIV FAITHFUL THREATEN HUNGER STRIKE

MAY 20 — UAOC believers of the city of Chernihiv sent a statement to the chairman of the oblast (province) committee — Oleksander Lysenko, the chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet — Leonid Kravchuk, and the Patriarch of the UAOC — His Holiness Mstyslav Skrypnyk.

In the statement the Ukrainian Orthodox faithful declared that they would hold a hunger strike in the lobby of the oblast administration's offices in protest against the refusal of the authorities to officially recognise their community.

The Chernihiv Orthodox community has been trying to officially register itself for over a year now in order to be able to take over some of the area's churches. The Communist authorities have consistently replied with threats of monetary fines.

(Rukh-Press)

TARAS SHEVCHENKO COMMEMORATED IN UKRAINE

KANIV, May 22 — A group of believers of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) arrived here — the gravesite of Taras Shevchenko (19th century Ukrainian poet and political thinker). They were taking part in a two-week long commemorative journey to mark the 130th anniversary of the poet's reinterment in Kaniv (near Kyiv), retracing the route followed by Shevchenko's remains from St. Petersburg (now Leningrad), where he was buried in 1861, to Ukraine.

The Patriarch of the UAOC — His Holiness Mstyslav — joined the marchers in Kaniv, where he was to lead a religious service at the foot of Shevchenko's grave. Several pleas that the area before the monument be vacated for a short while so as to allow the Patriarch to lay a wreath and conduct the planned religious service all came to naught. The Ukrainian Orthodox faithful were forced to hold their religious commemoration at another site nearby.

After being prevented for the whole day from approaching the grave and monument as it was not "their turn" yet, the participants were compelled, with the help of local workers, to force their way through militia cordons and crowds of flag-wielding Communists and priests of the so-called "Ukrainian Orthodox Church" (note: the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine has been renamed the "Ukrainian Orthodox Church" and is not to be confused with the UAOC), brought in by busses in advance.

Clashes broke out between the demonstrators and the militia, which ripped up the national Ukrainian and other religious flags that the UAOC faithful were carrying.

At the grave it was announced that the loudspeakers to be used for the remembrance service and commemorative rally would not be turned on until the flags were lowered.

KHARKIV, May 22 — The Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) and other democratic organisations of the city organised a public rally and laying of flowers at the monument to Shevchenko to commemorate the 130th anniversary of the poet's reinterment in Ukraine.

The participants were addressed by the chairman of the culturological commission of Rukh — Petro Cheremskyi, who spoke about the revolutionary aspect and ideological misrepresentations of Shevchenko's works. A student choir sang various Ukrainian hymns and songs.

KYIV — A public commemoration of the 130th anniversary of the reinterment of the remains of Shevchenko was held beside the monument to the poet in the Ukrainian capital.

People's deputies from the Narodna Rada (parliamentary opposition group) addressed the gathering.

The rally was followed by a concert of Shevchenko's songs and other Ukrainian folk songs.

Before the meeting the chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet — Leonid Kravchuk, and premier Vitold Fokin laid flowers at the foot of the monument, and after the event — Cardinal Myroslav Ivan Lubachivskyi, head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

COMMUNIST MUSEUM FIREBOMBED IN LVIV

LVIV, May 22 — A fire destroyed the house of Communist intelligence officer Nikolai Kuznetsov, now a museum, during the night.

According to an anonymous telephone call, the firebombing of the building was carried out in retaliation for the destruction of the monument to the leader of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists — Stepan Bandera, blown up on December 30, 1990. The caller identified himself only as a member of a nationalist youth organisation.

RELIGIOUS OPPRESSION PERSISTS IN UKRAINE

BILA TSERKVA (Kyiv oblast), May 23 — The local authorities have refused to hand over the Mykilska Church to the city's community of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC).

The historic church was built by Hetman Ivan Mazepa (1644-1709). Today it stands in the courtyard of a church which belongs to the so-called "Ukrainian Orthodox Church" (the former Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine that was recently renamed the "Ukrainian Orthodox Church") and is used as a subsidiary premises. The UAOC activists are preparing to continue their efforts to gain control over the church.

(Rukh-Press)

CHERNIHIV May 19 — The weekly religious service of the UAOC community, held outside the Pyatnytska Church, which is closed, was very nearly disrupted by the organisers of a “Pioneer” (Communist youth organisation) event. The church, where a puppet show was planned, was opened for the “Pioneers”. The UAOC faithful managed to persuade the parents and children and the show was not held.

(Rukh-Press)

250 UKRAINIAN CHILDREN FROM CONTAMINATED ZONE TO SPEND SUMMER IN FRANCE

KYIV, May 23 — The women’s branch of Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) received a visitor — the vice-chairman of the charity organisation “Children of Chernobyl” from France — Ivan Bardak. He spoke about the activity of his organisation, which, among other things, is preparing this summer to accept 250 Ukrainian children from the contaminated areas into French families.

Last year 50 children spent time in France thanks to the “Children of Chernobyl” organisation.

(Rukh-Press)

DEATH OF NATIONALIST LEADER COMMEMORATED

LVIV, May 23 — Several Ukrainian nationalist organisations — Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM), Ukrainian National Party (UNP), Ukrainian Nationalist Association (UNS), the Lviv Brotherhood of Soldiers of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) — organised a march to mark the 53rd anniversary of the death of OUN leader Colonel Yevhen Konovalets, who was assassinated by a Soviet Russian agent in Rotterdam in 1938.

A public remembrance service was held on the square beside the opera house. The participants then formed a column and marched through the streets of the city with lit torches and nationalist flags.

The procession was led by members of the youth organisations. They were followed by the veterans of the OUN and the UPA, and then a large group of Lviv residents. The total number of participants was approximately 1,000 people.

The event concluded with a rally outside the opera house.

The chairman of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) — Yuriy Shukhevych and the UMA vice-chairman — Yuriy Mykolskyi, addressed the participants.

KHARKIV, May 21 — Representatives of Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine), the Ukrainian Language Society and the “Spadshchyna” (Heritage) Society held a meeting with democratic bloc deputies from the municipal and provincial soviets on the city’s Radyanska Ukraina Square. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the issue of the allocation of premises to Rukh and other democratic organisations.

In the opinion of the deputies, the present constellation of forces in the soviets makes them powerless to make any changes.

May 23 — The Youth League of the Kharkiv region held a public remembrance service for the founder of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) — Yevhen Konovalets, killed by a Soviet agent in Rotterdam 53 years ago.

The speakers talked about Konovalets's role in the Ukrainian liberation movement and the activity of the OUN.

CONGRESS OF UKRAINIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS HELD IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK

IVANO-FRANKIVSK, May 24-28 — The European Congress of Ukrainian Medical Associations (EKULT) was held in Ivano-Frankivsk. It was also attended by representatives from Australia, the USA and other countries.

There were three themes for discussion: the history of Ukrainian medicine, medical-biological aspects of the ecology of the Carpathian region and the moral-ethical problems of doctors in Ukraine and the diaspora.

In his address, entitled "Crucified medicine", Zvenyslav Helner from Lviv talked about Ukraine's repressed doctors, many of whom died during the Stalinist repressions. Serhiy Dudnyk, a medical student from Kyiv University, gave an account of the life of St. Ahapit Pecherskyi — Ukraine's first doctor. The participants appealed to the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet to erect a monument in Kyiv to commemorate St. Ahapit.

Doctors from outside Ukraine addressed the issues of morals and ethics of the Ukrainian doctor. Pavlo Dzhul from the USA spoke on "Medical morals and ethics", Ihor Huk from Australia on "Organ transplants — the first contacts with Ukrainian patients", and Yaroslav Babiuk from Prague on "Ethical problems of unborn children and others".

Regarding the third theme of the congress — the medical-biological problems of the Carpathian region — the Congress representatives from the USA, Poland and other countries underlined the fact that questions concerning the protection of the environment are very pressing and vital not only in Ukraine, but also throughout the world. Particular attention was given to the elimination of the aftereffects of the Chernobyl accident.

At the end of the Congress, the delegates and invited guests took part in a round-table discussion on the training of doctors and other medical staff.

Funds collected abroad for the treatment of children of Chernobyl and machinery for children's hospitals were handed over to the Congress.

LEADER OF UKRAINIAN GOVERNMENT FROM 1918 COMMEMORATED IN POLTAVA

POLTAVA, May 25 — A remembrance service was conducted on the anniversary of the assassination in Paris in 1926 of Symon Petlura — the head of the government and commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the Ukrainian National Republic (1918) in this city where he lived.

The service was conducted by a bishop of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, and the commemorative rally was attended by activists of democratic organisations from all regions of Ukraine.

UAOC BISHOP ANTONIY VISITS DNIPROPETROVSK

DNIPROPETROVSK, May 27 — Bishop Antoniyy, who heads the Chancery of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, paid a visit to this city in Ukraine's industrial heartland.

The Patriarch of the UAOC — Mstyslav, who was planning to visit Dnipropetrovsk himself, cancelled the trip because the city authorities refused permission for a religious service in the city's Cathedral of the Transfiguration.

RUKH DISPLAY ATTACKED IN UZHGOROD

On the night of May 27-28, a Rukh show-window in the centre of the city was smashed. This is the second occasion on which displays with Rukh materials have been destroyed in Uzhhorod.

According to Vasyl Zilhalov, the displays are destroyed when they show new material about Moscow's management of affairs on the territory of Carpathian Ukraine. The most recent display contained information concerning the Kremlin's attempts to appropriate the gold deposits of the Berehiv region.

The local authorities are doing everything possible to prevent the dissemination of the democratic press. In particular, the newspaper of the regional Rukh branch — "Karpatska Ukraina", remains without premises and finds itself in a tight situation.

STRIKE COMMITTEES MEET IN LVIV

KYIV, May 28 — Representatives of this city's workers' and strike committees met in the Ukrainian capital to discuss the holding of a conference in Kyiv and membership of the all-Ukrainian union of strike committees.

The meeting was chaired by the joint chairman of the Kyiv strike committee — Volodymyr Bubnov.

The conference was planned for June 11.

TRANSCARPATHIAN STRIKE COMMITTEES RENEW ACTIVITY

TRANSCARPATHIA, May 28 — The strike committee of the Solotvyno salt-mine held a meeting with representatives of the provincial and Tiachiv district administrations and the salt-mine management.

During the meeting, the strike committee members expressed indignation at the fact that the demands they put forward last year have not been met and placed an ultimatum before the authorities: if the demands are not met, the employees of the mine will go out on strike.

The strike committee also demanded the dismissal of the chairman of the village soviet — Ishtvan Tomash, because of his unfavourable policies towards the miners.

The chairman of the regional Rukh branch — People's Deputy Viktor Bed, addressed the meeting, expressing his support for the miners' demands.

KHMARA TRIAL ADJOURNED UNTIL JUNE 5

KYIV — The trial of People's Deputy Stepan Khmara is proceeding along now familiar lines.

On May 28, under the pretext of the absence of the defendants' defence lawyers, the court ruled to adjourn the trial until June 5. The trial has already been postponed several times.

The attorney for Oleh Batovkin, one of the defendants in the now infamous "Khmara case", protested the delay, stating that the other attorneys were absent simply because they were denied access into the court. Her arguments were ignored.

The other co-defendants in this case are: Oleksander Kovalchuk, Mykhailo Ratushnyi, Leonid Berezanskyi and Mykola Holovach.

NKVD VICTIMS UNEARTHED

YAREMCHE (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast) — On May 29 members of the local branch of the "Memorial" society and many volunteers began to excavate the remains of victims of NKVD (precursor of the KGB) terror here on the banks of the river Prut.

According to witnesses, the former military trenches contain the remains of dozens of people from Yaremche and surrounding villages, shot and tortured to death by Stalin's secret police.

According to Vlas Ozhha, the local "Memorial" chapter chairman, the remains of eight people have so far been uncovered. The work is being recorded on videocassette and camera. A diary is also being kept.

The Yaremche "Memorial" chapter has appealed to all local residents to come forth with information on the years 1944-55.

UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS PREVENTED FROM SEEING POPE

UZHGOROD, May 29 — Local authorities are making attempts to prevent nearly 1,000 Ukrainian Catholics from meeting Pope John Paul II, who will be visiting Poland from June 1 to 9.

A day before the pilgrims were due to leave, the chairman of the local council on religious affairs announced that their Soviet travel documents are invalid and arrangements have to be made on the regular passports half a day before the proposed journey.

LVIV STRIKE COMMITTEE LEADER HARASSED

LVIV — On May 30, the Halych district militia informed the chairman of the Lviv strike committee — Viktor Furmanov, that the district court has fined him 600 roubles for his part in the organisation of an unsanctioned protest march against the union treaty referendum, held on March 17, 1991.

Furmanov was recently fined 400 roubles for an unsanctioned rally on March 3. He now faces a total fine of 1,000 roubles.

KHMARA CHAIRS URP MEETING IN TERNOPIL

TERNOPIL — The regional branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) recently held a meeting in this city. The meeting was chaired by People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, the vice-chairman of the URP, whose trial has been postponed until June 5.

The participants discussed preparations for the second congress of the URP, as well as the need for more intensive political activity on the part of the members of the party.

UKRAINIAN REPUBLICAN PARTY HOLDS SECOND CONGRESS

KYIV, May 31-June 2 — 483 delegates gathered over the weekend in a cinema on this capital city's Saksahanskyi Street to attend the second congress of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) — the largest democratic-opposition party in Ukraine. The cinema was large enough to hold the many delegates, foreign and Ukrainian guests, and numerous journalists that came for this congress.

Representatives from the consulates of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the USA also attended the Congress, as did representatives of the Ukrainian diaspora from Canada (12), the USA (11), Australia (3), Lithuania (1), Estonia (1), and Russia (18).

Among the Ukrainian parties and organisations represented at the congress were: the Popular Movement of Ukraine — Rukh, the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party, the Ukrainian Peasant-Democratic Party, the Ukrainian Society of the Repressed, the Association of Women, the Association of Ukrainian Students, the Ukrainian Student Association, "Helsinki-90", "Memorial", the Social-Democratic Party of Ukraine, the Party for the Democratic Revival of Ukraine, the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, the Brotherhood of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, and the political association — State Independence of Ukraine. The guests included 11 people's deputies to the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet.

The media contingent, some 62 journalists in all, included 9 URP publications, Ukrainian television and radio, Moscow television, Radio Liberty, Radio Australia, CNN, BBC and Reuters.

The large number of people attending the congress was only partially a reflection of the URP's significant role in present day Ukrainian politics.

Several weeks prior to the congress, rumours were afoot of an impending rift between the more moderate faction in the ranks of the URP and the radical faction, titularly headed by Stepan Khmara.

Prior to the opening of the congress, a press conference was held on May 31 at 5:00 p.m. at the Ukrainian Writers' Union offices.

At 10:00 a.m. on June 1 the Congress was officially opened. This was followed by introductory remarks by the chairman of the organisational committee of the congress and the election of a congressional presidium. Afterwards, URP chairman — Levko Lukyanenko, delivered his report, which was followed by a series of addresses by a number of guests and other reports of various commissions.

At the close of the day's plenary session, the delegates to the congress ratified the URP Statutory by-laws, which incorporated several proposed changes.

On Sunday, June 2, the second plenary session of the congress began amidst rumours that Stepan Khmara was a candidate for URP chairman. Mr. Khmara, however, refused to run and in an attempt to maintain party unity, Mr. Lukyanenko, following his re-election as URP chairman, proposed Mr. Khmara as one of the vice-chairman, together with Oleh Pavlyshyn. A party Programme was also ratified at this session.

Near the end of the session Mr. Khmara forwarded a resolution that incorporated some of the primary demands of the more radical elements in the URP: the immediate dissolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR and the holding of new elections; the withdrawal of democratic deputies from soviets in which Communists are in a majority; and an emphasis on extraparlimentary methods of struggle, such as strikes, demonstrations, campaigns of civil disobedience. This resolution led to a heated debate that may have led to a rift within the ranks of the URP. Mr. Khmara decided to withdraw his proposal so as to avoid such a rift.

The URP's second congress ended with a press conference that began at 5:00 p.m.

11TH ANTI-BOLSHEVIK BLOC OF NATIONS CONFERENCE HELD IN KYIV

KYIV — The 11th conference of representatives from subjugated nations was held in Kyiv on June 1, 1991. The preparatory conference committee was formed by the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA), headed by long-time political prisoner Yuriy Shukhevych, son of General Roman Shukhevych — the commander of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army until his death in battle in 1950. The Conference was held in the building of the Ukrainian Writers' Union.

The national representations included: from Georgia — the Society of "St. Illia the Righteous", the Citizens' League of Georgia; from Azerbaijan — the National Party "Musafat", the People's Freedom Party; from Lithuania — the Union of National Lithuanian Youth, "Young Lithuania"; from the Crimea — the Organisation of the Crimean Tatar Movement; and from Ukraine — the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, the Ukrainian Nationalist Association, the All-Ukrainian Brotherhood of Soldiers of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army.

The main purpose of the conference was to revive and strengthen ABN activities and objectives among the subjugated nations of the Soviet Union.

Representatives of various nationalities reported on the current situation in their homelands. Many noted that the Communist Party still has a strong hold on power and that there are insurmountable difficulties in achieving independence by parliamentary methods. The democratic opposition movements are trying to peacefully recapture their rights from Moscow. It was noted, however, that Moscow has often instigated conflicts between nationalists in order to pit one group against another. This was evident in Azerbaijan, where three hundred peaceful citizens were crushed by Soviet tanks, reported Niyaz Ibrahimov from the National Party "Musafat" (Azerbaijan).

From the Baltic nations, Dajnius Varnas ("Young Lithuania") reported that intensive russification is continuing. The KGB has tried to penetrate the infrastructure from within and the "fifth column" is very strong.

The conference participants also raised the issue of cooperation between the subjugated nations with the national groups within the Russian Federation. Such cooperation would strengthen the process towards the dissolution of the USSR.

After the reports from the various representatives, greetings from the ABN's Central Committee were read out.

The conference participants passed a declaration on the revival of ABN activities on Soviet-occupied territories, as well as various statutes on political aims and objectives. Special messages from the conference were sent to the ABN headquarters and the World League for Freedom and Democracy. An Appeal to the subjugated nations in the Soviet Union was ratified.

One of the resolutions of the conference called for the publication of an ABN bulletin within the Soviet Union.

It was decided that the next ABN conference will be held in Georgia. The previous conference was held in the Georgian capital — Tbilisi.

MEETING OF INDEPENDENT TRADE UNIONS BANNED IN PORT CITY

ODESSA, June 1 — A founding meeting of independent trade unions was to be held at the city's shipyard, under the auspices of the local activists of the "Democratic Ukraine" bloc, employed at the shipyard.

Leaflets were handed out around the shipyard, calling on workers to take part in the meeting. When the meeting began, a detachment of militia and KGB arrived.

The shipyard management then announced that the meeting was banned. A KGB officer added that should the meeting be continued outside the shipyard, it would be regarded as an unsanctioned rally. The organisers were threatened with arrest. In this way, the meeting was disrupted.

DEMOCRATS UNITE IN DONETSK REGION

MAKIYIVKA — At a recent conference that was held in this mining and industrial region of Ukraine, several democratic organisations and parties united to form a single democratic union.

Representatives of Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine), the Ukrainian Language Society, "Memorial", the Party for the Democratic Revival of Ukraine, the democratic bloc in the city council, the independent miners' union, the voters' association, representatives of free trade unions, the Green Party and the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association took part in the conference.

During discussions the delegates expressed the need to form a bloc for coordination and common action in the struggle against the Communist regime.

People's Deputy Henadiy Masliuk passed a motion to collect signatures on a petition for the introduction of a Ukrainian currency. He also pointed out that it is imperative to begin preparations now for new elections on all levels.

A Coordinating Council was elected and the structure of the new Democratic union was established.

CONFERENCE OF "DEMOCRATIC UKRAINIAN YOUTH"

DONETSK — The regional Donetsk organisation — "Democratic Ukrainian Youth", held a founding conference in the city's educational centre. Delegates from the Donetsk, Dnipropetrovsk and Luhansk oblasts (provinces) took part in the conference.

The conference was also attended by a guest from Canada. In her address, Valentyna Rohal pointed out that at the present time the primary objective is to unite all of Ukraine's youth into a single organisation, whose purpose would be the revival of Ukrainian culture.

The delegates elected a chairman — Valeriy Oliynyk, and a Coordinating Council.

The principles and goals of the new organisation are based on the struggle for the revival of Ukraine.

RALLY IN DONETSK MARKS BLOODY INCIDENT IN 1962

DONETSK, June 2 — A rally was held here on the city's central square to commemorate a tragic event, which occurred in Novocherkask in June 1962, when the local Communist Party authorities ordered army units and the KGB to open fire on peaceful civilians.

Ludmyla Tor — a guest from New York, who was invited to Donetsk by the strike committee, addressed the participants of the rally. Ms. Tor announced that this tragic occasion was also being commemorated in the USA and that she was in Donetsk on an official visit to establish links with the Donbas miners.

TRANSCARPATHIAN STRIKE COMMITTEES HARASSED

MUKACHEVE — The Communist authorities and KGB are conducting an active struggle against the city's strike committees. They are employing every means at their disposal against the strike committees. One particular case is that of Maria Adzioma, an employee of the Mukacheve sewing factory. Because she had formed a strike committee at the factory, Ms. Adzioma was harassed in a number of ways and finally dismissed from her job.

WESTERN UKRAINIAN RUKH LEADERS MEET

UZHHOROD — The regional of Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) organisations held a conference here on June 1. The participants discussed the political situation in the western Ukrainian provinces of Lviv, Ternopil, Ivano-Frankivsk, Chernivtsi, Rivne, Volyn and Transcarpathia, as well as the question of the union treaty, Rukh tactics, and matters concerning the Popular Movement's Third Congress.

Among those participating in the meeting were: Lubomyr Senyk — chairman of the Lviv provincial Rukh branch, Ivan Shovkovyi and Roman Luchytskyi — leaders of the Ivano-Frankivsk Rukh, Rukh leaders from the other provinces and the chairman of the Transcarpathian regional Rukh organisation — Viktor Bed.

While discussing the political situation in the provinces, the participants agreed that the conference should develop more efficient measures for providing practical help for the Rukh organisations in the Bukovyna region and Transcarpathia.

The regional Rukh organisations confirmed their position concerning the union treaty, ratified at their previous meeting in Lviv, and pointed out that it should be implemented in their daily work.

During discussions regarding the Third Rukh Congress, the conference pointed out the necessity to resolve a series of organisational problems prior to the

Congress so that the event could be held in a businesslike manner and lead to the consolidation of Rukh and the other democratic forces in Ukraine.

The regional Rukh organisations pointed out that it is imperative to expedite the process of forming efficient strike committees. Courses should be held to prepare Rukh cadres, with the aim of strengthening the organisation.

The organisational committee was delegated with particular tasks. A regional conference on the theme — "The Present Political Situation and Rukh Tactics" will be held in Lviv on June 29-30.

The meeting drew up a petition to the Narodna Rada (People's Council — parliamentary opposition group), in which the regional Rukh organisations urge the democratic deputies to put maximum effort into preventing the Supreme Soviet from signing a new union treaty.

A separate petition to the Supreme Soviet was also drawn up, calling on the deputies to concentrate on establishing an independent Ukrainian state, and not to debate the signing of a new union treaty.

The delegates also appealed to the strike committees to prepare for mass opposition to the attempts to sign a union treaty.

The next regional Rukh meeting in western Ukraine will be held in Lutsk at the end of July.

KHMARA TRIAL ADJOURNED FOR ANOTHER WEEK

KYIV — People's Deputy Stepan Khmara's trial resumed on June 5, and was again suspended until June 12 in what is clearly developing into a pattern. The pretext for this latest in a series of adjournments was the allegedly hostile and disruptive behaviour in the courtroom of one of the co-defendants in this case — Oleksander Kovalchuk. Mr. Kovalchuk's attorneys strongly suspect that their client is being injected with or otherwise given various psychotropic drugs. Mr. Kovalchuk's abnormal mental and physical state lead them and many other observers to this conclusion. Efforts to have Mr. Kovalchuk examined by Amnesty

International's psychiatrist in Kyiv have been to no avail.

Following Mr. Kovalchuk's outburst today, he was severely beaten by the security forces in the courtroom. After the presiding judge in the case declared the adjournment, the other co-defendants in this case, other than Mr. Khmara (Leonid Berezanskyi, Oleksander Kovalchuk, Oleh Batovkin and Mykhailo Ratushnyi), were all handcuffed and carried out of the courtroom in an atmosphere of heightened tension.

In protest, the several hundred supporters of Stepan Khmara and the other defendants, who had gathered outside the municipal court, staged a march through the centre of the Ukrainian capital. A cordon of militia, however, prevented the protesters from approaching the republic's Supreme Soviet.

VOLYN DRAFT BOARD PRESSURISING RECRUITS INTO SERVICE OUTSIDE UKRAINE

LUTSK — The draft boards in this city are putting increased pressure on recruits in an attempt to compel them to consent to military service outside Ukraine.

In this regard, the leaders of the Volyn regional Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) branch are conducting educational work among the youth, informing them of the decree of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers on military service, which calls for all draftees to be given the opportunity to serve exclusively on Ukrainian soil. According to this decree, military service outside the republic is strictly on a voluntary basis.

The URP leaders are seeking to have the decision of the recruits corroborated by their parents. In case of pressure, the recruit should have the right to appeal to the prosecutor's office or to his people's deputy.

JOINT MEETING OF RUKH LEADERS AND STRIKE COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES

IVANO-FRANKIVSK — On June 4, a joint meeting of the leaders of the Ivano-Frankivsk regional Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) branch and representatives of the oblast (province) strike committees was held.

The participants ratified a statement to workers' collectives, business enterprises, institutions, organisations and parties, which states that the Communist majority led by Leonid Kravchuk — the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet chairman — is trying to force Ukraine into a new form of colonial bondage by signing a "new union treaty". The statement concludes by stating that only a simultaneous general strike throughout all of Ukraine can protect the right of the Ukrainian people to an independent state.

The regional Rukh leaders resolved to form an oblast strike committee to coordinate action and are planning to hold an oblast conference of strike committees some time in the near future.

REPRESSIONS AGAINST STRIKE ORGANISERS IN DONBAS

DONETSK — Repressive measures against the organisers of the recent coal-miners' strike here are continuing. Coal-mine managers have resolved to eliminate the organisers of the protest actions in any way possible.

According to Mykhailo Plieshanov, the strike organisers at the "Sotsialistychnyi Donbas" coal-mine are either forced to resign from work, or transferred to less-paying jobs.

FRANCE OPENS CONSULATE IN UKRAINE

KYIV, June 13 — France's foreign minister — Roland Dumas, and the French ambassador to the USSR arrived in the Ukrainian capital for the official opening of a French consulate in Ukraine. A French cultural centre and trade mission will also be based at the consulate.

On this occasion, Mr. Dumas met the chairman of the Presidium of the UkrSSR Supreme Soviet — Leonid Kravchuk, and the chairman of the UkrSSR's Council of Ministers — Vitold Fokin, to discuss the prospects for future economic co-operation between France and the UkrSSR. Explaining his attitude towards Ukraine's integration into the European community, Dumas underlined that the significance of Ukraine's membership in the United Nations, which has now become clear, will give the country a considerable advantage in its attempts to join Europe.

At a press conference in the foreign ministry, Roland Dumas pointed out that the opening of a consulate is an amicable gesture towards Ukraine.

UKRAINIAN STRIKE COMMITTEE PROTESTS AGAINST AFL-CIO MEMORANDUM

DONETSK — The organisers of the All-Ukrainian Union of Strike Committees (VOSK) recently sent a letter to the director of the AFL-CIO's department of central and east European free trade unions, which stresses that the AFL-CIO's memorandum from February 1991 regarding cooperation in administrative-trade relations with the coal-mining industry of the USSR is not in the interests of Ukraine and the Ukrainian people.

The VOSK letter, which was also written on behalf of Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) and the democratic opposition in the UkrSSR Supreme Soviet, further states that the memorandum does not take into account Moscow's continuing monopoly of the coal-mining industry in Ukraine.

Moreover, the letter continues, the representatives of the Donetsk strike committee were not authorised to sign the document.

The letter is signed by the chairman of the republican strike committee — Oleksander Ivashchenko, People's Deputy of Ukraine — Larysa Skoryk, the chairman of the regional Rukh organisation — Evheniya Ratnikova, the chairman of the Donetsk branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party — Maria Oliynyk, and members of the republican strike committee.

MILITARY LEADERS VISIT UZHGOROD

UZHGOROD — On June 11, the commander-in-chief of Soviet forces in Czechoslovakia — General Vorobiov (a People's Deputy of the USSR), arrived in this western Ukrainian city with a contingent of high-level military officers.

According to the chairman of the oblast (provincial) executive council, People's Deputy Voloshchuk, the visit is connected with Moscow's recent decision to transform the Pistrialiv strategic radar station into a space research centre, for which the local authorities in Uzhgorod have given their consent.

Representatives of democratic organisations of the Carpathian region of Ukraine have expressed their protest against this decision.

"GREEN WORLD" CHAIRMAN CRITICISES IAEA

KYIV — On June 11, the Ukrainian association "Green World" held a briefing in the press centre of the UkrSSR Foreign Ministry.

People's Deputy Yuriy Shcherbak — the chairman of this Ukrainian environmentalist political party, read a statement, in which he harshly criticised the conclusions of the IAEA conference which was recently held in Vienna.

The IAEA, according to Mr. Shcherbak, did not use maximum possible measures to help in the clean-up of the aftereffects of the Chornobyl disaster. "The IAEA once again convincingly demonstrated that it is an organisation, which is completely subservient to powerful atomic institutions and lobbies of a number of countries, which are putting considerable effort into concealing the true tragic consequences of the Chornobyl tragedy", Shcherbak said.

The conclusions of the IAEA negate the efforts of the Ukrainian Health Ministry and can bring an end to international assistance for Ukraine.

Mr. Shcherbak also announced that signatures are being collected on a petition calling for Ukraine to leave the IAEA.

The "Greenpeace" representative in Ukraine — Norton Andersen, who was present at the briefing, agreed with Mr. Shcherbak and expressed doubts regarding the objectivity and conclusions of the IAEA. He pointed out that insufficient numbers of people were examined for scientific analysis, and that the people who were evacuated from the 30-km exclusion zone and those who carried out clean-up operations at the Chornobyl power plant were not examined at all.

UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST LEADER COMMEMORATED

ZASHKIV, June 14 — Thousands of people, including representatives of the Ukrainian diaspora, gathered in Zashkiv (Lviv oblast) to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Col. Yevhen Konovalts (1891-1938; founder of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists).

Last year, during the first open commemoration of the Konovalets anniversary, Zashkiv residents declared that they would rebuild the house where the Colonel was born and erect a monument to mark the hundredth anniversary of his birth.

With the help of neighbouring villages, the house was restored and converted into a museum and a monument was erected outside.

The event opened with a commemorative service beside the monument, conducted by Ukrainian Catholic clergy from Zashkiv and other nearby villages. The requiem service was followed by a moleben (a dedicational service) and a consecration of the monument and the museum. The monument was unveiled by a relative of Konovalets, by Volodymyr Mandziak — the chairman of the village council and the organiser of the project, and by Ivan Hel — the vice-chairman of the Lviv provincial soviet.

Following the religious commemoration, a number of speakers addressed the participants. First to speak were the priests. They were followed by Yuriy Podilchak — the chairman of the "Prosvita" society in the village, who spoke about the life of Yevhen Konovalets, Ivan Hel, Slava Stetsko — the chairman of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, who resides in Munich, Germany, and People's Deputy Roman Ivanychuk, who pointed out that one of the first "Prosvita" branches established in Ukraine was in Zashkiv.

The speakers recounted Konovalets's significance and contribution to the Ukrainian liberation struggle.

People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, who was also present at the commemorative event, announced that Ukrainian independence cannot be achieved through parliamentary means and stressed the need for a Ukrainian army.

Major Nedelskyi from Kharkiv, who was dismissed from the army for membership in the Ukrainian Republican Party and his attempts to build a Ukrainian army, swore an oath to concentrate all his efforts on creating a national army.

The meeting ended with the singing of the Ukrainian national anthem.

REMAINS OF NKVD VICTIMS UNEARTHED IN LVIV

LVIV — Excavations are presently underway at a militia school, a former NKVD prison, situated on Zamartynska Street, to unearth the remains of political prisoners murdered by Stalin's secret police in 1941. The operation has been organised by the oblast branch of the "Memorial" society.

The remains of nearly 1,500 people have already been found. In connection with this, the Lviv prosecutor's office has begun a criminal investigation.

SPECIAL CLASSES FOR RUSSIAN-SPEAKING STUDENTS ABOLISHED IN TERNOPIL

TERNOPIL — The city's executive council met on June 14 to discuss the abolition in Ukrainian schools of classes for Russian-speaking students.

Due to over-crowding, the city cannot accommodate Ukrainian-speaking students.

Statistics show that 92.5 per cent of the city's schoolchildren are being taught in the Ukrainian language, and only 7.5 per cent in Russian. In spite of this, 11 per cent of schools in Ternopil have been allocated to the Russian-speaking children. The average size of Russian classes is three times smaller than Ukrainian classes. Because the local authorities do not have the means to build more schools, the city executive council moved to abolish Russian classes in Ukrainian schools.

DEMOCRATIC ACTIVISTS PICKET CARPATHIAN MILITARY DISTRICT

IVANO-FRANKIVSK — Members of Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine), the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers and SNUM (Independent Ukrainian Youth Association) organised a picket of one of the units of the Carpathian Military District (MD) of the Soviet armed forces.

The demonstrators called on the soldiers to defend their homeland and not the Soviet empire — not to volunteer for service as an occupational force in the Caucasus.

The protesters demanded guarantees that Ukrainian citizens will carry out their military service on the territory of their republic.

The city's democratic organisations discovered that as of May 30, 680 Ukrainian recruits volunteered for service in the Caucasus. It is interesting to note, they say, that these volunteers are all from the provinces of the Kyiv MD.

There were, however, no volunteers from among the recruits drafted from the Carpathian and Odessa MDs.

LUTSK MILITARY AIRFIELD CLOSED

LUTSK — The Volyn provincial soviet recently voted for the immediate closure of a military airfield in Lutsk. The air base, the legislators claim, is polluting the environment and disturbing the local inhabitants. The soviet is demanding compensation for the problems created by the airfield.

The reasons for the decision are serious enough, but the most persuasive argument was the threat by People's Deputy Oleksander Hudyma, that: "If the provincial executive committee does not make an appropriate decision, the members of oppositional parties will take decisive measures — they will picket the runway".

CHORNOBYL-RELATED DEATHS

DNIPROPETROVSK — According to the city's "Chornobyl" association, 250 residents of the oblast who took part in the clean-up operation at the Chornobyl power station have died.

In the last six months, the death rate among veterans of the clean-up has doubled. The chairman of the Dnipropetrovsk branch of the "Chornobyl" association — Mykhailo Rozumov, believes that the death toll is going to rise even further.

DEMOCRATS HARASSED IN THE IVANO-FRANKIVSK OBLAST

HORODENKA (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast) — Law enforcement institutions are continuing their harassment of city leaders and Rukh activists. The district inspector — Vasyl Zavadovskyi, visited the municipal soviet for a talk with the mayor — Bohdan Hrytsiuk; Rukh member Bohdan Hronskyi and the chairman of the district "Memorial" society — Ivan Bachynskyi, were interrogated by the department of internal affairs.

Although the municipal soviet passed a bill to remove a memorial plaque dedicated to a man named Fedorenko, who betrayed members of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists and Ukrainian Insurgent Army to the NKVD, the security organisations are charging Rukh members with the unlawful dismantling of the monument.

UKRAINIAN PUBLIC COMMITTEES MEET IN KYIV

KYIV, June 15 — Representatives of the growing network of Public Committees that is being set up as an alternative to the Soviet government met in the building of the Ukrainian Writers' Union to discuss ways to reenergise the campaign to register citizens of a Ukrainian National Republic (UNR). Registration began last year, achieving relative success. According to a spokesman of the Inter-Party Assembly (UMA), as of June 1, 1991, over 2.5 million Ukrainians have registered in this campaign.

According to Viktor Melnyk — the chairman of the UMA Executive Committee, the registration of UNR citizens is not the end goal; it is merely the first step towards the establishment of close contacts with the population, towards improving the image of the Public Committees, in the hope that they will soon become a viable alternative structure to the established administrative bodies.

It was pointed out during the meeting that one area that needs to be strengthened in the Public Committees' activity is the area of information gathering and

dissemination. So far only the Cherkasy, Rivne, Odessa, Ternopil and Vynnytsia Public Committees have taken serious measures in this direction.

The newspaper "Visti" (News) was asked to assist in establishing a more effective information service; the Public Committees are to help improve the quality of this publication and to ensure its regular distribution among readers.

Furthermore, Viktor Melnyk and Petro Kahuy — the vice-chairman of the UMA Executive Council, pointed out that information leaflets ought to be printed on a local level, for which the UMA executive is prepared to offer all the assistance that may be required.

The participants also discussed preparations that are presently underway for the fifth UMA session. They resolved to ensure that it is held in a constructive and businesslike atmosphere. The session is to ratify a draft economic programme and a constitution of an independent Ukraine, as well as a series of political resolutions.

The secretary of the Political Council — Anatoliy Lupynis, spoke about the political situation in Ukraine. He pointed out that everything must be done to raise the national consciousness of the Ukrainian people, and that particular attention must be paid to ensure the continued development of the national strike movement and of the Public Committees throughout all of Ukraine.

(UMA press centre)

ALL-UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENT TRADE UNION ESTABLISHED IN KYIV

KYIV, June 21-23 — Delegates from workers' collectives and strike committees from all over Ukraine gathered in the republic's capital over the weekend for the founding congress of the All-Ukrainian Union of Strike Committees (VOSK).

The three-day event opened with blessings by Bishop Volodymyr of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, who then greeted the delegates. Afterwards, the president of the Antibolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN) — Slava Stetsko, who resides in Munich, Germany, addressed the delegates and participants.

The businesslike and constructive atmosphere at the congress raised hopes that an effective workers' organisation had finally been established in Ukraine. The strike last spring did not achieve its fundamental goal — full economic and political independence for Ukraine. Despite warnings of insufficient preparation, no strong local network of labour organisations, no cooperation between various industries, and no financial base and political experience, the leaders of the strike committees, "... succumbed to provocation and began the strike, which was doomed to failure from the very beginning", said Oleksander Ivashchenko, chairman of the congressional preparation committee.

