

Foreign Affairs Information Series
No. 16

Russian World Ambitions
AND
World Peace
The Only Solution.

HITLER'S FATAL BLUNDER; BRITAIN'S OPPORTUNITY

by R. Ilnytzky

Foreword by

John F. Stewart

July, 1953

Price 2/-

SCOTTISH LEAGUE FOR EUROPEAN FREEDOM

SCOTTISH LEAGUE FOR EUROPEAN FREEDOM

President

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD IRONSIDE,
G.C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., L.L.D., FIELD MARSHAL.

Vice-Presidents

The Rt. Hon. THE EARL OF MANSFIELD
GORDON DUNCAN
PROFESSOR A. DEWAR GIBB
SIR MALCOLM BARCLAY HARVEY, K.C.M.G.
Major SIR GUY LLOYD, D.S.O., M.P.
Captain SIR J. H. F. McEWEN
Lt. Col. SIR THOMAS MOORE, C.B.E., M.P.
SIR GEORGE A. WATERS, LL. D.

Chairman

JOHN F. STEWART

Vice-Chairman

D. MACNAUGHTON, W.S.

Address:

Ashfield
Juniper Green,
Edinburgh.

Telephone:

87789

Russian World Ambitions
and
World Peace

HITLERS FATAL BLUNDER; BRITAIN'S OPPORTUNITY

by R. Ilnytzky

A WARNING
AGAINST THE IMITATION OF HEINRICH HIMMLER

(The struggle over the programme of psychological warfare against
the Soviet Union)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. The American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia and its programme of action.
2. German policy in the East during the second World War:
 - a) The plan of Alfred Rosenberg.
 - b) Programmes of A. Hitler, H. Himmler, H. Goering and Keitel.
 - c) The conception of Count von Schulenburg.
3. The Wiesbaden Conference, November 3rd—7th, 1951.
 - d) K.O.N.R.—or the experiment of Vlassov.
4. Protests against the Eastern European programme of the "A.C.L.P.R." by
 - a) Ukrainians
 - b) Byelorussians
 - c) Turkestanians
 - d) Cossacks
 - e) Georgians
 - f) Azerbaijanians
 - g) North-Caucasians
 - h) A.B.N.—the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.

FOREWORD

The following little work is most timely and important. The word has apparently gone round in America and Britain towards renewed disastrous appeasement of Moscow. Apparently the tendency is to look for better relations with Malenkov and do nothing which would irritate him. And then there will be some assurance of peace! This kind of talk always amazes me—who of all countries in the world is endangering peace? Surely it is only Russia. As for "Talks", any Talk by Russia only means demanding more concessions, and there is little more in Europe they can ask for.

As for the attitude we should observe towards the Russians, I take another view. I always believe in telling the truth about anything, pleasant or otherwise. Can you ever negotiate with the Russians and can you depend on their word, and have they anything in their mind but world conquest? I think the answers to all these are unfavourable. However, here are some other opinions from men of unquestionable authority.

A book of extraordinary interest has been just published, "Journey for our Time". It is a translation from the French of the Journal of the Marquis de Custine, who made a tour of Russia in 1839, where he went to study on the spot, Russian conditions, the national and personal characteristics of the people, and so on. He was an experienced observer, keen, shrewd, capable. He had direct access to all classes, from the Tsar downwards and ample opportunities for close study. Further, he went to Russia with the exalted ideas of the country, etc. that so many of our Labour extremists hold. He finished his tour disillusioned. Here are some extracts from his book, and they should be studied in order to know the kind of people you are dealing with.

"Here a capital question arises: is the idea of conquest, which is the secret life of Russia, to seduce dense populations?"

"The more I see of Russia, the more I agree with the ruler when he forbids Russians to travel and makes access to his own country difficult for foreigners. The political system of Russia could not withstand twenty years of free communication with Western Europe. Do not listen to the boasts of the Russians; they take pomp for elegance, luxury for politeness, police and fear for the foundations of society".

"If you had accompanied me on this journey you would have discovered, with me, in the depths of the souls of the Russian people, the inevitable revages of arbitrary power pushed to the utmost of possible consequences. The first result is the savage indifference to sanctity of the word, sincerity of sentiment, justice of deed; the second result is deceit triumphant in all the actions and transactions of life—the absence of probity, bad faith, fraud in all its forms. In a word, a deadened moral sense".

"They (the Russians) wish to rule the world by conquest; they mean to seize by armed force the countries accessible to them, and thence to oppress the world by terror. The extension of power they dream of is in no way either intelligent or moral, and if God grants it to them, it will be for the woe of the world". (*Is not this exactly the position today? J.F.S.*)

Innumerable quotations of this sort could be given, and, as Bedell Smith, the former Ambassador in Moscow says in a foreword, the author's journals could have been sent by him to the State Department as his own — Russia then is Russia today.

Prince Adam Czartoryski was a member of the Russian Imperial Court, an intimate friend of the Grand Duke Alexander, a confidant of Prince Paul, and a Russian Ambassador. He lived from 1779 to 1861, and his Memoirs were published in 1868. Here is an extract:—

"...the instinct of conquest: they employed artifice and violence by turns, and succeeded with rare ability in augmenting their territory at the expense of their neighbours.

"All the objects which Russia pursues unceasingly—amounting to nothing less than the subjugation of the greater part of Europe and Asia... Russia has come near to the attainment of its object without Europe succeeding in stopping her... Peter's pitiless ambition (for conquest of the world) still lies at the bottom of every Russian heart".

I can quote an even greater authority and a more modern one. The late Maxim Litvinov was the Russian best known to the West and the most human. Shortly before he died he gave an interview to a special correspondent of the *Washington Post*. The United States Government and the newspaper decided that it should not be published during Litvinov's life as it would have meant his execution. In the course of his interview, in answer to questions, he concluded that "We Russians were not to be trusted". "If concessions were made to the Russians and they were given all they asked for, it would not mean peace, but would be followed by other demands". "It would make no difference if war averted long enough for the younger generation to take over and change conditions, for the younger generation were educated in the ideas of the old". "I am always amazed when I read the reports of foreign correspondents that the Russian people say this or the Russian people say that; what people? whom do they see? no one". "It was not possible for the East and West to live peaceable side by side, for the Russian concept was that the more territory you have the safer you are, and that meant continual territorial aggrandisement".

There was much more to the same effect (*J.F.S.*).

The present policy towards Russia is to placate her and then we shall agree. Personally, I do not believe in this or in the efficacy of UNO, NATO, or anything of the sort. They will never keep Russia back. As long as the West keeps up that attitude, so long will Russia press for more conquests. What might have effect is

the realisation by Russia that the West has seen through her and trusts her no more, and will take other steps to bring peace to the world.

And the one way by which peace might have been brought is described in the following pages.

Count von Schulenburg had the way, Alfred Rosenberg had the way, and Russia's menace to the world could have been ended for ever. Hitler missed this opportunity, destroyed Germany, and gave the West the victory they otherwise would not have had. The Germans, in their invasion of Russia, were welcomed by every non-Russian nationality in the U.S.S.R. as liberators. When Hitler made public his plan of complete subjugation of these peoples, they unanimously turned against him, and fought the Germans as they were fighting the Russians.

Britain has at this moment the same opportunity as Hitler had, and it will mean a world disaster of the first magnitude and the wiping out of Britain, if she has no statesmen fit to grasp this heaven-sent chance.

J. F. S.

In the beginning of 1951 there was established in New York the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia". The founders of the Committee set themselves a far-reaching aim: they intended to unify in one organization refugees from the different peoples of the U.S.S.R. and to make them one single weapon for the fight against Bolshevism in the U.S.S.R.

The problem was one of bringing to a common denominator the political conceptions of Russian and non-Russian refugees. Anyone possessing some knowledge of Eastern European affairs will agree that the task could be described only as "formidable". It implied not only the pacification of the ever-clashing parties but also their linking firmly together and making friends out of enemies. The will of non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. to form their own national States—independent and separate from Russia—had to be harmonized with that of the Russians—to preserve the conquests of the tsars and bolsheviks in a Russian democratic Empire after the fall of Bolshevism. Experts on Eastern European problems unhesitatingly predicted failure for the American attempt. Imperialism which had deeply rooted in past centuries of Russian history is still fully alive in Russian political anti-communist circles. It would be obviously impossible to make away with this attitude of mind in a few months time by means of negotiations. It has to be stressed that there is no Russian political party or even a circle of Russian politicians of any significance that would be prepared to recognize the right of non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R. to have their own national State. The most progressive forces among them are unable to go beyond the principle of federation when thinking of the future post-communist Russian Empire—and even that with due reservations. No Russian political party has gone farther.

On the other hand, the non-Russian peoples are not less resolute than the Russians. They are firmly determined to bring to an end once and for all not only Bolshevism but also the Russian Empire. There is no political party or political circle worth mentioning among Ukrainians, Turkestanians and Caucasians which would

not defend most resolutely the right of their nations to their own States, independent from Russia. Their programme knows no compromise: first — full sovereignty, afterwards — negotiations over the manner of international co-operation with their neighbours. First—equality, afterwards—discussions on one or another kind of international agreements.

Unfortunately, the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" did not make any allowance for these historical facts. In spite of all warnings, it attempted to establish an association with a marked preference for the Russian imperialistic point of view, entirely disregarding the will of non-Russian peoples.

The American Association began its work with 5 socialist or socialistically-coloured organizations of Russian exiles, first among them being members of the so-called "Vlassov-movement" which had been brought into existence by Himmler. The programme which was worked out by the 5 Russian parties together with the American Association, completely ignored the principle of equality of nations and their rights to self-determination.

This was particularly manifest in the proposed resolution on the form of organization of the common association. It stated amongst other things: "The 5 political organizations, namely: the League of Fighters for the Freedom of People (L.B.N.S.), the National Union of Labour (N.T.S.), the Russian People's Movement (R.N.D.), the Union of Fighters for the Liberation of Russian Peoples (S.B.O.N.R.), the Union of Fighters for the Freedom of Russia (S.B.S.R.), have agreed on the following resolution with regard to the composition of the "Council for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" and its Executive:

1) The "Council for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" consists of 60 members.

2) The above named political organizations are represented on the Council by 4 delegates each.

3) One third of all members of the Council shall be representatives of democratic political organizations of the nationalities of Russia. Only such political organizations of nationalities may be admitted into the Council which have agreed to work on the basis of the political programme of the "Council for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia".

4) There shall be invited into the Council also prominent democratic representatives from the population, Cossack soldiers and representatives of cultural life. Only those accepting the programme of the Council shall be invited, their number corresponding to one third of the total Council membership."

The same Russian political parties have accepted simultaneously the following resolution concerning the other nations of U.S.S.R.: "The 5 Russian organizations consider it important to stress that, while recognizing the right of every nation of the U.S.S.R. to self-

determination, they are convinced that a division of Russia is not in the interests of the above mentioned nations either politically or culturally or economically. The balkanization of the territory of Russia would have detrimental consequences for all nations of Russia without any exceptions. It would bring about not only the breaking of vital cultural and economic links but also the danger of continuous conflicts which would result in civil wars.

It is our opinion that the only way to proceed correctly and in the interests of all nations is to preserve the unity of the family of all free nations of Russia, namely, on the basis of a federation and a national and cultural autonomy".

These two documents do not require any commentary. They make it obvious that the Russian refugees claim a predominant position in the proposed association, and that they have in no way retreated from the imperialistic aims of Russian policy. It is significant that the Russians demand for themselves over 50 p. c. of seats on the "Council for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia", reserving the rest for the other nine nations. The above resolution speaks for itself, and provides a sufficient reason for non-Russian peoples to reject the whole idea of the "Council", which they accordingly did. Not a single representative of the non-Russian peoples accepted the Russian offer,—it was rejected by all. The political solidarity of non-Russian peoples which became manifest during the campaign for the Council was highly impressive. Details and documents in this respect will be given later. It will be enough to mention here that the few persons—mostly unknown and entirely insignificant—from among the ranks of the several millions of non-Russian refugees who chose to enter into negotiations with the Russians were either expelled or boycotted by their countrymen. This shows even more clearly the unity in the ranks of the non-Russian nations.

* * * *

Where lies the problem?

Russian activities are given importance because they have been started on the initiative of American politicians and journalists, and with financial support from certain American circles. The American Association reflects views which are not uncommon in the West as regards Eastern European problems. The question is one of basic, and in many ways decisive importance: how should psychological warfare be conducted against the Soviet Union to achieve success? This question provokes the clash of two opposite views: one argues that slogans proclaiming the division of the U.S.S.R. into national states have to be disseminated in the East: the other maintains that the only password to win the support of peoples of the Soviet Union is the promise to do away with the Bolshevik regime and to preserve on the whole the present Empire. The "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia has from the beginning declared itself for the second alternative.

The same problem was facing Germany on the eve of her assault in the East. At that time too, there was a struggle between different views as to what should be the policy towards the peoples of the Soviet Union in order that the war might be won both politically and psychologically. In Germany opinions were then divided over the same questions which are so hotly disputed in the West to-day. Roughly speaking, there were four different conceptions of the German Eastern European policy which were mutually opposed. It was fatal for Germany as well as for the peoples of the Soviet Union that the views prevailed which in the end contributed towards the German defeat in the East. It was, on the one hand, the policy of the so-called "subhumanity" and, on the other, that which was known under the name "Vlassov-experiment". The latter resembles the so-called S.O.N.R.-Action (American Association for the Liberation of the Russian Peoples) almost exactly. It is this similarity which makes us enter into a detailed discussion of the German Eastern policy during the second World War; this example will show to what consequences the S.O.N.R.-Action may and will lead the American and the whole Western policy.

THE GERMAN EASTERN POLICY DURING WORLD WAR II

In the beginning of the German-Soviet war, German Eastern policy was split only in two directions—other two appeared during the war. One was represented by the Reichsleiter and later Reichsminister for the occupied Eastern areas, Alfred Rosenberg. The fundamental conceptions of his policy were set forth in the most detailed and clearest way in his speech of 20th July, 1941, before a narrow circle of those associated most closely with the Eastern problem. Following is the text of his speech:— (We have omitted irrelevant parts).

"As Germany was chattered and politically deceived in an unheard-of manner, the possibility of an armed conflict drew obviously nearer. This possibility has been reckoned with and prepared for from military and economic standpoints, and these measures are being expanded. It is not my task here to touch on these matters: I shall discuss the setting of political aims. It is my conviction that military actions assume true significance only when these political aims are fixed. I believe that the economic measures have to be co-ordinated with political aims for the benefit of both tasks which have to be fulfilled.

"There are unquestionably two different conceptions of the East: one which is traditional, and the other which, I believe, we shall have to adopt. Developments during the coming centuries will take place according to our decision to accept or reject such a decision. The first conception declares that Germany has entered the final struggle with Bolshevism; this struggle has to be fought out from military and political standpoints; afterwards there would come the

construction of the entire Russian economy, and an alliance with the newly created national Russia. This alliance would form for all time an unassailable continental Block of nations in Europe. In addition, it would be extremely useful for a successful stand against the capitalistic world that Russia is an agricultural and Germany an industrial country. This conception has been generally accepted in many circles up till now. I believe that for these 20 years I have never concealed my opposition to this ideology. It has to be admitted, to render it justice, that this conception was understandable while Russia had not yet become an aggressive factor of world politics.