Ivashchenko's address raised many eyebrows among the delegates, guests and journalists.

To begin with, he reminded the audience that it was the coal miners who had initiated the strike movement in Ukraine. For two years they struggled in the belief that they could achieve their rights and freedoms through a unilateral strike of one branch of industry, Ivashchenko said. Presently, the strike committees and individual labour leaders have resolved to take more decisive measures — to unite all of Ukraine's strike committees into a single organisation.

Ivashchenko went on, giving a detailed account of the preparations undertaken by his committee in organising the congress. "The principal goal of the preparation committee", he said, "was the creation of efficient and effective structures, the establishment of contacts with the oblasts [provinces], and the election of coordinating bodies and delegates to the congress".

He further stated that in one month it was practically impossible to set up workers' bodies in the oblasts, where almost no strike committees existed at all. Even with the assistance of pro-democracy parties and public organisations, Ivashchenko said, only the western Ukrainian regions are ready to begin effective protest measures.

Many of the delegates found Ivashchenko's account of the situation in the Donbas region even more disturbing and controversial. Up to the spring of 1991, this region had the most powerful strike movement. Today, according to Ivashchenko, there is complete disorganisation in Donbas. First the regional strike committee fell apart. Then the Donetsk strike committee adopted an unusual position. In a covert deal, Ivashchenko contended, the leaders of the Donetsk strike committee signed a statement of co-operation with representatives of American companies.

The American businessmen "threw the miners promises of modern technology as a gratuity" in exchange for their refusal to continue the political struggle for the sovereignty of Ukraine. "The purpose of this document was to preserve the [Soviet] Union". For this reason, Moscow and the Ukrainian government, supported these negotiations. "It is convenient for them to buy us, the Donbas miners, through barter and so on", Ivashchenko said.

Ending his address, Ivashchenko declared that he will do everything to create "an efficient organisation with effective local structures, which will function as a trade union. And, in the first place, we will not allow a new union treaty, in whatever form Moscow propagates it, to be signed. We do not want to be slaves. We will fight for our rights and freedoms".

The second day of the congress, Saturday, June 22, the delegates adopted VOSK statutory by-laws and elected the executive bodies. Oleksander Ivashchenko was elected chairman, and Mykhailo Ratushnyi (central region), Oleh Karpiuk (western region), Serhiy Voloshyn (southern region), and Oleksander Nahirnyi (eastern region) as vice-chairmen. Volodymyr Bubnov, Fedir Zakharchuk, Ihor Shvets, Volodymyr Luchyshyn, Hennadiy Sazonov, Serhiy Fomin and Anatoliy Hlodin filled the post of secretaries.

An Advisory Council was also established to which Stepan Khmara, Larysa Skoryk, Fedir Sviderskyi, Mykhailo Shvaika, Oleksander Hudyma, Mykola Porovskiy, Bohdan Ternopilskiy, Yuriy Ayzvazyan, Yevhenia Reshetnykova, Maria Oliynyk and Anatoliy Lupynis were elected.

A press conference was held at the end of the second day's session.

The congress ended on June 23 with the passing of a number of resolutions. In a Statement to the Supreme Soviet of the UkrSSR, the newly-formed trade union demanded a "new law on elections and new elections in September of this year", and an "immediate moratorium on laws, which may result in unfortunate consequences for Ukraine and its citizens".

The VOSK congress also demanded the review of draft laws, which would protect the internal market and prevent further chaos.

ANTI-UNION RALLY HELD IN LVIV

LVIV, June 23 — The square beside the city's opera house was the scene of a rally, organised by Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) to protest against the signing of a new union treaty by the UkrSSR Supreme Soviet.

People's Deputies Orest Vlokh, M. Batih, the chairman of the Lviv regional Rukh — Lubomyr Senyk, I. Kulyk (Ukrainian Republican Party), and P. Sheremeta (Democratic Party of Ukraine) addressed the participants. They spoke about the danger looming over Ukraine, stemming from the attempts of the communist majority in the Supreme Soviet to force the signing of a new union treaty. They made no concrete proposals, however, on how to oppose the signing of the union treaty.

Several other speakers, on the other hand, called for more practical measures to oppose the union treaty. People's Deputy Boyko — chairman of the Ternopil Rukh, for instance, pointed out the steps which should be taken once the union treaty has been signed. Boyko proposed that, in addition to mass protest actions throughout Ukraine, the Narodna Rada (People's Council — the opposition coalition of democratic forces) should pull out of the UkrSSR Supreme Soviet and form an effective opposition, declaring itself a National Congress and setting up an alternative government, from ministries down to local administrative authorities. The deputy also pointed out that the impending election of a republican president is a communist ploy: once elected to the post, Leonid Kravchuk (whose present title is: Chairman of the UkrSSR Supreme Soviet's Presidium) will crush all opposition.

People's Deputy Mykhailo Kosiv pointed out that although he has always opposed radical actions, he will now propagate such measures.

The chairman of the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party — Vasyl Sichko, stated that everyone is content with a democratic order which in reality does not exist because all power is concentrated in the hands of the communists.

Slava Stetsko, president of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), based in Munich, Germany, greeted the people of Lviv on behalf of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and the ABN. Mrs. Stetsko also informed the people

about the programme of the OUN, whose goal is the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state, which would guarantee the rights of all national minorities in Ukraine, and about the diaspora's contribution to Ukraine's struggle for independence. She said that in the present situation it is necessary to concentrate all efforts on effectuating Ukrainian independence and statehood. In the first place, she said, it is necessary to use all possible means to oppose the signing of a union treaty, which would harness the Ukrainian people to a new colonial yoke.

A resolution against a union treaty was adopted at the end of the rally.

Some 10,000 people gathered that Sunday in Kyiv for a rally to protest against a new union treaty. The participants, who braved the inclement weather to voice their protest, were addressed by People's Deputies Levko Lukyanenko, Volodymyr Yavorivskyi, Ivan Drach, Ihor Yukhnovskyi and others.

Later, the demonstrators formed a column and marched down the capital's central Khreshchatyk boulevard to October Revolution (Independence) Square, where a requiem service was held for the victims of communist terror.

WORLD CONGRESS OF UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS HELD IN KYIV

KYIV, June 23-24 — A world congress of Ukrainian political prisoners was held in the republican theatre in this capital city. The theme of the congress was: "Repressive regimes in Ukraine: past and present". The congress was sponsored by the All-Ukrainian Society of the Repressed with the participation of the World League of Ukrainian Political Prisoners (based in Winnipeg, Canada) and the Association of Ukrainian Political Prisoners.

Delegations of political prisoners from Magadan, Vorkuta, Kazakhstan, Arkhangelsk, Volyn, Ivano-Frankivsk and Lviv regions, as well as from Canada, the USA, Great Britain, Israel, Armenia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia and many other countries of the world attended the congress.

Among the participants of the congress were Slava Stetsko, President of the Antibolshevik Bloc of Nations, based in Munich, who greeted the participants; Oksana Bandera — the youngest sister of Stepan Bandera — head of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (1940-1959); Mykhailo Marunchak — chairman of the World League of Ukrainian Political Prisoners; and Yevhen Stakhiv — chairman of the Ukrainian-Jewish Society in New York.

Written greetings were received from People's Deputies Vyacheslav Chornovil and Mykhailo Horyn.

The congress ratified a number of documents, among the most significant of which are: an appeal to the Ukrainian people, a statement on the 50th anniversary of the outbreak of the German-Soviet war, an appeal to USSR president Gorbachev concerning the aggression against the Armenian people, a congressional declaration, and an appeal to all those who suffered repression for their defence of human and national rights.

VETERANS OF PAST LIBERATION STRUGGLE MEET IN LVIV

LVIV, June 24 — On the initiative of the Lviv regional organisation of Veterans of the National-Liberation Struggle, a meeting of those who fought for Ukraine's independence was held in this western Ukrainian city's Zankovetska theatre.

Taking part in the meeting were: members of the All-Ukrainian Brotherhood of Soldiers of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), members of the Association of Ukrainian Political Prisoners, as well as guests from outside Ukraine. The meeting began with the Lord's Prayer, sung by the "Virly" choir. The participants then honoured the memory of their colleagues, who fell in battle for the liberation of Ukraine, with a moment's silence.

Slava Stetsko greeted the participants on behalf of the leadership of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and the Antibolshevik Bloc of Nations, of which she is president. She pointed out the significance of this event, the need to hold such meetings, stressing that the Ukrainian diaspora is making every effort to assist Ukraine in its struggle for national independence.

Other greetings were from Canada and Australia.

The veterans gave their accounts of the past struggle, and the period spent in prisons and the gulag. Much of the discussion revolved around what role the veterans are to play today, how to carry on the struggle of the past, particularly with the youth, in order to strengthen the movement for

Ukraine's independence. In particular, the participants voiced their fears regarding the threat of a new union treaty being signed. The veterans decided that they will resolutely oppose any new union treaty and called on the people of Ukraine to resist its signing.

The meeting was chaired by vice-chairmen of the UPA Brotherhood — S. Pushchyk (Lviv), and M. Semeniuk (Volyn).

Filming the gathering were cameramen from the "Vremya" television programme and Moscow TV news.

Other speakers included representatives of Lithuanian political prisoners' and veterans' organisations, and Johann Urwich — a German, one of the leaders of the Vorkuta concentration camp uprising, which took place in the 1950s.

The following day, an academic conference was held. The theme of the conference was: "The National-liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people in the 1920s-50s". It was organised by the All-Ukrainian Brotherhood of UPA Soldiers, the Association of Ukrainian Political Prisoners and the Lviv branch of the archaeological commission of the UkrSSR Academy of Sciences.

Taking part in the conference were: the World League of Ukrainian Political Prisoners, the Lviv regional Rukh organisation, the "Memorial" society, and the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly.

According to the organisers, the aim of the conference was to renew historic objectivity about the national-liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people in the 20th century.

The academic mediators of the conference were: Yaroslav Dashkevych and Myroslav Panchuk. The panelists were: Petro Duzhyi, Vasyl Kuk, Hryhoriy Demian, Mykhailo Osadchyi, and historians from outside Ukraine: Omelan Kushpeta, Stepan Protsyk, Mykhailo Marunchak, Johann Urwich. A paper by Volodymyr Kosyk, a historian from Paris unable to attend personally, was read out.

The conference was greeted by ABN President — Slava Stetsko, Vasyl Shpitser — the mayor of Lviv, Lubomyr Senyk — chairman of the Lviv regional Rukh branch, Oleh Romaniv — chairman of the Taras Shevchenko Academic Society, Roman Pankevych, from the preparatory committee of the conference, and Serhiy Pushchuk from the UPA Brotherhood.

CARPATHIAN MILITARY DISTRICT PICKET CONTINUING

IVANO-FRANKIVSK — The Committee of Soldiers' Mothers has picketed the staff of the Carpathian Military District on three occasions: June 7, 13 and 24, demanding written guarantees that recruits drafted last autumn, who have been posted outside Ukraine, will be returned to Ukraine and that recruits from the spring draft will remain in Ukraine.

On June 25 the military commanders agreed to a meeting with representatives of the pickets. The meeting was attended by Col. Cherkasov and Lt. Col. Kriukov — staff officers from the Carpathian MD, the vice-chairman of the city executive council — Zynoviy Shkutiak, and the chairman of the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers — Natalka Kovalenko.

Nothing constructive, however, emerged from this meeting. The officers explained that although they understand the pickets' demands, all decisions concerning such matters are out of their hands.

In consequence, the mothers resumed their protest action on June 26.

"DEMOCRATIC KHERSON" BLOC FORMED

KHERSON — A "Democratic Kherson" bloc, an umbrella organisation uniting the democratic organisations of the province, has been set up in this city. According to the chairman of the regional Rukh branch — Taras Dobush, the bloc was established with one primary objective: to make preparations for future elections to the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet and local sovie's.

The bloc passed a statement to the Supreme Soviet and the Narodna Rada (People's Council — the opposition coalition in the UkrSSR Supreme Soviet), expressing support for an independent Ukrainian state that would not enter into any new union treaty.

FIFTH UMA SESSION HELD IN LVIV

LVIV, June 29 — The Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) held its fifth session today in this western Ukrainian city. The session was convened on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Ukrainian independent statehood, which was proclaimed in Lviv on June 30, 1941.

Over 100 UMA members and sympathisers from all over Ukraine gathered for the session, including many representatives from other political parties and organisations, which do not belong to the UMA, and guests from Australia, Georgia, Armenia and the Baltic states. A considerable number of Ukrainians from outside Ukraine also attended the session.

Among the guests was Slava Stetsko, president of the Antibolshevik Bloc of Nations.

The session opened with a presentation of the UMA banner and the singing of the march of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists.

The session programme included:

- a report on the UMA activities since the fourth session on March 23;
- a report of the UMA Great Council;
- a report of the revisionary commission;
- the tasks of the UMA in the present political situation;
- a paper on the labour movement;
- a report of the mandates commission;
- a discussion and passing of a political resolution;
- a paper on the economic question;
- a discussion and passing of an economic platform;
- a discussion and passing of appeals and resolutions.

The session passed an appeal to the Ukrainian people, to the participants of the national-liberation struggle; a political resolution of the fifth UMA session, and an appeal to political prisoners Mykhailo Ratushnyi, Mykola Holovach, Leonid Berezanskyi, and Oleksander Kovalchuk, co-defendants in the Khmara-Hryhoriev case, and an appeal on the political situation and position regarding the law enforcement organs.

LVIV MARKS 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF RESTORATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

LVIV, June 29-30 — The people of this western Ukrainian city commemorated an important date in their nation's history — the restoration of an independent Ukrainian state on June 30, 1941. The event, organised by the city's veterans of the national-liberation struggle, took place in the Ivan Franko theatre.

The Mayor of Lviv — Vasyl Shpitser, greeted the people of Lviv on this historic occasion and spoke about the present political situation; Petro Duzhyi, a veteran of

the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists, described the circumstances leading up to the proclamation of independence. Slava Stetsko — the president of the Antibolshevik Bloc of Nations, spoke about the prime minister of the independent Ukrainian state in 1941— her late husband, Yaroslav Stetsko.

The commemoration continued the following day with a public rally.

Mayor Shpitser greeted the people who had gathered on the Rynok square, outside the "Prosvita" society building, where Ukraine's independence was proclaimed fifty years ago.

Slava Stetsko described the historic significance of the restoration of Ukrainian independence in 1941.

People's Deputies Stepan Khmara, Volodymyr Muliava, and Larysa Skoryk, representatives of various political parties and public organisations, including Roman Pankevych — secretary of the Brotherhood of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, as well as other guests from abroad also addressed the participants of the rally.

After the rally, a memorial plaque was unveiled on the "Prosvita" building, marking this important event in Ukrainian history. Some 30,000 people took part in the rally.

Similar commemorations were held in Kharkiv, Lutsk, Ternopil and other oblasts of Ukraine.

To mark the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Ukrainian independence a monument to Stepan Bandera, leader of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (1940-1959), was unveiled in the village of Saryi Uhryniv, Ivano-Frankivsk oblast. Bandera was born in this village.

The event was organised by the Ivano-Frankivsk regional SNUM (Independent Ukrainian Youth Association). The original monument, unveiled in the village on October 14, 1990, was blown up on December 30 of last year, prior to a commemoration marking Bandera's birth on January 1, 1991.

UMA'S LUPYNIS ARRESTED

KYIV (UMA Press Centre) — Anatoliy Lupynis, chairman of the consultative board of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA), was arrested here on July 6.

Lupynis was on his way to the Ukraina Hotel to meet with Stepan Khmara, who is currently awaiting trial on fabricated charges of accosting an MVD officer last November.

Lupynis has been charged with violating Article 187 paragraph 4 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, which carries a penalty of two to three years' incarceration.

ACTS OF TERROR CONTINUE

ZASHKIV, July 10 — In a nighttime raid armed soldiers attacked and blew up the statue of Col. Yevhen Konovalets — founder of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) in the village of Zashkiv, near Lviv. The statue was unveiled on June 14 to mark the hundredth anniversary of the nationalist leader's birth.

Witnesses say the perpetrators arrived in a military vehicle, concealing themselves in a nearby forest until nightfall. Around 3:00 am, four masked soldiers with automatic rifles assaulted the statue firing into the air. They forced the guards to lie on the ground, laid the charges and fled.

The blast completely destroyed the statue. The force of the explosion smashed the windows of nearby houses, injuring several people. The house where Konovalets lived, converted into a museum, was badly damaged.

Several empty cases, parts of the explosive device and a mask were found at the scene.

STARYI UHRYNIV —The same night, the village of Stryi Uhryniv in the Ivano-Frankivsk oblast was the scene of a second explosion, reports UIS correspondent Vasyl Sikach. A group of masked soldiers blew up the statue of OUN leader Stepan Bandera. The statue was previously blown up on December 30 and had been repaired for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Ukrainian independence on June 30. Several people, including a child, were injured by the blast.

That night SNUM activists were taking turn to guard the monument.

At around 3:00 am, six soldiers attacked the statue. When Vasyl Maksymchuk, one of the district Independent Ukrainian Youth Association leaders, began to flee, calling out for help, the soldiers shot and seriously wounded him. The second guard, Yaroslav Turchyniak — a local Rukh activist, was knocked to the ground by a rifle butt. The assailants then lit the fuse and fled.

The explosion destroyed the statue and several surrounding buildings, sending debris for hundreds of metres.

The villagers called for medical help and informed the militia.

Maksymchuk underwent a complicated seven-hour operation to remove the bullet, which entered through his armpit, broke two ribs, damaged his lungs and lodged in his spine. He is in a critical condition.

"The attackers acted boldly and unceremoniously, openly, certain of full impunity, not even bothering to cover their tracks", said a militia man, who wished to remain anonymous.

UAOC HIERARCHY MEET IN KYIV

KYIV — The hierarchy and Patriarchal Council of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church met in the capital's "Ukraina" Hotel on July 17-18.

During the meeting, the bishops ratified the structure of the Church and its spiritual centre. External affairs, publishing, economic, and missionary departments were also established, with the appointment of their respective leaders.

KHMARA, EIGHT ASSOCIATES ARRESTED

KYIV — People's deputy and outspoken Ukrainian independence leader Stepan Khmara and eight of his associates were arrested in a latenight raid July 18 on Hotel Ukraina, which also resulted in dozens of injuries.

Some 50 OMON troops, a special paramilitary, anti-riot unit, stormed Khmara's hotel room at 9:20 p.m., smashing the door with axes, breaking windows and demolishing his quarters. There were some 30 people outside his room and 20 inside when the soldiers burst into the room after stunning the occupants with a Soviet version of tear or mustard gas. Some 200 troops were stationed around the hotel.

According to eyewitness reports, the OMON troops used excessive force in dispersing the crowd. One of those arrested had his head beaten several times against the wall. A Canadian female journalist was viciously manhandled and thrown out of the room.

After securing the premises, sources said the troops began to clean up the quarters in an attempt to conceal the incident. Doors were replaced, windows restored and bloodstains wiped clean.

In addition to Khmara, who has been arrested twice since November 1990 and is currently awaiting trial, others arrested were: Oles Serhiyenko, a former political prisoner; Anatoliy Rebro, Volodymyr Kuziv, Viktor Nikazakov, Khmara's defence attorney; Leonid Safonov, chairman of the Kyiv city council's verification committee; Serhiy Korolov, Yevhen Ihnatov and Volodymyr Ramzin.

The Ukrainian Republican Party, of which Khmara is a vice-chairman, and other opposition groups in Ukraine are meeting to determine future actions in the wake of this raid. Some published appeals from these groups have asked the West not to provide assistance to Moscow, which, they believe, will prolong the empire's brutality.

SNUM ACTIVIST BURNS DOWN SOVIET ARMY MONUMENT

LVIV, July 22 — At 2:00 pm, SNUM (Independent Ukrainian Youth Association) activist Viktor Levytskyi burnt down a Soviet army monument — a military vehicle, on the city's Bozhenko Street.

The action was undertaken in retaliation for the destruction of statues of two Ukrainian nationalist leaders (Yevhen Konovalets and Stepan Bandera) in the early

hours of July 10. Masked soldiers attacked and blew up both monuments, shooting and wounding Vasyl Maksymchuk — one of the unarmed youths guarding the Bandera monument in the village of Staryi Uhryniv (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast).

Levytskyi was arrested by the Lviv militia, who are now investigating the incident.

DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS ADVISORY COUNCIL HOLDS CONFERENCE IN KYIV

KYIV — A conference of the Advisory Council of the Democratic Congress was recently held in the Ukrainian capital.

During the conference, the delegates, who represented some 40 parties, organisations and movements from 13 of the USSR republics, discussed their respective position towards the newly-formed Moscow organisation — the “Movement for Democratic Reform” (RDR).

Although judging this a positive step, the democratic representatives disagreed with the RDR position on the future of the republics within the framework of a single state.

KHMARA TRIAL CONTINUES

KYIV, July 23 — Prosecution witnesses in the Khmara-Hryhoriev case testified before a Commission of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Court. People’s Deputy Stepan Khmara is on trial on bogus charges of assault against militia colonel Ihor Hryhoriev during an incident which occurred on November 7, 1990. Although Hryhoriev assaulted a woman and, subsequently, Stepan Khmara, who interceded on her behalf, it was Khmara who was imprisoned for six months and eventually put on trial, facing assault charges against Hryhoriev.

The witnesses — four militia officers — testified that they, together with three or four others all dressed in civilian clothing, met Hryhoriev on the Khreshchatyk boulevard by accident, and, again, purely by accident, were all heading in the same direction.

At the scene of the first incident, the militiamen alleged, Hryhoriev moved a peddler out of the way to clear the way for pedestrians. In the circumstances, the witnesses continued, anyone would have done the same. The militiamen all categorically denied that Hryhoriev had assaulted the woman in question — Lubov Zhyrna.

Following this incident, the militia officers alleged, they all went their separate ways, and no one could confirm Hryhoriev’s whereabouts prior to his alleged “brutal beating” by People’s Deputy Stepan Khmara.

Ms. Lantsovska, attorney of co-defendant — Oleh Batovkin, took part in the cross-examination. In answering her questions the witnesses were unable to sustain their version of the events which occurred on November 7.

Col. Potibko, one of the Kyiv militia commanders, praised Hryhoriev, claiming that the Colonel had no previous record of brutality. He was, however, compelled

to retract his statement when a previous incident concerning a repairman, who was working in the militia building and whom Hryhoriev beat up after a quarrel, was brought up in court.

Nevertheless, despite the obvious fabrication of the case against Stepan Khmara, the court cleared Hryhoriev, ignoring the charges which Khmara had brought against the militia officer last year.

ARMY OFFICERS HOLD CONGRESS

KYIV, July 27-28 — Trying to turn words into actions, more than 300 Ukrainian army officers gathered in the republic's capital city to take part in the first congress of Ukrainian officers. More than half of the delegates attending this Rukh-sponsored gathering are serving officers; the rest are reservists or retired officers.

The two days of lively exchanges revealed dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs in Ukraine: the absence of a Ukrainian national army, the political supremacy of the CPSU, as well as the numerous social problems.

The speakers, who included people's deputies O. Yemets, I. Derkach, O. Hudyma and L. Skoryk, Lt. I. Zhytnyk from the Social-Democratic Party, Col. V. Lytvyn from the Party for the Democratic Revival of Ukraine, L. Brovchenko from the Ukrainian National Party, the chairman of the All-Ukrainian Solidarity of Labourers Union — O. Ivashchenko, and several officers — O. Zelinskyi, P. Nedzelskyi, O. Boyko, B. Pavlyk and M. Horbovyh, all stressed that a free Ukraine is impossible without national armed forces.

Although the problem of a Ukrainian national army was raised a long time ago and has since formed the subject of extensive debate, the soldiers took it upon themselves to take active measures towards exercising this right, laid down in the Declaration of Sovereignty of July 16, 1990.

As a first step they founded the Association of Ukrainian Officers (SOU), the executive body of which is the SOU committee. The committee is chaired by Col. Vilen Martyrosian, a champion of Ukrainian statehood. Martyrosian — Armenian by origin and a people's deputy of the USSR — is well known for his public defence of democracy.

Two officers from the interior ministry (MVD), also represented at the congress, were elected to the SOU committee. The congress approved their proposal to issue a statement demanding the de-politicisation and subordination of the militia and all interior ministry troops to the Ukrainian government.

The congress also ratified an appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, calling on Ukraine's legislators to initiate proceedings for the formation of a Ukrainian army.

In another appeal the democratic-minded officers called on their colleagues from the officer corps who are serving outside the borders of Ukraine not to take

part in inter-ethnic conflicts and the suppression of democratic movements. Citizens of Ukraine, the appeal states, have the right to serve in their own country.

According to the SOU statutory by-laws, membership of the Association of Ukrainian Officers is open to any officer who believes in a professional Ukrainian national army free from Communist Party influence and control.

UAOC TO OPEN SEMINARY IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK

IVANO-FRANKIVSK — The first all-Ukrainian Synod of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) decided to open a religious seminary in the western Ukrainian city of Ivano-Frankivsk.

According to a July 1 decision of the oblast council, the seminary will be housed in the city's music school no. 1.

(Vita Nova)

STEPAN BANDERA REMEMBERED IN KOLOMYIA

KOLOMYIA — The city council here recently passed a resolution to rename the city's "May 1 Street" to "Stepan Bandera Street" and to erect a statue to the leader of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (1940-1959) in the centre of the city.

A Bandera monument has been blown up on two occasions — on December 30, 1990, and last month, in the nationalist leader's birthplace — the village of Staryi Uhryniv. In a recent series of terrorist acts, carried out in each case by masked gunmen in military uniforms, statues of Ukrainian nationalist leaders were blown up in Zashkiv — that of another OUN leader, Yevhen Konovalets, and the Bandera monument in Staryi Uhryniv. The monument to the Ukrainian Division "Halychyna" near the town of Brody was also blown up.

(Vita Nova)

REFINERY POLLUTES LVIV RIVER

DROHOBYCH, July 31 — At 4:00 am, more than 200 cubic metres of waste spilled into the river Tysmenytsia (a tributary of the Dnister) as a result of an accident at the Drohobych oil refinery.

The following day, huge oil slicks appeared on the Dnister in the district centre — the town of Halych.

Several precautionary measures were taken — people were warned about the spill over the radio and instructed not to graze cattle on the banks of the river. In Halych drinking water was turned off.

The oblast environmental committee will determine the extent of the damage caused to the river, which flows through five districts of the Lviv oblast, and will issue fines to the Drohobych refinery. However, there is no equipment for cleaning up the oil spill.

Large quantities of dead fish were discovered at the point where the Dnister enters the Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, to the southeast.

A special commission has been set up to establish the causes of the spillage and to determine the extent of the damage caused to the Lviv oblast.

(Vita Nova)

LUPYNIS THREATENED WITH PSYCHIATRIC CONFINEMENT

KYIV — Anatoliy Lupynis, a leading advocate of Ukrainian independence who was arrested last month, is threatened with psychiatric imprisonment, according to members of TUSM's (Ukrainian Student Society of Mykola Mikhnovskiy) Freedom Corps presently in Ukraine.

At a press conference called on August 2 by the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) here at the office of the Union of Writers, Viktor Nikazakov, one of Lupynis' lawyers and that of Stepan Khmara, said that without official authorisation Lupynis would be confined in a psychiatric ward for testing.

The UMA charged that this action is a clear violation of his human rights and proof of the true intentions of the so-called democracy proponents to destroy any opposition that will bring about the downfall of the Soviet empire and the restoration of Ukrainian independence.

It was later learned that in the wake of intercessions by people's deputy Larysa Skoryk and Kyiv council deputy Yevhen Proniuk, the Kyiv procurator's office ordered that, on the basis of his previous psychiatric confinement, Lupynis be again examined this time in the Pavlov psychiatric asylum, stated the Ukrainian capital's Rukh office on August 5.

Lupynis was reportedly visibly upset with the decision. He protested against the authorities' use of psychiatry for repression and demanded a retraction of their decision. In the event that they do not comply, Rukh said, Lupynis will appeal to the independent psychiatric association to monitor his confinement in order to prohibit the procurator from incarcerating him.

Lupynis is chairman of the consultative council of the UMA, advisor to the consultative council of the All-Ukrainian Union of Solidarity of Workers and a longtime political prisoner.

On July 6, while on his way to a meeting with Khmara, a people's deputy of the Ukrainian SSR, at the Hotel Ukraina, Lupynis was attacked by unknown assailants and thrown into an unmarked car. He was taken to militia headquarters, where he was held for several hours without being formally charged. Lupynis was subsequently arrested and placed in solitary confinement for three days. He was eventually transferred to the Lukyaniv prison, where he is being held to this day.

Lupynis is being charged with organising unsanctioned meetings. His lawyers later learned that his arrest was not authorised. Oleh Kubak, chairman of the UMA

press office, said that the principal reason for Lupynis' arrest was to curtail the activities of organisations that seek the restoration of Ukrainian independence. Kubak indicated that the authorities' intention was to stop the man that is the biggest threat to the Soviet regime and by arresting him they had hoped to curtail the activities of the UMA.

Participants of the press conference included UMA members Kubak, Kuzma Fedchenko and Serhiy Hrynychuk. In his opening remarks, Kubak criticised the small press turnout at the conference.

At the conclusion, a statement from the American Friends of the UMA critical of President Bush's support for Mikhail Gorbachev was read out.

UKRAINIAN YOUTH MEET IN KYIV FOR SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS

KYIV — Some 250 delegates representing 35 Ukrainian youth associations from around the world met over the weekend of August 3-4 in the capital city's pedagogical museum (formerly the seat of the Central Rada — Ukrainian revolutionary parliament, 1917-1918) for the second world conference of Ukrainian youth.

The delegates established a Coordinating Council, the highest executive organ of the conference, and Ihor Derkach, who headed the conference in the past year, the leader of SNUM (Independent Ukrainian Youth Association) and a people's deputy, was elected to chair the council.

Delegates included students and youth from Ukraine and from around the Soviet Union, as well as representatives of youth organisations which unite Ukrainians all over the world — Ukrainian Youth Association (SUM), the Organisation of Democratic Ukrainian Youth (ODUM), "Plast" (Ukrainian scout movement) and others.

The first congress was held last August in Bialy Bir, Poland.

The delegates worked in four commissions, dealing with the following issues: political matters, culture and education, socio-economics and information, each submitting a resolution and programme at the end of the two-day deliberations.

One of the key documents signed at the conference was titled: "Cooperation and Coordination of Ukrainian Students and the Now United Ukrainian Youth Association and SNUM".

The political resolution called on Ukrainian youth to actively resist the signing of a new union treaty and engage in mass acts of civil disobedience should it be signed by the Supreme Soviet; and to change the mentality of the Ukrainian people from serfs of the Soviet empire to a free society in a national state.

This resolution also underlined the need for consolidation and mutual cooperation between the various pro-independence organisations and political lines (evolutionary and revolutionary), emphasising the need for the continuous development, modernisation and improvement of national ideology.

The document further condemned communist ideology, in the name of which so many dreadful crimes against humanity were committed in the 20th century, and demanded that the perpetrators of these crimes be brought to justice.

In their resolution the political commission also called for:

- a constitution of an independent Ukrainian state;
- Ukrainian citizenship;
- a law on political parties and public organisations and an end to party control over means of production and state institutions;
- a professional Ukrainian army;
- the nationalisation of Communist Party and Komsomol property; and
- a law on multi-party elections.

These, they said, are measures which would consolidate and guarantee the economic reconstruction of a free Ukraine.

The conference delegates saw fit to set up a Coordinating Council, which will coordinate the activities of participating youth organisations in the interim period up to the next conference, scheduled to be held next year in the eastern Ukrainian city of Kharkiv.

"MEMORIAL" CONTINUES TO EXPOSE HORRORS OF STALIN TERROR IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK OBLAST

IVANO-FRANKIVSK — Since its foundation in 1989, the city's cultural and educational society "Memorial" has been involved with uncovering Stalinist crimes in the oblast. From 1989 up to the beginning of 1991 the "Memorial" society conducted the exhumation and reinterment of 1,237 victims of repression discovered in mass graves in 16 population centres around the Ivano-Frankivsk oblast.

Excavations in the village of Voinyliv have also recently been completed. Here the remains of 246 people murdered by Stalin's secret police were exhumed in a former NKVD prison. The medical commission which examined the remains found 38 skeletons belonging to children under the age of ten.

Close to 30 remains were also exhumed in the former NKVD prison in the city of Yaremcha, where workmen discovered two or three mines under each skeleton.

In a forest near the former village of Nosich, depopulated and destroyed at the beginning of the 1950s during counter-insurgency operations against the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), "Memorial" officials discovered the grave of students of a nearby Greek-Catholic religious seminary, shot in 1941 immediately before the withdrawal of the Red army from the region in the face of the oncoming German advance. According to eyewitnesses, these graves hold the remains of some 300 seminarians.

During restoration work on a Roman Catholic church in Rohatyn a large number of skeletons were found in the vaults of the building, each with a bullet hole in the back of the skull.

Excavations are also being conducted in Kosiv, Bykachivka and Lanchyn, and work is soon to begin in the town of Rozhniativ, where eyewitnesses claim dozens of victims of the NKVD are buried.

The Ivano-Frankivsk "Memorial" has done much to expose the extent of Stalinist crimes in this western Ukrainian oblast, but most towns and villages from one end of Ukraine to the other suffered no less repression and murder in the 1930s and 1940s. Although the larger burial sites discovered in Demianiv laz (Ivano-Frankivsk) and Bykivnia (near Kyiv) hit the headlines in recent years, much effort is still needed to establish the full scale of the horror of Soviet Russian occupation and communist terror in Ukraine.

DOCUMENTS & REPORTS

CONTENTS

UKRAINE: THE ROAD TO INDEPENDENCE	80
Ukraine's Political Forces Assess Situation	
Amid Confusion and Uncertainties of Moscow Coup	80
Ukraine Reacts to Moscow Coup	81
Discussions Continue as Kyiv Politicians Try to Assess Situation	84
Kravchuk Demands Gorbachev's Presence at USSR Supreme Soviet Session	84
Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Considers Own Currency and National Guard	85
Kravchuk Holds Press Conference	85
Deputies Meet Kyiv Military Commanders	86
Ukrainian Interior Ministry Moves to De-Partify Its Ranks	86
Lviv Officials Move Against Communist Party	86
Thousands Rally in Support of Supreme Soviet Opposition	86
Ukraine's Supreme Soviet Declares Independence	87
ABN President Asks Canadian PM to Recognise Ukraine	89
UKRAINE IS AN OCCUPIED TERRITORY <i>Yuriy Shukhevych</i>	91
THE TRIAL OF STEPAN KHMARA: POLITICAL AND UNJUST	92

*Unless otherwise stated, all the material in this section was provided by the
Ukrainian Central Information Service*

UKRAINE : THE ROAD TO INDEPENDENCE

Ukraine's Political Forces Assess Situation Amid Confusion and Uncertainties of Moscow Coup

KYIV, August 19 — The State of Emergency Committee's announcement about the deposition of President Mikhail Gorbachev and the imposition of a state of emergency in the USSR created an atmosphere of unease and uncertainty in the Ukrainian capital.

The coup had taken everyone by surprise except the army. According to sources from the Kyiv military district, the Soviet army high command had prepared detailed plans for the takeover.

An hour before a state of emergency was imposed in the USSR, units of the Kyiv MD began preparations for military manoeuvres. At 8:00 am a higher state of alert was declared. People suspected that covert preparations were taking place, which included the mobilisation of reservists.

That day General Valentin Varennikov, commander of Soviet ground forces, met Kravchuk, informing the Supreme Soviet chairman that the republic's leadership would be replaced if it refused to carry out the directives of the Emergency Committee.

The opposition spent the first part of the day trying to assess the situation. Those present at an emergency meeting in the Writers' Union building denounced the coup as an attempt to restore totalitarian communism by force.

Leaders of the Supreme Soviet met representatives of the republic's main political forces: the Communist Party, Rukh, the Ukrainian Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the Party for the Democratic Rebirth of Ukraine. Rumours about a telephone conversation between Leonid Kravchuk and Russian president Boris Yeltsin were circulating around the political circles, and people generally believed that Kravchuk would support Yeltsin and his call for an indefinite political strike.

At 4:00 pm Kravchuk appeared on Ukrainian television. Without issuing a direct statement on the events in Moscow, the Supreme Soviet chairman pointed out that changes in the government structure of the state must take place within the framework of existing laws. Kravchuk further announced that a state of emergency would not be imposed in Ukraine and stressed that all power belongs to the legally-elected and constituted republican organs. He called on the people, political parties and organisations to maintain peace and exercise restraint, and to rally round the sovereignty of Ukraine.

Although lacking a quorum, the Supreme Soviet presidium began an emergency meeting at 6:00 pm. The presidium, including the Communist Party members present, declared that only the laws and decrees of the republic's Supreme Soviet and government are valid on the territory of Ukraine.

Nevertheless, armed patrols appeared on the streets of the capital, and throughout the day army helicopters flew over the Supreme Soviet building.

Groups of people gathered on Kyiv's central October Revolution square to protest against the putsch in Moscow. Towards the evening their numbers had reached 1,500.

At 9:00 pm the Narodna Rada (National Council) opposition bloc held a press conference in the Writers' Union building. The opposition deputies announced to journalists that, with the exception of Kyiv, all other television broadcasts had been suspended in Ukraine.

The first night, however, went by in relative calm.

Ukraine Reacts to Moscow Coup

APPEAL

OF THE ASSOCIATION OF OFFICERS OF UKRAINE TO FELLOW OFFICERS

Brothers! We appeal to you, to your officers' honour!

Today, sweeping aside a legally-elected President, a group of mutineers has seized power through a coup d'état. Today our greatly-suffering, semi-starved and divested country has been thrown into a chasm of highhandedness and unlawfulness. The mutineers are trying to make you, the officer corps, stain your hands — the hands of the defenders of our country — with the blood of workers and students.

Brothers! Your actions will determine whether there will or won't be bloodshed.

Remember that all dictatorships come to an end, and that to carry out a criminal order is itself a crime.

No — to dictatorship!

No — to civil war!

Let us be honourable, officers and gentlemen!

*Association of Officers of Ukraine
August 19, 1991*

**STATEMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT OF UKRAINE
ON THE COUP D'ÉTAT IN THE USSR**

Defending the right of the Ukrainian people to an independent, lawful and democratic national state; Recognising the legitimacy and plenary authority of the constitutionally-elected and constituted governing bodies on the territory of Ukraine; and Basing itself on the Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine and the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR,

The People's Movement of Ukraine states the following:

1. The unconstitutional government organ which has been established — the State Committee for the State of Emergency in Moscow, is unlawful and its decisions are not judicially valid in Ukraine.
2. Rukh does not recognise the State Committee and does not regard its decisions as binding.
3. Rukh calls on all citizens of Ukraine not to submit to the will of the putschists, but to set up bodies of active opposition, to coordinate an all-Ukrainian strike, which we are propagating as the only effective peaceful means in the struggle for the freedom and livelihood of our family, our Ukrainian State.

*Chairman of the People's Movement of Ukraine, Ivan Drach
August 19, 1991*

**APPEAL
FROM THE PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT OF UKRAINE**

To the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet

Realising the full extent of the danger which threatens the sovereignty of the Ukrainian SSR on the part of the unconstitutional organ — the State Committee for the State of Emergency in the USSR, the People's Movement of Ukraine is making the following proposals to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR:

1. To declare the State Committee an unlawful body whose decisions have no judicial force in Ukraine in accordance with article 71 of the Ukrainian SSR Constitution.
2. To arrange the takeover all power on the territory of Ukraine by constitutionally-elected state structures of the Ukrainian SSR.
3. In the event of a reaction on the part of the State Committee's forces of repression, to call on the people of Ukraine to stage an all-Ukrainian strike.

*Chairman of the People's Movement of Ukraine, I. Drach
August 19, 1991*

APPEAL TO THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE
FROM THE ALL-UKRAINIAN ASSOCIATION OF SOLIDARITY OF WORKERS (VOST)

In connection with the statement of the "State Committee for the State of Emergency" on the imposition of a state of emergency in individual regions of the USSR, which is in actual fact the first step towards the establishment of a military dictatorship in Ukraine and contradicts the Declaration on State Sovereignty of Ukraine and other international acts, the Republican Strike Committee (Presidium of the VOST Coordinating Council) appeals to the people of Ukraine, when called upon, to be ready for immediate acts of civil disobedience throughout the whole of Ukraine.

The Republican Strike Committee demands that the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine immediately annul the decrees of the so called "State Committee for the State of Emergency" on all Ukrainian territory.

Beginning with 19.8.1991 the Republican Strike Committee declares a pre-strike readiness throughout all of Ukraine.

Only the united efforts of the Ukrainian people can prevent the outbreak of civil war, the imposition of a military dictatorship, and safeguard human rights and the freedom and independence of Ukraine.

Chairman of the All-Ukrainian Strike Committee (VOST)

O. Ivashchenko

August 19, 1991

APPEAL TO SOLDIERS

The group of putschists who seized power through despicable means do not have the support of the people and rely solely on bayonets.

Today many servicemen will have to make a choice. Those of you who will carry out the orders of this "committee" of usurpers should be aware that you will be violating your oath and thereby breaking the law.

Officers! Do not hope that the military takeover will solve your problems, give you a place to live and bring your families prosperity. Yazov, Pugo and Kryuchkov need you to carry out their criminal plans. Do not become the hangmen of your unfortunate, greatly-suffering people because the blame will fall on you.

Enough red stains on army uniforms!

The people and the army are one in the struggle against the mutineers!

Soldiers of the Kyiv garrison

Discussions Continue as Kyiv Politicians Try to Assess Situation

KYIV, August 20 — By Tuesday the confusion of the previous day had passed. From 11:00 am representatives of various national-democratic organisations: the Ukrainian Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the Party for the Democratic Rebirth of Ukraine, the Green Party and others were meeting in the building of the Writers' Union of Ukraine to discuss the situation. The democratic activists expressed bitter criticism of the Communist Party leadership and the army, as well as the leaders of the republic's Supreme Soviet for failing to assume a clear position towards the coup.

The previous day Kravchuk had urged Ukrainians "to show wisdom... to be calm and avoid actions that could destabilise the situation".

"We should not rush into hasty judgments. The rule of law prevails in Ukraine", Kravchuk said. He did not follow Yeltsin in calling a general strike, saying that strikes would only increase tensions.

A joint statement was issued on behalf of the democratic community representatives, condemning the military takeover in Moscow as an armed assault on democracy, demanding an immediate suppression of the coup and urging the people to rise up in defence of Ukrainian sovereignty.

Levko Lukyanenko, Ukrainian Republican Party chairman, announced that military units had been deployed around Kyiv. These 12 units, which have left their bases around the republic, number up to 20,000 men.

At 10 o'clock that morning the presidium of the Supreme Soviet resumed its emergency meeting. The pro-democracy deputies demanded that Ukraine's leaders join Yeltsin in opposing the junta, while the communists, led by Supreme Soviet chairman Leonid Kravchuk, called for a wait-and-see position. As regards the question of power on the territory of Ukraine, however, the presidium was unanimous in recognising the Supreme Soviet and the Ukrainian government as the only legitimate governing bodies in the republic.

OMON units (special-purpose troops of the MVD) were patrolling the centre of the city while other units of the interior ministry guarded the Supreme Soviet. Several thousand demonstrators held a peaceful rally in protest against the military takeover in Moscow.

*Kravchuk Demands Gorbachev's**Presence at USSR Supreme Soviet Session*

KYIV, August 21 — In a telephone conversation today Leonid Kravchuk — the chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet informed his counterpart in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR — Anatoliy Lukyanov, that neither he nor the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine recognise the new State of Emergency Committee.

Kravchuk further stated that he demands the participation of deposed President Mikhail Gorbachev at next Monday's (August 26) session of the Soviet Supreme Soviet in Moscow. Failing this, Kravchuk threatened to walk out of the session and make a statement to the United Nations on behalf of Ukraine as a fully-fledged member of the UN.

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Considers Own Currency and National Guard

KYIV, August 22 — The presidium of the Ukrainian SSR's Supreme Soviet met to discuss a way out of the present political and economic crisis.

The presidium instructed the Council of Ministers and the Ukrainian National Bank to prepare a draft decree on the minting of a national currency in Ukraine.

The parliamentary leaders also called for the creation of a national guard in Ukraine and control of Soviet forces on its territory.

A special session of the Supreme Soviet was set for August 24.

Kravchuk Holds Press Conference

KYIV — On August 22 Leonid Kravchuk — chairman of Ukraine's Supreme Soviet, held a press conference for foreign journalists to describe the steps taken by the Ukrainian leadership during the three-day crisis.

According to Kravchuk, on the morning of August 19, he was visited by General Valentin Varennikov — commander of Soviet ground forces, who informed him that the army would act independently of the Ukrainian leadership.

Kravchuk refused to talk to Varennikov. The same morning he held a telephone conversation with President Boris Yeltsin of the Russian republic, expressing his support for the latter.

Kravchuk asked the chairman of the Ukrainian KGB — Mykola Holushko, to establish communications with Mikhail Gorbachev in the Crimea. The security chief, however, whose service is under direct control from Moscow, refused to allow Ukrainian officials to contact Gorbachev. Kravchuk's two private attempts to reach Gorbachev by telephone were also unsuccessful.

Leonid Kravchuk had no contact with the members of the Emergency Committee during the crisis period.

The Supreme Soviet chairman told the journalists that all armed forces on the territory of Ukraine, with the exception of strategic forces, should be placed under the direct control of the Ukrainian government.

He also pointed out that the republics should not rush into a new union treaty, but should instead sign an economic agreement, which would not have the character of a political treaty between individual republics.

Deputies Meet Kyiv Military Commanders

KYIV, August 22 — People's deputies of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet met commanders of the Kyiv military district to discuss the military coup in Moscow and the action taken by the Kyiv MD during the those three days.

On the request of the officers, journalists were not permitted to attend the meeting.

Ukrainian Interior Ministry Moves to De-Partify Its Ranks

KYIV, August 23 — The Ukrainian SSR's Interior Ministry yesterday adopted a resolution to remove all Communist party influence within its ranks. The Ministry has asked the republic's Supreme Soviet to pass legislation to this effect.

Lviv Officials Move Against Communist Party

LVIV — The nationalisation of Communist party assets has begun in this western Ukrainian oblast. The reason for these measures is the oblast CPU committee's open support for the junta.

On August 22 the democratically-controlled Lviv oblast council moved to remove all Communist party influence and control from local government, security services and businesses in the Lviv oblast, and to evict the oblast and district party cells from their premises.

A commission has also been set up to investigate the implication of party members and other oblast officials in the failed coup d'état.

On August 23, with the help of the crowds, the headquarters of the Lviv oblast CPU committee was closed and sealed off. A similar fate awaited the party's district committees.

Party cells are also being evicted from their offices throughout the entire oblast.

The Lviv militia is overseeing the move, which has so far encountered no opposition.

Thousands Rally in Support of Supreme Soviet Opposition

IVANO-FRANKIVSK — Many thousands took to the streets of this western Ukrainian city to express support for the Narodna Rada's (National Council — the democratic opposition) demand for a Supreme Soviet session to proclaim Ukrainian independence and assume control of the KGB and the Interior Ministry in Ukraine.

The crowds also demanded a ban on Communist party activities, the creation of national Ukrainian armed forces and the sacking of people's deputies who supported the military coup.

The city's Ukrainian Republican Party, Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party, Rukh and the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association declared an indefinite picket of the CPU oblast and city committees until the party premises are handed over to the department of social security and the board of education.

Ukraine's Supreme Soviet Declares Independence

KYIV, August 24 — Today's special session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet began at 10 a.m.

The more than 20,000 demonstrators, carrying Ukrainian national blue-and-yellow flags, who had gathered outside the Supreme Soviet building broke through militia cordons and occupied the plaza outside the republican parliamentary building. They are demanding the declaration of independence, the release of arrested People's Deputy Stepan Khmara and the other political prisoners, the dissolution of the Communist party and the nationalisation of its assets.

In his address to the deputies Supreme Soviet chairman Leonid Kravchuk proposed a debate on the creation of a Ukrainian defence council and plans for the republic's defence, the creation of a national guard, the adoption of a law on Soviet forces in Ukraine, the granting of temporary emergency powers to the Supreme Soviet chairman, the transfer of the KGB and interior ministry forces in Ukraine under republican control, the de-participation of the security services, and the de-politicisation of the army.

Kravchuk further stressed that the official position towards the union treaty would have to be reviewed. Ukraine would only join a union which did not encroach on its sovereignty, he said. The Supreme Soviet chairman did, however, point out the importance of economic agreements between the republics.

Communist majority spokesman — People's Deputy Moroz, condemned the coup d'état and expressed full support for the creation of a national army in Ukraine. Moroz emphasised that the Communist Party of Ukraine has to leave the CPSU. Should the CPU leadership refuse, he will form an independent Communist party in Ukraine, Moroz said.

Ihor Yukhnovskiy — leader of the Narodna Rada opposition, described briefly this week's events in Ukraine and the measures taken by the democratic forces in support of President Yeltsin and the Russian leadership. Yukhnovskiy then submitted a draft resolution which includes: a declaration of independence; the arrest and trial of all those involved in the coup; the nationalisation of union enterprises in Ukraine; a ban on Communist party activities and the nationalisation of its assets.

Ending his address the leader of the opposition called on the Supreme Soviet presidium to resign. The presidium had failed to adopt a decisive position towards the coup, he said.

After a break the "Act of the Declaration of Independence" was adopted by a vote of 346 to 1. Thus, from August 24 only the laws and decrees of the Ukrainian parliament and Council of Ministers are valid on the territory of Ukraine. A referendum will be held on December 3 which is to endorse the Supreme Soviet decision.

Arguments erupted over the removal of the party's political control in Ukraine. In support of this measure, a group of communist deputies resigned from the party.

After another break, the deputies adopted a resolution on the de-partification of the Interior Ministry and the KGB, state institutions and organisations. According to this resolution party cells at individual factories and businesses will be banned with the consent of respective workers' collectives.

The Ukrainian parliament agreed to the Narodna Rada's demand to raise the national Ukrainian flag in the chamber and approved an appeal to the Russian leadership, expressing hopes for a further development of economic and cultural relations between Ukraine and Russia.

The Declaration of Independence of Ukraine

In view of the deadly threat posed to Ukraine by the coup d'état in the USSR on 19 August 1991;

- *Continuing the thousand-year tradition of state-building in Ukraine;*
- *Expressing the right to self-determination as envisioned by the UN Charter and other international documents;*
- *Fulfilling the Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine;*

The Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic solemnly declares:

The independence of Ukraine and the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state —Ukraine.

The territory of Ukraine is indivisible and inviolable;

From today, on the territory of Ukraine, only the Ukrainian constitution and laws are valid;

This proclamation takes effect from the moment of its approval.

The Supreme Soviet of Ukraine

ABN President Asks Canadian PM to Recognise Ukraine

ABN

ANTIBOLSHEVIK BLOC OF NATIONS — CENTRAL COMMITTEE PRESIDENT

Munich, September 4, 1991

The Right Honourable Brian Mulroney
Prime Minister of Canada
Parliament Buildings
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

Dear Prime Minister Mulroney

We applaud Canada's decision to officially recognize the Baltic nations — Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and we hope that this is the first step towards also recognizing other former republics of the Soviet Union. Canadian press reports indicate that your government intends to wait before officially recognizing Ukraine's declaration of independence of August 24, 1991. Please be assured that Canada's support and recognition are necessary during this critical time, when forces in Moscow are putting pressure on former republics to enter into a new "union".

Ukraine's struggle for independence has been and continues to be a long and arduous process. Ukraine's history as a nation spans more than a thousand years. In the middle ages, the Ukrainian nation lived in an independent state known as Rus' for more than six centuries. In the 17th century, independence was restored and the Autonomous Ukrainian Hetman State was only tolerated by the Russian Tsarist empire until 1784. Ukraine was then known to Europe and other parts of the world as an independent state. At this time, the French philosopher Voltaire wrote, "L'Ukraine a toujours aspire a etre libre" (Ukraine has always aspired to be free).

The repressive measures of Tsarist Russia did not allow the restoration of Ukraine's freedom until the empire collapsed in 1917. Ukrainians then seized the moment and declared autonomy and then complete independence on January 22, 1918. Ukraine was immediately recognized de jure by Germany, Austria, Hungary, Turkey, Bulgaria and Romania, recognized de facto by France, Great Britain, Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Lithuania, Persia (Iran) and the Vatican. De facto and de jure recognition came from Latvia, Argentina, Finland and Russia.

Ukraine's short-lived independence was again forcefully crushed by the Soviet Russian empire in 1922. Nonetheless, Ukraine's struggle for independence did not cease. When fighting two formidable opponents — Nazi Germany and Bolshevik Russia during World War II, Ukraine utilized this turbulent moment to once again restore independence on June 30, 1941. However, this long-awaited freedom was cut short with the brutal arrest of the government leaders. This last struggle for self-determination continued as late as 1954-56 at which time the national independence movements went underground.

As a result of this armed struggle, Stalin made concessions to Ukraine by changing the constitution to allow Ukraine to have its own Ministry of Foreign Affairs and by allowing "separate" membership of Ukraine and Byelorussia in the United Nations. Ukraine has never given up its desire for freedom, self-determination and independence.

Last week, United Nations General Secretary Xavier Perez de Cuellar stated that Ukraine's independence will be recognized in the UN because Ukraine has been a member since its inception. This de facto recognition by the world's highest political body should pave the way for all Western democracies to follow suit.

Prime Minister Mulroney, we appeal to you on behalf of the more than half million Canadians of Ukrainian descent and Ukrainians throughout the world to officially recognize Ukraine's independence.

Respectfully yours,

Slava Stetsko
ABN President
Chairman of the
Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists

UKRAINE IS AN OCCUPIED TERRITORY

Printed below are excerpts from Yuriy Shukhevych's address at the Second Congress of the Ukrainian Republican Party. Mr. Shukhevych is the chairman of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, which does not recognise the legitimacy of Soviet rule in Ukraine.

I would like to thank the leadership of the Ukrainian Republican Party for inviting me to this congress and giving me the opportunity to speak. As you know, I am representing here our Ukrainian "ultras". Who are these "ultras" — a lot has been recently said and written about them, but I want to tell you that we stand on principled positions. We recognise that Ukraine is an occupied territory. We were deprived of our statehood in 1920. Bolshevik Russia occupied Ukraine, depriving us of our statehood. And as an occupied territory, we cannot participate in the occupational structure that is the Supreme Soviet. We do not recognise the laws of Stalin and Brezhnev. And on the basis of these principled positions we always conduct our political actions and prepare our statements.

It is specifically because Ukraine is occupied that we could not participate in the referendum because the occupant has no right to conduct a referendum on an occupied territory. Recognising this referendum would have meant legitimating Moscow's rule in Ukraine. And it is not our intention to legitimate that rule, thereby removing Ukraine from consideration by the UN declaration on decolonisation. Because by recognising the regime in Ukraine as legitimate, we would consequently lose our right to decolonisation. This is the essence of our "ultra-radicalism" and we do not and will not ever reject it.

We support strikes because we recognise that strikes can be the fulcrum which can displace the imperial structure, displace the empire's rule. And for that reason we welcomed the Donbas strikers, helped them in every way possible. And in the future it is our intention to support such strikes. Look at what the empire controls on the territory of Ukraine, look at how much industry is in its hands; and could not strikes be that force against Moscow, that demand to transfer these industries to Ukraine's hands, temporarily into the hands of Soviet Ukraine. You must appreciate that it is incumbent upon us to develop an appropriate privatisation concept because it may come to pass that tomorrow, after having been lulled asleep in a "union republic", we will awake as a "banana" republic of the likes of Costa Rica or Panama. Having attributes that resemble independence, but controlled by God-knows whom; and things are heading in that direction. The empire is selling our goods, selling our land, selling everything that it can. However, we are convinced that in Ukraine all priorities should be in the hands of the Ukrainian industry, the Ukrainian worker, the Ukrainian soldier.

Esteemed delegates, it is my wish that the Republican Party also set out on this

course — a course of not recognising this occupational rule and a course of fighting, truly fighting for an independent, indivisible Ukrainian state. And if they accuse us of calling for violence, then I tell you: No, and once again no. We support all possible methods of fighting. Today, if necessary, this could mean civil disobedience, this could mean strikes; however, if tomorrow it becomes necessary to take arms, then we are prepared even for that. And we are morally preparing our nation. We do not want to lull it into a stupor with sweet poison, the illusion that the fight must only be by peaceful means. A completely different situation could face us. We will not be caught by Moscow's democratic illusions, because we understand that tomorrow Yeltsin could become an enemy worse than Gorbachev is today. Yeltsin also is in favour of the Union.

Let us remember our history. At one time our socialists believed the socialist Lenin and he showed us what kind of peace-loving person he was. This could happen even today and let us never forget what history has taught us.

Again, I wish you, delegates, all the best, I wish you fruitful deliberations and hope that in the future we will be on the same side of the barricades.

Glory to Ukraine!

THE TRIAL OF STEPAN KHMARA: POLITICAL AND UNJUST

Dr. Gregory Stanton, a renowned human rights and international law advocate, returned from his second trip to Ukraine on May 18. Dr. Stanton, professor of law at Washington and Lee University, was invited to Ukraine by the Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) Secretariat at the request of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA). He served as an observer and consultant to the defence teams of Stepan Khmara and the other defendants.

Upon his return, Natalia Kormeliuk, director of the UCCA's Ukrainian National Information Service (UNIS) in Washington, D.C., had the opportunity to interview Dr. Stanton about his trip to Ukraine and the events surrounding the trial. The following are excerpts from the interview conducted on May 30:

UNIS: Having been to Ukraine twice, what is your opinion of Khmara's position on the democratic leaders about whom he has voiced some disappointments?

Stanton: I am able to comment on this because I was able to watch Khmara interact with several deputies during my stay in Kyiv. I feel that Khmara has a clearer vision than most others, a characteristic of a great leader. He always is looking to the future while at the same time concerned about the people right around him. He is not a people user, he genuinely cares about people.

UNIS: There appears to be a struggle developing over who will win the intellectuals, the people and workers on one side or the communist establishment on the other side?

Stanton: Khmara is worried about this because he knows how seductive the

establishment can be especially after spending time in the Soviet gulags, which many of the people's deputies have. They now can stay in hotels, receive the best seats on trains and even travel to the West, luxuries which most citizens only dream of. He explains that the communist system has collaboration tendencies built into it and the communist leaders know this and use it to their advantage. Khmara, himself, has basically taken the position of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, which rejects the parliamentary system in its current state, believing that it is a danger to Ukraine. Khmara, however, has not totally boycotted the system because he is taking advantage of his opportunity to speak out on what he believes. He uses the Supreme Soviet as a forum to voice his opinion, calling for the dissolution of the government and new elections.

UNIS: Did you ask Khmara about the coincidence of democratic reforms going on at the same time as the new wave of repressions? How does he explain this?

Stanton: I did not put it in quite those terms, however, we did speak about reforms and repressions. Khmara is convinced that the democratic reforms have come about only through popular pressure. He continued by saying that if it were up to the people, Ukraine would be independent. He believes that the communists are trying to use this idea of "democratic" reform to continue their rule. An example of this is saying the elections are being run democratically while at the same time stacking the elections so that the communists can be the only victors, as it happened in eastern Ukraine.

UNIS: In the process of democratisation and reforms, do you get the sense that Ukraine has the same opportunities as the other republics?

Stanton: No, I am not under that impression. The reason for this is the communist system in Ukraine is among the most conservative. Yeltsin came to power long before Shcherbytskyi, a Brezhnev holdover, was removed. Also, because of the local communists throughout Ukraine the elections were stacked, guaranteeing the communists a victory. Khmara kept repeating that there is no good way for a communist leader to reform because he has already shown that he is corrupt. Therefore, communists should be swept out of office because they can't be trusted.

For example, Kravchuk is a smooth authoritarian leader. Something that struck me when I was watching the sessions of the Supreme Soviet on television is that the President is the chairman of the sessions and has the right to answer all the deputies' speeches. This is completely different from our system, where the chair has to leave his seat, step down to the podium before he can respond to any statement. Kravchuk, on the other hand, can turn off the microphone, as he often does, and he has the opportunity to rebut any statement immediately. This only emphasises how authoritarian the Supreme Soviet system really is.

UNIS: I viewed one of the videotapes of your first trip to Ukraine and noticed one particular incident which I would like you to comment on. During a protest against the arrest and detention of Khmara, the militia said that these people didn't have

the right to protest against the incarceration of Khmara. A woman replied: "you [the militia] have jailed the person I voted for to represent me in the Supreme Soviet and I have the right to demand his release".

Stanton: This woman is absolutely correct. Under international law, people have the right to be represented, therefore, she has the right to protest the release of the man she voted for to represent her in the Supreme Soviet.

UNIS: Because there are not many deputies who support the Khmara case, do you believe this confuses the people?

Stanton: That has been disappointing that they haven't done more. The purpose of my first trip was to try to coalesce deputies to fight for Khmara rather than to sit back and let things move the way the authorities want them to go. Some deputies have really fought for Khmara, especially Larysa Skoryk and Sviderskyi and many non-deputies, Lupynis especially, who happened to get arrested while we were there.

Lupynis (the head of the political coordinating committee of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly) was arrested and held for five days of administrative detention. During this time he did not have the right to counsel or trial. Dr. Rosslyn Higgins had brought this up last August at the United Nations Committee on Human Rights. Dr. Higgins stated that the Soviet Union still had and used administrative detention which is against international law. The Ukrainian representative at the meeting replied that it was very seldom used. However, during my trip, this was used and it is used particularly for political repressions.

UNIS: Is there any sense of where the trial is going, or what the communists want out of this?

Stanton: The communists have found themselves at a loss. The trial against Khmara has turned into a trial of the regime. I believe that the reason it has been postponed so many times (at least four times) is because the communists don't know what to do. Khmara has turned this trial into an anti-communist forum. Prior to each proceeding he would walk up the steps that led to a balcony and speak through a bullhorn to the people gathered in the square below. In addition, the courtroom was wired so that the people standing outside the courthouse could hear the entire trial.

As for the trial, it is an example of outrageous procedural violations. There is the heaviest police presence in a courtroom that I have ever seen except maybe with the exception of the trials of mafia leaders in Italy, where the defendants are actually placed in cages. The courtroom holds only 60 people, of which the entire front row is filled with armed, uniformed police. These police officers had Asian features, probably brought in from the Asian trouble spots. There were also police standing at all sides of the defendant's box as well as a wall of police in front of Khmara, who was sitting near it. This heavy-handed police presence only proves how political the trial really is.

UNIS: Why hasn't there been any attention in the West about this trial?

Stanton: One reason is that on the third day the authorities did not let any Western reporters into the courtroom. The reporters received the special passes needed to enter the courtroom; however, they weren't allowed in. This reminded me of a situation I viewed in the Pol Pot case, when the authorities believed that by keeping the reporters out, the news would not get out. It is always hard to report on a negative. Even when the reporters in Ukraine were let into the trial there wasn't much to cover. The first day the proceedings lasted about 15 minutes, the second about 20 minutes, and the third about a half an hour.

There is a light of hope, however, because Amnesty International is sending a Polish jurist from Poznan to observe the trial. This should attract attention to the trial due to the moral weight in human rights throughout the international community Amnesty International holds.

UNIS: In traditional communist trials they seek to extract confessions. Have they done so in this trial?

Stanton: The communist system placed high value on confessions, which comes out of this communist belief that they are so morally right that if anyone has gone against them or has made a mistake and confesses they are brought back to the "right" path, in many ways what the Spanish Inquisition did in Spain to cleanse them of their sin then kill them. It carries with it totalitarian righteousness.

There has been a vast improvement, people say they are not guilty and they aren't forced to make confessions before they go to trial. Although some of the treatment of Khmara and the others is another form of torture. For example, when Khmara was on a hunger strike they ran tubes through his nose and anus, which hurt terribly. And Kovalchuk has even said that they have given him drugs.

UNIS: What has not changed is that this is not a fair trial and thus there is a predetermined outcome.

Stanton: The Communist Party has already decided how much time they will give the defendants. Although I do not know the answer, my guess would be that they will sentence Khmara to time served because they realise what it would mean to lock him up again. However, I am worried about the other defendants who could spend time in prison.

UNIS: This trial should be a very clear indicator to the West of how legitimate Gorbachev's glasnost and perestroika really are. Why then with the economic conference coming up and Gorbachev begging to go ...

Stanton: Why the United States isn't taking a harder line?

UNIS: At least staying away from it. I am not even saying go and support Khmara but why work with the Communist Party?

Stanton: I've raised this with American officials and the American Consulate in

Kyiv. We even visited Shifter's (the chairman of the Human Rights Bureau of the State Department) office about this specific case and it has been raised at top levels of the Soviet government by the ambassador, and this would not only be done by high-level instruction. The Consulate in Kyiv has been very sympathetic and even sent an observer, John Stepanchuk (first secretary of the Consulate). I believe the Bush administration is trying to maximise the number of relations we have and not daring to upset the delicate relationship we have with the central government, while very quietly pursuing diplomacy behind the scenes. My real complaint is that they haven't done enough of the second thing. They need to create relations with the democratic opposition leaders, parties and movements within the republics.

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A quarterly journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

Winter, 1991

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A Quarterly Journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

EDITORIAL BOARD

Slava Stetsko <i>Editor</i>	Roman Zwarycz <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Borys Potapenko <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Lev Shankovsky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Dr. Oleh S. Romanyshyn <i>Associate Editor</i>
Prof. Volodymyr Zarycky <i>Assistant Editor</i>	Stephen Oleskiw <i>Associate Editor</i>

**Price: £5.00 or \$10.00 a single copy,
Annual Subscription: £20.00 or \$40.00**

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, N1 1LF. Tel.: 071-607-6266/7*

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

Vol. XXXIX, No. 4

A Quarterly Journal

Winter, 1991

CONTENTS

Editorial: THE EMPIRE IS DEAD. LONG LIVE A NEW AND BETTER WORLD	2
THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION IN UKRAINE <i>Prof. Volodymyr F. Pohrebennyk</i>	3
MODERN STUDENT MOVEMENT IN UKRAINE — FROM BIRTH TO MATURITY <i>Taras Korpalo</i>	11
HISTORY, AS "TIME FUTURE" <i>Roman Zwarycz</i>	18
MYKHAILO DRAHOMANIV AND ENGLISH LITERATURE <i>Prof. Dr. Roxoliana Zorivchak</i>	24
NEWS FROM UKRAINE	33
DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS	52
BOOKS	92

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

The Empire is Dead. Long Live a New and Better World

December 1, 1991 — a date that future historians will undoubtedly mark as the day that the USSR, the Soviet Russian empire, ceased to exist. On that day, despite Mikhail Gorbachev's bellicose threats, disguised as they were behind a thin veil of increasingly hollow utterances about "impending doom", the Ukrainian people resoundingly voted in a national referendum for an independent and sovereign Ukrainian state. In light of Gorbachev's statements to the effect that he could not envisage a Soviet Union without Ukraine, Moscow's largest colony within an empire that encompassed nearly one-fifth of the earth's land surface, this overwhelming vote in favour of Ukrainian independence was the last and most decisive nail driven into the coffin of the empire's corpse.

Following the collapse of the Russian empire in 1917, the tsars' heirs, calling themselves the centre of a world-wide communist movement, managed to galvanise the shredded remnants of Russia's former imperial "glory" and began a march towards global expansionism that left in its wake countless millions of victims. Their legacy is one of genocide, forced deportations, artificial famines, terror, concentration camps, psychiatric prisons, colonial exploitation, military adventurism, international subversion, nuclear blackmail, bloodshed, intense Russification, state-sponsored terrorism and the most vicious form of imperialism that the world has ever seen. In an age that was built upon the mutual respect of every nation's right to self-determination, i.e., national independence, sovereignty and statehood, the Soviet Russian prison of nations was like some anachronistic blight on all freedom-loving humankind, making any further progress towards a new, free and just world order virtually impossible. As the world stood on the cusp of a new century, it had become painfully clear that the further existence of this colonial anachronism, within which nations with a proud ancient cultural heritage like Ukraine were denied their right to a separate existence, would only lead to further turmoil, global tension and, undoubtedly, bloodshed.

The United States doggedly courted Mikhail Gorbachev, even when his base of popular support in the USSR had almost completely eroded. Faced with the choice of either supporting what were essentially status quo forces in the Kremlin, or the genuine forces of freedom in Moscow's colonies, President Bush opted for something that was then labelled "stability", completely neglecting America's own revolutionary heritage, which gave birth to a free nation. The US President chided the Ukrainian "Founding Fathers" in August in the Ukrainian capital — Kyiv, warning them of the dangers of "suicidal nationalism". Political stability, however, can never be maintained, when the irrepressible human will to freedom and justice is suppressed and denied. This fundamental political precept became stark political reality on August 19, when the last of Lenin's heirs attempted to throttle the irresistible forces of freedom in an aborted coup attempt.

Today, all of humankind can now look towards the future with a sense of optimism, as the world's last, albeit most sadistic, empire has finally collapsed. Now, indeed, a new world order can be built, based on the universal ideals of freedom and justice, on mutual goodwill and wellbeing, on peace and global stability, on the mutual respect of every nation's right to exist. The first step in that direction is for the world's democracies to recognise the newly emerging nations and to treat them as worthy co-architects in the construction of a new world. The opportunity is there.

THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION IN UKRAINE

By Prof. Volodymyr F. Pohrebennyk
Kyiv University

On August 24, 1991, the Supreme Council in Kyiv declared independence and the establishment of a sovereign Ukrainian state. From that moment on, only the Constitution and laws of Ukraine were to have jurisdiction over the territory of the republic (fifth in Europe in surface area and population), which was declared indivisible and inviolable.

This is not, however, the first national-state formation in Ukraine which served the interests of its people. After the decline of the powerful Kyivan Rus' state the aspirations of the Ukrainian people towards independence were embodied in the Kozak state of Bohdan Khmelnytskyi. Khmelnytskyi, however, was compelled to sign a military alliance with Muscovy (the Pereyaslav Council, 1654). Since then Ukraine was continuously harnessed to a colonial yoke, suffered economic ruin, administrative persecution of its national culture, the falsification of its history, a ban on the Ukrainian language, and finally genocide. In spite of all these calamities, Ukraine gave the world the first democratic constitution of Pylyp Orlyk* and fought a difficult, but determined, liberation struggle.

The second successful attempt to establish an independent state came with the fall of the Russian empire in 1917. With the proclamation of the "Fourth Universal", the democratically-elected parliament — the Central Rada, proclaimed the independence of a sovereign and united Ukraine. Encircled by inimical forces and pressured by the Bolsheviks, who had the support of the pro-communist puppet government in Kharkiv, the defensive measures of the Central Rada, and later the Directory, proved futile. The Central Rada was succeeded by the Hetmanate — a government set up (in 1918) with the help of the Germans, which nevertheless had more of the attributes of independence than what later became the Ukrainian SSR. A third attempt to achieve statehood came in 1941-42.

Having won the civil war of 1917-20 the Bolsheviks established a dictatorship of the Communist Party. Shortly afterwards, they enforced a predatory "peace" on the peoples of the former tsarist empire in the form of the USSR. According to Lviv historian — Yaroslav Dashkevych, Ukraine did not sign the 1922 Union treaty, and, therefore, this treaty never had juridical force in Ukraine.

Having carried out a policy of "total collectivisation" and having introduced a predatory system of agricultural procurement, the centre of the newly-created Union

* Signed on 16 April 1710 in Bendery by the newly elected Hetman Pylyp Orlyk (1710-1742), who succeeded Ivan Mazepa.

proceeded to conduct an exploitative colonial policy in Ukraine and other so-called socialist Soviet republics. Eight million Ukrainians died as a result of the man-made famine of 1932-33. As convoys of Ukrainian bread were rolling west, Ukrainians were starving to death. The political machinations of the Party apparatus led to bloody Stalinist repressions and, between 1930 and 1985, cost the Ukrainian people more than 40 million lives. Ukraine's road to Golgotha was strewn with myths of the flourishing and mutual enrichment of the peoples and cultures of the USSR. The torment of the subjugated nations, on the other hand, was portrayed as a "black past". In the last few years, the Party, through various kinds of machinations, managed to engineer the election of people's deputies from within its faithful ranks and its affiliated civic organisations (the so-called "list of one hundred"), the election of a USSR president, a referendum on the Union treaty; the Party also invented the lie of pseudo-sovereignty; and, finally, it staged the coup on the night of August 19, 1991. Hopefully this has been the Party's last move.

The present political situation in Ukraine took root during Gorbachev's *perestroika*, introduced in 1985, although for a long time this policy was nevertheless subjected to various obstructions at the hands of our Party leadership. Chernobyl roused the people to civil disobedience. Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) was born during the furious communist counter-attack as a democratic umbrella organisation, and later Ukraine's first political parties emerged: the Ukrainian Republican Party (which united the former dissidents), the Ukrainian Democratic Party, the Party for the Democratic Rebirth of Ukraine and others, in all more than 30, although many of them remained in a state of flux.

The tolerance of the democratic forces towards all nationalities and cultures in Ukraine allowed for the formation of national associations of ethnic minorities, each with its own structure and publications. The new circumstances led to the establishment of numerous societies and associations — culturological, ecological, and others — (the "Lev" Society, "Green World", "Spadshchyna", etc.). The youth — the Ukrainian Youth Association (SUM) and the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) — also became politically active with a heightened political awareness.

The elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, which resulted in a triumph of the Party apparatus, united the democratic opposition around the platform of Rukh. As a result of the elections to the Supreme Soviet and local soviets of Ukraine, many democratically-elected deputies came to power in the western regions. Parliamentary seats (apart from the "group of 239") were won by deputies who shortly afterwards formed the Narodna Rada (People's Council) — the official parliamentary opposition.

Next on the political agenda was the abolition of Article 6 of the Constitution of the USSR and UkrSSR — the legalisation of political parties. This coincided with

the Declaration of Sovereignty of Ukraine by the first session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet in the summer of 1990, which was the only chance of survival for more than 50 million people, the only way to save the mineral and natural resources of Ukraine from being plundered; to salvage the world's most fertile black-earth regions from being destroyed; in a word, the only way to restore the unique character of Ukraine, without which the treasury of world civilisation would become impoverished.

On the eve of the August coup, the political situation was complex. The Party majority was not prepared to carry out even those compromises achieved by the student hunger strike of October 1990 (the student actions had almost the same significance for Ukraine as the 1968 student movement did for France). The Narodna Rada and Rukh were unable to give the striking miners effective support. The attempts by the Ukrainian Republican Party and the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) to organise a strike in Kyiv also ended in failure. When in November 1990 the CPU launched a counter-attack (the arrest of Stepan Khmara, changes in Supreme Soviet regulations), the democratic opposition lacked the means of organising an effective opposition. The democrats resorted to tedious everyday work, propaganda and agitation, and even reached a compromise with the ruling majority, in an attempt to split it in two.

Then in a single blow the Committee on the State of Emergency finally toppled the Union and "guaranteed" de-communisation. Everything the democratic forces were hoping for became a reality. It would be wrong to say that the opposition forces played no part in this process. Without the coup the process would merely have taken longer. Today the communist empire is crumbling (to throttle this natural process artificially could bring about undesired and dangerous consequences for the world community). A great temptation exists to finish off the political opponent, particularly since part of the communist leadership, in an attempt to save themselves, immediately left the Party (thereby justifying the opposition's tactics to exacerbate the discord within the communist majority).

The communist majority in the Presidium then proceeded to ban the Party, something which did not even happen in the countries of Eastern Europe. Their decision was based on the fact that the leadership of the Communist Party of Ukraine supported the coup d' état (Party activities over the last 74 years were not mentioned). The plotters were going to make use of Party structures; these, in their turn, were ready to join the "new order" and part of the CPU openly supported the Committee on the State of Emergency (the others adopted a wait and see policy). In my opinion the banning of an officially-registered party should have been effectuated legally and juridically — through a court of law or a Supreme Soviet session, to avoid bringing about the "martyrdom" of the CPU. Does the banning of a political opponent without a relevant court decision not give a dangerous impetus

to neo-bolshevism? Particularly striking is the fact that the decision to ban the Party was supported by former communists. Having quickly changed their colours they swore allegiance to "independent Ukraine" and banned the activities of their former Party colleagues. Views can of course change and it is good when from a more realistic assessment and from a purely human point of view Oleksander Moroz's position can have greater appeal than that of Leonid Kravchuk. One should, after all, be able to answer for one's deeds.