"This policy was understandable also in 1920 while the struggle between the Bolsheviks and the White Russian generals was undecided and a possibility existed of White Russian victory. To-day, however, this thesis becomes dangerous for the future of Germany. The Soviet Union as the successor of the tsarist Empire is no longer a factor in European politics but an object of German world-policy.

It is time now to consider the dangers of the above conception. When, after the defeat of Bolshevism by the German Wehrmacht, we would proceed with the reconstruction of the national Russian State, it would result in the following developments: the reconstruction of these gigantic areas by German technicians and agriculturists would mean drawing on the best German forces, not for the benefit of Germany, but of Russia. The dangerous attraction of the East is obvious for all who have been there themselves. People from the big industrial cities, once they have seen the Eastern space, are tempted to become rich in this vast country and to forget their petty middle-class existence. Even in the age of nationalism there is the danger that these people, supplied by Germany, would be lost not only politically but also racially, i. e. they would form the leadership for the Russian State during the coming generations. This would bring about a new germanification of the Russian leading class which, not being satisfied with a subordinated role for long, would raise again the same old imperialistic demands of the Russian Empire concerning the Baltic Sea, the Dardanelles, the Persian Gulf, etc. The realisation of these claims would mean, in turn, that after some 50 years we would be faced with a new conflict, being opposed to a gigantic block of 200 million people; in the meantime, the industrial resources of the present-day Russia would have increased twice, thrice or even tenfold by the new leading classes, and the exploitation of the immense reserves in Siberia would have started. This would set off a new struggle for the domination of Europe, and we would be ourselves the originators of these developments. It would be a repetition of what we call the "Petersburg period" of Russian history.

We are now waging, therefore, a crusade against Bolshevism, not only in order that we may save for ever from this Bolshevism the "poor Russians", but in order to pursue the aims of German

world-policy and to secure the German Reich. We want to solve not only the temporary problem of Bolshevism but also those problems which reach far beyond these temporary phenomena and which constitute the basic substance of historical forces in Europe. Our future attitude has to be adjusted accordingly. To wage a war with the aim of creating an undivided Russian Empire is out of the question. To exchange Stalin for a new Tsar or even a nationalistic leader in that area would only help to mobilise all forces against us. Instead of this until recently current idea of unified Russia, there has arisen an entirely different conception of the Eastern problem. I shall ask you to consider the following historical survey.

“Russia has never been a national State but a State of nationalities. Yet, the Russian historians of the last 150 years have skilfully painted before Western eyes the picture of a Russia inhabited and ruled by Russians only, a State similar to Germany, Great Britain of France. This doctrine of a United Russia had been accepted and accordingly taught in all German schools and universities. I have experienced quite recently that other views were severely criticised and declared as “scientifically unsound” by some particularly “expert” professors. It was only grudgingly admitted that in this colossal State there were dozens of tribes and races. Attempts were made to minimize the problem of nationalities by asserting that there were about a 100 splinter-tribes but no real nation. And yet all these peoples remained hostile towards the Russians. It became manifestly clear in 1917. At first opportunity, Finns, Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians broke off from the Russian Empire and founded their own States. There was vindicated then the opinion of Mommsen who said: The Russian Empire is a dust-bin that is held together by the rusty hoop of this Tsardom. To the amazement of all, 30,000 Ukrainians appeared before the Historical Museum in Petersburg a few days after the Revolution, demanded their Hetman-Insignia and carried them in triumph to Kyiv. In 1918 proposals were made to German army commanders not to withdraw their armies to Germany but to let the German soldiers become Ukrainian citizens, so that the Ukrainian State might be defended jointly against the Russians. The situation at that time naturally prevented the acceptance of such proposals. It was then that the time of great revolts began. 200,000 men were assembled under Petlura for the struggle against Moscow. The peasant revolts during the following years failed because of the geographical conditions—before the rebels were able to assemble in any numbers they were overrun by the superior technique of the Red industrial cities. The awakening Ukrainians led the fight against the “Muscovites”. At the same time a free Republic of Georgia arose in the Caucasus, and the Turkestanians proclaimed their independence. The Muscovite centralism shattered all these independence movements with

the exception of the Western States. It seems to me therefore that the task of our policy should be to take up again in an intelligent and purposeful manner the aspirations to freedom of all these peoples and to mould them into a definite political system, i. e. to cut out organically from the Soviet State-Colossus certain political areas and to build them up against Moscow, in order that the German Reich might be safe from the Eastern nightmare for coming centuries. There are four large Blocks that should serve us as protection, bringing at the same time far towards the East the concept and the reality of Europe:

1. Finland,
2. The Baltic countries,
3. Ukraine,
4. Caucasus.

FINLAND was liberated by German soldiers in 1918 and is about the only country that has shown by example that it has not entirely forgotten the deed. During their struggle with Russia, the Finns received a lesson in history in such a way that they became convinced once and for all of the necessity to turn towards Germany. I am sure also that the Finnish character—which has been proved true of all Finnish soldiers—inspires perhaps more confidence than that of many German allies in the past.

THE BALTIC COUNTRIES were once the oldest German colony. They were always self-supporting and contained a small German minority which, however, maintained itself under the Russian rule. The Baltic nations have never become Russians—they turned to the West at the first opportunity. The Estonians have undoubtedly a high percentage of Swedish (and German) blood in them. Conditions in Livonia and Lithuania are somewhat more difficult. At any rate, this entire area will have to be cut out from the body of the Soviet Union with the aid—closed details of which cannot yet be discussed—to bring it into the closest relations with the German Reich. It is a question for the future whether Germanization can be achieved through allocating farmlands to German soldiers of this war and to the old fighters for the Baltic provinces. South of the Baltic countries lies Byelorussia, which is intended to be incorporated in the Commissariat of the Baltic provinces. Byelorussia of course, has an entirely different character; however, there will be most probably quite a number of unsocial people that will have to be banned from these Baltic countries, and Byelorussia is a most suitable receptacle for these unpleasant elements, and also for those from the Generalgouvernement and the Wartheland.

UKRAINE adjoins Byelorussia on the South. Ukrainians have fought for centuries against the Poles and the Muscovites. During the 17th century Ukrainians succeeded in

throwing off the Polish yoke, but for a short time only; under Chmelnitzky they defeated the Poles but were overpowered later and had to turn to Moscow. At the national assembly in Pereyaslav (1654), the alliance was concluded between Ukraine and Moscow. Russians were the stronger partner and won the consequences by systematically russifying the Ukrainian intellectuals. In 1918, Bolshevism became the ruler over 40 million Ukrainians. The Bolsheviks recognized a Ukrainian federative republic with Ukrainian as the official language. In recent years, however, reaction against these concessions is at work. Russian has become again the principal language in all Ukrainian offices. All nationally-minded Ukrainians have been deported in hundreds of thousands to Siberia and to the Urals. The Russian way of life largely predominates in Ukraine to-day. Here the aim of Germany obviously is the freedom of the Ukrainian people. It has to be included in the programme as a purely political item. There is as yet no sense in discussing in what manner and to what extent the Ukrainian State could be later developed. In any event, everyone closely concerned with the Eastern problem will have to be open to an understanding of this problem and to assume in this regard a friendlier attitude than the one which will be probably required towards the Baltic countries. At the same time one will have to proceed carefully. Publications on the Ukrainian struggle for liberation have to be encouraged with the view of awakening consciousness of Ukrainian history. There should be a university established in Kyiv. Building of technical High Schools, cultivation of the Ukrainian language by translating into it Ukrainian classics partly composed in Russian is recommended. Finally one would have to consider later developing a political movement, something on the lines of a Free Ukrainian Association of Cossacks. In the Baltic provinces one would have naturally to prevent Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians from organising political parties, whereas—considering different aims—it could be encouraged in Ukraine according to experience. Besides, it should be possible to support the cult of Ukrainian national heroes, such as Hetman Chmelnitzky, Sahaidachny and Mazeppa. These all will be means to make the Ukrainian national soul alive again. When one sees there a possible danger for the future, it should not be overlooked that the Muscovite State is by force of necessity not a friend but a mortal enemy of Germany and accordingly of Ukraine. Ukraine will have to rely always upon the support of another great Power which can be no other than Germany. Finally there will have to be provided beyond this a certain compensation which is not yet open for discussion. If the economic planning of the Reichsmarschal aims at securing the most profitable exploitation of the area, it will certainly pay to support the outlined political attitude and leadership; for it makes a considerable difference if I can win 40 million people for a voluntary co-operation inside a few years instead of having

to put a soldier behind every farmer. I believe that if both sides agree on this necessity, political consideration will help economic planning and, conversely economic planning will be easily set out according to the political aims.

As the third chapter we have the CAUCASUS. It serves as a home to dozens of races and tribes, the decisive thing being the absence of a major nation capable of forming a State.

Numbers of these different tribal components vary between one and a half to three millions, being in some cases as little as 20,000. We find there Georgians, Armenians, Tatars, Cherkesses, Abkhazians, Chechens, Kabardans and whatever else may be their names. If one would leave this mixture of nations alone, they would all cut one another's throats. Indeed, such was the case in 1918-1920 when the Caucasus was occupied by different Powers in turn. The aim here is not to establish a Caucasian national State but to find the solution in a federation; this could be brought so far with German help that these peoples might request Germany to guarantee their cultural and national existence. Moreover, Germany does not need to proceed here in the same way as did the Russians who insisted on setting up their own officialdom; these peoples may be granted an independent basis for organization that could secure a lasting peace. Here then the road over the Caucasus and across Ukraine to Germany has to provide a line of communications within a circle of States along the Black Sea. The solution in Caucasus requires a great deal of circumspection and a careful treatment of different nationalities. One has to be able to appreciate also conditions which may seem curious to us. This is a task of pre-eminently psychological and political nature, and I will ask you to select according to this point of view all the officials who have to be appointed, so as to prevent any harm occasioned through an in-landish attitude or certain meanness.

The fourth Commissariat is that of Russia proper, i. e. the area between Petersburg, Moscow and Urals. We have to declare here that even now we are not enemies of the Russian people. All of us who have been acquainted with Russians before—we all know that a Russian by himself is personally a kind and culturally gifted man, only without the Western firmness of character. We have to tell, however, that we do not want to begin this struggle with a new injustice—for it does not appear to us as divine justice when the Russians exert oppression over all other nations. Russians have ruthlessly tyrannised all nations. Peoples that have never had any minorities, as the English and the Russians, have as yet never understood a national struggle. Our fight for reorganization will take place in the name of a national self-determination for nations; surely, these nations have been in existence for centuries, even for thousands of years—they were brought under the yoke later. There is nevertheless no reason to assume that this oppression is a divine

law. The aim of the German Eastern policy with regard to the Russians will be to bring the original Muscovy back to its own traditions and to turn it to the East. Siberia has unlimited space and its central areas are fertile. Many revolutionaries that were deported by Tsarist Governments to Siberia were excellent people. The Siberian regiments were considered racially sound in the Russian Empire. Even when the Russians are stripped of those areas which do not belong to them, they will be left in possession of a larger territory than ever held by any nation.

I have now to point out to you shortly the boundaries of these four Reichskommissariats—of course, pending the decision of the Fuehrer. Consideration has been given to political aims, nationalities inhabiting the areas and to the present administrative boundaries of the Soviet Union which cannot be changed overnight.

The Reichskommissariat of the Baltic provinces will comprise four "Generalkommissariats" (three of them named "Landeshauptmannschaften") which will be later subdivided. The boundary goes West of Petersburg and South to Lake Ilmen, then southwards 250 km West of Moscow to the Ukrainian national boundaries. The boundary is marked ostensibly farther East, partly because there are in these areas remnants of Estonian and Latvian races, and partly because it will be useful, if we are planning a far-reaching germanization and blood-transfusion in the Western Baltic, to create a resettlement area between Estonia proper and Russia for Estonians and Latvians who will fulfil their duties industriously, being bound to Germany by vital interests; for any Russian aggression would mean their destruction. (The final boundaries will be defined, of course, by the G.H.Q., according to strategical requirements.) Adjoining comes Byelorussia (White Ruthenia) as a reception-centre for numerous unsocial elements. It will be treated also as national preserve. This area will have to be granted a certain autonomy some time later. As distinct from the designation "Landeshauptmannschaften" for Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, Byelorussia will be known as a "Generalkommissariat".

This Reichskommissariat attains an area of 550,000 square kilometres with 19.3 million inhabitants.

The Ukrainian boundaries embrace the settlement area of Ukraine proper, plus the districts of Kursk, Voronezh, Tambov and Saratov. For some years I have been supervising in my office the making of ethnic maps for the entire East. We have more or less ascertained the course of ethnic boundaries. The black-earth area, which yields the richest crops in Russia, can be safely incorporated under the Ukrainian administration without preposterously making the final decision.

Ukraine will be divided into 8 Generalkommissariats with about 24 Hauptkommissariats. It has an area of 1.1 million square kilometres with 59.5 million inhabitants.

In Caucasus, the boundary runs East of Volga and South of Rostov. On the whole, the existing State-frontiers with regard to Turkey and Iran remain. This area stretches over 500,000 kilometres and has 18 million inhabitants. It will be divided in General-kommissariats.

The remaining area is Russia proper. It has a population of between 50 and 60 millions spread over 2.9 million square kilometres.

To treat this area accordingly, to rule over it and to preserve it, is a task which the present generation will hardly be able to solve entirely—it is a task for centuries. It comes practically to establishing three gigantic State structures, each according to a different principle; the Baltic provinces (at first) in the form of a protectorate, Ukraine as a national State and the Caucasus as a federation. For every area an entirely different psychological approach to the respective nationalities is required. Russia, which will be separated from the West by these three Blocs of States, will be at liberty to pursue national developments eastwards without being forced to be europeanized.

We have before us two enormous tasks:

1. To safeguard the German Food and War economies; this is the great task of the Reichsmarschall, and

2. To free Germany for ever from the political pressure from the East: it is the political aim of our fight. This aim has to be striven after by means of a clever policy which would take into account the past and the present.

This policy requires firmness and clearness in thought and action. Every action has to serve both these tasks. A voluntary co-operation of all those who want to go with Germany guarantees an easier way towards reaching the economic necessities for the benefit of both parts".

Thus for the political views and plans of Rosenberg. In spite of his outspokenly hostile attitude towards some Eastern peoples, e. g. Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians and Byelorussians — his conception of the Eastern policy is the most far-reaching recognition by any Nazi politician of the true circumstances in the Soviet Union. His basic programme with regard to Ukrainians and to the Caucasian peoples failed mainly because his proposals for the creation of a Ukrainian national State and of a Caucasian federation were not often proclaimed and publicized in the beginning of the war, and because their realization was postponed to a later and unspecified time. It is not known what were the reasons that compelled Rosenberg to take this course, but one may assume that an important role in this respect fell to the strong opposition of leading personalities of the German Reich to Rosenberg's plans. Political concessions which Rosenberg made to his opponents in this decisive item produced a catastrophic effect on the morale of peoples in the Soviet Union, and, on the other

hand, provided the adherents of the policy of "subhumanity" with a good opportunity to realize their sinister plans in the East.