Democratic Russia suppressed the coup and won a victory. Unfortunately the democratic forces of our republic lost. The threat of a restoration of a totalitarian communist regime hangs over sovereign Ukraine like the sword of Damocles. Although Ukraine declared itself free, it failed to free itself of communist predominance. The *nomenklatura* still controls key positions in republican and local political and economic structures. On August 23 and 24 Union departments and ministries dispatched coded telegrams ordering the destruction of all written instructions issued during the coup. Republican and local leaders who recognised the Committee on the State of Emergency and issued directives to this end began to destroy all documentation in order to leave no evidence of their involvement in the coup. Had it not been for the decision of the democratic authorities in Lviv to impound the oblast CPU headquarters, a circular issued by the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CPU in support of the putsch would not have been discovered. What is significant is that the oblast Party committee received and registered these instructions, labelled "top secret", on August 18 — a day before the coup!

Perhaps the most unfortunate issue in this episode is that the Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers carried out the directives of the Central Committee.

The Party leaders who led the coup (Yanaev stated that he is a member of the Central Committee and proud of it), the Party members who headed the army which attempted to suppress the sovereignty of the republics with its tanks, and the Party media which broadcast the junta's decrees, should repent for all the harm caused by the Communist Party in 74 years of totalitarian rule. If the Party wants to remain in the political spectrum, it must return without delay all illegally-acquired assets — buildings, specialised factories and so on, and vacate all institutions and businesses. This process has already begun, albeit not voluntarily. The situation in the economic sphere is more difficult. Through dubious collective ownership the Party owns the land, and through its links with government institutions it also controls practically all of Ukraine's economy (some 85 per cent of small businesses and most of the directors of large businesses have not shed their communist mentality). The Party is effectively still in a position to do anything it wants, including sabotage and various forms of anti-national activity. The situation will not change so long as the same people remain in the prosecutors' offices and courts and until there is a law on private ownership.

Until such time cases such as the following will continue: the Mykolayiv municipal council does not recognise the independence of Ukraine or any of the decrees issued by the Supreme Soviet Presidium after August 24. There have been numerous instances when documents have been destroyed in impounded buildings. The first secretary of the Hadiach district Party committee in the Poltava oblast declared that he is not interested in Ukrainian independence and the post-coup decisions of the parliament, and will continue to operate in the old manner.

The position of Ukrainian activists during the coup cannot be ignored. Supreme Soviet chairman — Leonid Kravchuk, adopted an overly cautious and diplomatically-considered position at a time when the people of Russia were waiting for a manifestation of support. This support came from other leaders: Rukh chairman — Ivan Drach, Green party chairman — Yuriy Shcherbak, and the head of the Lviv oblast council — Vyacheslav Chornovil, who did not waste any time in openly condemning the coup.

The position of the Central Committee of the CPU was pitiful. The Central Committee only declared its position when the coup was practically over, and, in an attempt to maintain power, it tried to dupe the people once again, claiming to be the heroic force which “through peace and tenacity” contributed to the triumph of democracy in Moscow.

I would like now to say a few words about the farce surrounding the Act of August 24 and its consequences. Those who until very recently denounced the proponents of independence, now stood up and applauded this declaration. Their “joy”, however, predicated on the hope that the Communist Party can thus be saved, seemed premature.

The proclamation of independence did not reduce, but on the contrary increased, the danger of Ukraine again being brought into a Union treaty. In an interview in “Vechirniy Kyiv”, people’s deputy Larysa Skoryk announced her opposition to any political agreements signed by Ukraine, particularly with a state such as Russia, whose leader had reserved himself the right to review our borders. As long as Ukraine continues to be treated as some “national periphery”, then any agreements on cooperation can be broken when they are no longer convenient for Ukraine. This political context includes the fact that our republic was not among the eight which signed the economic agreement in Moscow. To sign a document which includes clauses that contradict Ukrainian decrees is inconsistent to say the least.

Like the Declaration of Independence of 1918, the Act of August 24 was also a paper declaration. In 1991 the situation is analogous to the circumstances of 1918. In 1918 the principal unintentional transgression of the Ukrainian National Republic was that it did not understand the importance of its own armed forces. When it did finally understand, it was too late. Ukraine was already occupied. Presently, Ukraine is trying to avoid past mistakes. Ukraine has a Defence Minister

— Maj. Gen. Konstantyn Morozov, and is forming a republican army and national guard. To subordinate them to Moscow, however, is outright nonsense.

In the present political situation in Ukraine, the first place in daily life is occupied by the need for a substantive renewal of governmental institutions. It is time for Ukrainian deputies to leave the all-union parliament — the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, which in my opinion, has fulfilled its mission. The Supreme Soviet of Ukraine has also taken us as far as it can. For the moment there are hopes that the future president of the republic will restore a normal social order (*perestroika* did not affect the majority of the population at all; on the contrary, it may have brought greater impoverishment), that he will consolidate his efforts to effectuate the Act of Independence. The proclamation of Ukrainian independence, which according to Hans-Dietrich Genscher, every serious politician must take into account, concretely means that Ukraine has seceded from the USSR; it is tantamount to the disintegration of the Union and its removal from the political arena. This should also be of interest to other "union" republics and the world in general.

The political situation in Ukraine this autumn is twofold: there is a continuity of the "pre-coup" situation (the power of oblast Party committees throughout most of Ukraine is hastily being turned over to the people; the military-industrial complex and the collective agricultural system remain inviolable; Moscow-inspired agitation for the establishment of autonomous regions within Ukraine has not subsided), as well as the features of the new situation. The waves of a "mild revolution" are rolling through the republic, bringing down the bastions of totalitarianism. The destructive activities of the old order are being replaced by efforts to build a state.

At the second Halychyna assembly Vyacheslav Chornovil stated, "the new political situation demands a well formulated consistency of action, particularly as regards preparations for the referendum and presidential elections on December 1". Chornovil further underlined the inexpediency of holding a referendum after the declaration of independence by Ukraine. The Ukrainian people have since Kozak times been struggling for freedom. Is it not time to put a stop to this referendum? The aim of the referendum, which was proposed by representatives of the now banned CPU, was probably to assist in the secession from Ukraine of individual regions, from which "communist reservations" could still be created, i.e. the Crimea. One hopes that when the referendum is actually held it will be no more than a ritual. At least we can take solace in the results of a survey of the Institute of Sociology of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Sixty-three per cent of respondents replied positively to the question: "do you approve of the declaration of Ukraine as an independent state?"; 17.3 per cent answered — "No". Not only western Ukraine, Kyiv, but also a majority of respondents from the cradle of the Soviet political cadres — the eastern regions (Luhansk, Donetsk, Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhia oblasts), which had been victimised by a policy of brutal Russification

for more than 300 years, opted for sovereignty, although every fourth person stated that he/she is a supporter of a "single Rus'." In the Crimea, 44.4 per cent responded positively, while 30 per cent indicated their opposition. This gave the official leaders of the autonomous territory a pretext to pose the question on an independent Tavrian republic or a Tavrian *gubernia* within the Russian federation.

The democratic forces of Ukraine had begun (through the press, television and radio) a widespread campaign well before the referendum, fully understanding the importance of each vote for the fate of independent Ukraine. At the same time their opponents are going onto the wider all-union auditorium, for instance the Ukrainophobe Honcharov in an interview in the revived programme "Vremya". In connection with this, the world community's support for Ukrainian sovereignty is of particular significance. One would like to believe that by the results of the referendum the republic — a member of the United Nations — will not ignore the right of the people to self-determination, statehood, laid down in the documents of the organisation. And the Prime Minister of Canada — Brian Mulroney, will have a formal basis as will the heads of other governments, to keep his word and recognise Ukrainian independence.

Most of its population connects the fate of their country with the dissolution of the old partocratic Supreme Soviet and the formation of a new legislative body, as well as the elections of a president in December. There were 94 registered candidates. Among the numerous pretenders, more than 60 were self-nominated, many of them unemployed. The most serious candidates are the chairman of the present Supreme Soviet Leonid Kravchuk, Vyacheslav Chornovil, the chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party Lev Lukyanenko, a former political prisoner, and academician Ihor Yukhnovskiy, chairman of the Narodna Rada parliamentary opposition, writer and people's deputy Volodymyr Yavorivskiy, Ivan Drach, and others. At the end of October the number of candidates became markedly reduced: only those candidates who gathered one hundred thousand signatures in their support will appear on the ballot on December 1.

It is a great pity that the democratic front in Ukraine could not come up with one candidate. The threat of mutually destructive fighting between the democratic candidates became a real possibility; only a third party could gain from such infighting. In this situation, the local democratic organisations should have the last decisive word in terms of determining the candidate who will clearly have the best chance of going through to the second round of elections. In my opinion it is V. Chornovil, the energetic leader of the Halychyna region and a leader of the democratic processes in Ukraine. In a dignified manner he defended the honour of Western Ukraine during the coup, introduced many positive changes in his oblast in agriculture and education (Polish and Jewish schools were even opened in Lviv) and so on. One should add that the issue of the presidential election in Ukraine is

becoming complicated by the fact that the nation — in Stepan Khmara's assessment, is simply not ready, because of being subjected to decades of disinformation that was carried out by the party officials. We have generally speaking inherited from communism a destroyed society that lacks confidence. Moreover, Ukraine's mass media are for the time being effectively supporting only one candidate, almost exclusively broadcasting the press conferences and interviews of Leonid Kravchuk. His visits to Germany, France, Canada and the USA raised the international prestige and importance of Ukraine and to a certain degree that of Kravchuk himself. Having gained a strong grip on the reigns of power he is forming a new agenda. It includes the transformation of Ukraine into a nuclear-free zone, the formation of a republican army, the introduction of a separate currency, the establishment of an independent economy.

Thus today the predominant political idea in Ukraine is the "idea of its own way" (Chornovil), and "independence as the code of our thinking" (Kravchuk). For its realisation there are several economic preconditions. Ukraine's economy is completely destroyed. Deutsche Bank, for example, believes that it is now that republic among the former Soviet republics, which has the greatest chances of attaining economic success on the basis of independence.

Ukrainians need to revive the complex of social relations that have characterised our nation throughout its history. This complex once characterised Ukrainians in Europe as a people of an unusually high productive culture, determined Ukraine as a granary, as a forge, as a centre of a highly intellectual culture. I am certain that as soon as we push aside the ashes of totalitarianism, make way for the shoots of the new, as soon as our worker will begin working for himself, for Ukraine and not for a foreign power, the glory of Ukraine will soon be reborn.

MODERN STUDENT MOVEMENT IN UKRAINE — FROM BIRTH TO MATURITY

By Taras Korpalo

The roots of the modern student movement in Ukraine do not go back very far. But the time is so precipitous that events even of the last two years already seem very distant.

This essay will attempt to present a concise overview of the development of the student movement from its inception to the present, in the hope that it will help people to understand the current situation in youth circles as well as the general political situation in Ukraine.

The student movement began with the emergence in Ukraine of several informal student organisations. (The term “informal” refers to those organisations which came into being without the approval of and in opposition to the Communist state structures).

The first of these organisations was probably the Lviv-based “Lev” Society. It was not exclusively a student organisation. It was a cultural organisation, which already at that time (late 1987) was somewhat unique: a Ukrainian-orientated organisation formed without funding and support from official circles was unprecedented. The greatest achievement of the “Lev” Society was the publication of “Postup” — the first independent newspaper in this third in this century Ukrainian rebirth. The newspaper itself was on a relatively high plane, when compared with all later independent *samvydav* (underground publications). “Postup” was at the height of its popularity in the first half of 1989. People would literally grab it from newsstands when it appeared. It survived until the triumph of democracy in the Lviv *oblast* (province) when it stopped being a *samvydav* publication and later disappeared completely from the political scene.

The first truly political student organisation became the Kyiv “Hromada”. It came into being at the beginning of 1988 in Kyiv University also ostensibly as a cultural organisation, although from the start it began issuing political statements and entered into an open duel with the Communist party machine. It was dealt with very quickly, but not in the classical Brezhnevite style. Initially no one was arrested or expelled from the university. First the authorities tried to win an “ideological” victory. At Communist and Komsomol (Communist Youth League) meetings and gatherings “Hromada” was denounced, the “flaws” in its thinking were exposed, corrected, and in the end it was infiltrated by KGB moles and finally split into two parts — those hostile to the ruling administration and those loyal to it. Later the more vociferous were expelled from the university on “legal” grounds after

receiving unmerited failing grades. In the autumn of 1988, that is after the liquidation of "Hromada", a series of strikes began in Kyiv University against the military faculty, ending in a partial victory. The organisers and active participants of these strikes were yesterday's "Hromada" members, although as an organisation it was no longer in existence.

At the time when "Hromada" was being decimated in Kyiv, student brotherhoods were being formed in Lviv. The situation in the Lviv region from the national standpoint was always better than in Kyiv, and in the middle of 1988 the authorities were no longer able to disperse these incipient student groups. In 1989 the "Student Brotherhood" (SB) of Lviv became one of the largest Ukrainian political organisations in Lviv at that time. It almost continuously organised some form of protest actions in opposition to the authorities (mainly concerning the problem of the "bolshevisation" of the educational system). One of the particularly effective methods employed by the SB was the collective hunger strikes that it organised. They were conducted often and, in retrospect, frequently for aims which did not warrant such efforts. In Lviv students were also expelled from higher schools, but not as rapidly as was earlier the case in Kyiv with "Hromada". The educational administration in Lviv was slow to react to the demands of the KGB and CPU. The case of each student was protracted, which gave new impulses to the student movement. In the autumn of 1989 the idea of the establishment of an all-Ukrainian student organisation based on national principles became increasingly prominent.

A founding congress was convened in Kyiv in December. More than one hundred politically active students attended this congress, primarily from Lviv and Kyiv, although there were also students from Cherkasy, Chernivtsi and Kharkiv. Only the Lviv students represented some form of organisation (naturally not yet registered), which although small, nevertheless gave the Lviv students a better sense of the significance of the student movement. Others simply wanted to fight for Ukraine and were ready to set up such an organisation. The Lviv students did not want to join the newly-formed organisation. They argued that they already had an organisation while the others were not yet organised. They argued that the centre and leadership of the organisation should be in Lviv, which the other students did not support. The conflict soon took on the characteristics of the traditional chasm between the so-called "easterners" and "westerners". The misunderstandings revolved around whether the organisation was to be a "trade union" or a "civic-political" forum. In the end two student bodies were set up: the "Student Brotherhood" (SB) of Lviv and the Ukrainian Student Association (USS) based in Kyiv. Although formally they were united in the Confederation of Ukrainian Students (KSU), in practical terms the links between them were not particularly sturdy. Membership in the two organisations was small (at that time the Kyiv USS had around 30 active members and the SB no more than 100). Despite such limited

human resources, the students began to organise an “all-Ukrainian student strike” (February-March 1990).

This strike took place only in Lviv and even then not in all of the city’s colleges and institutes. The pickets outside the educational institutions of Kyiv were small in number and did not have the mass support of the general student body, which was astonished by these strikes. A group of leading USS activists in Kyiv received 15 days of administrative arrest, perhaps the most significant achievement of the action because it shook Ukraine to some degree at the time of the election campaign. The people stood on the side of the students and they were released before serving the full 15 days, but the action did not come out as planned. The weakness of the student movement was obvious as was the need for a greater degree of unity.

After the Lviv meetings of the summer of 1988, this strike became an event which blazed the next step on the path towards the rebirth of Ukraine. Later that spring Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) was registered. That summer the 500th anniversary of the Kozaks was commemorated in Zaporizhia and the Declaration of state sovereignty was declared in Kyiv, although by the Communist majority in the Supreme Soviet.

The students continued their struggle in the form of smaller actions, although in the summer they had reached consent on the need to hold a wide-scale student protest action in October, which was to surpass in scale all previous actions in Ukraine in the preceding few years and to give fresh impetus to the national rebirth, which had somewhat subsided after the declaration of national sovereignty.

The leaders of the USS and SB held frequent meetings to discuss possible plans of action. That the October protest action was to begin with a mass hunger strike in Kyiv was agreed on very quickly, but the mechanism of its realisation and the further development of the action was not clearly articulated. The reaction of the Communist party and KGB was not taken into account and, hence, no contingency plans were developed. Nonetheless, at the beginning of September the basic plans were ready and direct preparations began.

From the start, most of the student leaders anticipated that they would be arrested once the hunger strike began and would therefore have to continue their action from within the prison walls. A campaign in defence of the Ukrainian student prisoners would then begin. The primary role should therefore be played by those members of the USS and SB who would not take part in the first stage of the action but should be ready to begin a strike in the universities.

This scenario relied on the most decisive forms of opposition to the authorities. It later became clear that the authorities were not prepared for the strike and, therefore, events unfolded along unanticipated avenues.

In general, preparations for the action were very serious, taking the worst-case scenarios into account. In Kyiv tents, warm clothing, wooden panels and other items necessary to erect a camp in the centre of the city in one day were being

secretly stockpiled. Preparations in Lviv were no less serious. Later events proved that without such careful preparation there could not be any hope of success.

Although a detailed account of the action is beyond the scope of this paper, it is, nevertheless, worth stressing some of the more pertinent aspects.

The first few days were the most difficult. Around 150 students arrived and made known their demands, which were written on placards stating that they were on hunger strike. The striking students lay down beside the Lenin monument (on October Revolution now Independence Square). They issued the following demands:

1. Dismissal of Supreme Soviet chairman — Masol
2. A new round of elections to the Supreme Soviet for the spring of 1991
3. Rejection of a new union treaty
4. Military service by Ukrainians on the territory of Ukraine
5. Nationalisation of the assets of the CPU and Komsomol in Ukraine.

At that time these demands frightened even many democrats. The reaction of the militia was incomprehensible. First they surrounded the students, then they walked away, warning the protesters that they would be dispersed as soon as the first tent went up.

The behaviour of the militia can to some extent be explained by the position of the Kyiv city council. The council has never been particularly Ukrainian or particularly democratic. But when it came to dealing with the student strike, it proved incompetent. Naturally, a majority of deputies wanted us off the square as soon as possible but were afraid to take responsibility for such a move. On the first day the city council met from morning till evening trying to reach a decision. The deputies finally agreed to let us erect the tents and remain on the square overnight. They thought that in the morning they would persuade the students to disperse without having to resort to force. This indecision in actual fact decided the further development of events. When the tents were erected it was possible to deliver panels, fold-up beds, mattresses and so on to the camp, which further complicated the issue for the municipal government. And when the next day the tents were surrounded by a solid circle of people and Kyiv learned about the camp, the situation began to gradually change in favour of the students. The Kyiv municipal council continued to meet, but was unable to reach any decisions, thereby, in effect, sanctioning the activities of the student strike. The number of supporters grew and the camp gradually increased in size.

It is interesting to note the reaction of the authorities in those days. In the beginning they gave the impression that nothing out of the ordinary was taking place (this was also the position of the official press). It was as though the students were not even there. Attempts by various democratic deputies to bring the issue before the Supreme Soviet were immediately shouted down by the Communist majority with demands to “restore order”.

What was also baffling was the position of Rukh, the Ukrainian Republican Party and other democratic parties. There was no official reaction from them in the

first days of the action. It seemed as though no-one could understand what exactly was going on. No material or other help was forthcoming.

The hunger strikers were continuously subjected to surreptitious acts of provocation in the camp both in daytime and at night. Unknown youths would attempt to provoke fights. From time to time explosive packages would be thrown into the camp. Various kinds of pamphlets and leaflets appeared on the streets of Kyiv attacking the students and calling them CIA agents. All the same, public opinion in the capital remained on the side of the activists. The people of Kyiv supported the students in various ways and the organisers were faced with the problem of what to do with all the warm clothing, thermoses with hot drinks and the like provided by the Kyivites.

On the fifth day the Communists prepared a large-scale provocation. They organised a rally of WW2 veterans, which was to include a wreath-laying ceremony at the foot of the Lenin monument around which the students had set up camp.

The attempt failed. The party managed to mobilise no more than 3,000 Communist veterans. To protect the students, on the other hand, more than 50,000 Kyivites had taken to the streets. The veterans were thus compelled to march to the Lenin museum (now a civic-political centre).

This was the first victory, for which much credit is due to the Rukh leadership, which helped organise the opposition to the veterans' rally. Later the students were joined by a group of deputies led by Stepan Khmara. The final upsurge, however, came when the general student body of Kyiv finally woke up.

This wave of mass support came just as suddenly as the birth of national consciousness within the student organisations earlier that spring (when the students shed their fear of the system and made ready for the struggle, even if it meant the most serious consequences for them). On the twelfth day of the hunger strike, a series of strikes spread throughout Kyiv's universities and institutes and the central streets of the capital were filled with columns of youths. This seemed strange. A day earlier the Kyiv students still timidly by-passed the hunger strikers. The following day, however, they were already on the streets. There were continuous rallies beside the tent city. After October 15, as a result of the mass march to the Supreme Soviet, a tent city appeared outside the republican legislature (this demonstration was even sanctioned by the city council). That same day a column of students, who were continuously demonstrating in the streets, occupied the red campus of Kyiv University. By the following day seven other Kyiv campuses had been occupied. The strike began to spill over to workers' collectives (the workers began to form strike committees and gradually joined the student demonstrations). Ukraine was almost completely covered with tent cities of hunger strikers in solidarity with our demands. The principal events were in the western *oblasts* of Ukraine although the eastern Ukrainian cities of Kharkiv, Zaporizhia and Donetsk also distinguished themselves.

On October 16 the Supreme Soviet, whose Communist majority was a day before still demanding that order be restored by force, set up a negotiating commission. The following evening, October 17, the document issued by the commission was signed.

Formally this document met all the students' demands. In practice, however, only two demands were fully met, a compromise was reached over two others, and one (concerning the assets of the CPU and Komsomol) was rejected by the Communist majority. Despite all this, the issuance of this document signified the most important victory of Ukraine's democratic forces over the colonial regime in the period of the third national rebirth. The Supreme Soviet's decree that a new union treaty could not be signed prior to the adoption of a new UkrSSR Constitution blocked Moscow's attempts to force Ukraine to sign the union treaty as soon as possible. The postponement of this issue was fatal. Other points of the decree were also important. They practically determined the direction taken by the Supreme Soviet for a whole year, although ultimately became realised only after the failure of the recent Moscow coup. The main issue was naturally to postpone the signing of a new union treaty.

After the October demonstrations the student and youth movement in general found itself in a difficult situation. On the one hand everyone was caught up in euphoria (how the students alone achieved more than all the democratic forces of Ukraine put together); on the other the student movement remained split between east (USS) and west (SB).

On November 7 the USS opposed the compromise reached between the democratic organisations and the authorities over the commemoration of the Bolshevik Revolution in Kyiv and decided to disrupt the military parade on Victory Square. Several thousand militia with the support of the Kyiv military garrison had no difficulty in clearing the square of 150 or so students. A small group of students then managed to barricade themselves in the Rukh building, voicing their protest at the passing parade. But this was no great achievement.

After November 7 the authorities launched a counter-attack. Stepan Khmara was arrested. All the criminal cases which were initiated during the hunger strike and were later delayed were now put into motion again. New conflicts, however, arose within the student movement. One after another USS and SB actions ended in failure. They had a local character and only served to destroy the authority that the student movement had acquired earlier, which only encouraged the Communists.

In January 1991 student leader Oles Doniy was arrested. Preparations were also made for the arrest of a number of other activists. This caused the USS and SB to work together for a short while, but this new atmosphere of cooperation did not lead to fresh widespread opposition to the authorities. In a sudden volte-face the Communist leaders decided to end the assault against the students; the Khmara affair became the only case against the democratic activists. Doniy was released and

the student rapprochement again sank during further negotiations. The student organisations continued to function. Ukrainian students, for instance, went to Vilnius to defend the Lithuanian parliament. Although local activities in Lviv and Kyiv continued, the impasse was obvious. The idea of creating a youth party on the basis of the student organisations was being discussed in student and youth circles. However, in order to realise this idea it was first necessary for the two student organisations to unite. The leaders of the Lviv SB tried to force events. The Kyiv students, on the other hand, dragged their feet hoping to gain the same position within the new structure as their colleagues from Lviv. Finally when a joint congress of the USS and SB met in Kyiv (March 1991) the leaders of the two organisations could not reach an agreement. The congress was held in an atmosphere of confusion. Although a single organisation — the Ukrainian Student Association (SUS), was formally announced, an executive comprised of people who had no authority in the student movement and were thus in no position to head the new organisation was elected. This was another Kyiv-based leadership, which represented no-one and whose later activities led to the profanation of the student movement. The chain of failed actions and mutual pretensions continued. Gradually the student organisations began to concentrate more and more on infighting.

After the declaration of independence on August 24 the need for a revolutionary student movement has subsided. Although these organisations still exist they have outlived themselves. The reluctance to become involved in any less fundamental but constructive work in defence of student rights, the development of our higher education and the upbringing of our youth deprives existing student structures of the opportunity to find their place in the new political situation in Ukraine. If nothing changes soon they are doomed to eventual extinction, although their achievements have already become a part of the history of the struggle for Ukrainian independence.

Perhaps this essay has shattered some people's illusions about the contemporary student movement in Ukraine. It is, however, an accurate description of our student movement. Although it lacked firm organisational structures and was based almost exclusively on enthusiasm, it was staunch and uncompromising in its dedication to the cause of Ukraine's liberation. In conditions of fierce struggle against the authorities it grew in strength before our eyes only to face decline in periods of relative calm. The student movement will never reach the same peak again, but the high productive potential of the Ukrainian students (still the most nationally-conscious element of Ukrainian society) remains, and one can surmise that in the near future it will form new organisations, and continue to work for the Ukrainian cause.

HISTORY, AS "TIME FUTURE"

By Roman Zwarycz

With the accelerated collapse of the USSR, i.e. the Soviet Russian empire, well under way, all humankind is presented with what many view as a worrisome dilemma, while others see a unique opportunity. While some are troubled by a spectre of chaos in this critical geopolitical area of the world and project a wave of instability spilling over into regions of the globe that were once controlled by Moscow, others welcome the liberating breath of fresh air, the exuberance of freedom and hope, that has been released with the demolition of Moscow's expansionist/terror apparatus. This paper is unabashedly and unapologetically written from the latter perspective, a point of view that was recently eloquently expressed by Lewis H. Lapham in an article that appeared in *Harper's* magazine:

If the future is never any further away than the next sentence, the next gesture, the next best guess, then it belongs to the people who possess their own history, rely on their own history, rely on their own experiments, and speak in their own voices. The great argument going forward in the storm of the world is the same in the United States as it is in what was once the Soviet Union. To the best of my knowledge it is the same argument that enlivened the scaffolds of Renaissance Italy and the annals of imperial Rome. In brief and in sum, it is the old and often violent argument between time past and time future, between the inertia of things-as-they-are and the energy inherent in the hope of things-as-they-might-become. ["Notebook; History Lesson," *Harper's*, Vol. 283, No. 1698, November, 1991, p. 13]

Briefly, at the risk of seeming to be unscientifically subjective, this essay is punctuated by that ebullient "hope of things-as-they-might-become"; it is history viewed as "time future", i.e., it seeks to present a historical analytical framework for the events presently unfolding in what was once the USSR in particular, and in the world in general, with a view towards developing a working theoretical paradigm for the future.

History—a universal progression towards freedom and justice

Since history was first recorded, humankind has been a witness to an uninterrupted struggle for universal justice, for a truly just and free world order. The human condition can, indeed, be defined in accordance with that irresistible, inherently human desire to live in freedom and justice. From this perspective, it

would not be an oversimplification to state that history may be viewed as a chronicle of this universal progression towards an ever-more sophisticated, progressive and clearer perception of justice, which is subsequently incorporated in a given political system, in actual sociopolitical inter-relations, both "externally", i.e., on an international scale, and "internally"— within a particular system of government and law. Throughout history, given the ebbs and flows of humankind's universal progression towards a just and free world order, various forces have come to the fore, some in the name of justice, others — using force in an attempt to throttle this irrepressible human will to justice, that has, indeed, become characteristic of the human condition. Ultimately, the final criteria by which history has judged these processes and forces, their "progressive/revolutionary" or "retrogressive/reactionary" nature, is to what degree they facilitated in advancing humankind to a higher plane of understanding, towards a more progressive conception of that Platonic "Good", or that Kantian "categorical imperative", i.e., a commitment to effectuate in sociopolitical interrelations humankind's more-developed, collective understanding of the ideal of universal justice.

The modern era in human history was ushered in with the French Revolution of 1789, a period during which the universal ideal of justice was inextricably linked with what was initially a purely European phenomena, that only later, primarily in the 20th century, acquired global magnitude: the recognition of the universal rights of man. This notion, i.e., that every human (rational) being has certain inalienable rights and liberties, concretely manifested itself in two parallel historical processes: on a macro level: as the political enfranchisement of nations and, on a micro level: as the enfranchisement of the individual. In sum, the two principles of national rights and individual liberties, the agenda of nationalism and democracy, were certainly not mutually exclusive trends, as some have argued, but actually reinforced each other, as two concurrent manifestations of one fundamental process. The emerging nations of the 19th and 20th centuries all soon realised that individual rights and liberties are incomprehensible within the inhibiting vacuum of colonial enslavement, and only acquire concrete political meaning within conditions of national sovereignty and statehood. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, whose ideas gave birth to the French Revolution and, in some measure, to the modern age of nation-states, very forcefully argued that a people, i.e., a nation, can become a completely enfranchised political entity only upon having appropriated its sovereignty, i.e., its right to rule itself, its right to self-legislation. It is only through a nation's sovereignty that an individual can become a fully enfranchised "sovereign" being, i.e., a citizen. To put it in other words, an individual who is oppressed within conditions of colonial tyranny remains something less than fully human. Democracy is incompatible with colonialism.

The incorporation of individual rights and liberties can only occur within a

genuine civil society in which the rule of law has been firmly anchored in that society's legal/constitutional and political/institutional framework. In other words, individual enfranchisement at the very least requires an antecedent, or — in conditions of colonial enslavement — a concurrent enfranchisement of the people, the nation, in general. While democracy stresses individual rights and liberties, individual interests, nationalism, on the other hand, underscores the need to pursue public policy with a view towards the common good. Aristotle had as early as the 4th century B.C. argued that any genuine civil society, i.e., a society that is structured around some specific understanding of the ideal of justice, does not so much require the subordination of individual interests to the common good, as rather a proportional reconciliation of these two seemingly conflicting agendas according to a mutually acceptable principle of distributive justice.

The modern age is the age of nations, and modern history is primarily propelled forward with an irresistible dynamism by the struggle of the various peoples of the world to establish their own national and independent, democratic nation-states; or — to paraphrase Lewis Lapham — to speak in their own voices, to take possession of their own histories, all of which taken together make up the multifarious history of modern civilisation.

On the cusp of a new historical era

History can never stand still, frozen in some vacuous state of suspended animation. It is always being propelled forward with an irresistible dynamism, as the past is continuously being transcended by the future, with the present becoming a fleeting blur in the vortex of historical change. In our human consciousness, however, we maintain a certain reassuring ballast of sanity amidst this whirlpool of flux because of our innate capability to acquire a historical memory; a memory that is not only an abstract, lifeless recording of the past, but which also projects a meaningful vision of hope regarding the future. While some may choose to perceive this vision as fraught with dangerous risks, others find it pregnant with promising possibilities... Every nation, every individual that took up the struggle in the name of universal justice and freedom needed to first develop such a vision from the latter perspective: from the position of the irresistibility of hope for the future. To amplify the risks that any major undertaking entails, particularly in the universal struggle for justice, is to project the failures of the past into the future; is equivalent to not being able to differentiate these two temporal realms.

Many Western scholars and statesmen fail to realise that the colonised peoples of the world must, in fact, live in the future, since they cannot perceive any hope in the present. Perhaps it is natural for the powerful industrialised democracies of the "First World" to maintain a steady course that is dictated by a need to sanctify the existing status quo. Perhaps this attitude, which sees modernity as some myopic matrix within a static consciousness of the past, may be why the dynamics of

national liberation, with its inherent revolutionary ramifications, are so foreign to many of the leaders of the Western Democracies. They fail to appreciate the fact that their own democratic order was initially secured and later flourished largely because of these very same dynamics. History, however, cannot be denied, not because of a determinist wizardry of some sociopolitical theory, but precisely because of the inherently human will to justice.

The most dynamic force of historico-political processes of the modern age has been the struggle of the individual against all forms of injustice, a struggle that has been fought since time immemorial, and which in its present, historically most developed and progressive form is represented by the aspirations of once colonised peoples to national independence. This struggle also presents humankind with a key to resolving most, if not all of today's international and sociopolitical problems. This key is something that many have called the idea of nationhood, i.e., on the one hand, from the perspective of a just and free world order — a mutual respect towards every nation's right to independence, sovereignty and statehood; and, on the other hand, from the perspective of civil society — a recognition of the nation, its common good, as the most fundamental regulating factor of all social and political relations within a sovereign nation-state. The first, "external" aspect of this "national ideal" was eloquently expressed by President Woodrow Wilson in his Fourteen Points, specifically in the principle of national self-determination. This principle has subsequently come to be understood in international law as the right of all peoples to national independence, sovereignty and statehood (see: the United Nations Charter, The UN Resolution on Decolonization from 1960, and, in particular, the UN Resolution on Namibia from 1976). The second, "internal" aspect of this principle was most forcefully expressed by President John F. Kennedy in his inauguration speech from 1961, which echoed Rousseau's thoughts on a "General Will" and in which this visionary US President stated: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country".

The irreversible triumph of the national ideal over all types of supra-nation, i.e., imperialistic, concepts and constructs has been firmly entrenched in the evolving historical processes of the modern era. The fact that nearly all the colonial-imperialist systems and sub-systems of the world have collapsed over the course of the 20th century under the weight of the national-liberation aspirations of the colonised peoples of the world is a testimony to the irrepressibility of humankind's triumphant march towards universal justice and freedom. Today it is clear that sooner or later even the last empire of the world — the Soviet Russian "prisonhouse of nations", which in its most contemporary form was formally and deceptively called the "Union (*implying voluntary submission, R.Z.*) of Soviet Socialist Republics (*implying autonomous self-rule, R.Z.*), is now on the verge of total dissolution. This historical anachronism in this age of nations has stood as an impassable barrier on the road of humankind's historical progression; an

obstacle that impeded any progress towards a new, higher, more advanced stage of human development, characterised by a more superior, more clearly crystallised conception of universal justice and freedom. Without the final dissolution of this reactionary imperialist system, the ideal of justice remains unfulfilled in this modern historical era.

A genuinely new world order, or a reordering of the old?

US President George Bush has often spoken of the opportunity presently facing all of humankind to build a "new world order". The military campaign that was undertaken by the Western Democracies against Iraq in January 1991 was partially rationalised by the justifiable argument that Saddam Hussein represented a serious threat to this newly emerging order. Moreover, the fact that the United States was able to rely on Mikhail Gorbachev's tacit and at times reserved support for this undertaking was presented by Washington as proof positive that not only had the Cold War ended, but that a new era of friendship, global peace and security had already been launched. Ironically enough, with the world's attention diverted to the ominous events unfolding in the Near East, several days prior to the Allied (sic., or more precisely — overwhelmingly American) invasion of Iraq, President Gorbachev, our newborn "democratic" friend in the USSR, smugly presided over a bloody Soviet military invasion of the independence-minded, democratic Lithuanian Republic. The rhetoric of "a new world order", however, dictated that President Bush quickly dismiss this invasion as an accidental aberration in the incipient new era of friendly US-USSR relations.

Following the aborted August 19 coup in Moscow, the United States nearly bent over backwards to artificially prop up Gorbachev's "central" authority, which by now is nothing more than an anachronistic icon of the USSR's imperialist past. Lewis Lapham is certainly not alone when he uses the phrase — "what was once the Soviet Union", since he sees history from the perspective of "time future". President Bush and the foreign policy establishment in Washington and the other capitals of the industrialised democracies, with their firmly-entrenched status quo myopia, are desperately trying to re-formulate Western policy, albeit, however, from the anachronistic perspective of "time past". The simple point that the West fails to understand is that the world has changed, not only cosmetically, but rather at the very core of its political order; the very structure of international relations has undergone a revolutionary transformation with the collapse of the USSR as a dominant, oftentimes odious, force in the world. The *de facto* and *de jure* dissolution of the USSR has also led to the incontrovertible collapse of the multi-dimensional client-state relationships that Moscow has established over the years with many countries of the Third World, and through which Moscow was able to project its power throughout the world, by keeping these countries in a position of servility.

The United States had accepted Moscow's incremental territorial expansionism by rationalising it according to the principle of "spheres of influence", although over the years the West's own "spheres" began to erode, as Moscow became more forceful in pursuing its policy of expansionism, which itself was justified by the USSR's ubiquitous support for something that was euphemistically termed — "wars of national liberation". Ironically enough, the USSR's accelerated collapse was itself predicated by the internal processes of national liberation that ultimately tore assunder the Soviet Russian imperialist system of oppression.

Having itself been victimised by Moscow's support for "wars of national liberation" in the Third World countries, the West, and the United States in particular, was unable to fully appreciate the dynamics and the potential of national-liberation processes within the USSR. In spite of President Bush's rhetoric of a "new world order", he, nonetheless, arrogantly lectured the Ukrainian people on the dangers of "suicidal nationalism" during a trip to Kyiv — the Ukrainian capital this past summer. Would President Bush have the audacity to label George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, or even Patrick Henry, who once said — "Give me liberty, or give me death!" — "suicidal nationalists?" The American Founding Fathers had a noble historical vision of a genuinely new world order, of a world built upon the universal ideals of freedom and justice, because they saw history as "time future", from the perspective of "things-as-they-might-become". President Bush's "new world order" is, apparently, simply a rhetorical disguise for a modified status quo; it is, in fact, a reordering of the old, *ancien regime*, because otherwise he would be more true to the revolutionary American heritage and support the Founding Fathers of the newly-independent nation-states of what was once the USSR.