Rosenberg's opponents were, at any rate, too powerful for his plans in the East to be accepted. They included Adolf Hitler himself and such authorities as Goering, Himmler, Bormann, Keitel and Lammers. Their programme can be reduced to one single demand: the entire conquered East has to become a German "Lebensraum", i. e. a German colony, and all inhabitants of these areas have to be made slaves of the German Reich. This plan had no place even for the basic programme of Rosenberg.

This second conception of the German Eastern policy which was replaced only towards the end of the war by the so-called "Vlassov-experiment", was accepted as official for practically the whole duration of the war. It was formulated by Hitler in a conference with the Reichsleiter Rosenberg, Reichminister Lammers, Fieldmarshal Keitel and Reichsmarshal Goering on 16th August, 1941. Following are the minutes of this conference as taken down by Martin Bormann:

"Fuehrer's G. H. Q., 16th Aug. 1941
BO/FU.

File: *Secret State matter!*

On the initiative of the Fuehrer, a conference took place to-day at 3 p. m. in his rooms with Reichleiter Rosenberg, Reichminister Lammers, Fieldmarshal Keitel, the Reichsmarshal and myself being present.

The conference began at 3 p. m. and lasted, with a break for coffee, until about 8 p. m.

The Fuehrer began by saying that he wanted first to make certain fundamental statements. Certain measures were now necessary; this was made clear because of an insolent allusion in a Vichy newspaper that the war against the Soviet Union was the war of the entire Europe which had to be waged by the whole of Europe. What the Vichy paper apparently meant by this allusion was that the Germans were not the only ones who were entitled to benefit by this war, and that other European nations had to derive from it their profit, too.

The motivation of our steps before the world had to be done according to tactical viewpoints. We had to proceed exactly in the same way as we had done in Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium. We had not disclosed in those cases anything concerning our intentions, and we were not going to do it this time either.

We would have to repeat again that we had been forced to occupy a certain area to establish there order and security; in the interests of the local inhabitants we would have to take care of law and order, food, traffic, etc., etc.; therefore our regulations. It should

not be perceived that thereby the final regulation has been indicated. Notwithstanding that, we can take all necessary measures—shoot, deport, etc.

On the other hand, we do not want to turn some people too soon and unnecessarily into enemies. We proceed merely as if we had been assigned a mandate. We must, however, clearly understand that we would never retreat from these areas.

The plan for action is accordingly as follows:

1. Not to construct anything as final arrangement; this latter has to be prepared behind the scene.

2. To stress that we have come as liberators.

In details:

The Crimea has to be cleared of all aliens and colonized by Germans. So has the once Austrian district of Galicia (Western *Ukraine, Ed.*). Fundamentally, our task is to cut the gigantic cake with skill, so that it can be

- first, mastered,
- secondly, administrated,
- thirdly, exploited.

The Russians have now given an order for guerilla-war behind our lines. This has its own advantage: it provides us with the opportunity to destroy whatever is against us.

Fundamentals:

Creation of a military power West of the Urals is out of question, even if we have to fight for a hundred years to enforce this. All successors of the Fuehrer must be aware that the Reich cannot be safe while there is an alien army West of Urals. The defence of this area against any possible danger will be taken over by Germany. It must be and remain an iron rule: under no circumstances can anyone but Germans carry weapons. This is particularly important, for it is wrong to induce any subjected peoples into rendering us military assistance, even though it may appear more convenient at first sight. There is no doubt about it—they will turn against us sooner or later. Weapons may be carried only by Germans, certainly not by Slavs or Czechs, or Cossacks, or Ukrainians!

On no account can we pursue a vacillating policy as happened in Alsace before 1918. Where the English excel is in their continuous perseverance in one direction and towards one single aim. In this respect we have to learn from them unhesitatingly. We cannot make our policy dependent on any one single personality: here again the English attitude in India towards the Indian princes etc. serves as an example. It is always the soldier who has to safeguard the regime. Out of the newly aquired Eastern areas we have to make a garden of Eden; they are vital for us; the role of colonies is comparatively subordinate.

However, if we are proceeding now with the division of certain districts, we have to maintain that we are the defenders of all

rights and of the population. All necessary definitions have to be chosen accordingly. We do not speak of a new district of the Reich but of a task that has been made necessary by the war.

In details:

In the Baltic provinces, the area up to the Daugava—after consultations with Fieldmarshal Keitel—has to come under the administration.

Reichsleiter Rosenberg maintains that in his opinion a different treatment of the population is required in every Commissariat. In Ukraine we should begin with cultural welfare, we should make Ukrainians conscious of their history, we should establish a university in Kiev and so on.

According to the Reichsmarshal, we have to think first of securing enough food for us,—all the rest may follow later. (Incidentally: Is there any educated class left in Ukraine, or are all Ukrainians of better standing to be found only outside of Russia as emigrants?)

Rosenberg continues that in Ukraine certain aspirations to independence should be encouraged.

The Reichsmarshal asks the Fuehrer for information as to what areas have been promised to other states.

The Fuehrer replies that Antonescu claims Bessarabia and Odessa with a strip of land West-North-West of Odessa.

To objections by the Reichsmarshal and Rosenberg the Fuehrer declares that the boundary claimed by Antonescu differs little from the present Russian frontier.

The Fuehrer declares further that nothing definite has been promised to Hungarians, Turks or Slovaks.

The Fuehrer invites opinions on whether the Austrian part of Galicia should be included directly in the Government; after objections, the Fuehrer decides that this part will not be included in the Government but only placed under the administration of the Reichsminister Frank (Lviv).

The Reichsmarshal considers it right that certain parts of the Baltic provinces should be allotted to Eastern Prussia, e. g. the Forest of Bialystok.

The Fuehrer emphasizes that the whole Baltic area has to become Reichsterritory. The Crimea, too, has to be incorporated in the Reich with a possibly large area to the North of it. (Incidentally, it appears several times that Rosenberg cares particularly about the Ukrainians; he wants to expand the old Ukraine considerably).

The Fuehrer emphasizes further that the German Volga colony has to become a territory of the Reich, and similarly the area round Baku; this has to be a German concession (a military colony).

The Finns desire Eastern Karelia, but the peninsula of Kola will fall to Germany because of the large nickel deposits. The affiliation of Finland as a federal State has to be carefully prepared. The area around Leningrad has been claimed by Finns; the Fuehrer

wants to raze Leningrad to the ground and hand it then over to the Finns.

The Fuehrer reminds the Reichsmarshal and the Fieldmarshal that he had been always pressing for the police-regiments to be equipped with tanks; it is most necessary, for police action in the new Eastern areas as a police regiment with an adequate number of tanks can achieve a great deal. On the whole, emphasizes the Fuehrer, the security ring is naturally rather thin. However, the Reichsmarshal will transfer all his training air-strips to the new areas, so that even the Ju-52's might be used for quelling revolts by bombing in case of necessity. Naturally, the vast territories have to be pacified as soon as possible; this can be best achieved by shooting everyone who shows a wry face.

Fieldmarshal Keitel maintains that the inhabitants of all areas have to be made responsible for their affairs themselves, for it is naturally impossible to put a guard at every shed or station. They have to be aware that everyone not functioning properly will be shot, and that they would be made liable for every offence. (Incidentally: the Fuehrer states with emphasis that any activity by the Churches is completely out of the question. Papen has already sent him a long memorandum through the Foreign Office asserting that it was now the right moment to reintroduce the Churches. This is definitely out of the question).

It is clear from the quoted minutes that Rosenberg was faced with a united front of Hitler, Goering, Keitel, Bormann and, naturally, Himmler. He obviously tried to defend his basic programme of Eastern European policy, but he had no chance to penetrate through the exceedingly influential coalition which was opposing him. By Hitler's orders and with the consent of all his closest associates, the policy of "subhumanity" was proclaimed officially.

* * * *

The third conception of German Eastern policy appeared only a few months after the outbreak of war. It was formulated by the German Ambassador in Moscow, Count von Schulenburg.

This outstanding expert of Russian affairs timely recognized the cause and importance of the voluntary surrender of 2 million Red Army soldiers. He perceived that it was a manifestation of the will of non-Russian peoples (most of the deserters were non-Russians) to break loose from the Russian Empire. He submitted accordingly the following proposals to the leaders of the German Reich:

1. The German Government declares that it has no territorial claims in the East.
2. The German Government agrees to permit the establishment of self-governments in all conquered countries of the Soviet Union, i. e. for all nations of the U.S.S.R.
3. Germany will treat these governments as her allies.

We do not have at our disposal any documents defining the views of Count von Schulenburg. We refer to the researches of the American politician Caroll and of the British General Fuller—both excellent experts on the archives of the German Foreign Office.

The proposals of the Count von Schulenburg were received in German ruling circles as politically unacceptable and harmful; they were treated accordingly. Count von Schulenburg himself was executed after the attempt on Hitler's life.

The fourth conception of German Eastern policy is closely connected with the political life and aspiration of the Russian exiles. To present it clearly, we have to point out at least the chief characteristics of the Russian policy in exile during the second World War. The fourth conception of German Eastern policy can be classified under the title "Vlassov-experiment".

THE POLICY OF THE RUSSIAN ANTI-COMMUNIST PARTIES DURING THE WORLD WAR II.

Russian anti-communist parties became active only outside of the Soviet Union. There was no underground activity by Russian parties in Russia itself.

At the outbreak of the war, all Russian Parties which were active outside of the Axis' sphere of influence, appealed to the Russians in exile and at home to fight in the Russo-German war on the side of Stalin.

On the contrary, those Russian parties in exile which were active within the Axis' sphere of influence, regarded as their most important task to penetrate into leading German circles and to work against the realization of the political conceptions of Rosenberg and Schulenburg. They increased their efforts considerably in 1942 when the defeat of the U.S.S.R. was palpably near, and they began to prepare a political plan for Russo-German relations in case of German victory. It was the ex-general of the Red Army, Andrey Andreyevich Vlassov, who became the spokesman and symbol of this policy. While in the ranks of the Red Army, he had distinguished himself through his firm and unconditional loyalty to Stalin. When he was taken prisoner in 1942, he lost, however, his confidence in Stalin's victory and decided to come over on the side of Germany—not so much because of his opposition to the Bolshevik regime but rather because he felt bitter at the hopeless situation and wanted to soften for Russia the possible consequences of a German victory. He prepared a basic programme of Russian policy in order to save whatever there was to save in the case of defeat.

As early as 10th September 1942, General Vlassov made an appeal to the Red Army in which he said, among other things.

"The 'clique of Stalin hopes to receive assistance from England and from America in the form of a second front. Most of them are perfectly aware of the policy of these two countries: they intend to fight against Germany to the last Russian soldier. If you glance at history in retrospect, you will see it is not the first time that the Russian people has shed its blood in the interests of Anglo-Americans. How can we avoid this situation? There is one, and only one, way out. Whoever loves his native country and desires happiness for his people, has to make every effort to overthrow the Bolshevik regime and establish a new anti-Stalinist government. Everyone has to do the utmost to end this war which is waged in the interests of England and America, and to strive for a just peace with Germany.

"In September 1942, in a new appeal, Vlassov defined his political aims which he wanted to achieve in alliance with Germany. He said: "Comrades! Soldiers, officers and political leaders of the Red Army! You are worried mainly by two questions. You are asking yourselves if there still are people in existence who would be capable of taking over the rule in our country after the collapse of Stalin's government. You are wondering also what will happen to you after the war is ended.

"The Soviet propaganda, inspired by the Jew Losovski, cannot admit the thought that there is someone capable of replacing Stalin. The aim of these assertions is to force you all to go on fighting. Is this propaganda true?

"The Soviet propaganda wants to persuade you that Germany intends to enslave the Russian people. What do you know of Germany?

"Every day you are being told of the shameful things happening in Germany. Those of us who have surrendered, or come over on the side of Germany,—soldiers, officers and political leaders of the Red Army, we know for certain that all these charges are false. Adolf Hitler has succeeded in establishing a State without misery and terror, while we have been forced to live in misery and distress for 20 years. Having realized all this, we—your comrades and friends—decided to work in unity for the setting up of a new order in Russia. We appeal to you to throw off the yoke of Stalin with the help of the German Army, and to save Russia from an imminent catastrophe. Our future, i. e. the future of the Russian people, lies to a great extent in our hands. It depends on how far we are going to take part in the overthrowing of Stalin's rule. This will be decisive for our freedom and for the conditions of Peace with Germany. Once the war is over, Germany will help us a great deal. Every nation will be allotted its due place in the new world. Our place will depend on what we have achieved in the common fight against Stalin."

The plan of General Vlassov was to secure the indivisibility of the Russian Empire by serving Germany. One should not forget that his political activity began *only when the situation of the Soviet Union was practically hopeless from the military point of view*.

At first, Germans used Vlassov-movement for propaganda aims only, without committing themselves to any political promises. This attitude was changed in 1944 when it was Germany's turn to stand on the verge of defeat. It was then recognized in German ruling circles that the war could be won only through the help of all peoples of the Soviet Union. Looking at these events from our perspective, it is almost a mystery why the German Command, in the political and military situation of 1944, did not make use of the political plans of Rosenberg or Schulenburg. This mystery is the more difficult to explain when one remembers that the first three years of war in the East had proved conclusively, that it was only the non-Russian peoples who were firmly set on fighting against Stalin and his Empire. It may have been partly due to personal enmity between Rosenberg and partisans of the official German Eastern policy. It is probable also that the German Command did not want to show any weakness towards non-Russian peoples whose co-operation it had rejected already in the beginning of the war. Whatever the reasons, we can only confirm to-day that Rosenberg's programme was never realized, and that on the very eve of Germany's collapse his views found no endorsement. It is paradoxical that in 1944, at the most difficult time for Germany from the political standpoint, it fell to Heinrich Himmler, possibly the most narrow-minded of all German politicians, to work out the basis for a new German Eastern policy. He chose as his aim to unite Russians and non-Russians in one Committee, and to make them all fight against Stalin in the name of a Russian federal Empire. This Committee was given the name "Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" (K.O.N.R.), and its foundation took place in Prague on November 14th, 1944 (see S.O.N.R.).

The organization of this Committee was achieved by means of pressure and deceit. All national politicians of non-Russian peoples, i. c. Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Turkestanians, Cossacks and Caucasians, rejected the invitation to join the Committee because they found it impossible to identify themselves with the political programme of the future Russian federation. After this refusal, use was made of certain persons with a weaker character, and, although these represented no one and nothing, they were set up as tools in Vlassov's Committee. Thus was the co-operation of non-Russian peoples secured in the K.O.N.R. In the Committee itself there was an overwhelming Russian majority (cf. S.O.N.R.). Out of 50 seats ever a half were Russian, the rest having been divided among bribed Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Turkestanians and Caucasians. All the top leading positions on the Ex-

ecutive were filled exclusively by Russians. At the top of the Executive was General Andrey Vlassov. In accordance with Himmler's plans, he had to take over us as G.O.C. all foreign military units—Russian and non-Russian—which were already fighting with the German Army against Stalin.

Chief points of the K.O.N.R. programme proclaim:

1. Defeat of Stalin's tyranny, liberation of the peoples of Russia from the Bolshevik system, and restoration of rights victoriously fought for by peoples of Russia during the National revolution of February 1917.

2. Ending of war and a just peace with Germany.

3. Creation of a new free popular order for the peoples of Russia, without Bolshevism and exploitation.

The programme clearly consisted of commonplaces without directly indicating what rights would be granted to non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union. The programme of S.O.N.R. repeats similar generalizations which serve only to veil from non-Russian peoples the intention to maintain an indivisible Russian Empire.

Non-Russian politicians strongly opposed the plan. An unofficial boycott was proclaimed against the Committee. Germans resorted to compulsion, first against the Cossacks. Their national units were fighting under the command of the Cossack General Krasnov. Their strength was about 200,000 men. General Krasnov protested most categorically against the inclusion of Cossack forces in the so-called K.O.N.R. In reply to this, a conspiracy was organized against Krasnov and he was deposed from his command in favour of the servile Domanov, who had expressed his willingness to be Vlassov's subordinate. The Ukrainians were not treated in the same manner, and the reasons for such difference were of a deeply political nature. The Turkestanian, Byelorussian and Caucasian military units continued to be subordinated to the German Command.

The Russo-German front at that time was not far from the German border. Behind the Soviet lines there were fighting powerful units of the 200,000 men strong Insurrection Army (U.P.A.). These fights took in Ukraine the appearance of a national revolt. Ukrainian political leaders, striving for the restoration of the Ukrainian State, fought incessantly against the Russians, just as they had done a few months before against the Germans. In the military situation of the late Autumn 1944, it was of particular interest to Germany that here existed strong anti-bolshevik forces behind the enemy lines. A policy was therefore required which would not be repugnant to these forces. This is confirmed by documents of the German Propaganda Office. Dr. Taubert, Director of the Anti-Comintern section of the Propaganda Office wrote on 22nd December, 1944, to a Secretary of State not indicated by name:

"To the Secretary of State... Re: Policy in the East. —The enclosed suggestions are based on the views of the permanent Secretary Dr. Brautigam from the Ministry of Eastern affairs and on those of Messrs. Arlt and Krieger, close collaborators of the Obergruppenfuehrer Berger. According to our proposals, the formation of organized leadership for the Eastern European peoples should be undertaken as follows:

a) German sections for every nationality have to be formed under the overall authority of Obergruppenfuehrer Berger. These sections will provide directions for respective national Committees (Russian Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Tatar, etc.).

b) General Vlassov is proposed as the head of the Russian Committee. He would possess political as well as military authority.

c) For Ukrainians, it is proposed to form a kind of all-Ukrainian Committee which would include representatives from all political parties. At the head of this Committee there should be placed some personality representative of all Ukrainians (most probably Mr. Skoropatzky). In the Committee itself we should like the chief functions to be entrusted to our much favoured Mr. Semenenko, the ex-provost of the city of Kharkov. We are in favour also of securing strong positions on the Committee of the extreme Right-wing movements of Bandera and Melnyk. Both gentlemen are representative of those political formations which have waged guerrilla warfare against us when we were in the possession of Ukraine. Co-operation with these formations was attempted a considerable time ago, but the best opportunity is provided now. Co-operation with them would enable us to establish contact with the Ukrainian partisans behind the Soviet front.

d) Vlassov has been trying to unite all national committees of the Eastern peoples into one. Views on whether this is advisable are divided. As for us, we are of the opinion—shared by the representative of Obergruppenfuehrer Berger, Arlt, and Reichsminister Rosenberg,—that such unification should not be permitted to take place as it would create a kind of supreme body over all Eastern peoples. It is not in German interests to unite but to separate these peoples. Besides, if such unity is achieved, co-operation with Ukrainians will be made impossible. We should never forget that in the Eastern districts we have occupied, non-Russian people have a most important part to play: 60 p. c. of workers recruited from the East are Ukrainians, and there are even more Caucasians in the voluntary units.

e) During the past months we have been trying to make prevail the view that Ukrainian partisans should be supplied with weapons. Our efforts are being now realized. This action is closely connected with the mentioned plans. In this way it will be finally possible to stir up the Ukrainian people to fight for its freedom against Bolshevism, and to supply it with weapons".

In a report on the activities of his department in the Ministry of Propaganda Dr. Taubert wrote on 31st December, 1944, among other things:

"The Vlassov-movement endeavours to absorb Ukrainians, Caucasians and other non-Russian peoples. The danger of these efforts is that the Ukrainian partisans are not prepared to interfere with the Soviet supply lines until a political agreement is reached between the Reich and the Ukrainian underground government. Ukrainians demand from the Reich guarantees of the independence and integrity of Ukraine, together with assurances that they will not be sacrificed to the national government of Vlassov. If we sacrifice, therefore, Ukraine for Vlassov, we shall have no possibility to cut off the Soviet supplies. On the contrary, in case of agreement with Ukrainians, we shall be in position to inflict such losses to Soviet supplies that the Soviets will be hardly able to bear them."

Those were the political reasons which prevented Germans from using compulsion against the Ukrainians and from making them enter the K.O.N.R. and the army of Vlassov. In any case, no agreement was reached with Stepan Bandera and the command of the Ukrainian Army of Resistance, as well as its political leadership Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.). Ukrainian politicians considered it too late to negotiate with Germany in the Autumn of 1944. On the side of Germany, however, a Ukrainian Committee of liberation was established in Berlin under the chairmanship of General Pawlo Shandruk, but without Bandera and Melnyk. This Committee was intended to counter-weigh the conception of Vlassov concerning the inclusion of Ukraine in the Russian federal Empire. General Pawlo Shandruk was charged also with forming the so-called Ukrainian Army of Liberation from among the Ukrainian prisoners of war.

FAILURES OF THE VLASSOV-MOVEMENT

As already stated, the K.O.N.R. was established regardless of protests made by the legitimate representatives of non-Russian peoples. On 14th November, 1944, this Committee was congratulated by the Minister of State, K. H. Frank, by the acting Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lorenz, and by Heinrich Himmler on behalf of the German government. The K.O.N.R. had now the unconditional support of those same men who had professed the policy of "subhumanity" only a short while before. And yet, the hopes that were placed upon the Committee proved to be completely false. The prisoners of war and the conscripted labourers had no desire to report for the Vlassov army. Non-Russian soldiers did not want to do it because of their opposition to a federation with Russia, and the Russians avoided it because deep in their hearts they were not prepared to fight against Stalin, who because of the

victorious war became a hero in the eyes of the Russians. Out of his promised 2 million soldiers, Vlassov could obtain only 22,000. Their value as fighting units was disproved at the first contact with the Red Army. General Vlassov deserted in Prague to the Czech Red partisans and thus betrayed his ally Germany. It is revealing that he had been asked to do so by Fieldmarshal Koniev in a broadcast from Brunn. As the Red Army entered Prague, the whole city was decorated with pictures of Stalin and Vlassov. Part of Vlassov's army was taken over by the Red Army, all officers and N.C.O's preserving their Vlassov-ranks. It was not until two months later that many of them were dismissed from the Red Army or arrested.

The Russian newspaper "*Chasovoy*" in Brussels (1948, No.277) gives this description of the events: "In this decisive moment, the radiostation of the Russian Liberation Army received a broadcast of the Soviet High Command appealing to Vlassov as a Slav and as a Russian to help the Red Army to capture the city of Prague. General Vlassov and his closest associates made quick decision. Loyalty to Russia was stronger than the hatred of Stalin. Vlassov ordered the First Division of the Russian Liberation Army to advance to Prague against the S.S.-divisions which were heavily defeated. Finally, the Vlassov-units occupied the station where a short while before a German guard of honor had welcomed the arrival of the allied General Vlassov. This sealed the fate of Germans in Prague. The Lord-Provost of Prague welcomed the liberator of the city, General Vlassov, and presented him with a bronze statuette of Karl Marx. The city was decorated with the pictures of Vlassov and Stalin.

When Vlassov realised that the help he had rendered to Czech insurgents was not sufficient to reconcile Stalin and to atone for his crime (Czech government demanded surrender to the Red Army), he ordered the first division to retreat from Prague and decided to surrender to the Americans. He still had a slight hope that the Americans would not deliver him up to Russians. This hope did not materialize. The extradition of General Vlassov and his soldiers cannot be estimated to-day as a proof of the anti-communist attitude of Vlassov's command. Decisive is only what Vlassov did himself, not the treatment Stalin meted out him. It has been positively established that Vlassov was willing to work for a reconciliation with Stalin and to lessen his guilt by supporting the revolt of Prague. This is easily understandable when we remember that Vlassov started his political activities in Germany only because he did not believe any more in Stalin and consequently in Russian victory. Now, when the situation had completely changed, he was ready to return to political views he had been holding until 1942.

The experiment of Vlassov has clearly demonstrated how ill-advised was the idea to advance in the East proclaiming the prog-

ramme of a Russian federal Empire, and how loyal at the same time to their Communist government were the Russians. This was made still more evident after the end of the war, and by the return of the prominent leaders of the Russian anti-communist emigres from different countries of Europe, America and Asia. There remained in Germany mainly non-Russian workers, confirming thus, their anti-communist and anti-imperialist attitude. Statistics give the following picture of those who refused to go back to U.S.S.R.:

Ukrainians	200,000
Latvians	85,000
Russians	60,000
Lithuanians	49,000
Cossacks	43,000
Estonians	35,000

("The Free Press of the Suppressed Nations"—published by the Free Press Association in Germany).

The Russian loyalty to Stalin even in exile became evident when thousands of ordinary Russians and eminent politicians returned to the U.S.S.R. in mass. It is sufficient to mention only a few names to confirm this statement. In 1945/46, there returned to Soviet Union, among other persons, the following Russian politicians of the exile: Admiral Kedrov, deputy-chairman of the Russian soldiers' Organization, Maklakov, the Russian ex-ambassador to Paris and historian, General Govorov, General Postovskiy. Soviet citizenship was accepted by the Archbishop Yevloghy (the Metropolitan of all Russians in exile) and by Professor Berdyayev. The Russian Metropolitan with all his clergy returned from China, and in one transport alone, 3,000 Russians emigrants returned to the Little Father Stalin from Shanghai. Among the homecomers were Prince Dolgorukov, leader of the Russian Agrarian party, and the Secretary-General of this party Butenko. The two last-named were close collaborators of Kerensky. Other home-comers: Isyumov, leader of the Social-Democrat party, Brushvit, leader of the Social Revolutionaries (to which belonged Kerensky), the well-known journalist Varshavsky, General Khodorovich, General Shilling, General Dolgopyatov. All the above-named were leading personalities of the Russian opposition against Stalin since 1917.

The return from exile of leading Russian politicians in a body proves clearly that the Russians fought against Germany on the side of Stalin not only for tactical reasons and because of historical necessities, but because of their conviction that the existing Communist government was the best representative of Russian Imperial interests.

The same story will be repeated in case of a future conflict between the West and the Soviet Union. This has been indicated already by the Russian military expert, General Holmston (at pre-

sent in Argentine) who stated in a paper of old Russian soldiers "Suvorovetz" on 24th November, 1951: "For us Russians the password of the Third World War will be not so much to fight as to have good organization and be in readiness to defend Russian national interests at the future peace negotiation. The Polish Marshal Pilsudski replied once to a reproach made by socialists that he had left their party: 'I have been for a long time together with you in the same compartment of the international train, but I have now alighted at the station where the signpost bears the name 'Poland'. The future C.O.C. of the Russian armed forces has to remember well the name of the station where he will get off from the allied train."

The West must be prepared to be forsaken by the future C.O.C. of the Russian army of exile as the Germans were forsaken by General Vlassov in Prague.

* * * *

On November 14th, 1944, the K.O.N.R. was established owing to the good offices of Heinrich Himmler. From 3rd to 7th November, 1951, the representative of the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia", Don Levine, tried to form the S.O.N.R. (Council for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia). The difference between what Himmler had done 7 years before in Prague and what Don Levine did in Wiesbaden is contained in a single letter: K.O.N.R. turned into S.O.N.R. These two organizations did not differ much in their essentials, either. As Himmler had done before, Don Levine wanted to organize Russians and non-Russians in one Committee and to start anti-communist revolution in the Soviet Union in the name of a federal Russian Empire. Having filled over 50 p. c. of the seats on the K.O.N.R. of 1944, Russians claimed the same proportion for themselves on the S.O.N.R. in 1951. The same can be said of the composition of the Executive and of the methods employed. As the legitimate representatives of non-Russian peoples refused to participate in the Council, Don Levine—following Heinrich Himmler's example—turned to insignificant and weak private individuals and engaged them for the Council. Political attitude of authorized representatives of non-Russian peoples will be proved beyond any doubt in the following pages. There should be pointed out here a further parallel: as Count von Schulenburg, and, to a lesser extent, Alfred Rosenberg, had urged their government in Germany during the Second World War to give up the wrong policy and to realize a programme of self-determination for the peoples of the Soviet Union, so there are raised to-day in the U.S.A. many courageous voices concerning questions of Eastern policy in an effort to bring the American people on the right road. Among these far-sighted politicians there are Harold E. Stassen, O'Connor, Manning and many others.

There is every reason to assume that the American people will choose the way indicated by elected representative minds and not by a Don Levine.

* * * *

Documentary evidence is given below in order to show the true attitude of different peoples of the Soviet Union towards the S.O.N.R.

UKRAINIANS

There are 7 Ukrainian parties which are active in exile and, besides, there is the "Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists" (O.U.N.).

The latter works secretly in Ukraine and is responsible for the formation of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.). All these parties have rejected most decisively the offers made by Levine. Taking them separately, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.), led by Stepan Bandera, has issued the following declaration (published by the newspaper "*Ukrainsky Samostyynyk*" in Munich).

"We consider the action of Russian imperialists—supported by American circles—as extremely harmful for the entire struggle against Bolshevism. Jeopardized are not only the liberation movements of peoples under Muscovite oppression but also the Western attempts to form a defence against Bolshevik pressure. By supporting Russian imperialists, the policy and aims of the U.S.A. are brought into discredit in the eyes of peoples fighting against the Russian Imperialism, and representing the only anti-Bolshevik force within the Soviet Union. By means of such policy, the basis for mutual co-ordination of political and strategical aims between the West and the peoples of the U.S.S.R. is seriously undermined. Besides, this policy is contrary to the will of the American people and to the interests of the U.S.A. It may easily result in the U.S.A. losing their most loyal and determined friends in the fight against Bolshevism. At the same time, it will hardly win any friends for the U.S.A. among the Russians, as Russian imperialists are not preparing for fight against Bolshevism but for take-over of power and for a fight against the liberation movements of non-Russian nations. In the same way as it is done by Russian politicians in exile, their American guardians are trying to conceal the historic fact that only non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union are actively engaged in the fight against the Soviet regime and empire. Instead of disclosing this truth to the Americans, they are misleading their people with the "Council for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia". All Ukrainian political forces and all Ukrainians in exile will prove to the world that the Ukrainian people will never be associated with Russian imperialists. The Ukrainian people will never give up its political aims which culminate in the demand

for an independent Ukrainian State. If Russian politicians are really serious about their professed intention to fight against Bolshevism, let them begin first with the chief task—that of working out an anti-imperialist programme for Russians themselves. If such anti-imperialist forces among the Russians become truly organized, it will be easy for them to find a common language with other peoples. We are sorry to state, however, that the existence of such forces among exiled Russians is not yet evident. We hope that Americans themselves will condemn the deplorable policy of certain American circles, and that they will assume a favourable attitude towards the liberation movements of non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R., proving themselves worthy of the great traditions of the U.S.A.—freedom and independence of all peoples”.