The true architects of a new, genuinely just and free world order are not the status quo forces in the West, but rather the nations that were formerly subjugated by Soviet Russian imperialism and communism in the USSR and what were once the "satellite" countries of Eastern Europe, since they are the ones that successfully dismantled the last empire, thereby paving the way for a genuine restructuring of international relations. This new world order, liberated from Moscow's nuclear blackmail, or the rather demented determinist wizardry of "mutually assured destruction", had already been projected, as an ideal vision, in the national-liberation struggle of the subjugated nations. This is a vision that is grounded in the universal ideals of freedom and justice, that presages a world free from all forms of colonial exploitation and the fundamental cornerstone of which is the national ideal, as the key to global peace and security. The only question that remains to be answered is whether the West can articulate a vision from the the perspective of "time future" and become co-architects with the newly-independent nation-states in building a global system of freedom and justice, of peace and security, of mutual respect for every nation's right to "speak in its own voice!"

MYKHAILO DRAHOMANIV AND ENGLISH LITERATURE

By Prof. Dr. Roxoliana Zorivchak

Mykhailo Drahomaniv — a Ukrainian scholar with European reputation, civic leader, publicist, political and social thinker — lived and worked at a time when Ukraine was ruthlessly persecuted by tsarism. In one of the darkest periods of Ukrainian history this fervent patriot did his utmost, dedicated all his intellect to show the whole world that his homeland had not perished and never would, despite the tyranny and despotism of the oppressors, in spite of Valuyev's circular and the Ems Ukase. Drahomaniv perceived the problems of his homeland, enslaved as it was, within a broad international context. He realised that Ukraine's historical destiny — that of being a country deprived of statehood — did little to enhance or encourage the development of Ukrainian studies in the Western world. He was also well aware that Ukrainian literature was rising above the level of a "literature for domestic consumption" and beginning to emerge as a complete national literature owing in a large measure to translations from foreign languages.

Mykhailo Drahomaniv was tireless in pursuing his aim: to contribute to the intellectual development of his people by enriching them with masterpieces of world culture into which elements of Ukrainian spirituality had been moulded. Having coined his motto "with our feet deeply in the native soil but with our head well in Europe", he insisted upon literary and social links between Ukraine and Britain, France and Germany, as, in his opinion, the English, French and Germans were the most civilised nations. He often urged his countrymen to study foreign languages, English and French in particular. "What Europeanisation can we be speaking about without knowing either languages or literature?", he wrote in his "Third letter of a Ukrainian to the editors of 'Druh'" ("A Friend") — "Tretiy lyst Ukrayintsia do redaktsiyi 'Druha'".

Belonging himself to an enslaved people Drahomaniv was greatly interested in Ireland, Scotland and Wales.

Lesia Ukrayinka's letter to him of March 15, 1892, informs us that it was Drahomaniv who suggested to her the plot of the poem "Robert Bruce, King of Scotland", particularly the episode with a spider. In a brilliant English translation by Vera Rich the passage in question sounds as follows:

And thuswise six times fell the spider
And six times she climbed, till at last,
The seventh time, she was victorious,
And the thread to the wall was made fast.

Straightway Robert sprang to his feet, grasped
His sword to his hand in grip sure,
And cried, "Can it be that a knight has
Than a spider less will to endure?"

In his article on Ukrainian literature in the years 1866-1873 Mykhailo Drahomaniv emphasised the renaissance of the Cymric language in Wales (a squat peninsula with an area of over 8,000 square miles which had been united — according to the official terminology — politically, administratively, and economically with England ever since the Act of Union in 1536 — R. Z.) and pointed out that in 1874 there were 25 newspapers in Cymric for 800 thousand population while in 1843 there had been only one. In the very article he writes that the Manx people of the Isle of Man (in the Irish Sea) have their own translation of the Holy Scriptures and ABC books. He also stressed that the English themselves promoted the development of the Cymric and Celtic languages and encouraged their study.

Drahomaniv was well read in English literature and held its authors in high esteem. Being a historian by profession he has not written separate scholarly works on British literature, but he has to his credit a number of original ideas concerning it which merit consideration, the major personalities being viewed by the Ukrainian critic in the context of Ukrainian-British literary links (these were pioneering efforts). They are expressed in his critical, memoiristic and epistolary writings.

In his memoirs "The two teachers" Drahomaniv describes visiting his Latin teacher Kazimierz Polevich while at Poltava Gymnasium and getting acquainted for the first time with "King Lear" in the Russian translation of Alexander Druzhinin. In his scholarly works Drahomaniv emphasises the vernacular character of Shakespeare's language. "I have been and I am of an opinion that with some modifications the great psychological dramas by William Shakespeare 'Hamlet', 'Macbeth', 'King Lear', 'Othello', both may and should be read by our peasants. They should also be staged for them, and I always feel keen regret that Marko Kropyvnytskyi and Mariya Zankovetska are not endeavouring to stage 'Hamlet' in the translation by Mykhailo Starytskyi", he wrote in his "Letters to Ukraine over Dnipro" — "Lysty v Naddnipriansku Ukrayinu". In another of his works Drahomaniv voiced an opinion that by using the idiom of Ukrainian popular songs and tales one can translate "King Lear", "Macbeth", "Hamlet", "Richard III", "Timon of Athens" into Ukrainian. "Shakespeare is read throughout the world", Mykhailo Drahomaniv wrote with enthusiasm in his work "Some queer thoughts on the Ukrainian national cause" — "Chudatski dumky pro Ukrayinsku natsionalnu spravu". In his article "Russian, Great-Russian, Ukrainian and Galician Literature" — "Literatura rossiyska, velykoruska, ukrayinska i halytska" — he considers William Shakespeare the only historical playwright, emphasising the romantic component in his writings.

On the other hand, he did not idealise everything in Shakespeare's writings. "There is much cynical and obscene in Shakespeare's works as well, he wrote, to be enjoyed by a rough and vulgar mob and not essential at all for the principal aim of his grand creations" ("A word about cynicism in literature" — "Slivtse pro synyzm u literaturi").

When some Shakespearean plays ("Othello", "Troilus and Cressida", "Comedy of Errors" — translated by Panteleimon Kulish, and "Hamlet" — rendered by M. Starytskyi) and Johann Wolfgang Goethe's "Faust" (translated by Ivan Franko) were published in Ukrainian Drahomaniv wrote an enthusiastic article in 1882 entitled "Goethe and Shakespeare in Ukrainian translations" — "Goethe i Shekspir v perevodye na ukrainskiy yazyk" — in "Volnoye slovo" ("A Free Word") edited by him in Geneva. In the above article he was proudly proclaiming, "The translations are proving that the Ukrainian language is not worse than any of the modern Slavonic languages as to the riches of its vocabulary, its elegance and expressiveness. Neither does it lack any notions to be difficult to render into it both the depth and profoundness of philosophical ideas and the artistic images".

At the Third International Folklore Congress (Chicago, 1893) Mykhailo Drahomaniv was to contribute a paper entitled "The taming of the shrew in Ukrainian folklore". Unable to attend the Congress himself, Drahomaniv's paper was read there in absentia on July 15, 1893, and was followed by a rather extensive discussion. In his paper the author traces the Shakespearean topic in Ukrainian folklore and arrives at the conclusion that tales having as a theme the taming of the shrew may have penetrated into Ukrainian literature from Western Europe as well as from Asia. The scholar draws a comparison between the Ukrainian variants of the travelling plot and the Danish, German, Italian, Spanish, Gasconian ones and demonstrates the national peculiarities of the Ukrainian versions suggested by the Ukrainian way of life and world outlook.

Drahomaniv's paper was published in English in the materials of the Congress (1898). It was reprinted in the daily "Svoboda" ("Freedom") on February 17, 1945, and in 1952 it was published again in New York together with the materials of a Symposium on Drahomaniv organised by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of Drahomaniv's birth.

Mykhailo Drahomaniv was a participant of the First (held in Paris in August 1889) and the Second (held in London in October 1891) International Congresses of Folklorists.

At the Gymnasium Drahomaniv got acquainted with the novels of Walter Scott. In his "Austro-Ruthenian memoirs" ("Avstro-ruski spomyny") he wrote that he had spent many nights reading Scott's works in bad Russian translations from French.

In his speech honouring Mykhailo Maksymovych at the meeting of the Kyiv Branch of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society on November 18, 1873,

Drahomaniv emphasised the significance of Walter Scott, whom he considered “the only historical novelist in world literature”, for the awakening of interest in popular poetry throughout Europe:

“The romantic trend could more easily appear and develop in the countries where at the end of the 18th century most traces of the ancient way of life survived. In Western Europe Scotland was one such country. Scottish legends, particularly James Macpherson’s Ossianic poems, provoked a great interest and enthusiasm in the second half of the 18th century. Macpherson was followed by Sir W. Scott who published collections of Scottish folk ballads (1802, 1803), his own poems in the style of romantic lore, his novels describing the life of old Scotland and the later Middle Ages in general. Doubtless, W. Scott gave birth to the writings of Charles Dickens and William Makepeace Thackeray and the Scottish legends elaborated and published by J. Macpherson and W. Scott provoked interest in popular literature and antiquity throughout Europe which yielded scientific, literary and social results”.

In his opinion, Ukraine has much in common with Scotland in that respect. Drahomaniv voiced the opinion that the works of Walter Scott had promoted the interest in popular poetry in Russia. The same was true of Ukraine.

While writing on the significance of local dialects for the development and enrichment of literary languages Drahomaniv points out that by using his own dialect Robert Burns influenced the writers of Germany who being inspired by his example began writing in Alemannic, Bavarian and Low-German dialects. In another article he names Burns alongside Taras Shevchenko and Alexey Koltsov as folk poets. The scope of the paper precludes any broad proof that as a folk poet Shevchenko has done much more for Ukraine than Koltsov has done for Russia or Burns for Scotland.

While analysing the novel “At the Black Sea” by Ivan Nechuy-Levytskyi, Drahomaniv makes some very interesting assertions about George Gordon Byron saying that the English bard hated certain national features of English life and way of thinking and left England for Greece. But while devoting himself to the cause of Greek liberation he has also done a great deal for England by developing among his own countrymen a critical view of their own way of life.

Drahomaniv insisted upon the significance of the Ukrainian translations of Byron’s works for the enrichment of the Ukrainian language and literature. In his biography of Mykola Kostomariv he emphasised that the latter had translated into Ukrainian “The Hebrew Melodies” by George Byron. Under Drahomaniv’s influence Mykhailo Starytskyi, who mastered French sufficiently well, translated Lord Byron’s romantic tale — the poem “Mazeppa”, into Ukrainian from a French translation. In his “Austro-Ruthenian memoirs” (“Avstro-ruski spomyny”) Drahomaniv maintains that at the beginning of 1867 or 1868 he sent a number of books and manuscripts, including a very good translation of the poem “Mazeppa”, to the editors of the Lviv magazine “Pravda” (“Truth”) through Mykhailo Dymet

from Lviv. Unfortunately, adds Drahomaniv, the manuscript of the translation was lost; only the introduction — “Zaspiv” — was published in the magazine. In actual fact the manuscript has not been lost: it was recently discovered by Danylo Kuzyk. It is now kept in the archives of Volodymyr Barvinskyi at the Lviv State Vasyl Stefanyk Library of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (No. 4661, pos. 302).

Mykhailo Drahomaniv was happy to learn that Panteleimon Kulish was working on a translation of Byron's last and greatest work — “Don Juan”, simultaneously noting that the novel would be less comprehensible to Ukrainian common folk than the plays “Hamlet”, “Othello” and other works by Shakespeare.

Drahomaniv highly esteemed Charles Dickens and William Thackeray. In 1873 he wrote that these two English writers were the greatest novelists of the last decades, that they had created a realistic trend in literature. He also describes the lyrical component in Dickens' writings and notes that it is essential to translate Dickens' works into Ukrainian because in order to become a good author one should be well acquainted with Dickens' works. Drahomaniv strongly believed that the vocabulary of Ukrainian folk songs and tales should be used in translating Charles Dickens' the “Christmas Carol”.

Drahomaniv was also greatly interested in the history of the English Church. In the second half of the 19th century the peasants of Ukraine who were dissatisfied with the official Orthodox faith founded an evangelical movement called Stundism. Considering Protestantism more amenable to progress than either Orthodoxy or Catholicism, Drahomaniv showed an unwavering interest in the emergence of evangelical sects in Ukraine. In the early 1890s he wrote a series of pamphlets, including one on John Wycliffe, hoping to encourage religious nonconformity and acquaint the Ukrainian peasant reformers with the traditions of Western Protestantism. In his pamphlet Drahomaniv accentuated the fact that Wycliffe had translated the Bible from the Vulgate into vernacular English. The reformer had in fact translated the Bible with his followers, and it is uncertain which part Wycliffe took for himself in the two 14th-century translations of the Bible, which tradition had always associated with his name. John Wycliffe is also mentioned in Drahomaniv's article “Some queer thoughts on the Ukrainian national cause”.

Drahomaniv strove to alert European opinion, that of the English in particular, to the plight of the Ukrainian people under tsarism and to the wealth of Ukrainian spiritual culture.

The seventies and nineties of the 18th century in England were marked by a whole series of articles and books dealing with Ukrainian ethnography and literature. This interest was greatly promoted by Drahomaniv, and it was not without his influence that the English Slavonic scholars — primarily William Richard Morfill and William Ralston — were interested in all matters concerning Ukraine. Drahomaniv was absolutely right when he wrote in a letter to the “Old

Community" ("Stara Hromada") of February 8, 1866, "three-quarters of everything written by the Europeans about Ukraine during the last 10-15 years was written about the popular poetry, and for the last five years about my Geneva publications".

While an assistant professor at Kyiv University Mykhailo Drahomaniv published an article in the "Athenaeum", the leading British journal of English and foreign literature, science, the fine arts, music and drama, — "The Kyiv Branch of the Russian Geographical Society and the last minstrel of Ukraine". In it he characterises the most important collections of Ukrainian folk poetry, from the 1819 collection by Mykola Tsereteli (Tseretev) to the two-volumed "Memorials of Southern Rus'" by Panteleimon Kulish (1855-1856) and "South-Rus' popular tales" by Ivan Rudchenko (1869-1870). Drahomaniv also adds that the absence of a dictionary with Ukrainian as a source language greatly impedes the study of Ukrainian poetry by foreigners.

In his article Drahomaniv describes the activities of the Kyiv Branch of the Russian Geographical Society, which carried out extensive research in Ukrainian geography, ethnography and economics. He also provides a detailed description of the most recent meeting of the Society when Ostap Veresay, the famous kobza-player recited some characteristic dumas and songs from his repertoire. According to Drahomaniv, at the same gathering Oleksander Rusov delivered a report on the biography of Ostap Veresay and Mykola Lysenko presented a paper on Ukrainian popular melodies and music, which included Veresay's music. For the first time Drahomaniv gave the British reader a detailed account of the dumas. In his opinion, they were analogous to the Serbian songs, Spanish romances and Scottish ballads, while greatly differing from the Russian bylinas in their historical content, for they spoke principally of the wars of the Ukrainian people against the Tatars, Turks and Poles in the 16th and 17th centuries.

Although Victorian anonymity and pseudonymity prevent our knowing for certain which possible pieces of doubtful authorship may be safely attributed to Mykhailo Drahomaniv, one can, nevertheless, assume that he did publish articles in English periodicals. Thus in his letter to the people of Kyiv of February 8, 1886, Drahomaniv wrote that he was about to finish an article on the Zaporozhian Sich (its political structure and ideas) for an English magazine. In the same letter Drahomaniv mentioned that he had published some articles in the British "Folklore Journal".

When the well-known "Historical songs of the Little-Russian people" (vols. 1-2, Kyiv, 1874-1875) by Volodymyr Antonovych and Mykhailo Drahomaniv appeared, the "Saturday Review" published a sympathetic anonymous review on June 5, 1875. William Ralston's authorship of the review was evidenced in a letter written by Drahomaniv to Omelian Ohonovskiy on November 13, 1893, "Reviews of the 'Historical songs of the Little-Russian people' by me and Antonovych were published in the 'Athenaeum' (by Ralston) and in the 'Saturday Review' (also by him)".

Professor Aleksander Chodzko's work "Les chants historiques de l' Ukraine", which contained translations of Ukrainian dumas from the collection of Antonovych and Drahomaniv, also inspired an enlightening review by William Ralston in the "Athenaeum" (No. 2715, November 8, 1879, pp. 592-3) and the "Academy", a weekly review of literature, science and art (vol. XVI, 1879, October 18, pp. 276-277).

Ivan Franko wrote in his article "The most ancient Ukrainian folk song" that once they became acquainted with the collection of Ukrainian historical songs by Drahomaniv and Antonovych, such Western scholars as Ralston and Morfill in England and Alfred Rambaud in France were astounded at the thousand-year-old tradition of the Ukrainian song.

The correspondence between W. R. Morfill, the first British Ukrainist, and Mykhailo Drahomaniv lasted from 1871 until 1895 (the year of Drahomaniv's untimely death). Because their letters have not survived (as far as is known) most of the facts are obtained from the correspondence between Drahomaniv and Mykhailo Pavlyk and M. Buchynskyi. On October 4, 1871, Drahomaniv wrote to Buchynskyi from Heidelberg, "From Prof. Morfill... I received a letter saying he was very much obliged to me for having sent him 'Memorials of Southern Rus' by P. Kulish and 'Songs...' by M. Maksymovych... Morfill writes that Ukrainian is worth investigating but unfortunately it is rather difficult to master". From the same letter we learn that Drahomaniv had already sent a collection of folk tales by I. Rudchenko to Oxford. In his letter to Buchynskyi of February 9, 1873, Drahomaniv wrote, "I have received a letter from Oxford from Prof. Morfill whom I sent not long ago a collection by Amvrosiy Metlynskyi. He says he would like to become a diligent student of Ukrainian but it is rather hard for him to study it without a dictionary. He only has the grammar by Osyp Levytskyi". Drahomaniv asked Buchynskyi to send Morfill a more detailed Ukrainian grammar written in Ukrainian by Mykhailo Osadtsa, which was done in due course.

Ivan Franko may also have provided Prof. Morfill with Ukrainian books. In his letter to Drahomaniv of September 22-23, 1892, Franko asked him for the British professor's in order to send Morfill Ukrainian books. In his reply of September 29, 1892, Drahomaniv provided Franko with Morfill's address.

In July 1892 the two scholars met in Paris. Drahomaniv wrote to Mykhailo Pavlyk from the French capital on July 27, 1892, "In Paris we [Drahomaniv and his wife — R. Z.] were cordially received by our friends... Among them was Prof. Morfill who happened to be here from Oxford".

Mykhailo Drahomaniv held William Morfill in high esteem. When in April 1886 the British scholar visited Lviv and the Lviv newspaper "Delo" ("Work") printed only a short announcement of his visit, Drahomaniv expressed his indignation in a letter to Ivan Beley, the editor of the newspaper, on April 19, 1886, pointing out

that it was shameful to give this British guest, who had written a number of works about the Ukrainians, only a brief mention. He went on to list these works.

Professor W. Morfill bequeathed his greatest treasure — the library of classical and Slavonic literature — to Queen's College. Since 1936 it has been preserved at the Taylor Institution (one of Oxford's largest centres for studying European languages and literature), placed there on loan by the Provost and Fellows of the Queen's College.

In July 1990 I was a participant of the Fourth World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies in Harrogate, Yorkshire. During my stay at Oxford prior to the Harrogate Congress I was privileged enough to work at the Morfill Collection. Dr. David Howells, a member of staff at the Taylor Institution, was kind enough to assist me in every possible way including a visit to the cemetery where W. Morfill is buried. I was the first researcher from Ukraine to work there. I had a rather extensive notion about the Collection. In 1984 Dr. Howells had sent me an inventory of Ukrainian books and journals kept there. But now I had the opportunity to hold each book in my own hands, to look through notes made in Professor Morfill's handwriting, to photocopy the title-pages with dedications to the British scholar.

The Ukrainian books and journals in the Morfill Collection number 110 valuable items, which include a number of multi-volumed editions, such as Volodymyr Hnatiuk's six-volumed "Ethnographic material of Hungarian Rus'" ("Etnografichni materyialy z Uhorskoyi Rusy" — Lviv, 1897-1911). The collection contains some valuable books by Drahomaniv: "Historical songs of the Little-Russian people" ("Istoricheskiye piesni malorusskago naroda", Kyiv, 1874, vol. 1, compiled with Volodymyr Antonovych), "Little-Russian folk legends and tales" ("Malorusskiye narodnyie predaniya i rasskazy", Kyiv, 1876), "Political Songs of the Ukrainian People in the 18th and 19th Centuries" ("Politychni pisni ukrayinskoho narodu XVIII-XIX stolit", Geneva, 1883, vol. 1), the four-volume collection of his folkloristic papers — "Researches in Ukrainian Folk and Written Literature" ("Rozvidky pro ukrayinsku narodniu slovesnist i pysmenstvo", Lviv, 1899-1907), the first issue of the Geneva journal "Community" ("Hromada") published in 1878. All these books were presented to Prof. Morfill by Mykhailo Drahomaniv, as is clear from the dedications on the title-pages in the latter's own handwriting in Ukrainian, French or Russian. The Morfill Collection also contains books by Panteleimon Kulish, Ivan Steshenko, Oleksa Kovalenko, Borys Hrinchenko, Mykola Voronyi with dedications from their authors. Particularly moving is the dedication by Mykhailo Pavlyk on a book dedicated to Mykhailo Drahomaniv and compiled by him: "Mykhailo Petrovych Drahomanov: 1841-1895. His jubilee, his death, his autobiography and the list of his works" ("Mykhailo Petrovych Drahomanov: 1841-1895. Yeho yubiley, smert, avtobiografiya i spys yeho prats",

Lviv, 1896) — “To the friend of the Deceased and our Ukraine, the Highly esteemed Professor W. R. Morfill — Lviv, Dec. 26 1895 — M. Pavlyk”.

Like most good subjects of research Mykhailo Drahomaniv is a bottomless pit. And it goes without saying that the study of his activity as a literary intermediary between Ukraine and the Western world, primarily the Anglophone, is as yet in a nutshell.

Out Now

The Third Reich and the Ukrainian Question. Documents 1934-1944

By Wolodymyr Kosyk

In this 175-page collection Wolodymyr Kosyk subjects the Third Reich's attitude towards the Ukrainian question to a painstaking analysis by compiling and commenting on the crucial documents covering a decade (1934-1944) which encompasses both peace and war.

This period of German-Ukrainian relations has heretofore been largely overlooked by Ukrainian and other scholars. Thus, Kosyk's attempt is a pioneering one. He draws the materials for his work from such unimpeachable sources as: the German Federal Archives (civil and military), the German Foreign Ministry, and the International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg.

Published in 1991 by the Ukrainian Central Information Service, London

Price: £8.00 (\$15.00 US)

Orders to be sent to:
UCIS, 200 Liverpool Road, London N1 1LF.

ISBN 0-902322-39-7

NEWS FROM UKRAINE

CONTENTS

UKRAINIAN PARLIAMENT ISSUES TEMPORARY BAN ON COMMUNIST PARTY . . .	34
SUPREME COUNCIL PRESIDUM DISCUSSES PLANS TO SET UP DEFENCE MINISTRY	35
UKRAINE, BYELORUSSIA SIGN TREATY; RECOGNISE EACH OTHER'S INDEPENDENCE	37
UKRAINE'S SUPREME COUNCIL CONVENES FOR FIRST POST-INDEPENDENCE SESSION	37
RED FLAG AT ISSUE IN KYIV	39
KRAVCHUK VISITS CANADA AND USA	40
IVANO-FRANKIVSK RALLY MARKS FORMATION OF INSURGENT ARMY . . .	40
PLANS UNFOLD FOR MOBILISATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ARMY . . .	41
LESIV KILLED IN AUTO CRASH	42
PRIVATE UNIVERSITY FORMED IN KYIV, NAMED KYIV-MOHYLIAN ACADEMY .	43
VETERANS OF UKRAINE'S LIBERATION STRUGGLE HOLD CONGRESS . . .	44
SUPREME COUNCIL OF UKRAINE MEETS IN FOURTH SESSION; MILITARY ISSUES FOREMOST IN THE DELIBERATIONS	45
UKRAINE BOWS OUT OF ECONOMIC PLAN. FEAR OF NEOCOLONIALISM IMPACTS DECISION	46
UKRAINE WANTS CHORNOBYL CLOSED BY 1993	48
BUSINESS TRAINING RAPIDLY BECOMING A MAJOR PRIORITY IN UKRAINE .	49
UKRAINIAN BISHOPS HOLD MEETING; RELEASE STATEMENTS ON INTER-CONFESSIONAL RELATIONS, INDEPENDENCE	50

Unless otherwise stated, all the material in this section was provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service

UKRAINIAN PARLIAMENT ISSUES TEMPORARY BAN ON COMMUNIST PARTY

KYIV, August 25 — Following the declaration of independence, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine adopted a resolution on the nationalisation of the assets of the Communist Party (both the CPSU and the CPU) on the territory of the newly-independent country. This decision entails the confiscation of buildings, printing and publishing houses, transport and other possessions of the Central Committees of the CPU and CPSU in Ukraine.

The same day the Kyiv city council resolved to impound the building of the CPU Central Committee. A special commission consisting of people's deputies, interior ministry officials and ordinary citizens sealed off the building. All confiscated papers were taken away for investigation.

According to People's Deputy of Ukraine Yuriy Zbitnev, similar actions took place in Zhytomyr, the Volyn region, Transcarpathia and in other areas of Ukraine. The Lviv oblast council had already impounded party assets on August 23.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet also decreed an amnesty on the occasion of the declaration of independence by Ukraine. All 10 political prisoners: Batovkin, Berezanskyi, Vyniar, Vorobiov, Holovach, Kovalchuk, Lupynis, Ratushnyi, Serhienko and Khmara were released late that night.

People's Deputy Stepan Khmara, however, refused to leave his cell in the Lukyaniv prison, since to do so and to accept the amnesty, Khmara argued, would be tantamount to recognising his own guilt.

Khmara was on trial on trumped-up charges of assault against militia Colonel Ihor Hryhoriev on November 7 of last year. On August 26 Khmara was reported to have left the prison.

August 25 was marked by a series of demonstrations. The first was held outside the city council in Kyiv, where the demonstrators demanded the nationalisation of party assets, already ratified by the Supreme Soviet.

This was followed by a demonstration outside the Supreme Soviet building, where the Presidium was due to meet at 2:00 pm to demand the imposition of a ban on the Communist party and the release of all political prisoners.

The demonstrators then proceeded to the CPU Central Committee, where they found that a city council commission had already started work on impounding the building. Forming a column, the protesters marched to Independence Square, led by People's Deputy Oles Shevchenko and the deputy chairman of the Rukh political council Bohdan Ternopilskyi.

The day's fourth rally began at 5:00 pm on Independence Square, attracting a large crowd of Kyivites and representatives from other Ukrainian oblasts. They were joined by the demonstrators who had arrived from outside the Supreme Council and the CPU Central Committee.

Narodna Rada (the democratic opposition in the Ukrainian Supreme Council) deputies Oles Shevchenko, Pavlo Movchan, Ivan Zayets, Bohdan Ternopilskyi, student leader Volodymyr Chemerys and representatives of the Ukrainian diaspora addressed the large crowds which had gathered on the square.

The speakers called on all democratic organisations to consolidate their efforts to transform Ukraine into an independent democratic state. The deputies also announced the impending release of Stepan Khmara and the other political prisoners.

The following day the Presidium of the Supreme Council moved one step further, issuing a temporary ban on party activities in Ukraine. A special parliamentary commission was set up to investigate the activities of individual officials, government and party institutions and organisations during with the coup d'état of August 19-21.

On its part the Kyiv city council resolved to officially rename the capital's central October Revolution Square to Independence Square and to dismantle the statues erected by the old order, beginning with that of Lenin. Although it was originally planned to blow up the large monument to the founder of the Soviet Russian empire, another option had to be considered to avoid damaging the subway tunnel which runs below the square. In the meantime Kyivites had begun to take the statue apart with their bare hands, ending the day by dismantling one of the symbols of the system which has oppressed their now independent country for over seven decades.

SUPREME COUNCIL PRESIDUM DISCUSSES PLANS TO SET UP DEFENCE MINISTRY

KYIV, August 27 — The Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Council met to discuss issues pertaining to the fourth session of the parliament. The Presidium resolved to hand over CPU (Communist Party of Ukraine) archives to the central archive department of the Cabinet of Ministers, together with the CPU's premises and technical equipment.

The second issue, presidium member Les Taniuk said, was the establishment of a defence council, and the third — subordination of military commissariats. Other minor issues were also to be considered.

As an additional measure Kravchuk proposed the registration of political parties which opposed the Committee on the State of Emergency, which were previously unregistered. The situation had changed, he said, and these parties needed to be registered.

The agenda further included a discussion on the Ukrainian chief prosecutor, Mykhailo Potebenko, instrumental in the arrest of Stepan Khmara last year and the preparation of the trumped-up charges against the deputy, and the future of the mass media in general, and the removal of their management, which discredited itself by its collaborationist position with regard to the junta.

It was decided to summon Mr. Potebenko, the Prosecutor General, and the chairman of the state television and radio company Mr. Okhmakevych to the meeting of the presidium, to hear them out and only then to make a decision about their future.

The primary issue revolved around the commission headed by People's Deputy Durdynets, who submitted his proposals for the formation of a defence council. Although this was a thoroughly prepared proposal, it did not satisfy the democrats on the presidium, inasmuch as the commission proposed forming the defence council out of commanders of the same military districts that took part in the coup. With warnings that such a defence council would be nothing more than a Ukrainian junta, by the following day the presidium agreed to prepare a concrete candidacy for the post of defence minister, who would then form a suitable defence council. This proposal was accepted in a unanimous vote.

The deputies also decided to set up a permanent presidium commission which would meet every day during the extraordinary situation and discussed economic attributes indispensable to Ukraine as an independent state, which would influence future relations with Russia.

A decision on the union treaty was postponed until after the referendum on December 1.

That day the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine resolved to recognise the independence of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia and establish diplomatic ties with the three Baltic states.

The same day Leonid Kravchuk held his first press conference as head of an independent Ukrainian state. The conference was held in the premises of the permanent commissions of the Supreme Council.

Mr. Kravchuk spoke about the first measures of the Ukrainian government: the impounding of Communist party assets and the temporary ban which had been imposed on the CPU activities. He also pointed out that at a meeting of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet on August 28 a temporary Defence Minister will be appointed.

Kravchuk further stated that Ukraine will protect the rights and interests of all citizens regardless of their ethnic background.

The Supreme Council chairman informed Ukrainian and foreign journalists about his resignation from the CPU Central Committee on August 27. However he refrained from giving a clear answer to questions whether a secret plenum of the Central Committee of the CPU was held in Kyiv. He pointed out that if such a meeting was indeed held after the issuance of the decree of the Council Presidium on the temporary ban on Communist party activities, then competent institutions will have to investigate the matter further.

UKRAINE, BYELORUSSIA SIGN TREATY; RECOGNISE EACH OTHER'S INDEPENDENCE

NEW YORK — Ukraine and the Byelorussian SSR signed on August 31 a treaty recognising each other's state independence, according to a joint press release issued by the two countries' UN missions.

"The treaty, based on the republics' declarations of sovereignty, opens up new prospects in Ukraine-Byelorussia relations, namely mutual recognition of state independence of both republics, full independence in resolving development problems on the basis of mutual benefit, in the spirit of fraternity, friendship and cooperation, the most favoured nation mutual treatment, fulfilment of bilateral obligations on inter-economic relations", said the missions' statement.

The treaty was signed by Anatoliy Zlenko, minister of foreign affairs of Ukraine, and Pyotr Kravchanka, Byelorussian foreign minister.

Since the August 24 Declaration of Independence, the Ukrainian SSR has ceased to exist. The name of the country is Ukraine, and according to a Ukrainian mission spokesman, that is the way the country has been registered in the United Nations. This change is reflected in the joint press release's letterhead.

Zlenko observed, "In the current transition period, this act signifies a lot by itself. But it is also of great importance, due to our initiative to convene in the nearest future a meeting of all republics' representatives (I mean the former Union) and sign an economic treaty. Now we need to preserve both the economic relations and corresponding infrastructure in order to sustain the national economy at the proper level. I believe that Ukraine and Byelorussia will do their best to this end".

Kravchanka commented, "I have always emphasised that Ukraine, this wonderful, industrious land with a 52-million population, should get the status of an independent state. The people in the middle of Europe, possessing such history and traditions has to reestablish what existed in ancient times and in the beginning of the 20th century. We'll always be side by side, we'll always be together".

UKRAINE'S SUPREME COUNCIL CONVENES FOR FIRST POST-INDEPENDENCE SESSION

KYIV— On September 3, 1991, the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet opened its first session, following the Declaration of Ukraine's Independence on August 24. This session was held without the large bust of Lenin, which the deputies had decided to have removed at the last session.

Stepan Khmara, who was imprisoned in November 1990 after the Supreme Soviet had rescinded his parliamentary immunity and who was recently released,

was the first to address the session. After the agenda was ratified, the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet — Leonid Kravchuk, read a speech in which he stated his belief that the central authorities are not capable of resolving the present political and economic crisis.

As the deputies were deliberating, a crowd of 15,000 demonstrators had gathered before the Supreme Soviet building, demanding that the Declaration of Independence be immediately effectuated and that the deputies begin taking concrete steps to establish an independent Ukrainian state.

In a separate vote, the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet appointed Maj.Gen. Vasyl Morozov Ukraine's Defence Minister. Only three deputies voted against Gen. Morozov's nomination.

The following day, September 4, the session continued its work. The deputies voted against reviewing those newspapers that supported the "putsch" of August 19, but presently are posing as "generally political" and even "popular" publications. It was decided that the session would return to this issue at a later date.

Representatives of the recently outlawed Communist Party of Ukraine tried to stage a counter-offensive. The First Secretary of the Chudnivsk district committee — Mr. Panasiuk — read a statement in which he demanded that the decision of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet to ban all Party activity be rescinded. This proposal was voted down by the deputies.

The session also ratified the creation of a Ukrainian Procurator's Office, which is to be headed by Viktor Shishkin. Later in the day, during a boisterous evening session, the Supreme Soviet deputies decided to have the Ukrainian national blue-and-yellow flag raised over the Supreme Soviet building. This decision required three separate votes by the deputies, and it was only taken after the crowd of demonstrators outside the building began storming the barricades in protest against the raising of the red-and-blue flag of the former UkrSSR.

On September 10, 1991, the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine continued its plenary session. People's Deputy Vitaliy Karpenko — the editor-in-chief of "Vechimiy Kyiv", a popular evening newspaper that is published in this capital city, addressed the deputies informing them of an attempt to shut down the newspaper by the recently outlawed Communist Party. He believed that this attempt was motivated by a desire on the part of the Communists to enact revenge against the democratic forces of Ukraine.

[On September 9, the director of the "Kyiv Pravda" publishing house — Mr. Pereverten, who was put into this position by the Communist Party, stated that "Vechirniy Kyiv" will no longer be published, ostensibly because of a lack of paper. The employees of the newspaper, however, stated that they recently received 108 tons of paper. They are demanding the immediate dismissal of Mr. Pereverten and have organised a picket action with this aim in mind].

In discussing the agenda of the session, the deputies decided to reject most of the

propositions of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. Many deputies were harsh in their criticism of the Cabinet of Ministers for having procrastinated in enacting many pressing questions. It was finally decided to include on the agenda such issues as: a review of a number of economic measures, designed to deal with the present crisis; issues concerning the army and the military draft in particular; the need to reorganise the Cabinet of Ministers, the KGB, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

The next question on the agenda was the issue of ratifying the Decrees that were issued by the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet in the interregnum between plenary sessions. Of particular note was the issue regarding a decree, according to which all enterprises and factories in Ukraine are to be placed under the direct jurisdiction of the Ukrainian government no later than October 1.

RED FLAG AT ISSUE IN KYIV

KYIV, September 4 — The red-and-blue flag of the former Ukrainian SSR has been infuriating Kyivites, according to an article in the "Financial Times".

Chrystia Freeland, in a article titled "Ukraine passes to democrats", published in the newspaper's September 5 edition, wrote: "Ukrainian nationalist deputies yesterday gained control of the republic's parliament while outside, as the Soviet flag still fluttered, a large demonstration overturned police barricades and stormed the building chanting 'Down with the red flag'".

Reportedly, a "visibly-shaken" government sent Lev Lukyanenko, chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party, to tell the crowd that the red flag would be replaced by the Ukrainian national blue-and-yellow flag.

Freeland wrote that as the crowd waited, they also chanted "Down with Kravchuk".

Kravchuk, she wrote, "the ex-communist leader of Ukraine, had maneuvered parliament into accepting a compromise to a long-standing dispute over national symbols by threatening to resign if members of parliament did not vote to have both the communist flag and the national one flown atop their buildings. Yesterday's events were thus a personal setback for him".

Freeland expects that due to this, Ukraine "is now likely to steer a more radical course toward independence".

The Ukrainian Communist Party attempted to overturn the government's decision to disband the party. However, Freeland continued, while 324 of the 450 legislators were communists before the failed coup, on the day of the vote to reinstate the party, they could muster only 50 votes.

The democratic legislators took advantage of their superiority by dismissing the communist Prosecutor General, Mykhailo Potebenko, who was responsible for the arrest of Stepan Khmara and the other "Kyiv 7" activists, and replace him with, Viktor Shishkin.

Freeland observed, "The sacking was particularly poignant because Potebenko is the man responsible for jailing many of the former dissidents who are now taking charge".

The lawmakers also voted to restore the parliamentary immunity of Khmara.

Reports from Ukraine indicate, that soon after this story was written, the Ukrainian parliament did vote to adopt the Ukrainian blue-and-yellow flag as the national-state flag of Ukraine.

Commenting on the issue of the flags Shishkin pointed out that, "the raising of the blue-and-yellow flag is in order: the Supreme Council has the right to accept a decision on national symbols. The removal of the state flag, in my opinion, was a violation of the law. This has been rectified — presently the red-and-blue flag is again flying over the Supreme Council. Until the adoption of a new constitution it, as the official state flag, should remain over those premises which symbolise state institutions".

KRAVCHUK VISITS CANADA AND USA

On Sunday, September 22, the chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Council Leonid Kravchuk met the Prime Minister of Canada Brian Mulroney. That day Kravchuk also held a meeting with the Governor General of Canada Roman John Hnatyshyn. The following day, September 23, Ukraine's Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko and the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs Barbara McDougall signed a declaration on relations between the two countries. Both countries desire to develop contacts at all levels, encourage exchanges in the fields of politics, economics, science, education and sports.

In the evening Leonid Kravchuk held a press conference.

On September 24 he flew to Toronto, where he met representatives of the Ukrainian diaspora and prominent businessmen. The same day he flew to the USA.

During his stay in the USA (from September 24-October 10), Kravchuk met President George Bush and leaders of the American Senate (25.9), the chairman of the International Monetary Fund (26.9), after which the Supreme Council chairman of Ukraine visited Boston and Chicago. On September 30 Kravchuk addressed the 46th General Assembly of the United Nations on the present economic, political and military potential of Ukraine.

IVANO-FRANKIVSK RALLY MARKS FORMATION OF INSURGENT ARMY

IVANO-FRANKIVSK — A rally commemorating the 49th anniversary of the creation of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army was held here on October 13.

Under a sea of national flags, the rally's participants marched from the town square through town and paid their respect at the memorial cemetery, where priests

of the Ukrainian Catholic Church conducted a Moleben service in memory of those who died in battle for Ukrainian independence.

From the cemetery the participants proceeded down Stepan Bandera street and placed fresh flowers at the site of a memorial plaque in honour of the OUN leader.

A resolution approved by the participants of the rally states:

1. We demand that the Supreme Rada of Ukraine recognise the OUN and UPA as a military formation.

2. Bearing in mind that the Act of August 24 was approved solely due to pressure from the masses and not with the good will of the Supreme Rada, we demand a referendum on December 1 on the disbanding of the Supreme Rada and reelecting government officials on all levels.

3. We condemn the efforts to separate Crimea, Transcarpathia, Bukovyna from Ukraine.

4. We call on all citizens of Ukraine to vote against the candidacy of Leonid Kravchuk for the post of president and to support Ukrainian independence in the referendum.

5. We reject all Russian territorial claims on Ukraine — alteration of borders is possible only if it favours Ukraine.

6. We demand a decision of the formation of active units of municipal police and the liquidation of the so-called Association of voluntary units and the reallocation of their funds to the newly-formed municipal police, at the next session of the Ivano-Frankivsk city council.

7. We demand the declaration of subdivisions of the KGB and prosecuting agencies on the territory of the oblast as illegal and their reorganisation into national structures with an appropriate change in personnel.

PLANS UNFOLD FOR MOBILISATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ARMY

KYIV — The Supreme Rada of Ukraine took a step on Friday, October 11, towards creating a republican army, approving a plan for more than 400,000 men and women in ground, naval and air forces.

Draft laws to be discussed by parliament in the next three weeks would provide the legal foundation for the armed forces, which lawmakers hope would be formed in the second half of the 1990s.

The army will be under the command of the Ministry of Defence, which is headed by Air Force Maj.-Gen. Konstantyn Morozov, 47. The Ukrainian president will be commander-in-chief of the armed forces. The bill bans the activity of political parties and movements in the armed forces and urges them to use the Ukrainian language.

In the wake of the failed August coup and collapse of Soviet central authority, several of the remaining 12 republics have announced plans to form their own

armed forces. Like Ukraine, these are limited to little more than a home guard for self-defence, with few weapons.

The plan to create an armed force for Ukraine was approved in a closed session of parliament. The republic currently has no tanks, ships, aircraft or even weapons of its own, aside from small arms, but hopes to acquire part of the Soviet navy's Black Sea fleet to defend its coast. Future conscripts and budget contributions to the Soviet military will be supplied only for a centralised force controlling strategic defence, according to the plan parliament approved.

Soviet Defence Minister Yevgeny Shaposhnikov strongly opposes the plans and has sent a letter to Ukrainian military units demanding they remain loyal to the Soviet Constitution. Several regiments based in Ukraine have said they will switch their allegiance to the Ukrainian parliament, according to Ukraine's Defence Ministry.

There are between 1 million and 1.5 million Soviet troops in Ukraine. The first Ukrainian unit to be formed in the coming months will be a national guard for the republic, initially about 20,000 to 30,000 men, based largely on Ukrainians serving as Soviet Interior Ministry troops. They will be armed only with small-calibre weapons.

"Ukraine's armed forces will be used exclusively for defence", said Vasyl Durdynets, chairman of parliament's Defence Commission. "These laws will show the world Ukraine is a peace-loving nation".

Morozov said the army would never possess nuclear weapons, and the government would take part in future international negotiations to remove Soviet missiles from its soil.

Yevhen Marchuk, Ukraine's state minister for defence and state security, said there are at least 150 intercontinental ballistic missiles in Ukraine. The number is believed to be as high as 176.

LESIV KILLED IN AUTO CRASH

IVANO-FRANKIVSK — The Rev. Yaroslav Lesiv, a Ukrainian Catholic priest and noted national activist, was killed in an auto crash near the city during the night of October 8-9.

People's deputy and former political prisoner Stepan Khmara called his death a political killing.

According to Ivan Dmytryk of the Ukrainian Information Service, Lesiv and his driver left Ivano-Frankivsk en route to Bolekhiv, when their car was hit by a black Volga, which immediately left the scene of the accident.

The oblast procurator's office and civic groups are conducting an investigation into the accident.

Lesiv was buried in a church graveyard in Bolekhiv on Sunday, October 13. Several thousand people attended the funeral. The Liturgy was celebrated by Bishop Pavlo Vasylyk of the Ivano-Frankivsk eparchy and local priests. Cardinal

Myroslav Ivan Lubachivskyi passed condolences to the family through Ivan Hel, a member of the Lviv oblast council.

At the wake, many national activists eulogised Lesiv. Among them were Bishop Vasylyk, Stepan Khmara, Mykhailo and Bohdan Horyn, veterans of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and co-inmates of the concentration camps.

PRIVATE UNIVERSITY FORMED IN KYIV, NAMED KYIV-MOHYLIAN ACADEMY

KYIV — A private university with ambitions to rival leading Western colleges has been founded in Ukraine, with tight admissions requirements and tuition equivalent to the average annual Soviet salary. The Kyiv-Mohylian Academy, established on Wednesday, October 16, occupies the same site on the banks of the Dnipro River as the former Kyiv Academy, organisers said. The religious school was closed by the Russian tsar in 1815 after 200 years in existence.

The academy was formed in 1632 by Metropolitan Petro Mohyla. Among its students were hetmans I. Vyhovskyi, Yu. Khmelnytskyi, I. Samoylovych, I. Mazepa, P. Orlyk, P. Polubotok, as well as the Ukrainian philosopher Hryhoriy Skovoroda.

"Ukraine now aspires towards independence and we need people who are very highly educated", said the professor behind the project, Vyacheslav Briukhovetskyi, a literature specialist at the Soviet Academy of Sciences who taught at Rutgers University and Manitoba University.

"We want to create a centre of education and science on the level of Oxford or the Sorbonne, Harvard or Columbia", Briukhovetskyi said at a news conference after the ceremony attended by the chairman of the Ukrainian parliament Leonid Kravchuk.

The Ukrainian government has promised to give the academy 300,000 karbovantsi (roubles) in seed money but no more, he said. The sum is equivalent to \$528,000 at the official exchange rate for international commerce of \$1.76 per rouble. But it is less than \$10,000 at the black market rate. Students will be charged about 4,000 karbovantsi a year, roughly equal to the average annual salary, when classes start next year. All education in the former Soviet Union was free under Communist rule.

Organisers said they want both foreign and local business to sponsor students through their four-year curriculum. It has no students yet, but does have a number of young faculty members, Briukhovetskyi said. The Kyiv-Mohylian Academy will admit students only with two years of study at another institution of higher learning and proficiency in Ukrainian and English.

VETERANS OF UKRAINE'S LIBERATION STRUGGLE HOLD CONGRESS

LVIV — A Congress of the All-Ukrainian Brotherhood of Ukraine's national-liberation struggle took place in this western Ukrainian city on October 12 in the assembly hall of the regional council. The Brotherhood is comprised of Ukrainian soldiers who fought in the ranks of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA — which led a two-front war of liberation during the Second World War), members of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), and former combatants of the Ukrainian National Army. Also attending the congress were many people's deputies, and representatives of several political and civic organisations. The congress coincided with the 49th anniversary of the formation of the UPA.

Prior to the convention of the congress, the participants marched through the centre of Lviv in a commemorative parade.

In his introductory remarks, Roman Pankevych — the secretary of the Brotherhood, spoke about the aim of the congress. Mr. Pankevych stated that the members of the Brotherhood have to be more forceful in demanding that the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine recognise the historical significance of the two-front war of liberation that the Ukrainian people led during and after the Second World War against Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia, and that the OUN and the UPA be accorded their rightful places in Ukrainian history.

Afterwards, Mykhailo Zelenchuk — the Brotherhood's chairman — delivered an address, in which he stated that the congress marks the first time that such a commemorative event was taking place in the ancient city of Lviv. He underscored that the congress is taking place on a considerably high level and he called on the intelligentsia to become a more integral part of the liberation processes in Ukraine.

Mr. Zelenchuk also called upon the Ukrainian youth to intensify its studies of Ukraine's glorious past, in particular of the OUN-UPA's liberation struggle, and to continue the heroic traditions of their forebears. He closed his remarks by stating that the Brotherhood, its members, have a vital role to play in the present processes of state-building, and that the Brotherhood must work in close cooperation with Ukraine's officer corps, particularly with the recently formed Association of Ukrainian Officers, with a view towards establishing a future Ukrainian army.

Petro Duzhyi then read a letter of greeting from the Chairman of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists — Slava Stetsko, which was met with a long round of applause.

The participants adopted a series of resolutions, calling for the recognition of the national-liberation struggle, for the extension of citizenship to all the participants of this struggle who now live outside Ukraine's borders, and for the erection of a monument dedicated to the "Freedom Fighters of Ukraine".

SUPREME COUNCIL OF UKRAINE MEETS IN FOURTH SESSION; MILITARY ISSUES FOREMOST IN THE DELIBERATIONS

KYIV, October 22 — The Supreme Council of Ukraine convened in its fourth plenary session. The deputies proposed to discuss throughout the week the question of the economic union of sovereign republics, to elect a chairman of Ukraine's National Security Service, to discuss the package of laws on defence and Ukrainian armed forces, and indexing of profits, as well as the social security of the population in the present market conditions and a law on trade unions.

The chairman of the parliamentary commission on international affairs — Dmytro Pavlychko, informed the deputies that Rukh, the Ukrainian Republican Party and the Democratic Party of Ukraine are convening a Congress of the Peoples of Ukraine in Odessa on November 16. Mr. Pavlychko urged a speedy discussion of the laws on national minorities.

At the morning session Gen. Konstantyn Morozov — the newly appointed Defence Minister of Ukraine, presented a draft law on defence and the armed forces. Gen. Morozov pointed out that the August coup in Moscow showed that Ukraine is completely defenceless against the threat of a violent overthrow of the government and various encroachments on its sovereignty.

"The armed forces continue to receive various orders from Moscow to halt the formation of Ukrainian armed forces in any way possible", said Morozov.

In his opinion this is leading to uncertainties regarding the armed forces as well as a possible confrontation. "However, the tide of history cannot be stopped. Ukraine will have its own armed forces", Morozov added.

Taking into account the direction of Ukraine's foreign policy, which is reflected in the defence bill, Ukrainian armed forces will be built on the principles of sufficiency for defence of the state and will consist of an army, navy and air force, Gen. Morozov further stated. According to the bill the President of Ukraine will assume the post of commander-in-chief and chairman of the defence council.

Morozov also said that servicemen will swear an oath of allegiance to the people of Ukraine. The law clearly regulates the rights and obligations of state and military institutions towards the armed forces. According to Gen. Morozov, the activities of political parties and organisations will be banned in the Ukrainian army. Soldiers, however, will have the right to profess any religious belief of their choice.

National service is to be introduced in Ukraine. Temporarily the republic will maintain the status of a nuclear power until international agreements on a multilateral reduction in nuclear weapons are reached. The official language of the army will be Ukrainian. Conscripts will serve exclusively on Ukrainian territory and students will be exempt from military service for the duration of their studies.

Since the morning, more than one thousand representatives of the "Greens", union activists and Donbas miners demonstrated outside the parliament building.

The "Greens" were demanding the shut-down of the Chornobyl power station, which continues to threaten the people of Ukraine.

The miners demanded a law on wage reform in 1991, pensions in the current year, work security, minimum holidays of 24 days, collective agreements, a resolution of labour disputes, the establishment of miners' trade unions, leisure facilities, as well as a forty-hour working week for all manual labourers in Ukraine. Leisure activities should be funded by local councils, the coal-miners argued.

From the Cabinet of Ministers the miners demanded a clear-cut government economic programme; the resolution of the problem of price indexes (the miners cited positive examples of the resolution of similar problems in Russian coal-mines); and that ownership of the means of production in the Ukrainian coal industry should be determined by December 1.

Additional demands included the participation of workers' collectives in the privatisation of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Ukraine, the abolition of the 5 per cent sales and service tax and the 1 per cent pension tax.

At the evening session the Supreme Council ratified in the first reading the laws on defence, the armed forces, the national guard and border troops. The laws foresee the formation of national armed forces in Ukraine throughout 1992.

Col. Volodymyr Kukharets was appointed commander of the republican guard. Major-General Valeriy Hubenko is to head Ukraine's border troops.

The deputies also adopted a law on state borders, according to which Ukraine's borders are inviolable and the territory of the republic indivisible.

UKRAINE BOWS OUT OF ECONOMIC PLAN. FEAR OF NEOCOLONIALISM IMPACTS DECISION

KYIV — Ukraine, asserting its sovereign independence, refused to sign the economic agreement with other republics of the former Soviet Union, charging that the pact would hamper the realisation of its national statehood.

"History has given us a chance to become an independent nation, and we don't want to be a colony", declared Ivan Plyushch, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian parliament, in a television interview.

Plyushch observed that the economic accord, as drafted, didn't provide Ukraine with enough independence. He characterised the agreement as a political game and said it represented efforts by the central government to control the republics. It also doesn't take into consideration objections that Ukrainian leaders raised about the earlier drafts, he noted.

Plyushch fears that the economic treaty will lead to a political accord and warned that these efforts amount to blackmailing the republics into reviving the hated

centralised communist command structure. He explained that Ukraine was not averse to an economic community, but it must be mutually convenient and not be controlled by Moscow. "We could never sign the treaty in its current form", he said.

The economic agreement calls for a unified currency and central bank, something that the Ukrainian parliament and its chairman Leonid Kravchuk have opposed.

Plyushch also said that Ukraine objected to a provision of the economic accord that would divide responsibility for the Soviet Union's \$68 billion foreign debt among the republics by January. That could saddle Ukraine with enormous debt payments.

Volodymyr Pylypchuk, head of the parliamentary commission on economic reform, pointed out that Ukraine wants its own monetary system. "With this plan we will have only responsibilities, but no independence", he said.

"The logic of that agreement is incomprehensible", stated Volodymyr Hryniv, deputy chairman of the parliament. He said many proposals by Ukraine were not considered.

Chairman of the Supreme Rada Leonid Kravchuk had said the republic will sign no agreement that jeopardises "a single drop" of its statehood.

Articles in some American newspapers demonstrate that the Ukrainian population favours the move and would rather have Ukraine go it alone.

The decision is seen in Moscow and around the world as a major obstacle to the success of the economic agreement, which was signed in Moscow on October 18 by representatives of eight republics and the USSR.

Some say that Ukraine's participation is crucial to the success of Gorbachev's plans to renew the union. He sees the economic agreement, to be fleshed out with 17 accords on specific areas, as the prelude to a Union Treaty establishing a new political relationship. Some republican leaders, however, are prepared to stay in an economic relationship for the time being but reject any attempt to bind them into a new political union. Gorbachev said in a television interview on Saturday, October 5, that it was unrealistic to think of economic ties without political ties. He also said he could not imagine a Soviet Union without Ukraine.

In the aftermath of Ukraine's boycott, Aleksandr Rutskoi, vice-president of the Russian republic, observed, "I do not know if Ukraine will survive without Russia, but I definitely know Russia will survive without Ukraine".

Rutskoi further complained, "You see what's going on in Ukraine and elsewhere? Some people think that democracy is doing anything you want. It's not. Democracy is the rule of law".

American government officials and those from other countries have stated that participation in the economic agreement would be a prerequisite for Western financial aid.

German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher on Thursday, October 17, called on the republics of the disintegrating Soviet Union to maintain a degree of economic cooperation.

Among the voices in favour of Ukraine's participation in the agreement was that of Prime Minister Vitold Fokin. While disavowing Rutsloi's critical statement, Fokin said the decision not to sign was dangerous for Ukraine as well as Russia.

"It would be very dangerous, as much for Ukraine as for Russia, to stay apart like perfect strangers. This would be a big tragedy", he said. "There is no real reason not to sign this agreement".

The treaty calls for cooperation and coordination in the following areas: enterprise, the marketing of goods and service, transportation, energy, power and information, monetary and banking systems, finances, taxation and prices, capital and securities markets, labour, customs rules and tariffs, foreign economic relations and currency policy, government scientific, technological, investment, ecological, humanitarian and other programmes, standardisation, patenting, metrology, statistics, bookkeeping and accounting.

Associate members who wish to sign certain clauses rather than all of them are permitted. The agreement was signed by representatives of Armenia, Byelorussia, the Kazakh SSR, Kyrgyzstan, the Russian SFSR, Tadzhikistan, the Turkmenian SSR, Uzbekistan and the USSR.

UKRAINE WANTS CHORNOBYL CLOSED BY 1993

KYIV — The Ukrainian parliament passed a resolution on Tuesday, October 29, urging the immediate shutdown of one of the remaining nuclear reactors at Chornobyl and an early closing of the entire trouble-plagued power plant.

The 1986 nuclear disaster at Chornobyl, the world's worst, took one of the four reactors out of commission permanently, but three others have continued to operate amidst ongoing concerns about safety.

A fire last month at one reactor — which caused damage and raised fears but which was extinguished without leaking radiation — renewed safety questions about the plant.

An investigation of the blaze found that some of the old safety problems remained. Although firefighters were praised for their skill, they showed up without any special protective gear.

The Ukrainian move to close Chornobyl was prompted by results of the latest probe.

Despite existing plans to close Chornobyl by 1995, the parliament wants the fire-damaged reactor shut down immediately and the other two Chornobyl reactors closed in 1993.

Ukraine asked the UN to help dismantle the Chornobyl plant and set up a special fund to carry out the decision.

BUSINESS TRAINING RAPIDLY BECOMING A MAJOR PRIORITY IN UKRAINE

The Supreme Council of Ukraine will soon adopt a law on private property that will also regulate a transfer to a free-market economy. This law, however, will still need to be implemented, something that will probably be a difficult task, considering that Ukraine's economic life was completely based on the Soviet centralised command system. The most pressing problem today is the training of qualified personnel for a free-market economy in Ukraine. This task of training personnel has been taken up by the International Institute of Management (IIM), based in Kyiv. IIM is a joint Ukrainian-Swiss enterprise, set up several years ago by members of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences with the support of the diaspora and experts from the International Centre for Technical and Vocational Training in Turin, as well as several Western companies interested in future economic cooperation with Ukraine.

IIM is a commercial institution. Its source of income is the wide educational network centred in Kyiv. The curriculum is diverse. Its task is first of all to acquaint the graduates with all aspects of free-market business, as well as its management. Additionally, the students have to learn English, following which they attend a two-month practical training course in Switzerland. IIM also offers short-term courses in which specialists on various levels of managements can study particular aspects of modern economics without having to leave their present jobs.

The director-general of IIM is O. Bilous, a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences. His assistant is V. Mashtabiy. The rest of the staff includes: the director of studies — Dr. S. Panchenko, Prof. Dr. S. Kozachenko, and M. Sydorenko — the head of the state committee to help small businesses.

IIM also has an advisory council, headed by Bohdan Havrylyshyn, an economist from the diaspora, who is also the chairman of the advisory group to the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Council. Members of the advisory council include foreign political activists, corporate directors, and academicians from Great Britain, the USA and Switzerland.

The business world of the West actively supports IIM, which is largely comprised of specialist lecturers from Ukraine and the West. Such companies as Canada's Alcan Aluminium Limited, Anowa from Switzerland, British Petroleum, Daimler-Benz and others are interested in the Institute and cooperate with it. Speaking to a correspondent of "Silski visti", V. Mashtabiy pointed out that it is not easy to obtain an IIM diploma. Graduates must possess a detailed business knowledge and a great deal of practical experience and must be able to defend their diploma in English, he said.

Mashtabiy further stated that the training of businessmen in Ukraine is now generally widespread. Numerous management institutes are conducting or

participating in various kinds of training courses, although all this is taking place hastily and with a lack of sufficient knowledge. There are many such courses in Ukraine, which are often organised for commercial reasons. The need for a school which would become a methodical centre for businessmen is becoming increasingly apparent. IIM is on the path to founding a National School of Management, as a centre of business studies and practical training. So far, however, only the first steps have been taken. IIM today is capable of training 1,500 new-style business managers every year. Ukraine, however, already needs 30-50,000 businessmen, and the needs will increase in the immediate future.

M. Sydorenko told "Silski visti" that a wide spectrum of programmes has been effectuated in Ukraine today on such issues as demonopolisation, privatisation, the development of business — all of which requires well-trained personnel.

This activity is closely linked with the state fund to support Ukrainian businesses, which is financing the training of future personnel. Sydorenko pointed out that today the number of small businesses in Ukraine is nearing one million, but many businesses lack practical experience.

Presently, the black market is dominant in Ukraine, as well as its various off-shoots. In the near future Ukraine has to attain a normal "civilised market". For this transformation to occur, it will be necessary to train tens of thousands of people. This is the main task of IIM, which in the near future should become an academy for the study of the economic situation in Ukraine and should organise a school of business.

UKRAINIAN BISHOPS HOLD MEETING; RELEASE STATEMENTS ON INTER-CONFESSIONAL RELATIONS, INDEPENDENCE

LVIV, November 12 — The bishops of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church in Ukraine met on Wednesday, November 6, in the residence of the Cathedral of St. George to discuss several issues currently facing the Church. The meeting was led by His Beatitude Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivskyi, Major Archbishop of Lviv and head of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church.

Joining him were Archbishop Volodymyr Sterniuk, auxiliary bishop of the Archeparchy of Lviv; Bishop Sofron Dmyterko, bishop of Stanislaviv (Ivano-Frankivsk); Bishops Filemon Kurchaba, Yulian Voronovskyi and Mykhailo Sapryha, auxiliary bishops of the Archeparchy of Lviv; Bishop Pavlo Vasylyk, auxiliary bishop and co-adjutor of the Eparchy of Stanislaviv; and Bishop Ireney Bilyk, auxiliary of the Eparchy of Stanislaviv; Bishop Ivan Margitych, auxiliary of the Eparchy of Uzhhorod-Mukachev.

Bishop Ivan Semediy, bishop of Uzhhorod-Mukachev and Bishop Josyf Holovach, auxiliary bishop of Uzhhorod-Mukachev, were invited to attend the meeting but were travelling outside Ukraine at the time. Representing Bishop Semediy at the meeting was his chancellor, Father Yuriy Sobol.

The primary topic of discussion was the participation of Ukrainian Greek-Catholic bishops in the Synod of European Bishops to be held in Rome on 28 November to 14 December 1991. His Beatitude Myroslav Ivan will lead a delegation from Ukraine which includes Bishops Dmyterko and Semediy. Bishop Ivan Martyniak of Peremyshl will also attend the Synod.

Of equal importance during this meeting was discussion of the current problems in Ukraine between Ukrainian Greek-Catholics and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate. In recent weeks, representatives of the Patriarchate have made accusations against the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church that it has chosen an agenda of violence and blackmail.

The Ukrainian Greek-Catholic bishops of Ukraine categorically rejected these accusations as false and inflammatory. The bishops noted that the leadership of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church has repeatedly directed its faithful to abstain from any inflammatory and aggressive actions, regardless if these actions may be of a defensive nature. The bishops also acknowledged that the hierarchy of the Churches can not be held responsible for the actions of individual faithful; that there are many divisive elements in Ukraine which are provoking misunderstandings between the confessions but that the policy of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church is to live in Christian peace and mutual understanding with the believers of all confessions in Ukraine. All hierarchs present signed an official statement.

The bishops also signed statements on the referendum on the independence of Ukraine which will be held on December 1 and a letter to Bishop Slavomir Miklovs, bishop of Krizevci, Yugoslavia

Regarding Ukrainian Greek-Catholic participation in the two inter-confessional commissions which have been set up in Ukraine, the bishops decided to continue participation in these commissions and to dedicate all efforts to the development of closer relationships with all confessions in Ukraine.

Finally, the bishops agreed to the creation of a Ukrainian division of the social-aid organisation "Caritas". They appointed Monsignor Ivan Dacko, vicar general of the Archeparchy of Lviv, as general director of Caritas in Ukraine. Each of the three eparchies will appoint a director for their particular territory.

Press Office of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church

DOCUMENTS & REPORTS

CONTENTS

UKRAINE FACES TWO PATHS	53
RESPONSE OF CARDINAL LUBACHIVSKYI	
TO ACCUSATIONS OF MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE	56
UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST LEADER ASKS BUSH TO RECOGNISE UKRAINE . . .	57
APPEAL OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF UKRAINE	
TO THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE	60
SECOND UKRAINIAN OFFICERS' CONGRESS	<i>By Eugene Kachmarsky</i>
INITIALLING THE SECOND PEREYASLAV TREATY	<i>By Ihor Dlaboha</i>
UKRAINE'S LEADERS SUBMIT TO MOSCOW'S PRESSURE	<i>By O. Chabarovskiy</i>
REFERENDUM ON INDEPENDENCE AND THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION . . .	68
• UKRAINE GOES TO THE POLL	68
• ARMED FORCES OPT FOR INDEPENDENCE	68
• UKRAINE EMBRACES INDEPENDENCE IN LANDSLIDE VOTE	68
• SIX CANDIDATES SEEK UKRAINE'S PRESIDENCY	69
• RUNDOWN OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES IN UKRAINE	70
• IN PURSUIT OF THE LEADER	<i>By Viktor Fedorchuk</i>
• CENTRAL ELECTORAL COMMISSION ANNOUNCES	
OFFICIAL ELECTION RESULTS	76
• UKRAINIAN PRESIDENT INAUGURATED	76
INDEPENDENT UKRAINE'S POSITION ON SEVERAL KEY ISSUES	79
• UKRAINIAN FOREIGN MINISTRY STATEMENT	79
• DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF NATIONAL MINORITIES	81
• STATEMENT ON THE MILITARY	83
• STATEMENT OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF UKRAINE	
ON THE NON-NUCLEAR STATUS OF UKRAINE	84
POSITION PAPER: ON UKRAINE'S NATIONAL SECURITY	85

Unless otherwise stated, all the material in this section was provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service

UKRAINE FACES TWO PATHS

Below is a statement issued on September 18 by the members of the National Council, the democratic opposition in the Ukrainian parliament, to the Supreme Council.

On August 24, the Supreme Council adopted an Act, proclaiming the independence of Ukraine. The practical realisation of this document requires energetic actions by the Supreme Council, its presidium and the government. However, today, these actions are absent. At the same time, the economic and civic-political situation in Ukraine has become more difficult and is characterised by the following:

1. The complete domination of the national economy by an absolutely ineffective command economy instead of a market economy. The command economy is proceeding on its inertia and is coming to a halt. The market economy has not yet acquired strength and does not have enough support from the government structures. In the next two months, Ukraine will be facing a paralysis of its national economy.

2. Throughout the world, including Europe and the countries of the former Soviet Union, Ukraine is perceived as being a communist, nondemocratic partial state, which is the result not only of the position of the chairman and presidium of the Supreme Council during the coup on August 19-21 but also because of the absence of practical steps to reform government structures in the wake of the Declaration of Independence.

3. The KGB, MVD and other structures, which personify the totalitarian regime, not only have not been reformed but have been left without personnel changes, which is extremely dangerous for democracy and an independent Ukraine. Efforts are under way to reactivate the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

4. Civic demagoguery, which is characterised by the ceaseless addresses and talks by leading individuals about the transition to a market economy, defence of human rights, recognition of Ukrainian independence, etc., have reached a critical point. Simultaneously, the dissatisfaction of the people is growing, primarily because of their economic status. The foundations are being laid for a civic explosion.

5. The Supreme Council and the government do not have a clear plan of action in this time of crisis.

6. There exists a real threat to discredit the Declaration of Ukrainian Independence.

Realising our responsibility and after analysing the civic-political situation in Ukraine, we consider it essential to declare:

The most important question, on which depends the fate of Ukraine, is the matter of hastening economic reform. Consequently, it is immediately necessary:

1. As regards the command economy structure, to strengthen existing and create new structures in the Cabinet of Ministers, which deal with the question of economic reform. Subordinate under them the structures of the command economy and not vice versa, as is the case today.

2. To liberalise prices, rescind wage controls, introduce income indexes; move to direct economic contacts and a market division of goods and material resources. To liberalise external economic relations, rescind quotas, embargoes, licenses, etc. on the export of goods, institute the best environment for private and cooperative businesses and distributorships. To open hard-currency accounts for Ukraine in foreign countries. Simultaneously to introduce our own currency and to ensure an effective mechanism for anti-inflation regulation. Furthermore, to implement measures to deregulate and demonopolise the economy, to privatise government and communist holdings. To create the most favourable conditions for foreign investments and businesses.

3. To create favourable conditions for free enterprise on the territory of Ukraine, including taxation, social welfare, customs tariffs, access to material, scientific and technological, natural and informational resources. To establish an economic infrastructure.

Realising the absolute importance of immediately resolving these questions, at the same time we appreciate that their resolution can only be undertaken by the overt political will of the Supreme Council, its presidium and the government. That will, which is extremely essential to the people of Ukraine, does not exist today. Therefore we demand:

1. The dismissal of those deputies of the Supreme Council, who directly or indirectly supported the Emergency Committee in Moscow. Place the question of confidence in them before their electorates in the form of a referendum.

2. We demand the dismissal of the following members of the presidium; Kotsiuba, Pecherov, Biloblotskyi, Matviyenko.

3. The dismissal of the leadership of the Secretariat of the Supreme Council of Ukraine and the complete overhaul of the Secretariat.

4. The dismissal of the Minister of the Economy Minchenko, the Finance Minister Kovalenko, the Minister of Trade and Transportation Hladush, the director of the foreign finance bank Terpylo, the Minister of Justice Boyko, and the director of the state television and radio company Okhmakevych.

5. The dismissal of the staffs of the KGB and MVD, and their total reformation.

6. The reformation of the committee on defence, state security and emergency situations. Hasten the formation of a Ukrainian army and a Ministry of Defence.

7. The election of a new Supreme Council.

8. The initiation of preparations for a new government structure and local self-government based on a presidential form of government.

9. In the case of a paralysis of the executive branch of government, we believe it essential to institute a presidential form of government. Due to the complexity of today's civic-political situation and the necessity for immediate structural and staff changes that have been dictated by the decisions of the temporary commission of the presidium of the Supreme Council for investigating the activity of principal individuals, government institutions, the government, civic associations and organisations in connection with the coup, we are convinced that it is essential to reschedule the presidential elections for the Spring of 1992. Otherwise, the presidential election campaign will mask the reality of an economic catastrophe. The political battle for presidential votes will waste time, demoralise the political will of the people, which must be directed today towards building the foundations of statehood and resolving the unpostponable social-economic problems.

10. The adoption of a clear concept of Ukraine's role in the dissolution of the USSR. Appoint an authoritative delegation to decide and negotiate the question of bilateral relations between Ukraine and the former republics of the USSR. Recall the current Ukrainian representative to the Union.

11. The radical reorganisation of the mass media. Hasten the adoption of a new law on the mass media.

12. We support the appeal of 31 people's deputies of Ukraine — economists, who have called for immediate economic reforms.

We feel it essential to take an active role in the preparation of bills and laws of the Supreme Council relating to the issues raised here. Ukraine today stands before elections. Either it will proceed along the path of thorough reforms in the direction of democracy and independence, or the unfinished discussions about democracy and independence will continue to conceal the inability of the Supreme Council and government to lead our nation out of this historic impasse.

People's deputies of Ukraine: Vitaliy Melnychuk, Yakiv Zayko, Fedir Sviderskyi, Stepan Khmara, Volodymyr Shcherbyna, Henrikh Arturian, Serhiy Semenets, Tetiana Yakheeva, Larysa Skoryk and 80 other members of the Supreme Council.

RESPONSE OF CARDINAL LUBACHIVSKYI TO ACCUSATIONS OF MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE

Lviv, 31 October, 1991 — Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivskyi, Major Archbishop of Lviv and head of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church, made the following statement regarding allegations in a statement released by the external affairs division of the Moscow Patriarchate on 11 October. The statement explained the decision of Patriarch Alexis II to decline an invitation to attend the Synod of European Bishops in Rome from November 28 to December 14, 1991.

Statement of Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivskyi

"I have reviewed the statement released by the Moscow Patriarchate in response to the invitation of His Holiness Pope John Paul II to Patriarch Alexis II to attend the Synod of European Bishops. I have also read the response of the Holy See and am grateful for its defence of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church against the harsh and untrue allegations of the Russian Orthodox hierarchy.

Prior to my return to Ukraine and since, I have attempted to begin dialogue with the Moscow Patriarchate in an effort to reach a point of mutual understanding and of peace. These attempts, which have been made both publicly and privately since 1988, have been ignored so far. To say that the Ukrainian Greek-Catholics have refused the path of dialogue is, therefore, simply untrue.

As head of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church, I find it categorically unacceptable that the Moscow Patriarchate should make such slanderous and unfounded accusations against this Church and its faithful. We have suffered much and have quietly accepted the fact that the Moscow Patriarchate has been openly hostile towards us during the times of our repression and now, when the people of Ukraine so desperately need a shining example of moral strength and unity among its Christian leaders. I should also underline that this situation exists only with the Orthodox of the Moscow Patriarchate and with no other confession.

It is impossible for any Church to be responsible for the actions of its individual faithful. The people of Ukraine, regardless of their religious confession, have suffered greatly under the repression of the former government and they need the gentle guidance and compassion found in the words of Our Saviour Jesus Christ. They need to see that the leaders of the various Churches are witness to the unity found in the Word of God. In the particular case of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, this must be preached by the pastors of both Churches.

Let this statement serve as a public directive to the priests of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church to focus on this unity and reconciliation in their sermons and daily work among our faithful.

I have called together the Bishops of our Church in Ukraine to make a formal response to this statement and to take concrete action. This statement and an announcement of these actions will be made public. I ask our faithful throughout the world and in Ukraine to pray for us during this time so that the Holy Spirit will guide us.

In closing, I can only say it is regrettable that the Moscow Patriarchate insists upon making untrue and unfounded allegations against the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church. As I have publicly stated before, the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church stands on the principles of Christian love, forgiveness and justice. We call upon the Moscow Patriarchate to abandon its divisive actions and begin a coexistence with us in Ukraine which will be built upon peace and justice”.

Press Office of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church

UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST LEADER ASKS BUSH TO RECOGNISE UKRAINE

Munich, November 6, 1991

His Excellency George Bush
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
USA

Dear Mr. President!

On August 24, 1991, Ukraine proclaimed its independence from the Soviet Russian empire, which was already partially dissolved long before the aborted coup attempt. The national-liberation processes, that had been unfolding since the Soviet Union's inception, if not long before the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, had reached a critical point this past summer. The events of this past August clearly indicate that the various non-Russian peoples, heretofore subjugated by Moscow in the USSR, would no longer yield in their desire for freedom, independence and statehood before any kind of terror or intimidation tactics. The coup attempt represented a last-ditch effort on the part of Soviet Russian imperialist forces in Moscow to salvage what was clearly a historical anachronism and an aberration in this era of liberation.

With the Declaration of Independence of August 24, the former Ukrainian SSR ceased to exist, being supplanted by a new juridical person in international law, a new state entity called — UKRAINE. This date marks the partial culmination of

the dreams and struggles of many generations of Ukrainians, who have lived under tsarist Russian and then Soviet Russian colonial tyranny for many long decades, if not centuries, and whose yearning for freedom and national independence actually grew in fervor, despite various attempts to physically destroy the Ukrainian people (e.g., the artificial famine of 1932-33). Despite the many political differences in Ukraine today, which is normal for an incipient, or even a fully developed democracy, most of the Ukrainian people are firmly united in one respect: in their determination to reestablish Ukrainian independence, sovereignty and statehood, which is the only guarantee, or at least a precondition, that the Ukrainian people can enjoy the full array of individual rights and liberties. Democracy is incompatible with colonialism. Regardless of whether the United States does or does not recognize Ukrainian independence, this determination to live in freedom in one's own national state, a basic human right, cannot be denied, or obfuscated.

Having declared independence, the Ukrainian people have naturally embarked on a course to solidify this historical declaration by building all the structures necessary for a sovereign political entity to function as such. One of these preconditions is the need to establish one's own national armed forces, a right that no one can deny, since without its own armed forces no country would be able to effectually defend itself from external threats, or — what is more important — effectuate sovereignty over its own national territory. This right of states to maintain their own armies has been one of the cornerstones of international law long before the emergence of the modern nation-state system. In accordance with this basic juridical precept, the United States reminded the government of Lithuania following its declaration of independence in March 1990 that US recognition can only be forthcoming when Lithuania was able to demonstrate that it can exercise sovereignty over its territory, which implies the existence of national armed forces. The government of Ukraine is also asking for recognition, in full cognizance that such recognition can only be extended when Ukraine also demonstrates its capability to exercise national sovereignty by establishing its own armed forces.

For these reasons, we feel that current US policy vis-a-vis Ukraine is somewhat inconsistent in this regard. Recently, Richard Boucher, a US State Department spokesperson, took a very negative position regarding the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet's decision to form national armed forces, stating that "the plans to create a large Ukrainian army appears to run counter to the efforts of all the nations of Europe and North America to reduce military forces and enhance stability..."

We take the liberty to submit, Mr. President, that regional peace and security will not by any means be endangered, but in fact enhanced with the formation of Ukrainian armed forces. Firstly, in light of the fact that Ukraine had just declared its independence, it never had its own armed forces to be able to "reduce" them. For that matter, the Ukrainian government's intention to establish an army of over

400,000 would in fact constitute a considerable reduction of military forces, since presently there are nearly one million soldiers stationed in Ukraine. A 400,000 strong armed force is a rather modest proposal, considering that the Ukrainian population is over 52 million people.