Another Ukrainian political party, headed by Andrey Melnyk, and also known as the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists-Solidarists has often declared its attitude to the S.O.N.R. in the party paper “Ukrainske Slovo” (The Ukrainian Word) which is published in Paris. This Organization, too, has firmly declined any co-operation with the S.O.N.R.

The same attitude has been taken by the Ukrainian Democratic Revolutionary Party (U.R.D.P.) under the leadership of Ivan Bahriany in the party paper “Ukrainski Visti” (Ukrainian News, Ulm, Germany).

Equally negative has been the attitude of the following Ukrainian political parties: Ukrainian National Democratic Association (U.N.D.O.), Ukrainian National Democrats Union (U.N.D.S.), Ukrainian Democratic Revolutionary Party (headed by Ivan Maystrenko) and Ukrainian Socialist Party (U.S.P.).

All the above stated parties have linked themselves in one body known as the Ukrainian National Council. This latter has published the following declaration as regards the S.O.N.R.:

“Russians emigrants of all political tendencies, from the extreme Right to the extreme Left, are favouring the preservation of the Russian Empire within the existing boundaries of the U.S.S.R. This attitude of Russian emigrants foils any chance of co-operation between the Russians and non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. in the struggle against the Communist regime. The Ukrainian National Council is of the opinion that Ukrainians and all other peoples have a right to rebuild their democratic States which they had already restored in 1917. Unfortunately, the representatives of Russian emigrants are not prepared to accept this solution.

As to the S.O.N.R., it is a new manoeuvre of Russian emigrants to preserve at any price the unity of Russian Imperialism, i. e. of the Empire created by the conquests of Czars and further enlarged by Bolsheviks.

We believe that non-Russian peoples have already expressed their will during the free elections for the revolutionary parliaments

of their national States in 1917/1918. Besides, the continuous struggle of over thirty years against the Russian-Communist oppression has clearly demonstrated that these peoples are as determined as ever to demand their release from the Russian Empire. There is no conceivable reason to arrange another plebiscite to ascertain the will of these peoples. We reject, therefore, most definitely any idea of plebiscite, and we demand the restoration of independence to the States subjugated by Moscow.

We declare at the same time that we have no hatred against the Russian people, and that we are prepared to maintain good relations with Russian and other neighbouring peoples, on condition that these, on their part, recognize and respect the independence and equality of status of the Ukrainian people. We are fighting only and exclusively against the Russian Imperialism in all its forms.

The Executive Committee of the Ukrainian National Council (U.N.R.) confirms with satisfaction that all Ukrainian political parties and organizations have clearly rejected any co-operation with the S.O.N.R. This is a proof of the unity of Ukrainian political thought concerning questions of foreign policy. The Executive of the Ukrainian National Council appeals to all Ukrainians to maintain this attitude and fight all Russian Imperialist plans". Signed by Isaac Mazeppa, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the U.N.R., and by Ivan Bahriany, Vice-Chairman.

The Foreign Representation of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.) has released a similar statement which reads as follows:

"In the name of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.) — the leading organ of the revolutionary fight for the liberation of the Ukrainian people at home—the foreign delegation of the U.H.V.R. has been authorised to make the following declaration:

"1. Since 1917 and until the present day, the Ukrainian people has been engaged in a ruthless struggle for its national and social liberation and for the political sovereignty of Ukraine, against Russian-Bolshevik Imperialism and against the totalitarian dictatorship of the Communist parties of the U.S.S.R. and their organizations as representatives of the Imperialism.

The military exploits of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.), the revolutionary activities of the organized national underground-movement which are maintained under the most difficult conditions and in a complete isolation (with regard to the world which is still free), the unceasing resistance of the Ukrainian people against the Bolshevik rule of oppression and thereby against the destruction of people and nations, the actions in the Soviet policy towards nationalities—new attacks on the Ukrainian cultural life in connection with the case of the poet V. Sosyura,

the activities of the entire organized Ukrainian political emigration in the world,—these all are excellent and most convincing proofs of this right.

2. In this hard fight against the Russian-Bolshevik Imperialism and the Stalinist system of terror, the Ukrainian people and its movement of liberation hold unwaveringly to the fundamental conceptions of freedom for nations and individuals.

3. Every appearance of an organization of anti-Bolshevik forces in exile—including such forces from among the Russian emigrants—ought to be welcome. It depends on whether such efforts serve towards strengthening the anti-Bolshevik fight in our home countries and the already existing anti-Bolshevik front in exile. However, the establishment of the so-called “Council for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia (S.O.N.R.)” at the meeting of 5 Russian political parties of the exile (17th-19th August, 1951, in Stuttgart, Germany cannot be considered by any means as a strengthening of the anti-Bolshevik and anti-Imperialist front.

The name alone of the newly created organization and the manner of its constitution out of five exclusively Russian parties, further its previous activities as well as the ones which are planned for the future, prove beyond any doubt that the founders of the so-called S.O.N.R. profess a conception which is extremely hostile towards all peoples of the Soviet Union and of its sphere of influence—namely, that of an Imperialist, centralized and indivisible Russia. This means depriving all peoples of the Soviet Union even of their formal rights which they have won in a cruel fight under the Bolshevik dictatorship.

The chauvinist Russian founders of the so-called S.O.N.R. will be, therefore, responsible before history and before the peoples fighting against the Bolshevik Imperialism for the efforts to disrupt and to weaken the battlefront of peoples in the Soviet Union and in its sphere of influence which are fighting for their freedom.

We have to affirm with regret that the “American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia”, which has enabled—by means of financial and moral support—a certain group of Russian emigrants to establish the new structure, has maintained an attitude which makes it share a certain degree of responsibility.

The responsibility of the founders of the so-called S.O.N.R. is increased by their attempts to form dishonestly organizations in the nature of agencies among the emigrants of the peoples oppressed by Bolshevism (e. g., among North Caucasians, Turkmenians and, lately, among ‘Ukrainians’, as was the case at a meeting in Fuerstenfeldbruck, Bavaria, on October 6th-7th, 1951). These attempts aim at disrupting the national anti-Bolshevik forces of the emigration by means of using some previously entirely unknown persons.

The first active steps of the persons belonging to the circle of the so-called S.O.N.R. have already proved that negotiations of

any kind between honest political circles of Ukrainian and other emigrants from among peoples under the Muscovite oppression, and between these persons are out of the question."

The Movement of Ukrainian Monarchists (U.H.D.) has published its declaration rejecting the S.O.N.R. also in the paper "*Ukrainsky Samostyynyk*" (Munich). The firm attitude of the political parties did not fail to impress Ukrainian society. All Ukrainian organizations representing scientists, teachers, social workers and trade have joined the politicians in their fight against the S.O.N.R.. Ukrainian emigrants in Germany, France, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Great Britain, the U.S.A., Canada, South America and South Australia have called protest meetings against the S.O.N.R. The Ukrainian Press in all Continents has been united in its denunciation of the S.O.N.R. Resolutions which were accepted at these meetings contain at present over 50,000 names.

In the face of this unity, the thirty men that met at Fuerstendbruck, Bavaria, on October 5th-7th, 1951, and founded in one single day (sic!) five "Ukrainian" political parties which were prepared to co-operate with the S.O.N.R. present a rather miserable sight. It is regrettable that these shameful proceedings were financed by the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia". The silent boycott of these so-called Ukrainian parties by the entire Ukrainian community in exile opened the eyes even of American and Russian organizers who refused to admit their representative to be present at the negotiations. This has not prevented, however, the consideration of these "parties" as potential candidates for the planned S.O.N.R.

GEORGIANS

In the same way as Ukrainians, the Georgians have also firmly rejected the political basis of the S.O.N.R. All national political Georgian parties were united in this respect. There was not a single Georgian political party that would fall for a programme of federation with Russia. Only individual persons were prepared to co-operate with the S.O.N.R.,—and they did it mostly because of material considerations, expecting an adequate reward from the American Committee. Any co-operation with the S.O.N.R. was rejected, among others, by the following organizations:

1. The National Centre (Paris) which includes all Georgian non-Socialist organizations,
2. the National-Political Committee for Central Europe (Munich), in which all Georgian parties and organizations are represented,
3. the Georgian military Union with its branches in the U.S.A., Great Britain, France and Germany,
4. the Georgian Party of National Democrats with its centre in Paris,

5. the Georgian Association, New York,
6. the American Georgian League, New York.

The Georgian attitude to the S.O.N.R. has been defined in principle by the "National-Political Committee for Central Europe" in a declaration issued on behalf of all Georgian political parties:

Munich, November 1951

"On November 7th, 1951, a conference took place in Wiesbaden of 5 organizations of Russian emigrants with some representatives of non-Russian groups.

To take part at this Conference, 2 Georgians arrived from Paris. We consider ourselves to be under obligation in this case to make a public declaration to the world concerning our attitude to the question of relations between the Georgians and the political emigrants.

The two Georgians who were present at the Conference represented only a tiny group in Paris, not the Georgian emigrants as a body. As such, they were not authorised to speak in the name of Georgians.

It would have been also impossible for Georgian emigrants to be represented at a Conference of the so-called Russian Peoples. The name alone of this organization is a proof of the political trend of the Conference: to regard all peoples oppressed by the Soviets as "Russian Peoples". The Georgian people is not a Russian people. It is not related to the Russians either in descent, or in language, or in the national character, or in its culture.

The Georgian State had been in existence several centuries before a Russian State was established. Georgia was first conquered by Russians in the 19th century.

Forced by historical events, Georgia concluded in 1783 a Treaty of protection with Russia. According to this treaty, Georgia retained its Monarchy and full powers of State. Agreement was required only in matters of foreign policy, and Russian protection was promised in case of war.

Russia, however, violated this treaty and annexed Georgia in 1801. Even the independence of the Georgian Church—6 centuries older than its Russian counterpart—was abolished, the Church being subordinated to a Russian Synod.

Georgia had thus lost its political sovereignty for the first time in its history, having been transformed into a Russian administrative province.

In 117 years of Russian domination the Georgian people has repeatedly manifested its will to restore the political life of its own—through revolts and revolutions, through various national organizations, through representatives in the Duma and in the Council of State, through the Association of Nobility, through the Press, etc. This implies, of course, that Georgians together

with other oppressed peoples have stood in the first ranks of revolutionary movements in Russia.

After the collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917, when the Georgian people was free to manifest its will, the entire people reaffirmed its desire to restore a national State and proclaimed the independence of Georgia at the National Assembly of May 26th, 1918. The Constituent Assembly which was elected by a direct, free, universal and secret ballot, ratified the spontaneous decision of people's representatives, prepared the constitution and voted its acceptance. The Georgian historical aspirations were thus accomplished.

The Republic of Georgia was formally recognized by Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Turkey, Japan, Belgium and fifteen other States in Europe, America and Asia. This placed Georgia in the same legal position as other sovereign States before International Law. The Soviet Union itself recognized the independence of Georgia and the inviolability of its frontiers by the Treaty of May 7th, 1920. However, in 1921, shortly before Georgia was to become a member of the League of Nations, it was attacked by the Soviet Union without any declaration of war; after fierce fighting, Georgia was occupied. This goes to show that Russia has flagrantly violated its treaties and obligations towards Georgia twice in one century.

Georgian-Russian relations can be understood only in the light of described historical events and basic international obligations; they cannot be explained by means of the so-called "realistic policy". With regard to International Law, Georgia finds itself in the same situation as Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland, Latvia, etc. The length of occupation is not important. The rights to freedom of an oppressed nation cannot become void through disuse. The problem of Georgia is not a Russian but an international problem.

There is another historical fact which has to be remembered:

All those people who were forcibly confined in the old Russian Empire—Finland the Baltic and Caucasian peoples, Ukraine, Turkestan, and others—broke off from Russia and restored their democratic States. In none of these countries could Bolshevism gain any foothold. Russia alone bowed before Bolshevism, and the Bolshevik Revolution was accomplished by the Russian people.

The non-Russian countries were brutally overpowered and deprived of their independence by the Soviets owing to the overwhelming military superiority of the latter.

These considerations are indicative of the political activities developed by Georgian emigrants.

These considerations are indicative of the political activities developed to represent the national interests of Georgia before the free civilized world; they have to win universal support for the rightful aspirations of the Georgian people; they have to help and achieve

the liberation of Georgia from alien occupation and to restore the independence of Georgia with the help and support of the free world—together with other peoples oppressed by Russia.

Georgians in exile are national emigrants who had been forced to leave their country on account of being under an alien rule. Among the Georgian emigrants, eminent personalities of political life are represented.

Following the decision of the Constituent Assembly, the Georgian Government was transferred abroad. Having been elected by the people, it is the legitimate Government of Georgia. There are in exile several members of the Constituent Assembly, elected representatives of cities and rural districts, ex-diplomats that had been formerly accredited abroad, members of the Georgian Army, proved fighters against the Soviet rule, and their leaders who have emerged from this fight, and, finally, representatives of the younger generation which fought against the Soviets in the last war.

The Georgian community in exile is made up of personalities who have come from the people, representing parties and organizations that have originated at home, in their own country. Contrary to this, the exiled Russians are political emigrants who had to leave their country because of an internal political revolution.

Russian organizations abroad are party-political institutions, originated and formed in exile, without any followers at home. They are not even known nominally in their own country. Russian emigrants fight against the regime; we are fighting, on the other hand, against alien conquerors of our country and against the Communist system.

It should be mentioned also that delegates of the Russian organizations represented at the Conference only a minor part of the Russian emigrants—namely those belonging to left-wing groups; emigrants as a body were not represented. This implies that Russian representatives are not equal partners with regard to us. Agreements with Russian emigrants, being therefore not legally binding for the Russian people, would serve no sense or purpose.

However, our negative attitude towards the Russian emigrants is based not only on formal and legal considerations but on a sense of mistrust bred of historical experience.

The Conference clearly proved that our doubts were justified. The events at Wiesbaden confirmed that during these thirty years Russians have learnt and deduced nothing from an age of mighty events and of national and social revolutions, when colonial peoples and even such as lost their countries two thousand years ago have had their independence and their States restored to them (India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines, Israel, etc.) when more and more peoples stake their claims, and the historical process continues in its development with undiminished force. They have not even noticed that small peoples exist just beside a

Great Power—the U.S.A.—sitting on world organizations as equal partners.

Russians have now proved that they are not prepared to relinquish their Imperialistic claims. The Conference was an attempt to realise the old Russian Imperialistic claims under a democratic disguise—by feigning that it had been organized with genuine public support as a free expression of will by “the representative of non-Russian peoples”.

Still more significant is the additional paragraph contained in the resolution—that the right of self-determination may be manifested either by plebiscite or by the respective national Constituent Assemblies, or by the All-Russian Constituent Assembly.

Shall we put only a formal and legalistic question: Who decides on the “Either-Or”? Who decides on what is the concern of a national or of the All-Russian Constituent Assembly? It is obvious what is intended by this resolution! It is Russians themselves who want to decide the fate of non-Russian peoples.

It is clearly said that the Russian Democrats are intent on preserving the Russian Empire built on the oppression of other peoples. In this respect, there is no difference between the Soviet rulers and these Russian Democrats. It would have been a betrayal of the national cause of our people if we had agreed to co-operate with Russians on this basis.

Should it be the wish of those in whose hands lie the fate of the free world to unite together in one organization Russians with the peoples oppressed by Russia, it would be certainly not on the lines of one of “Russian Peoples” but on organization of all peoples enslaved by Soviet-Russia—without any exceptions. This organization should be built on the same principle as the U.N.O. in which all peoples—the small as well as the great ones—can be represented with equal rights and duties.

Even then it should be stipulated that the Russians recognize unconditionally the independence and sovereignty of peoples subjugated by Russia — as Japan did to Korea in the treaty of San Francisco.

The interested Powers themselves or the International Organization should ensure that the Russian promises are held.

In agreement with other Georgian organizations in Europe and in America, we declare that the presence of Georgians at the above-mentioned Conference was a moral denial, on the part of this splinter-group, of the legacy of the innumerable victims of our people in its fight against the Soviet Union; from the legalistic point of view, it was a transgression of the fundamental requirements of the Georgian State Constitution; as such, their action is no more a matter of policy or political opinions—it belongs to the competence of the Supreme Court of Judicature.

The role of the Georgians is to fight against the Russian Occu-

pation and for the liberation of our country from the Russian rule. Our aim is the restoration of a sovereign Georgian State in a confederation with other free Caucasian peoples”.

(Signed)

Prince Niko Nakashidze

DECLARATION OF THE GEORGIAN NATIONAL CENTRE ABROAD

“The Georgian National Political Centre Abroad which comprises all Georgian political organizations and parties (with the exception of Social Democrats), protests most vigorously against the faked representation in the “Council for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia” (S.O.N.R.). The name of the Council alone provides sufficient proof of the imperialistic aims of Russian organizations and their stooges recruited among non-Russian peoples.

The Georgian National Centre declares that the so-called “All-Georgian Congress in Exile” and its derivative “the National Council of Georgia is an expression of the will of Georgian mand with one single purpose—to get the Georgians represented at the Conference of Wiesbaden. Neither the “Congress” nor the “Council of Georgia” is an expression of the will of Georgian emigrants; consequently, their activities are in no way binding for Georgians.

The Conference of Wiesbaden was summoned by Kerensky, his helpers and the master-minds behind their backs.

The Georgian National Centre emphasizes the false character of the Conference in Wiesbaden where means and ways were prepared for the third Russian Empire under the disguise of a unification of anti-Communist emigrants.

The Georgian National Centre recalls that all countries occupied by the Soviet Union are victims of a single country and of a single Regime with which they have nothing whatever in common. Only complete liberation and restoration of sovereignty to the States enslaved by Russia can be designated as the aim of the fight against Bolshevism.

The Georgian National Centre declares solemnly that it will not recognize any obligations or decisions which might in any way jeopardize the sovereignty of the Georgian people. The sovereignty of Georgia is the result of its history of 3,000 years and of its international treaties. The Georgian National Centre appeals to the representatives of other non-Russian peoples to unite their forces for the achievement of their aim—the division of the U.S.S.R. The Georgian National Centre draws the attention of N.A.T.O Nations to the fact that the 100 million non-Russian inhabitants of the Soviet Union would make a very useful ally for them.

The Executive of the Georgian National Centre Abroad.”
Paris, 27th November 1951.

AZERBAIJANIANS

There is but only one very influential Azerbaijanian party abroad —“Mussavat”. It has issued the following declaration with regard to the S.O.N.R.-action: “In accordance with the declaration of the 5 Russian parties to establish a “Council for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia” (S.O.N.R.), there was set up an organizational Bureau which summoned a meeting of the 5 mentioned Russian parties with the so-called representatives of non-Russian peoples. At the meeting which took place in Wiesbaden, a joint declaration was signed.

Among the signatures which have been appended to the declaration by these unknown persons, there may be found the Representative of the “Azerbaijanian Council of National Unity”.

The Party Information-Office considers it as its duty to offer the following comments:

1. There is no “Azerbaijanian Council of National Unity” in existence. Persons pretending to act in its name deceive public opinion.

2. The question of the independence of Azerbaijan belongs to the field of international problems, and no Azerbaijanian group has any right to make it into a Russian internal problem,

3. Any persons acting against these principles will be condemned by all Azerbaijanians.

20th Nov. 1951. The Information-Office of the “Mussavat” Party.”

The declaration of Azerbaijanians politicians.

We have been extremely surprised to find that the Declaration of Wiesbaden, which was accepted on November 7th, 1951, has been signed—among other entirely unknown representatives of the non-Russian peoples—also by three Azerbaijanians. Our surprise was still more increased because of their appearance on behalf of a non-existent “Azerbaijanian Council of National Unity”. The fact that D. Chadshibegli, Akber A. Sheykhul-Islamov and Ismail Akber have appeared as representative of a non-existent organization proves their intention to deceive public opinion.

Mechmad Yemin Resulzade,

Former President of the Azerbaijanian National Assembly.

M. Ali Resuloglu,

Former Member of the Azerbaijanian Parliament.

Machmed Sadyk Aran

Former Member of the Azerbaijanian Parliament.

TURKESTANIANS

The National Turkestanian Unity Committee, with its branches in Pakistan, Kashmir, India, Saudi-Arabia, Jordan; the organizations of Turkestanian emigrants in Pakistan, India, Egypt, Jordan,

Turkey and in other countries; and finally, the Turkestanian clergy in exile, have raised a sharp protest in the following terms against the Kerensky-Committee (S.O.N.R.):

1. The former Prime Minister of the Russian Provisional Government, Alexander Kerensky, inimated on 20th August 1951 in Stuttgart (Germany) the creation of an organization under the name "Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia". The National Turkestanian Unity Committee has nothing to do with the plans of Kerensky. The Committee does not recognize the new organization of Kerensky and declines any participation in it.

2. The new organization, the "Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia", as well as the other similar efforts of Kerensky, are purely Russian affairs.

3. Mr. Kerensky has no right whatever to speak on behalf of the Turkestanian people and has no authority to act in the name of Turkistan.

4. The Turkestanian people is not the Russian people, and Turkistan is not Russia.

5. The efforts of Kerensky have as their aim only a change of the present form of government in Russia. Apart from that, he supports the old Russian Imperialism.

6. It is the basis of our national struggle that Turkestan should be an independent national State representing one national unit.

National Turkestanian Unity Committee

Signed: *Veli Kayum Khan*

President

COSSACKS

On 25th December 1951, the Cossack Parliament in Exile was in session in Munich. With regard to relations between the Cossacks and Russia, the Parliament in Exile adopted the following Resolution:

"The Cossack people does not fight against the Russian people; it fights for freedom and independence which have been destroyed by the Russian-Bolshevik Power. The Cossack policy of the restoration of the Cossack State is not based on revenge against the Russian government and the entire Russian people for the moral and material losses inflicted on the Cossack people; it is based on the resumption of good-neighbourly relations with the Russian people when the latter recognizes the Cossacks' rights to a sovereign State. The Cossacks are of the opinion that their own fight, as well as that of other peoples oppressed by Moscow, is in the interests of the Russian people itself; only when all peoples oppressed by the Russian government regain their independence and freedom, and when the Russian people gets rid of its Imperialist Clique once and for all, will it be possible for the Russian people to gain its own

freedom and to become master in its own house. The Imperialist Clique incites the Russian people to undertake ever-recurring wars of conquest and turns it into an instrument of the policy of oppression.

As it has done in the past, the Cossack people will fight unwaveringly also in future against any kind of Russian Imperialism which has assumed its most repulsive shape in the form of Bolshevism. The Cossacks are opposed to any attempts by Russian chauvinists and imperialists under various disguises to preserve the Russian prison of nations in the form of the so-called Democratic Russian Empire.

Russian imperialists and chauvinists abroad are made up either of the former political leaders of the Imperialist Russia or of perpetrators of the same imperialistic policy of the Soviet Russia. The best proof of this is provided by the Russian press which is unanimous in rejecting the aims of the peoples oppressed by Moscow. The same political attitude has been adopted by the so-called Democratic circles of Russian emigrants which have been using all possible means to establish a copy of the former Committee of Vlassov for the Liberation of Russian Peoples (K.O.N.R.) under the new name of S.O.N.R. (Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia"). As formerly Himmler, so the Russian parties are doing now everything to include in their Committee weak and politically doubtful elements from the ranks of non-Russian peoples. Although the founders of the S.O.N.R. endeavour to disguise their imperialistic aims under quasi-democratic slogans, it is perfectly clear that they are striving after the preservation of the centralized Russian Empire.

The Cossack people firmly rejects any co-operation with the S.O.N.R., re-affirming its intention to fight side by side with the other non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. until the victorious end which will mean full sovereignty of the Cossack people. Any deviation from this principle would be a betrayal of vital Cossack interests.

The Cossack Parliament in Exile expresses its condemnation of all persons belonging to other non-Russian peoples who have entered into negotiations with Russian imperialists, accepting material benefits instead of freedom.

At the same time, the Cossack Parliament in Exile confirms with satisfaction that even the small and insignificant groups of russified Cossacks have rejected co-operation with Russian imperialists, having no faith in a federation with Russia.

The Cossack Parliament in Exile advises the Cossack Executive Council to maintain the same political attitude towards the Russian imperialists and chauvinists as before.

BYELORUSSIANS

The Council of the Byelorussian National Republic, which is equal to a Byelorussian Parliament in Exile, made the following decision during its 6th Session: The Executive Organs of the Council of the Byelorussian National Republic may be permitted to participate only in such international organizations where the following conditions are fulfilled:

1. All peoples are recognized as possessing equal rights, without paying any regard to their size, material resources, etc.
2. The right of the Byelorussian people to political independence and sovereignty within the ethnographic boundaries, according to the historic Declaration of 25th January 1918, is recognized.

The 6th Session of the Council of the Byelorussian National Republic rejects the political platform of the so-called "Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" which had been drafted by 5 Russian parties. This platform does not provide the least basis for the formation of a common front in the fight against Bolshevism.

New York, 28th October 1951.

A. Machnovski

A. Schukeleitz

NORTH-CAUCASIANS

On 16th September 1951, the supreme body of the Northern Caucasian emigrants in Europe, the General Assembly of the Northern Caucasian National Committee, met in Munich. 200 delegates were present. The Conference was held under the Chairmanship of the Chief Editor of the newspaper "*The Caucasus*", with Mahomed Borlak, as Secretary. The leading address was given by the President of the Northern Caucasian National Committee Akhmed Nabi Mahoma. At the Conference, the following resolution was adopted:

1. The General Assembly recommends to the Northern Caucasian National Committee to preserve the will of our people for the restoration of independence to the Northern Caucasian Republic as the basis of its activities. The Northern Caucasian Republic was restored in 1918 by a free decision of the entire people. The Northern Caucasian National Committee should never forget that generations of our people have covered themselves with glory during the uninterrupted fights against the Tsarist Despotism, and that the same struggle against a despotic Regime has been going on for the past 30 years.
2. The General Assembly recommends to the National Committee to work in co-operation with peoples oppressed by the Soviet Union.
3. With regard to the activities of Kerensky in Munich and his efforts to form a Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia (S.O.N.R.),—the General Assembly firmly rejects any at-

tempts to include in this Committee the representatives of non-Russian peoples, among them also Northern Caucasians. The General Assembly emphasizes once more that all Northern Caucasians are under the obligation to respect the will of the people—which is to restore the independent sovereign Northern Caucasian Republic.

4. The General Assembly expresses its condemnation of the unworthy attempts of General Bicherakov and some other Northern Caucasians to participate in the said "Committee" which denies the peoples their rights of self-determination and separation from Russia.

5. The General Assembly welcomes the fight of Russian organizations against the Communist dictatorship in Moscow, and it is convinced that more intelligent and clear-sighted Russians would declare themselves in agreement with the just Caucasian demands for full independence.

6. The General Assembly expresses its hope that the Great Powers, their organizations and representatives will apply to their national policy the principles of the American Democracy and of the right of peoples to self-determination.

Following the recommendations of the General Assembly of the Northern Caucasian National Committee of October 16th, 1951, the Executive of the Northern Caucasian National Committee decided to expel from it Mr. A. Autorkhanov on account of his expressed willingness to co-operate with the S.O.N.R. The decision was couched in the following terms: At the meeting of November 24th, 1951, it was unanimously decided to exclude from the Executive Mr. Abdurakham Autorkhanov (Kunt) on account of the following reasons: 1) Autorkhanov took part at the Conference of Wiesbaden, alleged that he was a Northern Caucasian representative and acted there on behalf of non-existent "Northern Caucasian Anti-Bolshevik National Union". 2) Because of co-operation with the Russian organizations of emigrants which have established or have been in close connections with the Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia (S.O.N.R.). 3) Because of his editorial policy in the newspaper "Free Caucasus" which displays opinions contrary to the national interests.

The Protest of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.

The Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations has declared its attitude to the S.O.N.R. three times: at the Press Conference of 24th August 1951, during the big demonstration in Munich on June 2nd, 1951, and at the Press Conference in Munich on November 6th, 1951. It is significant that protests against the S.O.N.R. were raised not only by the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union but also by the representatives of the satellite countries. Apart from the nine peoples of the Soviet Union, there are also represented in the

A.B.N. ten peoples of the so-called satellite States. They all made known their solidarity in the fight against the Russian Imperialism, once more publicly calling for division of the Russian Empire into national States.

The A.B.N. protests are worded as follows:

RESOLUTIONS

The Central Committee of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (A.B.N.) announces its attitude to the so-called "Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" as follows:

1. There are no "Peoples of Russia" within the Soviet Union. That state includes a Russian people within its ethnographic frontiers, and the following non-Russian peoples: Estonians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Turkestanians, Cossacks, Idel-Uralians, Georgians, Armenians, Azerbaijanians, North-Caucasians, and others. They do not live on Russian soil, but each on its own ethnographic territory.

These non-Russian peoples were subjected to Russian imperialism by force.

They still continue their fight against Russian imperialism in its present form of Bolshevism, and struggle for their freedom and political independence.

2. The term "Peoples of Russia" is a symbol for ancient Russian imperialism which has not changed, and a violation of the feelings of non-Russian peoples. It is intended to lead the Western World deliberately astray, and actually helps to maintain the despotic structure of the Soviet Union.

3. The attempt on the part of Russian exiles to speak on behalf of these is an abuse of the rights of non-Russian peoples, who have long had their own organizations for achieving national liberty, which alone are entitled to represent these peoples.

4. The organizations of Russian exiles which have joined to form the "Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" cannot claim recognition as representing non-Russian peoples, even if a few disillusioned or paid persons have declared their readiness to co-operate. The only genuine claimants to recognition as representatives of non-Russian peoples are the representatives of these countries who take active part in their national organizations for liberation. What is necessary is not the "Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" who do not exist, but the liberation of these peoples from their oppressor—Russia, and uncompromising opposition to all attempts to re-erect the Russian dungeon of nations in any form whatsoever.

5. The peoples oppressed by Russia, who are united in the A.B.N., are fighting for the dissolution of the Russian dungeon of peoples, whatever its form—whether totalitarian or democratic, republican or Tsarist—and the formation of independent, democratic national

States in their ethnographic frontiers; they repudiate all co-operation with Russian imperialists, no matter their species, and they will continue this fight to realise their ideals, regardless of the attitude of official circles in the West.