Secondly, the government of Ukraine has made it eminently clear that the formation of such armed forces was strictly defensive in nature and that it has no offensive aims in mind. On no occasion in modern history has Ukraine or its people engaged in any form of external aggression, expansionism or military adventurism. On the contrary, the Ukrainian people have always been victimized by the aggressive, essentially imperialist, ambitions of its neighbors, particularly Russia.

Thirdly, with the catastrophe of Chornobyl still fresh in the minds of all Ukrainians, the Ukrainian people have time and time again enunciated their intent to have Ukraine become a nuclear-free zone. With regard to the instruments of death that are presently deployed on sovereign Ukrainian territory, the Ukrainian government has clearly indicated its unequivocal intention to destroy these missiles, and under no circumstances will it use such weapons to launch a first, or even a preemptive strike against any other state or nation in the world. Given the long and well-documented history of Russian aggression against the Ukrainian people, however, we feel that it would be more prudent for the United States to ensure the Ukrainian people of the US government's willingness to incorporate Ukraine into the West's nuclear deterrent umbrella. Regrettably, the US State Department chose to interfere in the internal relations of a sovereign state, castigating the Ukrainian government for wanting to defend itself and for wanting to exercise its sovereignty over its own territory.

Presently, the Ukrainian government is doing all it can to establish relations with the other sovereign states that were formerly a part of the no longer existent USSR. We feel that the United States can nurture this peaceful process by encouraging such a dialogue, instead of trying to isolate Ukraine from the world community. We encourage you, Mr. President, to at least enter into bilateral relations with the newly-independent Ukrainian state and to help the Ukrainian people and the other peoples that were once brutalized as colonies in the USSR. Such a policy would undoubtedly serve US interests, as the champion of freedom in the world, and pave the way towards the establishment of a new, truly just and free, world order — a vision that the Ukrainian people certainly share with you and the American freedom-loving people.

*Slava Stetsko Chairman
Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists*

APPEAL OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF UKRAINE TO THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE

(Recently the Supreme Council of Ukraine issued the following appeal to the Ukrainian people regarding the up-coming referendum on Ukrainian independence, to be held on December 1 — UCIS)

Dear fellow countrymen!

On December 1 we have to make our choice — to express ourselves regarding the Act of Ukrainian Independence. We are making this choice for ourselves, for our children and grandchildren, for future generations. We have no right to make a mistake. Let each of us in this moment of truth remain alone with his conscience and his thoughts, so that no-one and nothing, apart from responsibility before the people and the future, could have any influence on our decision, for the fate of our young independent state — the future of our fatherland, our native land, rests in our hands.

The Act of Ukrainian Independence is not a creation of politicians, deputies or parties. Independence is the dream of our fathers and forefathers, it is equality with other peoples; it requires much work and boundless responsibility; it is a feeling of pride for one's people and its statehood; it is a love for one's ancestral home; it points the path to the future.

But independence is not an end in itself; it is not a political manoeuvre, but a means to achieve for our country the economic, political, ecological and cultural status, which has brought respect, prosperity, progress and democracy for the majority of peoples of our planet.

The Act of Independence is the continuation and implementation of the Declaration of state sovereignty of Ukraine, the logical culmination of all social developments of recent years, an understanding of the need and urgency of fundamental changes in our lives.

We have immense economic potential and vast resources; we have support in the world; our nation is industrious and wise, and so we are convinced that the path we have chosen is correct. We believe that only an independent Ukraine can guarantee prosperity and freedom for its people, not only Ukrainians, but also Russians, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Jews, Byelorussians, Moldavians and other national groups that make up our country.

Ukrainian independence is the inalienable right of the people, laid down in the UN Charter, to make independent political and international decisions, to choose friends and partners in the world.

Ukrainian independence is the only way to stop the impoverishment of our people and to create living, working and leisure conditions, which are worthy of our people and which distinguish the leading countries of the world.

Ukrainian independence is not alienation and isolation from the world, but the need to live according to our own thinking, our own efforts, answering for every step we take and cherishing the results of our work and creative efforts.

Ukrainian independence is the right and obligation to build a democratic, civilised state based on the rule of law, where the fundamental values will be genuine rights and the sovereignty of the individual, guarantees of progress and dignity for every citizen, every representative of every nationality, and respect for every ethnic minority that lives on Ukrainian territory.

There is no other way for Ukraine but independence.

This is the position of the Supreme Council. Therefore, putting our faith in the wisdom and political maturity of the Ukrainian people, we have in full consciousness decided to go ahead with the all-Ukrainian referendum. We urge you to support the Act of Ukrainian Independence.

Fellow countrymen! Let us be united in our aspirations, in building an independent Ukrainian state! Our country has endured many injustices and much suffering and enslavement; our history is sown with misfortune. Therefore on December 1 history itself is giving us the chance, possibly the last, to become true citizens, to create a new state, to build "our own house", under the reign of "our own truth, and strength, and freedom".

Supreme Council of Ukraine

SECOND UKRAINIAN OFFICERS' CONGRESS

By Eugene Kachmarsky

KYIV, November 2-3 — The Second Congress of the Ukrainian Officers' Association (SOU) was held this weekend in Kyiv at the former CPU Party School on Melnyk Street. Over 700 delegates — Ukrainian officers representing all branches of the armed forces (of the officers present: 81% are engaged in active service, 2% are ensigns and midshipmen, 1% are cadets from military schools, and 16% reserve officers), members of the Ukrainian Parliament and foreign guests — heard two full days of speeches and discussion addressing the issues concerned with the process of creating independent Ukrainian armed forces now underway.

Speaking on Saturday, the head of the SOU — Col. Vilen Martyrosyan, emphasised the urgency of creating an independent armed force that will be subordinated exclusively to the Ukrainian Ministry of Defence. He also passed on a warning to Ukraine's political leaders that if they do not consider the advice of professional Ukrainian officers when building a Ukrainian army, then "we will be left with the same idiotic system that we are faced with now".

Also addressing the congress were Ukrainian presidential candidates Levko Lukyanenko and Vyacheslav Chornovil. The congress' chief address was delivered by Ukrainian Defence Minister — Maj. Gen. Konstantyn Morozov, entitled "The tasks facing the SOU in creating independent armed forces for Ukraine".

The dominant theme at the congress — reflecting the prevailing mood among Ukrainian officers — was emphasised time and again by every speaker: the irrefutable necessity of creating a completely independent Ukrainian army without any central control from Moscow. Cooperation with independent armed forces from the former Soviet republics — based on the principles of state sovereignty and independence — was held as a possibility.

The congress closed with the adoption of several resolutions. Among these was a resolution on the material and social security of officers in the Ukrainian armed forces, as well as a resolution on dealing with political officers — mostly KGB or Party plants in the army to exert political control. Another resolution adopted by the congress outlined a definition of SOU membership — members can be either Ukrainian citizens or Ukrainian officers serving in any armed forces around the world.

The congress closed with a singing of the Ukrainian national anthem.

Appeal of the Second Congress of Ukrainian Officers to the Supreme Council of Ukraine

The Second Congress of Officers regards the creation of Ukrainian armed forces as the principal task in the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state and supports the efforts of the Supreme Council and the Government towards this end.

However, the process of the creation of armed forces is proceeding at a slow pace, lags behind developments in the political situation both within and outside Ukraine. The laws and bills adopted and discussed by the Supreme Council of Ukraine are, unfortunately, unclear, do not specify exact terms, and do not establish a mechanism for their realisation or provide an economic base and financial security. Statements by various political leaders that the creation of our own armed forces will take 4-5 years will not stand up to any criticism.

Basing itself on the will of the Ukrainian people to independence and the complex political situation the congress demands the following from the Supreme Council of Ukraine:

1. To ensure that all servicemen on the territory of Ukraine swear an oath of allegiance to the Ukrainian state before the end of 1991. Officers (ensigns and midshipmen) and servicemen on extended service should declare their wish to become citizens of Ukraine in a statement addressed to the Presidium of the

Supreme Council. Servicemen who do not wish to be Ukrainian citizens should be exempt from the oath of allegiance and should, by the end of 1992, be posted to their own states to complete their military service.

2. From 1992 the Ukrainian armed forces should be funded by the republican budget.

All contributions to the union budget should be terminated.

3. Throughout 1992 servicemen who are Ukrainian citizens and members of their families (with their consent) should be returned to Ukraine. Service by Ukrainian citizens in the armies of other states should be inadmissible, with the exception of instances specified in government agreements between Ukraine and other states.

4. Starting with the autumn draft of 1991 the Ukrainian armed forces should consist only of citizens of Ukraine. By the end of 1991 national servicemen who are not Ukrainian citizens should be posted outside Ukraine regardless of their service time.

5. Throughout 1992 the number of conscripts undergoing national service should be reduced by two.

6. Strategic defence forces deployed in Ukraine should be manned exclusively by servicemen who are Ukrainian citizens.

The strategic forces in Ukraine should be under the control of the Ukrainian Minister of Defence.

7. Political officers should retire with a pension or appropriate financial compensation.

8. The practise of forced retirement or the posting outside Ukraine of officers, ensigns (midshipmen) who are Ukrainian citizens without their consent or the permission of the Ukrainian Ministry of Defence should be prohibited.

9. Only servicemen who are Ukrainian citizens can be posted to Ukraine for military service.

10. The formation of professional Ukrainian armed forces should begin in 1993.

11. The military-industrial complex in Ukraine should be reorganised in accordance with the economic potential of Ukraine and the technological and military requirements of the Ukrainian armed forces.

12. By the end of 1991 parliamentary officials should be designated to ensure that the armed forces carry out the decisions of the Supreme Council and Ukrainian government on military issues.

13. Through its representations abroad the Ukrainian Ministry for Foreign Affairs should secure the rights and interests of Ukrainian citizens serving in the armed forces of other states.

14. The Cabinet of Ministers should set up a fund in 1992 to help officers, ensigns (midshipmen), who return to Ukraine.

15. The National Security Service of Ukraine should decisively serve the security

interests of the Ukrainian state, prevent the destruction and export of technology, military equipment, material wealth, businesses connected with the military-industrial complex without the consent of the Ukrainian government.

Kyiv,

3 November 1991

INITIALLING THE SECOND PEREYASLAV TREATY

By Ihor Dlaboha

Cautiously and apprehensively, the Ukrainian diaspora had viewed events in Ukraine up to November 6. As incredulous as it seemed, since August 24 the work of the Cabinet of Ministers and the Supreme Council of Ukraine, filled as they are with communists-turned-quasi-nationalists, was progressing in the direction of sovereign independence.

On November 6, after a heated session of the Ukrainian parliament, the people's deputies voted 237 out of 370 present to allow the government of Ukraine to initial the economic treaty with the other republics and the imperial union. The treaty had been denounced by parliamentary and government leaders as a return to subjugation. Truthfully, the parliamentarians stipulated that the treaty must be brought to Kyiv, where the Supreme Council will review and debate it before it decides whether to ratify it.

Leonid Kravchuk downplayed the significance of this move, saying, "This document cannot be viewed as a noose because, as a matter of fact, it does not exist". Nonetheless, the potentially fatal decision to allow even the initials of a Ukrainian official to appear on the treaty poses several questions for Ukrainians everywhere to ponder:

- Prior to the Declaration of Independence, the communist majority in the parliament consisted of 239 hardcore activists. Since then the party was more or less disbanded, stripped of its privileges, disgraced and thought to be impotent. Now they resurface in full force — 237 voting in favour of the treaty. Is there in Ukraine an underground, communist network, still loyal to Moscow, fulfilling its orders, flexing its muscles and battling to undermine Ukrainian independence?

- On October 18, Ukraine decided not to sign the economic treaty on principle, on good solid principles. Ivan Plyushch, deputy chairman of the parliament, eloquently declared on television, "History has given us a chance to become an independent nation and we don't want to be a colony". The Ukrainian parliament and government accused Moscow of lying about the treaty's content, substituting a different version. The text, which was not seen in Kyiv until the signing,

contradicted Ukrainian laws and its sovereign independence, they said. Ukrainian officials did not reject the notion of economic cooperation with anyone so long as it did not go against the interests of the people of Ukraine. What happened between October 18 and November 6 to reverse this decision?

- Vitold Fokin is not playing on the all-Ukrainian team but rather on the all-Union team. But Leonid Kravchuk seemed to be living up to his new "nationalist" veneer. What made him go along with this anti-Ukrainian decision on the eve of the presidential elections, with his popularity dropping from a mid-October rating of about 38% to an end-of-the-month popularity of 30%?

- Where were the remaining 80 deputies?

- Most disheartening and threatening are the reports on Kyiv and national television and radio that Kravchuk and Fokin manipulated the votes, which tallied about two dozen absent deputies voting "yes". After the vote they were whisked off by a waiting helicopter to Boryspil airport for a flight to Moscow, where Fokin signed the treaty. Are strong-arm tactics part-and-parcel of this leadership of a new independent, democratic Ukraine?

- What will be the reaction of the Narodna Rada opposition and the masses to the manipulation and the decision to initial the treaty?

Notwithstanding the treaty, which can turn into a 20th century version of the Pereyaslav Treaty, manipulation of votes is illegal and a throwback to the old days. Someone will pay for this resurgence of old-style communist terrorism and hopefully it won't be the people of Ukraine.

UKRAINE'S LEADERS SUBMIT TO MOSCOW'S PRESSURE

By O. Chabarovskiy

Not so long ago, Leonid Kravchuk in his public appearances gave a logical and well-argued explanation why Ukraine would not sign the economic treaty. This treaty was recently signed in the presence of Gorbachev by Russia, Byelorussia and six other republics. In a recent interview for "Literaturna Ukraina" Kravchuk again underscored that the precondition for signing the economic treaty between the republics is the preservation of their full sovereign status. And this was agreed upon during a meeting of representatives of the republics in the capital of Kazakhstan, Alma-Ata. In due course, however, without consulting Ukraine, the Alma-Ata draft economic treaty was amended on the initiative of Yeltsin and Gorbachev. It took on a centrist character, inasmuch as it placed the main economic resources under Moscow's control. Clearly, this new treaty was conceived as a first step towards a "new" Union.

These were the reasons why Ukraine did not sign the economic treaty, pushing instead for bilateral agreements between the republics as the basis for their

economic cooperation. After the declaration of independence by the Ukrainian parliament, however, Russian "democrats" adopted a hostile position towards the act and joined Russia's reactionary forces in a common front to retain Ukraine within the "new Union", that was to be governed by a "new" imperial centre in Moscow, this time under the aegis of the so-called democratic forces in Moscow.

The Moscow-based news agencies, television and radio stations, as well as the leading Russian newspapers, including the self-professed liberal media, launched a campaign to force the newly-independent Ukrainian state, which was still far from exercising real sovereignty, to submit to the new imperial-"democratic" centre. The mass media in Russia began to attack Ukraine's measures to consolidate its statehood, even going so far in some cases as to call for the secession of the Crimea and the industrial heartland in the eastern regions of Ukraine.

Moreover, Yeltsin began to organise an economic blockade of Ukraine. Having under its control gold and foreign currency reserves, Russia threatened Ukraine that it would sell it oil and other goods for hard currency if Ukraine did not join the "economic community". People's deputy Stetsiv stated in Munich recently that Russia began to halt shipments of fuel, gas, paper, wooden beams, required by the Donbas-based coal industry, etc.

Russia to a large degree relies on supplies of Ukrainian raw materials and industrial goods. This factor should have been brought to bear in the economic "cold war" between Ukraine and Russia, particularly inasmuch as the economic situation in Russia is worse than in Ukraine. Furthermore, Russia consists of a number of autonomous republics, which are also striving for independence. Thus, Ukraine stood a good chance of gaining the upper hand in this economic war.

Instead of pursuing a steadfast adherence to Ukrainian independence, however, the present Ukrainian leaders — Kravchuk and Fokin, submitted to Moscow's blackmail and agreed to sign the economic treaty. In accordance with the assurances of Prime Minister Fokin, before it came to the actual signing, agreement was reached regarding addenda put forth by Ukraine. Fokin, however, failed to mention the nature of this "agreement". He made a general assertion that, "most of Ukraine's amendments were included in the final draft of the agreement. Moreover, not all of the principle regulations were included in the final draft. International conventions on treaty practice have been violated".

Defending the signing of the treaty, which is still to be ratified by the Supreme Council of Ukraine on December 3, that is after the referendum on the Declaration of Independence, Leonid Kravchuk tried to down play the importance of this issue, using duplicitous diplomatic chicanery that has become a characteristic trademark. At a press conference in Kyiv, Kravchuk stated that, "the signing of this treaty does not mean Ukraine's immediate inclusion in the implementation of its clauses. First there are still protracted negotiations to decide the fate of Ukraine's 25 demands,

which were submitted as an addendum to the agreement". This immediately provokes the thought: is it not logical to implement these "25 demands" before signing the treaty. In this regard Kravchuk underlined that the implementation of the treaty is possible only after ratification by the Supreme Council of Ukraine and the parliaments of the other signatory republics. He also pointed out the "benefits" of signing the treaty. On November 6 Kravchuk and Yeltsin signed a bilateral economic agreement on behalf of their republics, which purportedly, terminates the economic hardships that Russia tried to force upon Ukraine.

Genuine pro-independence forces in Ukraine see the signing of the economic treaty in a completely different light. The move was subjected to harsh criticism by activists of Ukraine's political parties and organisations. People's deputy Mykola Porovskiy believes that this treaty is an open violation of the act of Ukrainian independence, and gives control over a number of Ukraine's economic resources to Moscow. Opposition leader Ihor Yukhnovskiy said that, "regardless of the need for economic cooperation, in its present form the treaty on the economic commonwealth does not correspond to the interests of Ukraine". In the opinion of Dmytro Pavlychko, the economic treaty is a further step towards the restoration of the Union. The signing of the economic treaty will be followed by demands to sign a treaty on a new political Union, which Gorbachev and Yeltsin clearly desire. Similar views were expressed by a number of other Ukrainian political activists.

It cannot be completely ruled out that the signing of the economic treaty may have a negative impact on the December 1 referendum. At the press conference Kravchuk expressed his optimism that a large majority of Ukrainians will vote for independence. It was this same Kravchuk, however, who, by signing the treaty, reinforced those forces in Ukraine which support the "new" Union and Ukraine's further subordination to Moscow. Looking for reasons why Kravchuk and Fokin have taken this step on the eve of the referendum, one can only conclude that they continue to nurture deep-rooted aspirations towards a continued political "commonwealth" of Ukraine and Russia, which until recently they still loyally served.

REFERENDUM ON INDEPENDENCE AND THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Ukraine Goes to the Poll

KYIV, December 1 — According to Vitaliy Boyko, chairman of the central electoral committee in Ukraine, by midday 52.2 per cent of the electorate had already cast their vote, writes the Ukrainian Information Service in Kyiv.

On a provincial level, by 12.00 more than 60 per cent of voters in the Volyn, Zhytomyr, Ivano-Frankivsk, Kirovohrad and Rivne oblasts, and around 50 per cent in the Crimea, had been to the poll.

80.9% of voters declared that they will take part in the referendum and presidential election, of whom 79.9% stated that they will endorse Ukrainian independence declared by the Supreme Council on August 24.

Armed Forces Opt for Independence

KYIV, December 1 — Servicemen of the former Soviet armed forces stationed in Ukraine have shown overwhelming support for Ukrainian independence, reports Yurko Horen, Ternopil-based correspondent of the Ukrainian Information Service.

According to Captain Zhyzhen, the Ternopil garrison voted unanimously for independence, while a unit of rocket forces based in this western Ukrainian city was a close second with 98% of its personnel endorsing the Ukrainian parliament's August 24 proclamation. Troops based in Berezhany also expressed unanimous support for independence.

Taking the Ternopil oblast as a whole, 90% of all servicemen based in the province voted to break away from Moscow.

Soldiers in the eastern regions of Ukraine were also clear about which way their country should go, with 83.7% of cadets attending the military communications school in Poltava, 85% of the Donetsk garrison, and 78% of army and navy personnel in Mykolayiv voting "yes".

In the southern port of Odessa, the Black Sea fleet also endorsed independence (92%).

Ukraine Embraces Independence in Landslide Vote

KYIV, December 2 — According to the latest information, Ukrainians overwhelmingly voted for independence in yesterday's referendum. The preliminary figures that were released in Kyiv today exceed even the highest expectations that were based on public opinion polls immediately prior to Sunday's referendum.

According to the Ukrainian electoral commission, the total electorate eligible to vote in Ukraine is 37,656,165. The number of voters who received ballot cards was 31,508,529, or 83.7 per cent of all eligible voters. Of those more than 90 per cent cast a vote in favour of independence.

Official figures released in Kyiv yield the following results:

Breakdown of votes by region (oblast):

Vinnysia oblast — 95.43%	Odessa oblast — 85.38%
Volyn oblast — 96.32%	Poltava oblast — 94.93%
Luhansk oblast — 83.86%	Rivne oblast — 95.96%
Dnipropetrovsk oblast — 90.86%	Sumy oblast — 92.61%
Donetsk oblast — 83.90%	Ternopil oblast — 98.67%
Zhytomyr oblast — 95.06%	Kharkiv oblast — 86.33%
Zakarpattia oblast — 92.59%	Kherson oblast — 90.13%
Zaporizhia oblast — 90.56%	Khmelnyskyi oblast — 96.30%
Ivano-Frankivsk oblast — 98.42%	Cherkasy oblast — 96.03%
Kyiv oblast — 95.52%	Chernivtsi oblast — 93.74%
Kirovohrad oblast — 93.88%	Chernihiv oblast — 92.78%
Crimea — 54.19%	Kyiv (city) — 92.88%
Lviv oblast — 97.46%	Sevastopol (city) — 57.07%
Mykolayiv oblast — 89.45%	

In a press conference that was held the same morning in Kyiv, Leonid Kravchuk, who won in his bid for the Presidency in the first free elections in Ukraine in over 70 years, stated: "I have all the reasons in the world to conclude that a new Ukraine has been born!"

Six Candidates Seek Ukraine's Presidency

KYIV — A former high-ranking Party functionary, two former dissidents, a director of a cooperative, and two scholars are contending for the office of the first democratically-elected president of independent Ukraine in Sunday's general election.

Ukrainian independence is the major plank of the election platform of each of the six contenders, despite any differences in their political views.

The presidential candidates are now touring the country. The chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet — Leonid Kravchuk, who was previously the second secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine and its ideological chief, is ahead of

other candidates in the ratings. He recently visited the central and eastern regions of Ukraine and met with miners in Donetsk.

Academician Ihor Yukhnovskiy visited the Crimea. Two former political prisoners, Vyacheslav Chornovil, chairman of the Lviv *oblast* council, and Levko Lukyanenko, chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party, visited the eastern and southern regions of Ukraine, where their popularity is not as high as in the western regions.

Leopold Taburyanskyi, chairman of the Dnipropetrovsk-based cooperative "Olymp" and leader of the People's Party of Ukraine, is so far the least active in his meetings with the electorate.

On November 25 Ukrainian Agricultural Minister Oleksander Tkachenko, who was also running for president, unexpectedly stepped down in favour of Leonid Kravchuk, thereby increasing the latter's chances of a December 1 victory. Judging by public opinion polls, however, Mr. Chornovil is running in second place.

Rundown of Presidential Candidates in Ukraine

1. Yukhnovskiy, Ihor Rafayilovych

Born in 1925 in the village of Kniahynyn (the Volyn *oblast*) in the family of Party officials. Ukrainian. WWII veteran.

In 1951 he graduated with honours from Lviv State University. Doctor of physics; professor of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine; director of the Institute of Physics of the Academy of Sciences.

In 1990 he left the Communist Party of Ukraine.

Organiser and chairman of the Lviv regional "Memorial" organisation; one of the founding members of the People's Movement of Ukraine (Rukh); People's Deputy of Ukraine; member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet; chairman of the permanent commission on national education and science; participant of various parliamentary coordinating commissions.

Head of the *Narodna Rada* (People's Council) — a coalition of national-democratic forces in the Supreme Soviet.

Nominated as a presidential candidate by the Party for the Democratic Rebirth of Ukraine (PDVU), which is running his election campaign.

Programme:

- 1) the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state;
- 2) equality of citizens regardless of nationality and religious beliefs;
- 3) the revival of the Ukrainian village. Collective and state farm lands to be transferred to collective ownership with the determination of the concrete allotment of each farmer, who may if he wishes receive it for private ownership;

- 4) privatisation through an open auction sale of businesses in the sphere of trade, services, food industry, transport;
- 5) reform of the taxation system with an aim to help private and joint initiative.

2. Lukyanenko, Levko Hryhorovych

Born in 1928 in the village of Khrypivka (Chernihiv region) in a peasant family.

In 1944 he was mobilised into the Soviet army. From 1945-49 he served in Austria; 1949-53 in Azerbaijan.

Graduated from the law faculty of Moscow State University in 1958.

Following his graduation Lukyanenko practised as a lawyer.

In 1958 he began to form the Ukrainian Workers-Peasants Union, whose aim was the secession of Ukraine from the USSR through a referendum.

In 1961 Lukyanenko was arrested and sentenced to death. After 77 days in the condemned cell, the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Court commuted the death sentence to 15 years of imprisonment.

He was released in January 1976. In the summer of 1976 he became one of the founding members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Monitoring Group.

At the end of 1977 Lukyanenko was arrested and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment and 5 years of exile for human rights activities.

In March 1988, while in exile, he became the head of the Helsinki Monitoring Group, which a few months later reorganised itself into the Ukrainian Helsinki Union. After returning to Ukraine in January 1989 Lukyanenko took an active part in the UHU.

On April 30, 1990, he was elected chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party, which evolved out of the UHU.

He is a People's Deputy of Ukraine.

Programme:

- 1) the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state;
- 2) the transformation of Ukraine's economy into a free-market economy;
- 3) unitary system of the Ukrainian state;
- 4) immediate recognition of private ownership of land and the allotment to peasants of land by the spring of 1992.

3. Chornovil, Vyacheslav Maksymovych

Born in 1937 in the village of Erky (Cherkasy region) in the family of a teacher.

In 1960 he graduated from the faculty of journalism of Kyiv State University.

From 1960-66 he worked in television and newspapers in Kyiv and Lviv.

In 1966 Chornovil was sentenced to 3 months of imprisonment for refusing to testify against Mykhailo and Bohdan Horyn.

In 1967 he was imprisoned for 3 years for writing a book on human rights violations in Ukraine, which were published abroad.

In 1970-72 he published the human rights journal "Ukrainian Herald", for which he was sentenced to 6 years of imprisonment and 3 years of exile.

In 1980 Chornovil was imprisoned on fabricated charges of attempted rape.

He returned to Lviv in 1985 and revived the "Ukrainian Herald." Later he became one of the founding members and activists of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union. He did not join the Ukrainian Republican Party because of differences in views with the Lukyanenko group regarding the party's structure and methods of activity.

People's Deputy of Ukraine; chairman of the Lviv oblast council. Nominated as presidential candidate by the People's Movement of Ukraine in opposition to the Rukh leadership (Ivan Drach, Mykhailo Horyn, and others).

Programme:

- 1) the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state;
- 2) private ownership of land;
- 3) creation of a market economy with an equality of all forms of ownership;
- 4) political-administrative reform, which includes local self-government;
- 5) Ukraine's participation in European security

4. Taburyanskyi, Leopold Ivanovych

Born in 1940 in Kryvyi Rih (Dnipropetrovsk oblast) in the family of a Soviet army officer.

Graduated from the Kryvyi Rih Mining Institute and the Kyiv Institute of Economy.

President of the "Olymp" cooperative; chairman of the People's Party of Ukraine. Nominated as a presidential candidate by the People's Party, which is running his election campaign.

People's Deputy of Ukraine. Married with two sons.

He does not have great authority in the political circles of Ukraine. He is the outsider of the election campaign. His programme does not greatly vary from that of the other candidates.

5. Hryniiov, Volodymyr Borysovykh

Born in 1945 in the Bilgorod oblast of the RSFSR. His mother is Ukrainian.

In 1969 he graduated with honours from the Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute.

In 1971 he received his master's degree and in 1981 his doctorate.

Until his election as People's Deputy of Ukraine he headed the faculty of applied mathematics of Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute. Married with two children.

Hryniiov was an activist of the democratic faction of the CPSU. He left the Party in the autumn of 1990.

He was a former joint chairman of the Kharkiv regional Rukh organisation. Now no longer a member of Rukh. Hryniov is one of the founding members of the Party for the Democratic Rebirth of Ukraine (PDVU); a member of the PDVU Presidium.

People's Deputy of Ukraine; second deputy chairman of the Supreme Council of Ukraine. His nomination is supported by the Constitutional-Democratic, Liberal, and the United Social-Democratic Parties of Ukraine, as well as the Kharkiv, Donetsk and Luhansk organisations of the Party for the Democratic Rebirth of Ukraine.

He is regarded as a moderate politician, who holds a centre position between the PDVU and centrist-communists. He is particularly popular in the Russian-speaking regions of eastern Ukraine. He regards himself as a cosmopolitan.

Programme:

- 1) quick and energetic privatisation, including agriculture;
- 2) wide-scale foreign investment;
- 3) a federative system for Ukraine;
- 4) integration of Ukraine in the world community;
- 5) priority of human values over state values.

6. Kravchuk, Leonid Makarovich

Born in 1934 in the village of Velykyi Zhytyn (presently Rivne region) in a peasant family. His father died while fighting on the front in 1944.

Kravchuk graduated from the Rivne Cooperative Institute, the economic faculty of Kyiv State University, the Academy of Social Sciences of the Central Committee of the CPU. He holds a master's degree in economics.

In 1958-64 he worked as a lecturer in political-economics at the Chernivtsi Institute of Finance.

Kravchuk has been a Party official since 1964. Until his election as chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the UkrSSR in July 1990 he held the post of ideological secretary of the CPU Central Committee; second secretary of the CPU Central Committee.

People's Deputy of Ukraine. Married with a son and two grandchildren.

In the Supreme Soviet Kravchuk was for a long time the leader of the so-called national communists. He was instrumental in the passing of a number of decrees and laws directed towards the realisation of Ukraine's sovereignty. During the August putsch he adopted a wait-and-see position. Kravchuk has the reputation of being a cunning politician who can skillfully judge any political situation.

Programme:

- 1) establishment of an independent Ukrainian state;
- 2) privatisation of ownership;

- 3) social security, including strict state regulation of prices on consumer goods in the period of the stabilisation of the economy;
- 4) free transfer of land to those who worked it, for life use with hereditary rights. Gradual introduction of buying and selling of land.

In Pursuit of the Leader

By Viktor Fedorchuk

It is not difficult to predict the outcome of the presidential election in Ukraine. From the beginning Supreme Council chairman Leonid Kravchuk gained a head start and continues to maintain the lead. Today there is no trace of the former ideological secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, who until recently opposed independence, democracy and a market economy, and attacked Ukrainian "bourgeois" nationalism and attempts to go beyond the "socialist choice". Leonid Kravchuk has skillfully mastered the experience of the Bolsheviks of 1917, who assured themselves of victory in the October Revolution by "borrowing" the popular agrarian programme of the Social Revolutionaries. Kravchuk's banner is strewn with slogans on reform, something the democrats have been talking about for a long time.

An efficient campaign team, composed of experienced professionals, an impressive outward appearance and public bearing are working to boost the Kravchuk image. Although there are no strikingly new planks in the Kravchuk platform, it is, nevertheless, systematic, clear-cut, and easily understood by the ordinary citizen. In comparison with other candidates, Kravchuk supports a gradual, evolutionary transition to a democratic society and a market economy.

The electoral platforms of each of the contenders appear almost identical. All the candidates are propagating an independent democratic state, an effective economy based on a diversity of forms of ownership, the integration of Ukraine in the world community, wide-ranging social reforms and the spiritual revival of Ukraine. The candidates' respective positions differ only with regard to specific nuances and emphases.

The democratic camp is split. It failed to rally around a single authoritative candidate. Five candidates, on the other hand, are successfully blocking one another, at the same time making life easier for Leonid Kravchuk. Instead of a single powerful and effective electoral campaign, the democratic forces are running five relatively weak and poorly organised campaigns. Even if one of the democratic candidates makes it into the second round (which is possible only if no one candidate manages to receive over 50% of the vote on Sunday, December 1), the reorganisation of the distinct electoral committees in two weeks is practically impossible.

Vyacheslav Chornovil has the highest rating among the democratic candidates. A former political prisoner, and, for over one and half years, the head of the Lviv oblast

council, Chornovil is the only democratic candidate with any practical experience. His election campaign, which is being organised and run by the largest political organisation in Ukraine — Rukh, is better organised and more far-reaching than the campaigns of any of his democratic adversaries. The main difference in the platform of the former dissident to that of the former CPU ideologue is that Chornovil had expressed his fundamental principles many years earlier. Moreover, Chornovil would like to see a federated state system in Ukraine, modelled on Germany.

Levko Lukyanenko, also a long-term political prisoner and chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party, is relying mainly on the support of his own organisation. He believes Ukraine should have a unitary system of government.

Academician Ihor Yukhnovskiy — chairman of the democratic opposition in the Supreme Soviet — Narodna Rada (People's Council), is running on a moderate platform, that stands somewhere between that of Chornovil and Kravchuk. Although the Party for the Democratic Rebirth of Ukraine (PDVU), which supports Yukhnovskiy, has significant intellectual potential, it lacks numbers and funds, and has proved incapable of organising an effective campaign.

The second deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, Volodymyr Hryniiov, a doctor of applied mathematics, is one of the founders of the PDVU. His electoral campaign is, however, being run by democrats, liberals, social-democrats and local PDVU organisations of the eastern regions of Ukraine. This points to differences within the party's ranks, the consequences of which are as yet difficult to predict. In his platform Hryniiov lays emphasis on the resolution of economic and social problems and is strongly in favour of a federative system of government. A lack of funds and organised assistance is also throttling the activity of the Hryniiov team.

These three candidates have an almost identical rating, which even on the basis of the most auspicious opinion polls does not exceed 15 per cent of the electorate.

Leopold Taburyanskyy — a member of the Narodna Rada and president of the Dnipropetrovsk cooperative "Olymp", is a little known figure in Ukrainian political life. He was nominated by the People's Party of Ukraine, which he founded and heads. This Dnipropetrovsk businessman can count on no more than 1 per cent of the vote.

The "dark horse" of the electoral marathon has been Agricultural Minister Oleksander Tkachenko. His nomination was completely unexpected, inasmuch as Tkachenko has never expressed a desire to play a leading role in politics. The minister's platform reflected a toned down version of the old programme of the CPU. Opinions were split concerning Tkachenko's candidacy. Some people regarded him as a secret protégé of Stanislav Hurenko — the head of the CPU, which may have put up Tkachenko to gauge their support within Ukraine. Others, however, believe that Tkachenko was acting in conjunction with Kravchuk. In the eyes of the electorate, Kravchuk finds himself in an uncomfortable position on the extreme right of the other candidates. To ensure a victory he desperately needed a

scapegoat to bear the brunt of anti-communist criticism. Tkachenko stepped down from the presidential race in favour of Leonid Kravchuk on November 25.

According to early public opinion polls, Kravchuk's popularity now rests on the 45-50 per cent mark of those voters who declared they will cast a vote on Sunday. The percentage of votes from Tkachenko's supporters, which will now be cast in favour of Kravchuk, can decide the election in the first round. However, Kravchuk's popularity has recently slowly begun to drop, mainly because of the leadership's inability to halt the worsening state of the economy. Perhaps this was the reason for Tkachenko's decision to step down in favour of Kravchuk. The Agricultural Minister is canvassing support for Kravchuk.

Leonid Kravchuk will probably become the first president of independent Ukraine. What is not clear, however, is whether the future of the highest post in the country will be decided on December 1?

Central Electoral Commission Announces Official Election Results

KYIV, December 4 — At a meeting of the central electoral commission the chairman — Vitaliy Boyko, announced the official results of the December 1 referendum and presidential election. The results of the election were as follows: Hryniiov 4.17%; Kravchuk 61.59%; Lukyanenko 4.49%; Taburyanskyi 0.57%; Chornovil 23.27%; Yukhnovskiyi 1.74%.

Mr. Boyko further stated that 31,891,742 citizens took part in the referendum. Of these 28,804,071, that is 90.32%, cast their vote in support of independence; 2,417,000 (7.58%) voted against. The number of void ballot cards amounted to 670,117, or 2.1%.

The commission exchanged opinions about the referendum and presidential election, reaching a general consensus that all the proceedings had been in accordance with regulations and that individual violations did not affect the final result. The members of the commission then signed their report, thereby officially confirming the birth of independent Ukraine.

Ukrainian President Inaugurated

KYIV — The Supreme Council of Ukraine reconvened on December 5 for a formal celebration of the country's independence. The debating chamber was packed with foreign dignitaries, journalists and delegates from all parts of Ukraine.

At the session the new president of Ukraine — Leonid Kravchuk, officially relinquished the post of chairman of the Supreme Council and swore an oath of allegiance to Ukraine on the Constitution and the Act of Independence adopted by the parliament on August 24. Beside him was a 16th-century Ukrainian Bible.

Notable writer Oles Honchar and Oleksander Haydamaka, an army officer, greeted Kravchuk with his election to the highest post of the newly-independent country on behalf of the citizens of Ukraine. Haydamaka pledged the army's

support for the Act of Independence and stated that the armed forces would defend the interests of Ukraine and the integrity and inviolability of its borders.

Russia's representative in Ukraine — Leonid Smoliakov, read out a telegram from President Boris Yeltsin in which the Russian leader recognised Ukrainian independence and assured the Ukrainian people of his government's intention to establish friendly relations with Ukraine.

In his speech Leonid Kravchuk greeted the Ukrainian people with the great historic victory and outlined his presidential programme. The goal of the new democratic state based on the rule of law, he said, will be to ensure general welfare and guarantee the rights and freedoms of every individual and national minority.

Kravchuk further announced a reorganisation of the power structure based on a division of legislative, executive and judicial power, the privatisation of land, denationalisation and privatisation of the economy, and the introduction of a national currency. He promised to lower taxes and reduce government spending.

Kravchuk further stated that 10% of the Ukrainian government's expenditure would be allocated to education and culture. He also stated that the Ukrainian government would take measures to prevent the unauthorised export of goods outside Ukraine.

In economic terms Ukraine will head towards economic integration on the basis of separate agreements with states of the former Soviet Union, the European Community and other countries.

The future armed forces of Ukraine, he announced, will have an essentially defensive nature, with their size reduced to a minimum.