In spite of all these protests, the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia has made continued efforts to achieve its aim. After the failure of the Stuttgart Conference on 20th August, 1951, and the Wiesbaden Conference on 3rd November, 1951, further meetings were held on 19th to 20th June 1952, at Starnberg and on 10th to 17th October, 1952, at Munich. A standing committee under the name of "The Co-ordinating Centre of the Antibolshevist Campaign" was finally formed at the latter gathering. In that "Centre" the same irresponsible people from among the ranks of the non-Russian peoples were included, about whom we have already spoken. It was found impossible to attract any representative forces from among the non-Russian peoples to that Committee in spite of the fact that nearly one year and a half were spent in trying to do so. It is especially significant that no single Ukrainian was won over for that purpose, so that all conferences without exception were held without the representative of the second greatest nationality of the Soviet Union.

In the course of that one and a half year, a real "cold war" went on between the American Committee and its Russian and Russo-philic fellow-travellers on the one hand, and the non-Russian nations on the other. Innumerable articles in the emigré press and numerous consultations and conferences were held.

We quote only some of most outstanding examples of common decisions:

On June 25th, 1952, the representatives of all Ukrainian political parties and organizations assembled and agreed upon the following resolution:

1) The conference takes note of the fact that the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" will continue under its new President, Admiral Kirk, to support the Russian emigrants in their efforts to retain a united Russian empire: That the European representatives of the committee are carrying on their work in this direction and that all Russian parties refuse the non-Russian peoples the right to the restoration of state independence and thus practically uphold the imperialist policy of the Kremlin.

The fact alone that the committee has retained its name, — American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia, — that efforts are being made to include non-Russian peoples in a common organization with Russians, and the methods which the spokesman of the committee employed, constitute a clear proof in our eyes that the problem of the non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R. is to be degraded to an internal question and that the

object in view is the maintenance of the Russian imperium after the defeat of bolshevism.

The political programme of the American Committee does not even regard the concession which the Ukrainian and other non-Russian peoples have wrung from the Russian bolsheviks after long and bitter struggles viz., formal independent Union Republics with the right of secession from the union of the U.S.S.R., representation in the U.N. etc.

2) As the American Committee under the chairmanship of Admiral Kirk, has placed its policy under the motto: selfdetermination for the nations, the conference declares that the Ukrainian decision of the Ukrainian Independent State which was established 35 years ago by liberation struggle is the will of the whole people of the realization of the right of self-determination as such. For the Ukrainian people has already passed that stage and in consequence to repeat the question as to national interests would mean a step backward.

3) The conference also takes note that particularly the plan of creating a special radio station to broadcast in the languages of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. means a propaganda campaign for a united Russian empire. Such broadcasts, made in the name of a Combined Radio Committee and under its direct control, would give the impression that a united Russian imperium had already been decided upon for the future, and that would have serious consequences in the fight for liberation from bolshevism. For this reason this Conference rejects the proposal to erect a radio transmitting station. Lone wolves who desire to destroy the unity of the Ukrainian front will in future be regarded as not belonging to the Ukrainian national group.

4) The Conference is of opinion that in future, too, joint discussions and decisions by all Ukrainian parties and political groups with regard to the American Committee and Russian emigrants are desirable and essential".

*Representatives of the Ukrainian National Council (U.N.R.);
Representatives Abroad of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation
Council (Z.P. U.H.V.R.);
Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists
(Z.Ch. O.U.N.);*

*Union of Ukrainian Monarchists (S.H.D.);
Ukrainian Socialist Party (U.S.P.);
Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.);
Association for a Ukrainian National State (U.N.D.S.);
Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party (U.R.D.P.), repre-
sented by its two wings;*

Union of Ukrainian Democrats (U.N.D.O.);

Ukrainian Peasants' Party (U.Z.S.U.);

Association of Ukrainian Creative Forces (S.U.K.T.S.).

In November 1952, the A.B.N. published the following declaration in its press organ — the "A.B.N. Correspondence" (November—December):

COMMUNIQUE

The Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Block of Nations (A.B.N.) on the Establishment of the so-called Co-ordination Centre of the Anti-Bolshevik Campaign in Munich.

After a thorough study of the resolutions passed at a conference of the four Russian and five non-Russian splinter groups, (10, to 18, October, 1952, in the Regina Palast Hotel in Munich), at which the establishment of what is called a Co-ordination of the Anti-Bolshevik Campaign was announced, we, the representatives of the liberation organizations of the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union, have to say the following:

1) We beg to call the attention of the whole free world to the danger inherent in the political principles with which certain American groups are approaching the problem of the U.S.S.R. These principles are likely to cause the hundred million non-Russian peoples to waver in their friendly attitude towards the West, which they regard as their natural allies in the struggle against bolshevism and Russian imperialism.

2) We consider the political platform and structure of the Co-ordination Centre as an expression of complete misunderstanding of the actual situation in the sphere of national conditions in the Soviet Union. We therefore stand in strict political opposition to this Co-ordination Centre.

3) We call upon our peoples to look upon this Centre as a dangerous attempt of certain American groups which doubt our hard-earned right, granted us by the natural order of things, to re-establish an independent national state, or wish our peoples to give up their rights in favour of Russian imperialism, within the limits of the year 1939.

The fact alone, that the great majority of the emigrants belonging to these peoples have taken a stand against the programme of the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia throws a light on the possible effects of such a policy. The Committee only succeeded in winning over, for money, a small number of emigrants who declare themselves willing to co-operate in that programme, also the fact that the Co-ordination Centre or the American Committee, in spite of all efforts, has been unable to find a single Ukrainian organization which would be ready to work with it politically. The Ukrainians have the largest population among the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union.

In particular we note:

a) In the political platform of the Co-ordination Centre, a new sort of right to self-determination for our peoples is demanded as the first condition of their separation from Russia, viz. by way

of general plebiscite of an All-Russian Constituent Assembly or National Assemblies of our peoples.

To that it may be stated, that our peoples, through their long uninterrupted and selfless struggle against Russian subjugation have already expressed their determination, and most clearly in 1917—1918 when they founded their independent states.

It may also be mentioned that no national state in all history has ever been founded by a plebiscite. That was not the case, either with the United States, or the liberation of Ireland or Belgium, and the same may be said of the restoration of the Polish, Rumanian, Greek and Baltic States. Recent examples are, India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, the Phillipines and Indonesia.

b) The platform of the above Centre claims that the whole territory of the Soviet State must be freed from bolshevism before the self-determination of our peoples can be set in motion. In that demand we detect a mental reservation, to have self-determination effected under the pressure of a strengthened post-bolshevik Russian state. The suggestion that the self-determination should be undertaken by an all-Russian assembly points to the real motive behind it all.

c) In the structure of the Co-ordination Centre we see a tendency to give preference to the Russian people before the non-Russian.

Of the 60 seats in the Council of the Co-ordination Centre, 50 p. c. are reserved for Russian organizations and 50 p. c. for the other five non-Russian peoples, which means that the Russians dispose of a 50 p. c. influence, while the single non-Russian peoples have only 10 p. c. each.

That preference does not correspond to international custom, or to the efforts of the Russians in the struggle against bolshevism. The "Co-ordination Centre" rejects the idea of equal rights among the nations, while A.B.N., by contrast, maintains that to every nation, whether great or small, the same unconditional rights should be accorded and respected, without discrimination as to the race, religion or riches.

d) We should like to remind the free world that the non-Russian peoples can only become allies of the West if the right to national independence and definite separation from Russia is granted them unreservedly.

May we express the hope that the newly elected president of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, will thoroughly revise the mistaken policy hitherto followed in America in reference to the subjugated peoples in the U.S.S.R. and the national problems obtaining behind the Iron Curtain.

We oppose, and shall always oppose, every attempt to retain the Russian dungeon of nations in whatever form it is proposed, and no matter who in the West supports that monster. Our aim remains unaltered: the dissolution of the Russian despotic empire into

independent, national, democratic states of all our peoples: Byelorussians, Ukrainians, Turkestanians, Georgians, Azerbaijanians, Armenians, North Caucasians, Idel-Uralians, Cossacks, etc.

Munich, November the 5th, 1952.

Press Bureau of the A.B.N.

In the same issue of the "A.B.N. Correspondence" the Byelorussian National Centre published the following announcement:

BYELORUSSIANS AGAINST IMPERIALISTS

Announcement by the Byelorussian Centre

It was mentioned in the press of late, that at the discussions at Wiesbaden and Starnberg (Bavaria), representatives of the Byelorussians also took part. In that connection the foreign section of the Byelorussian National Centre (B.N.C.), as the political representative of Byelorussians in exile, finds it necessary to announce that the participation of single Byelorussians at those discussions was a private affair, having nothing to do with the national liberation movement.

No authorization was issued by the foreign section of the B.N.C. to any Byelorussian liberation organization whatever to take part in the so-called American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia action, and for the following reasons:

Having studied the activities of the A.C.L.P.R. which is trying in the S.O.N.R. to establish a common front of peoples in the Soviet Union against the present state and political system, as represented by Moscow, i. e. bolshevism, the Foreign Section of the B.N.C. came to the conclusion that the participation of Byelorussian political exiles in that front was not permissible, for it would run contrary to the interests of the Byelorussian people.

Neither the A.C.L.P.R. nor any of the Russian exiles in the so-called S.O.N.R. recognize the right of the Byelorussian and other peoples under Moscow's bolshevist occupation, to national freedom and the re-establishment of their state independence, from which it may be concluded that the said organization's plans for the "maintenance of a united indivisible Russia" will be followed after the liquidation of Moscow's present statepolitical system.

By their unceasing struggle for freedom against the former tsarist regime the Byelorussians realized their right to self-determination at last, on March 24th, 1918, with the proclamation of the State independence.

Moscow's hand was forced by the persistent opposition to Russian bolshevism, to recognize, at least formally, the Byelorussian people's right to state independence, and created a Byelorussian Soviet Republic with the right even of seceding from the U.S.S.R. Later the right to be a member of the United Nations was granted too.

Acceptance of the new basis set up by the S.O.N.R. would be a fatal mistake which would throw the cause of Byelorussian liberation far back. It would be treason against the best sons of the people who are waging a desperate fight at home for liberty, under the cruel conditions of an alien dictatorship.

Considering what has been said above, the Foreign Section of the B.N.C., as sole political representative of Byelorussians in exile, is against Byelorussian organizations joining any such international institution, as long as, in practice, the democratic rights of our peoples to an independent state existence is not acknowledged, much as it approves of the idea of a common front.

In exile, September 28th, 1952.

*Presidium of the Foreign Section of the
Byelorussian National Centre.*

At the end of 1952 repeated attempts were made to win Ukrainian political parties for the Co-ordinating Centre. On December 27th, the so-far widest Ukrainian political conference was held in Munich in which beside the representatives of all Ukrainian parties the delegation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee (the representatives of all Ukrainians in the U.S.A.) took part. The delegates of all Ukrainian cultural and social organizations in Germany were also present.

As a result of three-days-long deliberations following decisions were made:

DECLARATION

*by the Ukrainian Political Institutions and Organizations
Concerning the Antibolshevik Activity of Various American Circles*

Authorized delegates of all Ukrainian political institutions and organizations in Europe have discussed the affair of the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" on December 27, 1952, based on information from the delegation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (U.C.C.A.) on the 19th—20th Dec., 1952. At this meeting, specially convoked for the purpose the delegates unanimously resolved in the name of the institutions and organizations represented, that the following declaration shall be regarded as obligatory directive for the Ukrainian policy as to the said affair:

(1) Co-operation between the Ukrainian political forces and various American circles in the field of antibolshevik campaign and on an appropriate political basis is necessary for the Ukrainian struggle for liberation, as well as for the common fight against bolshevism. Therefore, the undersigned Ukrainian political institutions and organizations are willing to fight against bolshevism and Russian imperialism in common with the said circles, under certain conditions.

(2) The delegates are of unanimous opinion that the political conception and the structure of the so-called "Co-ordination Centre of the Anti-bolshevik Campaign" (C.C.A.C.), which was constituted with considerable assistance from the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia", renders co-operation with American circles impossible. The C.C.A.C. repudiates the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations and the equal rights of nations; it allows representatives of those Russian parties to join and prevail, which, in practice, is based on Russian imperialism and deny the right of the Ukrainian and other subjugated peoples to restore their independent and democratic States. This conception impairs in its principles our struggle for deliverance and common fight against bolshevism, as

a) it is for maintaining of the Russian empire, at the cost of the subjugation of Ukraine and the other non-Russian peoples;

b) it tends to weaken morally and politically the most powerful and active factor of the anti-bolshevik fight within the U.S.S.R., namely, the national movements for liberation and national independence of the non-Russian peoples;

c) It diverts the policy of the United States of America to supporting Russian imperialism and renders the co-operation between the national movements for liberation and American anti-bolshevik activity impossible;

d) it abuses the American aid and funds by combatting the anti-bolshevik movements for the independence of the nations subjugated by Moscow.

Those principles upon which the C.C.A.C. is based render impossible such reform of it that would allow the Ukrainians to join. Therefore, any attempts in the direction of reform are in vain. Only the complete rejection of the said conception would render the organization of a common and expedient fight against bolshevism possible.

(3) Ukrainian political organizations are willing to participate in the activities of the different anti-bolshevik American circles, provided that the following premises have been realised:

a) Affirmative attitude towards the fight of Ukraine and other subjugated peoples for their independence.

All national representations joining the anti-bolshevik front bind themselves to respect the struggle of all nations for their independent democratic states, within their ethnographical boundaries and not to work against their fight. Only Russian anti-bolshevik forces, which will respect the principles mentioned and will observe them in their activities, are allowed to join this common front.

b) Each national representation keeps its independence in all domains of liberation policy. International co-operation is to be achieved in co-ordination and not in one-sided leadership.

c) Co-operation is exercised through equal delegations of each national group (equal votes to each people, as in the United Nations)

d) Each national group is represented by authorised delegates of the political emigration of their respective peoples.

(4) On the basis of these premises the American circles have the possibility to endorse the common anti-bolshevik front and to warrant simultaneously the realisation of the premises mentioned above by appropriate political conception.

Thus natural possibilities are at the same time given for a successful functioning of the common front of all subjugated peoples fighting for deliverance, including all peoples within the U.S.S.R. as well as the so-called satellites subjugated now.

The Executive Committee of the Ukrainian National Council (V. O. U. N. R.);

Foreign Representation of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (Z.P. U.H.V.R.);

Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Z.Ch. O.U.N.);

Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Solidarists) (O.U.N.S.);

Union of Ukrainian Monarchists (S.H.D.);

Ukrainian Peasants Party (S.Z.S.U.);

Ukrainian Democratic Revolutionary Party (U.R.D.P.);

Ukrainian Socialist Party (U.S.P.);

Ukrainian National Democratic Association (U.N.D.O.);

Ukrainian National State Union (U.N.D.S.).