Kravchuk underscored the government's position that Ukraine will adhere to agreements on nuclear weapons and stated that Ukraine gladly welcomes any foreign assistance with regard to dismantling the nuclear weapons that are deployed on Ukrainian soil.

"Ukraine has no territorial claims against foreign territory, and does not recognise any claims to its territory", Kravchuk said.

He concluded his speech by saying that, "Ukraine has risen from its knees and taken the first step towards freedom and prosperity".

The chairman of the permanent Supreme Council commission on external affairs — Dmytro Pavlychko, then read a statement to parliaments and peoples of the world.

The document urges recognition of Ukraine as an independent state, which attained independence through peaceful and legitimate means, and which respects international law and strives to build good relations with the world community. The document formally annulled the 1922 treaty, which although never actually signed by Ukraine, formed the legal foundation for Ukraine's membership of the USSR.

The deputies unanimously endorsed the document.

The statement also established that Ukraine will respect all former agreements and covenants that do not contradict the Constitution and interests of Ukraine.

The session ended with the singing of the Ukrainian national anthem.

After the celebratory session, the deputies held a plenary meeting at which they discussed the election of a new chairman of the Supreme Council.

To this post Leonid Kravchuk proposed his first deputy Ivan Plyushch. There were other deputies that were nominated to this post: Volodymyr Hryniiov and the former majority leader in parliament and the present chairman of the Socialist Party Oleksander Moroz. Hryniiov, however, declined to accept the position.

Oleksander Moroz asked to address the deputies, stating his conviction that the proposed democratic reforms would fall through and that the Socialist Party would win the next election. He also announced his candidacy for the post of Supreme Council chairman. In a secret ballot Ivan Plyushch was elected Supreme Council chairman by 261 votes (out of 388).

The election of Plyushch, who is known as a loyal associate of Kravchuk, demonstrates the new president's intention to maintain control over the Supreme Council.

After the plenary session President Kravchuk held a press conference. He stated that the need to restructure the Ukrainian economy will be his highest priority. The first step towards this end will be the denationalisation and privatisation of the economy.

Kravchuk further stated his firm intention to strengthen the executive power of the Ukrainian government. The newly-elected Ukrainian President also stated that he will submit his proposals in this regard to the Supreme Council in the immediate future. With regard to the future Cabinet of Ministers, Kravchuk assured the journalists that he has no intention of changing Ukraine's present prime minister — Vitold Fokin, although he further said that he would consider making personal and structural changes in Ukraine's Cabinet of Ministers.

The people of Ukraine expressed their support for independence in the referendum and the president cannot ignore the will of the people, said Kravchuk regarding the question of signing a political union treaty with other former republics of the now-defunct USSR. As regards the ratification of an economic treaty, Kravchuk ironically pointed out that it will fall apart before it comes to ratification. Kravchuk assured the participants that he will not make any decisions without prior consultation with and without the support of the leading political organisations of the country, including Rukh.

INDEPENDENT UKRAINE'S POSITION ON SEVERAL KEY ISSUES

Following the August 24 Declaration of Independence, the Ukrainian government issued a series of statements, which together outline the newly-independent state's future policy directions. UCIS is printing these significant documents below in their entirety.

Ukrainian Foreign Ministry Statement

On December 1, 1991, the people of Ukraine by a free expression of their will endorsed the Act Proclaiming the Independence of Ukraine, adopted by the Supreme Council of Ukraine on August 24, 1991.

More than 90 per cent of the voters in the referendum manifested their support for an independent Ukraine (90.32%).

The legitimacy and democratic nature of the referendum was testified to by observers from parliaments of many countries around the world, representatives of the European Parliament, the Bureau on Free Elections of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Ukrainian and foreign communities (the USA, Canada, France, Great Britain, Germany, Poland, Sweden and Hungary).

Ukraine regards, as pertaining to itself, the Treaty of 1922, establishing the USSR, and all subsequent constitutional acts of the USSR, null and void.

Ukraine is building a democratic and legitimate state, the primary goal of which is to guarantee the rights and liberties of the individual.

Ukraine will steadfastly uphold all norms of international law in conformance with the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, treaties ratified by it regarding human rights and other relevant international documents. Ukraine is prepared to join European structures in the field of human rights, among them the European Convention on Human Rights.

Desiring to consolidate in independent, democratic Ukraine the highest principles of liberty, democracy, humanism, social justice, equality of all nationalities which constitute the people of Ukraine, the Supreme Council adopted on November 1, 1991, the Declaration on the Rights of Nationalities of Ukraine, in accordance with which the Ukrainian State guarantees all peoples, national groups, citizens, which live on its territory, equal political, civic, economic, social and cultural rights, and freedom of religion.

Aspiring to guarantee the welfare and an environment for unhindered work in a free state, independent Ukraine is implementing a transition to a free-market economy, recognises the importance of private ownership. By way of a law of December 10, 1991, Ukraine accords protection to all foreign investments and guarantees to foreign investors.

Ukraine, as one of the founding members of the United Nations, in full compliance with the goals and principles of the UN Charter, will direct its foreign policies to strengthening peace and security in the world, establishing international cooperation in resolving ecological, energy, food and other general human problems. The external policies of Ukraine will be based on generally-accepted principles of international laws.

Ukraine, as a European state, is ready to join the Final Act of the Helsinki Accords, the Paris Charter and other documents of the CSCE. Ukraine appeals to the parliaments and governments of the countries-participants of the CSCE to support its efforts to become a direct and equal participant in the all-European process and to take part in other European structures.

Ukraine is prepared to enter into diplomatic relations with other states, and to build bilateral relations with them on the basis of equality, sovereignty, non-intrusion in the internal affairs of each other, recognising the territorial integrity and inviolability of the existing borders.

Ukraine considers its territory indivisible and inviolable, recognises as inviolate its existing borders and does not harbour any territorial claims against any country.

Ukraine reaffirms its international obligations and in accordance with the Law on the Legal Obligations of Ukraine, adopted on September 12, 1991, will fulfil all international legal obligations ratified by the former USSR, which do not contradict the Constitution or national interests of Ukraine.

In accordance with the Statement of the Supreme Council of Ukraine, issued on October 13, 1991, Ukraine is prepared, by itself or by way of an established international mechanism, to repay its share of the foreign debt and to receive its appropriate share of credits of the former USSR, while adhering to the principle of divisible responsibility.

Ukraine will abide by the tenets of the treaty between the United States and the USSR regarding the reduction of strategic offensive weapons of 1991, specifically, with regard to the section dealing with nuclear weapons located on its territory, it will strive for its quickest possible ratification.

In accordance with the Declaration on State Sovereignty of Ukraine, adopted by the Supreme Council of Ukraine on July 16, 1990, and the Statement of the Supreme Council of Ukraine on the non-nuclear status of Ukraine of October 24, 1991, Ukraine will be a non-nuclear state. Prior to its realisation, Ukraine intends to enter into negotiations with all interested states in order to conclude international treaties.

Ukraine welcomes the offers to assist in the elimination of the former USSR's nuclear potential on its territory and is prepared to accept such assistance.

Ukraine does not store nor does it produce chemical weapons and supports their universal and total outlawing and elimination.

Ukraine wishes to join the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear state, and to conclude a treaty with the International Atomic Energy Agency guaranteeing its implementation.

In accordance with the Statement of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of Ukraine of November 22, 1991, regarding the 1990 treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe, Ukraine considers as essential the implementation of this treaty relative to all armed forces stationed on its territory. The Armed Forces of Ukraine fall under the jurisdiction of this accord. They are being formed exclusively to defend the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and inviolability of the borders of Ukraine, with minimal, essential defensive goals in mind.

Ukraine considers that its military potential will depend on the extent to which its security will be guaranteed by all-European mechanisms.

Ukraine is fulfilling the programme of converting the military-industrial complex and changing the profile of a large portion of the military-technological potential of the former USSR located on its territory to meet the needs of its socio-economic development.

Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine

A.M. Zlenko

Declaration On the Rights of National Minorities in Ukraine

The Supreme Council of Ukraine,

basing itself on the Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine, the Act Proclaiming the Independence of Ukraine, and in light of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and international accords on rights and freedoms of individuals ratified by Ukraine;

endeavouring to consolidate in an independent, democratic Ukraine the sacred principles of freedom, humanitarianism, social justice, equality of all ethnic groups in Ukraine;

keeping in mind that citizens of more than 100 nationalities live on the territory of Ukraine, who together with Ukrainians constitute the 52-million population of Ukraine,

adopts this Declaration on the Rights of National Minorities in Ukraine:

Article 1

The Ukrainian state guarantees all peoples, national groups, citizens, who live on its territory, all political, economic, social and cultural rights.

Representatives of all peoples and national groups can be elected with all rights to government organs of all levels, can assume any post in administrative organs, business enterprises, institutions and organisations.

Discrimination against national minorities is forbidden and punishable under law.

Article 2

The Ukrainian state guarantees all national minorities the right to preserve their traditional settlements and guarantees the existence of national-administrative units, and assumes the responsibility to create an environment suitable for the development of all national languages and cultures.

Article 3

The Ukrainian state guarantees all peoples and national minorities the right to use their native languages in all spheres of civic life, including education, employment and receiving and disseminating information.

The Supreme Council of Ukraine interprets Article 3 of the Law on Languages on the Ukrainian SSR in the following manner: that within the boundaries of administrative-territorial units, which are densely populated by a certain national minority, its language can function on a level equal to that of the state language.

The Ukrainian state guarantees its citizens the unimpeded use of the Russian language. In regions, densely inhabited by several national minorities, the accepted language of that area can function on a level equal to that of the state language.

Article 4

All citizens of Ukraine, members of all national minorities, are guaranteed the right to profess their religion, preserve their national symbols, observe their national holidays, and participate in the traditional rituals of their peoples.

Article 5

Historical and cultural monuments of all peoples and national groups on the territory of Ukraine are protected by law.

Article 6

The Ukrainian state guarantees all national minorities the right to establish their cultural centres, societies, regional organisations and associations.

These organisations can conduct activities aimed at developing national cultures, engage in mass actions as prescribed by existing laws, form national newspapers, magazines, publishing companies, museums, artistic ensembles, theatres, film studios.

Article 7

National cultural centres and societies, representatives of national minorities have the right to unhindered contacts with their historical native land.

*The Supreme Council of Ukraine
November 1, 1991*

Statement on the Military

Ukraine is forming its own armed forces by way of reorganising military units that are currently stationed on its territory specifically in defence against external threats of war, regardless of their origin, to guarantee the inviolability of its state borders and territorial integrity. They are being formed in accordance with the Declaration on State Sovereignty of Ukraine, the Act Proclaiming the Independence of Ukraine, adopted by the Supreme Council of Ukraine, and laws pertaining to military matters.

This is what was stated in a declaration of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of Ukraine, made public on November 25, 1991. The text of the declaration was addressed to the President, the State Council and the Ministry of Defence of the USSR.

The tragic events of the August putsch, it was pointed out in the document, compelled the Supreme Council of Ukraine to adopt decisive actions in guaranteeing the defence of its sovereignty, constitutional order and citizens of Ukraine.

Ukraine will never allow the use of its own armed forces against the people of Ukraine, other sovereign states and it strives towards one goal: to guarantee peace and tranquillity on its territory. The declaration also states that Ukraine, taking into account all factors of national security, will progressively realise its goal of becoming in the future a neutral, nuclear-free state, which will not enter into military blocs and will adhered to the three non-nuclear principles: not to accept, not to produce and not to store nuclear weapons. It will participate in the implementation of all treaties and accords on the non-use of nuclear weapons, reducing conventional weapons and armed forces and will support the ratification of treaties and accords between the USA and USSR and others states on these matters.

The declaration also cites the decision by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of November 4 and 14, dealing with the preservation of a single armed force and the USSR Ministry of Defence leadership's ignoring of the constitutional right of sovereign Ukraine to form its own armed forces do not conform to the laws of Ukraine. This has given rise to tensions among the military personnel, who are based on the territory of Ukraine, has negatively affected their moral and psychological disposition, and military preparedness. Problems related to military matters also substantively influence the socio-political situation in Ukraine.

With the aim of avoiding a destabilising situation as well as the lowering of military preparedness of the army in Ukraine and in the other republics of the former Union, the declaration emphasised, the process of forming the Armed Forces of Ukraine is being carried out by taking into account the existing socio-political realities, legally, step by step, by means of mutual recognition of military politics and in consultation with other sovereign states and the USSR Ministry of Defence.

The Presidium of the Supreme Council of Ukraine appealed to the military

personnel stationed in Ukraine to steadfastly adhere to the code of conduct and military discipline and not to allow any destabilising actions. Simultaneously, the Supreme Council also emphasised that it will do everything to ensure the social and political security of military personnel and their families, and to establish the appropriate circumstances for fulfilling military service in Ukraine.

Turning to all citizens of Ukraine and military personnel, who are serving on its territory, the Presidium of the Supreme Council of Ukraine appeals to them to maintain civic peace and tranquillity.

Statement of the Supreme Council of Ukraine On the Non-Nuclear Status of Ukraine

Confirming the intention of Ukraine, proclaimed in the Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine of July 16, 1990, to adhere to the three non-nuclear principles: not to accept, not to produce and not to acquire nuclear weapons,

Recognising the necessity of strict observance of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1968,

Seeking to contribute to the strengthening of the international regime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons,

the Supreme Council of Ukraine states:

1. The presence of nuclear weapons of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the territory of Ukraine is temporary.

2. These weapons are now under the control of the corresponding structures of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Ukraine insists on the right of its control over the non-use of nuclear weapons located on its territory.

3. Ukraine shall follow the policy aimed at the comprehensive elimination of nuclear weapons and components of their deployment located on the territory of the Ukrainian State. It intends to achieve it in the shortest time possible, taking into account legal, technical, financial, organisational and other possibilities and with the proper securing of ecological safety.

In Ukraine a wide programme for the conversion of the defence industry will be launched, redirecting that part of the military industrial capability towards the needs of economic and social development.

4. Ukraine, as one of the inheritors of the international obligations of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, shall fulfil the provisions of the START Treaty of 1991 in that part which concerns the nuclear weapons located on its territory.

Ukraine is ready to begin negotiations with the Republic of Byelorussia, the Kazakh SSR, the Russian SFSR, with the participation of the corresponding structures of the former Union of Soviet Socialist on the elimination of strategic nuclear weapons covered by this treaty.

5. Ukraine shall take steps aimed at eliminating all other nuclear weapons located on its territory and for this matter is ready, in the case of necessity, to participate in negotiations with all interested parties, including existing multilateral mechanisms in the field of disarmament.

7. Ukraine intends to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear state and to conclude with the IAEA a corresponding agreement on guarantees.

Supreme Council of Ukraine
October 24, 1991

POSITION PAPER: ON UKRAINE'S NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

On August 24, 1991 Ukraine proclaimed its independence from the Soviet Union, following the aborted coup in Moscow. On December 1, this historic declaration was fully endorsed by the Ukrainian people by an astounding landslide margin. 87% of the voting populace of Ukraine participated in this referendum, of which nearly 91% voted in favour of Ukrainian independence. The unanticipated, overwhelming support for the idea of an independent and sovereign, democratic Ukrainian nation-state is, in fact, only the final pinnacle of a long and arduous process of national-liberation that began many years ago. Countless lives have been lost and sacrificed in Ukraine's liberation struggle to bring about this day. Despite Moscow's policies of mass genocide (e.g., the artificial famine of 1932-33, in which over 7 million people died from starvation in Ukraine), protracted Russification, severe oppression, terror and outright sadistic brutality, the idea of an independent Ukraine remained firmly embedded in the hearts and minds of every Ukrainian, as was demonstrated beyond any doubt in the December 1 referendum.

In light of the above, the primary concern on the minds of Ukrainian statesmen and politically aware people in Ukraine today is the imperative need to secure Ukrainian statehood and the sovereignty of the newly-independent Ukrainian nation. Every Ukrainian knows that historically Ukraine has been the object of the military expansionism and colonial exploitation of several of its neighbours, particularly Russia, who coveted its fertile lands and bountiful natural resources. The bitter experience that Ukrainians have learned from history is that unless they can effectively defend themselves from foreign invasions, or even the threat of such, then any freedom they may possess is tenable at best. It is also within this context that Ukraine's national security policy will be formulated in the coming months. Naturally enough, the future direction that Ukraine's national security policy may take has been cause for various kinds of speculation in Western circles, specifically within NATO.

Ukraine's decision to raise an army, that the West views as unjustifiably "large", has raised considerable concern among Western security experts. The fact that the Soviet Union, now defunct for all intents and purposes, had deployed a considerable portion of its strategic and tactical nuclear missiles in Ukraine only exacerbates these concerns. This paper will seek to address some of these issues with a view towards placating some of these concerns, in the hope that they are being raised by the governments of the Western Democracies in good faith.

The Issue of National Sovereignty

When Lithuania declared its independence in March, 1990 the U.S. response was that the American government would recognise Lithuanian independence only when it had assurances that the Lithuanian government would be able to effectively "exercise sovereignty" over its territory. In spite of the fact that the U.S. never recognised the military annexation of the three Baltic states into the USSR, this provision was completely understandable from a viewpoint of international law, which — according to various legal/juridical precedents — requires that a state be capable of demonstrating that it can exercise sovereignty as a condition *sine qua non* for extending diplomatic recognition. The U.S. government, however, was notably mute, at least in its public utterances, on whether it would press Moscow to remove Soviet military divisions from Lithuania, that — from the American perspective (given its non-recognition of Moscow's annexation of Lithuania) — could only be viewed as an occupational force. In effect, the United States had, perhaps unwittingly, placed the newly proclaimed, but very vulnerable, Lithuanian republic into a "Catch 22" situation: on the one hand, refusing to extend recognition until Lithuania was able to demonstrate that it was truly sovereign; while on the other hand — not pressing Moscow to remove its troops, which effectively rendered the exercise of Lithuanian sovereignty virtually impossible, since the Lithuanian people were certainly in no position to be able to drive this occupational military force from their lands.

On August 24, subsequent to the Declaration of Ukrainian independence, by which a new juridical person was created called UKRAINE, the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine also resolved to establish a national armed force. Later, the Supreme Soviet also passed a bill that authorised the creation of a 400,000 strong Ukrainian army. The figure notwithstanding, the decision to create an armed force is not at all surprising, but rather is completely consistent with the pressing need to exercise sovereignty that any emerging state, that had just proclaimed its independence, would be cognizant of.

The ability to exercise national sovereignty fundamentally has two facets: a.) control over one's territory from within; b.) the defence of the integrity of one's borders from a foreign invasion, or even the threat thereof, from without. Furthermore, a sovereign nation-state needs to be able to control and monitor the flow of traffic, including goods,

passing through its borders. Clearly, every nation-state needs to have some kind of military force at its disposal in order to be able to exercise its national sovereignty. This principle is so firmly embedded into the annals of international law that it can, indeed, be considered to be one of the cornerstones upon which the contemporary global political order is built. Ukraine's decision, therefore, to create an army is certainly consistent with these basic international precepts.

Offensive, or Defensive Capability?

Several Western military strategists have expressed concern that Ukraine's decision to acquire an independent military capability poses a serious threat to global peace and security. By proclaiming its independence, Ukraine becomes one of the largest and potentially one of the most powerful states, both economically and militarily, in Europe, if not the world. Moreover, the perceived, or rather imagined Ukrainian threat looms larger in the minds of some Western foreign policy experts, since one can seemingly only guess at what political course an independent Ukraine will take in the future. After all, it is often said, we are not talking about one of the three Baltic states, whose respective population base is not nearly large enough to pose any kind of threat.

Such military and political pundits in the West may rest more easily, however, if they consider the fact that at no time in Ukraine's history did the Ukrainian people engage in any form of foreign adventurism, military expansionism, or bellicose colonialism. On the contrary, the Ukrainian people throughout their history have been subjected to the colonial policies of its neighbours and other global powers. If only for that reason alone, the Ukrainian people have acquired a deep and abiding respect for the rights of all nations and all human beings. The various national minorities living in Ukraine today, including the Russian minority, clearly appreciate the Ukrainian people's commitment to human rights, because otherwise they would not have voted so overwhelmingly in favour of Ukrainian independence in the December 1 referendum. Moreover, the Ukrainian government, as well as every political party and civic organisation in Ukraine today have over and over again reiterated their unqualified commitment to democracy, global peace and security. Finally, the Ukrainian government has already taken steps to establish peaceful relations with the former republics of what was once the USSR. In a word, there is hardly a reason why Ukraine, having finally established itself as a free and sovereign state, independent from Moscow's control, should even consider jeopardising its newly-secured independence by initiating or being a party to some military action against another state or people.

The armed forces that Ukraine has embarked on creating will have a strictly defensive nature and under no circumstances will be used in an offensive capacity. Regardless of whoever may be at the head of the Ukrainian government now or in

the near future, the peace-loving Ukrainian people would never support a government that engages in any form of military adventurism, expansionism, or even bellicose "sabre rattling". The Ukrainian people also understand that unless Ukraine establishes its own formidable, albeit strictly defensive, armed force as a deterrent to inimical foreign designs on its lands, then Ukraine's newly-forged independence will remain in a state of permanent vulnerability and the hard-fought liberation struggle would have been for naught.

Given the actively latent "great Russian chauvinist" attitudes that have resurfaced in present-day Russia in a most ominous fashion, the West may be more prudent to monitor developments there, than in Ukraine, insisting on guarantees from the Russian SFSR government that the rights of Ukrainians and other national minorities be respected and secured. In spite of the dissolution of the USSR, many smaller peoples remain in a servile position in the Russian SFSR and have only recently begun to reassert themselves. The Ukrainian government would undoubtedly be wary of any moves that the Russian government may make to forcibly crush these peoples' aspirations, which would probably lead to widespread bloodshed and, perhaps, civil war in areas of the RSFSR that border with Ukraine. Such a Russian military crackdown launched against a national minority within the RSFSR may, indeed, become a false pretext for a subsequent Russian military incursion into sovereign Ukrainian territory. The Ukrainian government may, indeed, be responsive to a NATO suggestion that NATO observers be sent into Ukraine to monitor future events, particularly insofar as this may be an acceptable venue to preclude Russian military expansion into Ukraine. In brief, violence may be avoided if the Western Democracies bring pressure to bear on the Russian government to secure the rights of the many various national minorities living within the RSFSR's borders, rather than unilaterally and exclusively insisting that Ukraine alone abide by international covenants.

An Army that is "Too Large"?

It has often been suggested that Ukraine's plans to build an army numbering 400,000 troops is unwarranted and even provocative. James Baker, the U.S. Secretary of State, recently stated that he finds it very surprising that at a time when all the European countries together with the United States and Canada are presently negotiating treaties that would reduce the levels of military personnel in Europe, Ukraine, on the other hand, is planning on building a "large" armed force. The German Defence Minister also recently voiced his opposition to Ukraine's plans in this regard, pointing out that even at the height of the Cold War, active German military personnel numbered no more than 390,000.

Such positions neglect to take into account several important points. First, with the establishment of a Ukrainian army, the military personnel that are presently

deployed in Ukraine will actually be significantly reduced. Presently, there are over 1.2 million Soviet soldiers stationed in Ukraine. Ukraine's plans to ultimately build an army that will number no more than 400,000 soldiers means that over 65% of the soldiers in Ukraine will have to be demobilised, a reduction of 800,000 troops. Secondly, although technically correct, the German Defence Minister neglects to mention that in addition to German troop strength, the other NATO allies collectively had just as many, if not more, of their own troops stationed on German soil at any one time. Such a concentration of troop strength was clearly warranted given NATO's strategy of "forward defence", in which Germany was to be NATO's first line of defence in the event of a Soviet conventional attack.

When compared with the troop strength of other sovereign states in the world, which do not have any immediate reason to fear a military attack against them, the claim that a 400,000 strong Ukrainian army would be too large is dubious. If one were to conduct a soldier/per capita breakdown, the quotient of American troop strength stands at .0125. Assuming that Ukraine successfully builds an army of 400,000 troops within the next few years, the Ukrainian soldier/per capita quotient (based on a population base of 52 million people) would stand at .0075, a figure that is considerably lower than the American quotient. Granted, the U.S. has many responsibilities throughout the world that undoubtedly warrant a military force that is that large. Using the above quotient as a reliable barometer, however, Ukraine's plans compare favourably to existing troop strength in other countries. Moreover, Ukraine, at this particular point in its history, has ample reason to feel threatened. It should also be underlined that Ukraine's plans to build an army are just that — plans. Everyone in Ukrainian government and political circles is fully aware of the fact that the ravaged Ukrainian economy could not presently sustain an armed force of 400,000 troops and that it will take several years for Ukraine to be able to reach those optimal levels. In the interim, therefore, there can be no rational basis for viewing the creation of a Ukrainian armed force as a provocative move. Finally, any armed force that will be established in Ukraine will have a strictly defensive character for all the reasons that were stated in the foregoing.

Does Ukraine Want to Become a Nuclear Power?

Most ominous in the minds of many Western statesmen and military strategists is the fact that a considerable number of the now-defunct Soviet Union's strategic and tactical nuclear arsenal is presently deployed on Ukrainian territory. Understandably, this is a worrisome issue for the West and for all of humankind in general, since no one wants to see these weapons of unprecedented mass destruction fall into the hands of crazed fanatics. From a Western perspective it may seem to be more comforting to have these missiles remain under some sort of "central" control.

Such a false hope, however, is deceptively dangerous for two fundamental

reasons: a.) a "centre" as such, for all intents and purposes, simply does not exist any longer, or whatever there is that remains of it is by far incapable of wielding any kind of control and, hence, to press for some kind of "central" control will actually have an even more destabilising effect; b.) to press for "central" control in effect amounts to handing over control to the government of Russian President Yeltsin, who is not only an unknown factor, but who is a leader of a nation that may be experiencing withdrawal pains of sorts, having just lost a significant section of its former imperial "glory", and may be ready to lash out to salvage whatever it can of its crumbling empire. The Russian people have yet to demonstrate that they can effectively eschew their traditional, historically documented, expansionist attitudes and policies. We all hope, of course, that the new, seemingly democratic, leadership in Russia will develop a responsible nuclear policy, but that aim may not be achieved if Moscow sees that the Western Democracies, specifically NATO, have unilaterally targeted Ukraine in terms of insisting upon nuclear responsibility.

Moreover, being itself victimised by the most catastrophic nuclear tragedy in history (*viz.*, the Chornobyl disaster), the Ukrainian people are deeply committed to pursuing a course that will gradually transform this newly-independent country into a nuclear-free zone. During the height of the Cold War, Moscow had strategically placed a considerable segment of its nuclear forces on Ukrainian territory so as to manoeuvre NATO into targeting its nuclear missiles on Ukrainian lands, thereby transforming Ukraine into one vast nuclear laboratory in the foreboding experiment that was called "mutually assured destruction". This matter is a sore point with most Ukrainians and any restraint on the part of the Ukrainian government with regard to giving Moscow full control over the nuclear arsenal on Ukrainian soil is more a sign of warranted Ukrainian caution, rather than some attempt on the part of Ukraine to now use these weapons of mass destruction as some surreptitious threat or as a devious bargaining chip in any kind of negotiations with Moscow or with the Western Democracies. NATO leaders should appreciate Ukraine's reticence to unconditionally turn these missiles over to Moscow without any kind of assurances from its historical enemy that they will not be subsequently used against the peaceful Ukrainian people. The Ukrainian people want to see these terrible weapons dismantled and completely destroyed and they hope that the United States and the NATO powers will be of great assistance in this regard. Ukrainians also trust that in the interim, while Ukraine is left vulnerable to a nuclear attack, e.g., from the Russian SFSR, whose leader has more than once used belligerent language in openly questioning Ukraine's present-day borders, NATO will include Ukraine under its nuclear deterrent umbrella.

Conclusion

Future historians will undoubtedly mark December 1, 1991 as not only the date that Ukraine finally reestablished its independence, but also as the date that signifies the final fall of the USSR, i.e., the Soviet Russian empire, which for the last 70 years had been the scourge of all humankind. Thankfully, the Soviet Union did not explode from within a violent cauldron of mutually antagonistic national hatreds, as many prophets of doom both in the West and in the USSR prognosticated it would, arguing from this position that the West must prop up this dying empire. Instead, the USSR imploded in what was a remarkably peaceful process under the weight of irreconcilable internal contradictions and the irrepressible human will to freedom and justice. In light of the truly peaceful revolution that has completely transformed the world these past few years, Mikhail Gorbachev's desperate warnings of impending doom not only sound increasingly hollow, but are also a last-ditch attempt on the part of the last heir of Russian imperialism to salvage whatever remains of the empire that he had been bequeathed.

Now is the time for a constructive rebuilding process to begin, for new ties to be forged and for old antagonisms to be buried. The Western Democracies can be instrumental in this process not by signalling out Ukraine and laying on this newly-independent country the onus of responsibility for maintaining peace in the world, but rather by treating all the emerging national entities of the now defunct Soviet Union as equal partners, as co-architects of a new, truly just and free world order.

In conclusion, it is only natural for Ukraine, now that it is free and independent, to formulate its national security policy in accordance with its own national interests. What the West ought to realise, however, is that Ukraine's interests coincide with those of the Western Democracies, because it is eminently clear to Ukraine's leaders that it is in their country's interests to pursue global peace and security and to promote harmony and good-will among all of humankind.

Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists

Major New Study of Ukrainians in Canada, 1891-1924

In recognition of the centennial of Ukrainian emigration to Canada, the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press has published the most detailed study ever written of the early years of Ukrainian settlement in Canada. Orest Martynowych's "Ukrainians in Canada: The Formative Years, 1891-1924", is the result of years of research, drawing upon the periodical press, government publications, unpublished manuscripts, a vast number of secondary works, and archival sources never before utilised.

Martynowych's work goes beyond existing accounts of the history of Ukrainians in Canada in several important respects. The Ukrainian experience in this country is placed firmly within the context of Canadian history, as well as the history of immigrants and immigration. The social and economic forces that "pushed" Ukrainian peasants out of eastern Galicia and "pulled" them to Canada are examined. Martynowych discusses the impact of the Ukrainian national movement, which shaped the outlook of Ukrainian community leaders in Canada, showing how the movement's radical, secular and populist precepts sustained opposition to heavy-handed methods of "Canadianisation" and promoted self-reliance and resistance to economic exploitation. Ukrainian Canadian attitudes to the First World War, the Russian Revolution and the struggle for Ukrainian independence are also examined.

More than any previous historian, Martynowych delves into the everyday lives of Ukrainian immigrants, surveying material conditions, examining occupational structures and entrepreneurial activity, and considering social differentiation. The activities of Ukrainian community institutions such as parishes, reading clubs, drama groups, cooperatives, national homes, socialist circles and labour temples are analysed in detail, as are efforts of Ukrainian socialists and nationalists to transmit their ideologies and mobilise popular support.

"Ukrainians in Canada" (ISBN 0-920862-76-4) is a book of 705 pages, lavishly illustrated with 88 period photographs and ten maps, containing a wealth of statistical material. The book is available for \$49.95 (GST not included) from the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press and its distributors.

Books Received

Ukraine under Perestroika: Ecology, Economics and the Workers' Revolt

David R. Marples

Macmillan, 1991 ISBN 0-333-49260-9 (hardcover)

This book highlights the problems of the environment and industry in Ukraine from 1985 to 1990. It begins with the aftermath to Chernobyl and continues with other ecological issues. The main theme of the book is the close link between the damage to nature and the growth of political activism and patriotism in Ukraine.

In turn, industrial workers in Ukraine have acted independently to address labour conditions. The author pays special attention to the coalminers' strike of the summer of 1989. The volume demonstrates the politicisation of Ukraine on the eve of sovereignty and the follies of an outdated system of centralised planning.

Byzantium and the Slavs in Letters and Culture

Ihor Sevcenko

Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and Istituto Universitario Orientale, Naples, 1991

ISBN 0-916458-12-1

These reprints of articles, reviews, and other short pieces by Ihor Sevcenko are gathered together in one volume for the first time. The collection reflects the author's contributions to the study of the relationship between Byzantine and east Slavic culture. Sevcenko has provided a number of the original articles with his own addenda. The articles include the study, "Fragments of the Toparcha Gothicus", in which the author demonstrates their 19th-century provenance at the hands of Karl Benedikt Hase who discovered them; the analysis of the impact on Muscovite political ideology of the writings of Deacon Agapetus; the discovery of the Greek prose original of the putative poem contained in the Life of the Slavic Apostle Cyril; and the find, made at St. Catherine's Monastery, of Constantine Tischendorf's letters regarding the transfer of the Codex Sinaiticus to St. Petersburg. Other articles include the author's studies on the impact of Byzantine social history at the time of the Slavic Apostles.

Of further interest to Byzantinists and Slavists alike are Sevcenko's reviews and retrospectives, including those of George Christos Soulis, George Ostrogorsky, Francis Dvornik, and Michael Cherniavsky. The volume is a guide through the world of Byzantium and the Slavs and reconstructs the relationship between the two in the light of texts, both literary and scientific. It also reflects the history of Slavic and Byzantine studies in the US and Europe.

The Third Reich and the Ukrainian Question. Documents 1934-1944

Wolodymyr Kosyk

Ukrainian Central Information Service, London 1991 ISBN 0-902322-39-7

There are very few publications in the West dealing with the attitude of the government of the Third Reich towards the Ukrainian question. Apart from that, finding itself in the camp of the anti-Nazi coalition, the Soviet Russian government made every effort to falsify the true history of the struggle of the Ukrainian national-liberation movement against Nazism and the German occupation. The sole reason for this propaganda campaign was that the Ukrainian national-liberation movement was not only fighting against the German occupational forces in Ukraine, but was also waging war against the Stalinist dictatorship and Soviet Russian occupation.

The documents published in this collection exclusively relate the attitude of the Nazi government towards the Ukrainian question in international relations. They shed light on Hitler's policy towards Ukraine and show the true position of the Ukrainian liberation movement towards Nazi Germany during the German occupation of Ukraine.

Ukrainian Economic History Interpretive Essays

I. S. Koropecyk (Editor)

Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute Sources and Documents Series.

Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1991 ISBN 0 916458-35-0

This volume contains the papers presented at the Third Quinquennial Conference on Ukrainian Economics, held at the Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University, in 1985. The proceedings contain fourteen previously unpublished essays dealing with the one thousand years of Ukrainian economic history prior to the outbreak of the First World War.

The contributions are divided chronologically into three parts, covering the periods of Kyivan Rus', the 16th and 17th centuries, and the 19th century. Their intention is not to give a comprehensive survey of Ukrainian economic history, but primarily to deal with important economic issues of particular periods. The problem of the orientation of the Kyivan Principality with regard to the Nomadic East and the Byzantine South is discussed in the first part. The authors of the volume's second part analyse the economic ties of the Ukrainian economy during the rise and fall of Kozakdom and, subsequently, the Hetman State, with the West and Muscovy.

The contributions in the third part deal with the important problems of economic development during Ukraine's rebirth as a modern nation in the past century. Issues discussed include: population change, industrialisation, relations with the Russian Empire's metropolis, urbanisation, and the development of the southern and

western (within the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy) regions. Finally, the introductory essay offers a proposal for a periodisation scheme of Ukrainian economic history.

The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles: The Ostroz'kyj (Xlebnikov) and Cetvertyns'kyj (Pogodin) Codices

Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature Texts: Volume VIII

Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1990 ISBN 0-916458-37-7

In ca. 1307, three Old Rus' chronicles — the *Povest' vremennyx let* (Tale of Bygone Years, covering the years 872-1117), the Kyivan chronicle (for the years 1119-1199) and the Galician-Volhynian chronicle (for the years 1205-1289) — were joined together. These three component parts have come down to us only in the form of a compilation (datable to ca. 1425) which scholars have named the Hypatian chronicle.

Of the five extant witnesses of the Hypatian chronicle, the so-called Xlebnikov codex occupies a special place. It was most probably copied in Volhynia during the second half of the 16th century for Prince Konstjantyn Ostroz'kyj.

The so-called Pogodin codex, closely related to the Xlebnikov, was copied in 1621 in Zvyotiv for Prince Stefan Svjatopolk Cetvertyns'kyj.

Both the Ostroz'kyj and Cetvertyns'kyj codices appear here for the first time in facsimile. Until now they have been known only from footnotes to editions of the Hypatian chronicle.

Hryhorij Hrabjanka's The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj

Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature Texts: Volume IX

Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1990 ISBN 0-916458-38-5

The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj was undoubtedly the most popular of the so-called Kozak chronicles. Like his fellow chroniclers, Hryhorij Hrabjanka (d. 1738) belonged to the "stratum of military chancellors" who in the beginning of the 18th century transformed Ukrainian history writing by wresting it from the hands of Kyivan ecclesiastical circles.

Written in 1710, Hrabjanka's chronicle deals with the revolution of Hetman Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj and its aftermath. However, as Yuriy Lutsenko demonstrates in his introduction, the work is not so much a chronicle in the traditional sense of the word, but rather a well-written dramatic account of events intended to glorify the achievements of the Kozaks.

Hrabjanka's chronicle has come down to us in abbreviated and non-abbreviated versions. The present volume contains facsimiles of four of the most important witnesses of the work: a manuscript of the non-abbreviated version; a manuscript of the abbreviated version; the edition of 1854; and the forgotten *editio princeps* published in 1793.

Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'

Translated and with an introduction by Simon Franklin

Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature English Translations: Volume V

Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1991 ISBN 0-916458-41-5

The authors included in this volume, Ilarion, Klim Smoljatic, and Kirill of Turov, are remarkable for both their personal and literary achievements. Appointed in 1051 by Prince Jaroslav the Wise, Ilarion was the first of only two recorded "native" metropolitans of Kiev. His "Sermon on Law and Grace" constitutes the finest piece of 11th-century Rus' rhetorical literature. Klim Smoljatic, the second "native" metropolitan of Rus' (from 1147), is the author of the controversial "Epistle to Foma", which addresses the debate over the proper nature and limits of Christian learning. Finally, the 12th-century monk Kirill of Turov is best known for his collection of allegorical lessons and some of the most accomplished works of Kievan Rus'.

The volume contains the first complete translations of the "Epistle to Foma" and the lessons and sermons of Kirill, as well as an entirely new rendering of the "Sermon on Law and Grace". Simon Franklin prefaces the texts with a substantial introduction that places each of the three authors in their historical context and examines the literary qualities as well as textual complexities of these outstanding works of Rus' literature.