Supplementing the above declaration the Executive Committee of the Units Abroad of the O.U.N. announced its attitude:

STATEMENT

*by the Executive Committee of the Units Abroad of the
Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.)*

on the question of co-operation with American institutions, their conceptions and measures concerning the setting-up of a common anti-bolshevik front

The executive Committee of the O.U.N. Units Abroad having approved of the united position taken up by the Ukrainian political institutions and organizations of December 27th, 1952, formulated and drawn up with the active participation of our representatives, and also having approved of the joint *Declaration of the national political centres and the national liberty organizations of the peoples subjugated by Moscow*, of December 14th, 1952, this Committee issues the following addendum and expositions:

1) The only basis for co-operation between the Ukrainian and American institutions in the anti-bolshevik campaign is the recognition of the idea of the whole of Ukraine as a sovrenign state and the dismemberment of the Russian empire into national states, the support of said nations in their national fight for freedom against bolshevism and all other forms of Russian imperialism.

2) The American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia perseveres in its insistence on the opposite platform, namely, on the preservation of a united and indivisible Russian empire. That platform makes any co-operation impossible for us.

Beside the Russians, there are no "*peoples of Russia*", but there are *peoples enslaved by Russia*. The anti-bolshevik fight for freedom waged by the peoples subjugated by Moscow has nothing in common with the action of the Russian imperialists working against the bolshevist regime as such. The subjugated peoples are fighting for their detachment from Russia without regard to its political constitution, while the Russian imperialists of every trend are aiming at retaining those peoples within the Russian empire.

The menace to the freedom-loving world is to be found in imperialist Russia. As long as that empire exists there will be no liberty and no freedom from fear in the world. The pro-Russian action of the Americans in the A.C.L.P.R. (American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia), particularly the founding of the C.C.A.C. (Co-ordination Centre of the Anti-Bolshevik Campaign) has sown suspicion among the peoples enslaved by Moscow, who are friendly towards the Western World and want it as an ally in the anti-bolshevik campaign.

The so-called C.C.A.C. is an obstacle in the way of that campaign and the participation of non-Russians in it is equivalent to treason.

3) Those Russians who do not approve of the subjection of other peoples, and who are prepared to fight against Bolshevism for their own national state within its ethnic borders, may join the common front of the oppressed peoples.

The Executive Committee of Units Abroad of the O.U.N. declares that, up to now, not one Russian political group has come forward in favour of breaking up the Russian dungeon of nations and the building up of national states in their ethnographical borders.

On the contrary, the project of the American institutions to form a common anti-bolshevist front by setting their hope upon the participation of the Russians and casting them for the principal part has no proper foundations. That idea, and all steps taken in that direction, tend to bring America's anti-bolshevik policy and action to a stand-still and weaken the active anti-bolshevik front, as that is directed against any and every kind of Russian imperialism.

4) For successful joint action the West should set the subjected peoples in the centre of interest, not the Russians, who are intent on imperialist aims and will thus bring dissension into the common front.

The recognition by the American factors of the idea of sovereign, democratic states within their own ethnographical borders, instead of the decayed U.S.S.R., would make firm ground upon which all

participants in the common front might build their co-operation with America for the future, as well as to-day.

If the object of the American "psychological warfare" consists in mobilising the peoples behind the Iron Curtain in order to stimulate an active anti-bolshevik campaign, it can only be accomplished by the proper support of the idea of state independence for those nations.

The co-operation of American circles with a common front must not be just seizing a favourable opportunity, nor a means for political pressure on the Kremlin, in order then to come to an agreement at the expense of the enslaved peoples.

5) The still free, but menaced peoples, as well as the subjugated peoples, must fight shoulder to shoulder in a united front against bolshevism, the foe of the whole freedom-loving world.

The guarantee of victory over the common enemy is the consolidation of the anti-bolshevik campaign of the Western Block and the revolutionary national struggle of the peoples under bolshevist oppression.

Only to combat the U.S.S.R. from outside, without the co-operation of the allied revolutionary forces, can bring no decisive success, and the co-operation of the latter depends on the recognition and support of their struggle for liberty.

The role of the subjugated peoples in the anti-bolshevik world front bases on their own all-round revolutionary, and especially armed, political fight against occupation.

Special significance should be given to the Ukrainian Liberation Movement, — O.U.N. and U.P.A. (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army) which have without interruption directed and organized the armed political campaign for the whole of Ukraine; the Ukrainian people, however, to be main force in the total anti-bolshevik revolutionary proceedings within the U.S.S.R., which will conclude a general uprising.

The whole action outside the U.S.S.R.,—the Ukrainian as well as that of the West,—in the common front must take its bearings from the ideal, political position of the revolutionary struggle in Ukraine, with due regard to its requirements, so that it is afforded the necessary all-round, moral, political and technical support.

6) The idea of the common front for the revolutionary anti-bolshevik fight for freedom is anchored in the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nation (A.B.N.), the co-ordination centre of that fight. The A.B.N. was formed in the fire of the underground campaign against two fronts, against Hitlerism and bolshevism, on the initiative and with the participation of the O.U.N., U.P.A., Armenian, Azerbaijanian, Georgian, Idel-Uralian, North Caucasian, Turkestanian, Byelorussia and other National revolutionaries.

A.B.N., built up on the principle of equal rights, is a union of national freedom organizations of the peoples long subjected by

Moscow and those recently enslaved, who are all fighting for the destruction of bolshevism and the dissolution of the U.S.S.R., and for their own independent national states, in their own ethnographical borders, as well as for the return of their expelled or deported countrymen.

The fundamental conception of the A.B.N. bases on the nations' own forces, their national struggle for freedom and their collaboration in a joint front. A.B.N., organized and maintained by its own resources, without outside aid, is the expression of the aims of the peoples in their fight for freedom, and is their spokesman in their decisive role of an individual and independent force in the world struggle against bolshevism.

The A.B.N. and its idea must not be underestimated where it is a question of the serious treatment of the problem of a common front against bolshevism.

7) The interests of that front require that America gives up its pro-Russian policy and evinces a favourable attitude towards the fight for liberty and independence being waged everywhere, in the spirit of the noble ideas for which Washington's America once took up arms.

For the victory of the freedom-loving world, a positive attitude on the part of the Western Powers towards the Ukrainian anti-bolshevist liberation movement, its principles and struggle in Ukraine itself, and the joint stand of the political organizations in emigration of December 27th, 1952, as well as the analogous stand taken by the other peoples in the thraldom of Moscow, and the idea and action of the A.B.N., is indispensable.

8) The Executive Committee of the Units Abroad of the O.U.N. hopes that the U.C.C.A. (the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America) will distance itself from any measures and efforts to get Ukrainians to join the C.C.A.C., or similar formations, and calls upon the U.C.C.A. to share the united attitude of all the Ukrainian political movers and defend the position of the Ukrainian independence policy.

All Ukrainians abroad and all western anti-bolshevik circles should remember the words of the appeal made by belligerent Ukraine, October 1949, "...the only salvation for the world lies in the immediate and complete destruction of Russian imperialistic bolshevism in its present starting point. That can only be accomplished by the organized power of a uniform front of all peoples subjected, or threatened by Russian bolshevist imperialism.

December 30th, 1952.

*The Executive Committee
of the Units Abroad of Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists
(O.U.N.)*

The National Turkestanian Unity Committee as the representative speakers of the Turkestanian people did not delay in stating

clearly its point of view upon the matter. Its declaration was made accessible to the public in the "A.B.N. Correspondence" of January 1953. We read there the following statement:

Our Path knows no Compromise

The National Turkestanian Unity Committee (N.T.U.C.) always uncompromising in its struggle for liberation, will never compromise with the Russian imperialists. Collaboration with them will never bring about independence for Turkestan.

For these reasons the N.T.U.C. did not participate in the meetings of the Russian imperialists and Russophile circles arranged by the American Committee, which took place on 20, 8, 1951 in Stuttgart, on 3, 7, 51 in Wiesbaden, on 19—21, 6, 52 in Starnberg and on 10—17, 10, 52 in Munich (all in Germany). The aim of these meetings was to unite Russians and non-Russians under a Russian hegemony. The N.T.U.C. is opposed to their resolutions, plans and programmes.

The N.T.U.C. will never collaborate with Russian imperialism, as their aim is to free Turkestan from the Russians and to found an independent Turkestanian State. The aims of the Turkestanian emigration are also those of the N.T.U.C.

National Turkestanian Unity Committee

The Caucasus peoples too joined the united front and clarified their attitude towards the policy of the American Committee at their representative conference in Munich on the 11th and 15th December, 1952. In the declaration issued specifically for this occasion we read the following:

Declaration of the All-Caucasian Conference

The authorized representatives of the Azerbaijan National Centre, the Georgian National Political Centre Abroad, and the North Caucasian National Committee assembled in Munich from December 11th to 15th, 1952, so as to thoroughly discuss and elaborate the fundamentals for their common fight, in order to re-establish the independence of the Caucasian Republics that were forced to surrender after the invasion by Soviet Russia (R.S.F.S.T.) in 1920/21 and have ever since lived under the yoke of that country.

The members of the Conference unanimously agreed with all, besides other things discussed and decided to prepare the following Declaration:

Attitude Towards C.C.A.C.

The Conference confirms the will of the Caucasian Organization to carry on a decisive fight to overthrow Soviet tyranny and welcomes the co-operation in this respect of all national and international organizations recognizing the right to the restoration of the independence of the Caucasian Republics and other state foundations on the territory of the former Russian Empire.

The Conference regrets, however, the impossibility of working with the Co-ordination Centre of the Anti-bolshevik Campaign (C.C.A.C.), constituted in Munich on October 16, 1952, and declares that neither the beforementioned nor the association of Wiesbaden of November 7, 1951, recognizes the principles of a recognition of the restoration of the independence of the Caucasian Republics unconditionally.

The Co-ordination Centre of the Anti-bolshevik Campaign grants that right only to the Baltic States and is evidently taking a stand that is in contradiction to historical facts and the express will of the Caucasian peoples, contained in the Declaration of Independence given in 1918.

The Conference strongly disapproves of the behaviour of those Caucasians who signed the convention of Wiesbaden and Munich in the name of unknown and but recently founded organizations, together with other organizations which do not recognize the unconditional restoration of the Caucasian Republics and thus attempts to make the restoration of the sovereignty of the Caucasian Republics an inner-Russian concern.

The Conference expresses the hope that representatives of the States and organizations, including the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia concerned with the national problem within the U.S.S.R., will be led by the just democratic principle of self-determination of the peoples as laid down in the Atlantic Charter.

As the last chord in the action against the American Committee in 1952 can be regarded the common declaration of the under-mentioned representatives of the various centres and Liberation Movements of the non-Russian peoples. The full text of the declarations is as follows:

DECLARATION

The national-political centres and national liberation-movements of the non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R. make the following declaration of the standpoint of their nations concerning their anti-bolshevist, national fight for liberation:

I

1. Bolshevism, which has already crushed so many nations and is preparing to conquer the entire world, is a mixture of Russian imperialism and communism. These two elements, of different origin, have, in the process of history, grown together into an indivisible unity, and are working in one direction. They are held together by their common aim, by their effects on various spheres, and by reciprocal reinforcement. Both strive for the mastery of the whole world, which follows the creation of a single world-empire, accompanied by the supremacy of communism in all the spheres of life and the domination of Russia. Their common path is characterised by internal decomposition, conquest and domina-

tion of more and more nations, the abolition of their independence, their right to self-determination and their national character. Their aim is the extermination of religion and of all cultural, political, social and economic orders which are anti-communist. Added to this is the liquidation of all hostile elements, and the suppression of nations and human beings and all signs of life under this ruthless, terrorising dictatorship.

Russian imperialism and communism can regard each other as the strongest mutual support and guarantee of their mastery. The uniting of these two elements, their aims and their working is the main characteristic of bolshevism.

2. The enemy of all liberty-loving peoples is not solely the bolshevist amalgamation of Russian imperialism and communism, but also each of these two elements independently. Russian imperialism and communism retain their inimical traits in whatever form they manifest themselves, be they separated from each other, or hostile to one another, or even if they appear to be opposed to the regime of Stalin. Their opposition to the Kremlin or any other element does not divest them of their noxiousness or make them enemies of bolshevism, for each of them, in its own particular sphere speaks the same language as the Kremlin and prepares for the latter's expansion. That applies to the anti-communist variations of Russian imperialism among the emigrés and to anti-Stalinist communism, such as Trotzkyism and Titoism.

3. Our peoples were the first victims of the bolshevist assault when, at the end of World War I, they freed themselves from the domination of Tsarist Russia and restored independent national States. Then, the bolshevist forces began military aggression on our national States, with the aim of destroying them and once more enslaving our peoples within the bounds of the Russian Empire. In this conquest of the independent non-Russian nations they were aided, without any division on account of their mutual enmity, by the so called White-Russian anti-communist forces, who were themselves subsequently annihilated by the bolsheviks.

The hostile attitude towards our nations' fight for freedom still exists in the Russian anti-communist emigré circles and guides their political action towards the establishment of a Russian Empire, which is also the be-all and end-all of bolshevism.

4. Although our countries were conquered by armed force and occupied by Russian bolsheviks, our peoples have not given up the struggle. This struggle is directed equally against Russian imperialism and against the communist regime of force. The ultimate goal of our fight for freedom is this:—the complete elimination from our countries of these two elements of bolshevist oppression, our unconditional liberation from all subservience to Moscow, and the restoration of our national, independent States on democratic lines, with the safeguarding of all liberties, with social justice, the

free development of religion and culture and the well-being of all citizens.

Our nations' struggle against bolshevism embraces all spheres of life. It consists of frustrating the anti-social plans and actions of bolshevism, of preserving and developing all forms of our national heritage, the strengthening in our peoples of every kind of resistance against bolshevism and Russian-imperialism, and their preparation for the national revolutions which will destroy Russian bolshevist domination and communism. It has many forms, ranging from passive resistance and silent sabotage to the political-military revolutionary dealings of the organized underground movements.

5. The chief plans of the world-wide campaign against bolshevism—not only that of the nations subjugated, but also of those now menaced—must be carried out with the aim of destroying completely both its constituents, i. e. Russian imperialism and communism.

That conception of the anti-bolshevist campaign which is based only on the fight against the bolshevist regime and the communist system, or only against the intended aggressions of the Russian-bolshevist imperialism, is quite wrong, as it carries with it a tolerance towards the other element of the same adversary.

Still more misguided and dangerous, however, are the attempts to form a plan of campaign against bolshevism on the assumption that it is possible to turn Russian imperialism and communism into mutual enemies and, for this purpose, to regard certain of their variations as allies, and thus, in order to win these over, to sacrifice the reliable, anti-bolshevist, national forces of the non-Russian nations, and their cause. These attempts repel all those powers who will not work either with Russian imperialism or communism. This plan cannot bring liberty, peace and security to the freedom-loving peoples, any more than it has been achieved by the victory over Hitler in alliance with the U.S.S.R.

II

1. The so-called "Co-ordinating Center of the Anti-bolshevist Campaign" (C.C.A.C.), which has been brought into being by the lavish help of certain American political circles, must, in its composition and by its programme—as may be seen from its statutes and other official publications—be regarded as an attempt:

a) to incorporate in the anti-bolshevist front the Russian imperialist forces, which are disrupting, even if they are opposed to the regime;

b) to grant to them decisive influence over the anti-bolshevist revolutionary campaign within the bounds of the U.S.S.R.;

c) to sacrifice the liberation campaign of the non-Russian peoples subjugated in the Soviet Union, in favour of the Russian imperialists;

d) to direct American policy, which plays a very important part in the free world's fight against bolshevism, on to the "broad path" of support of Russian imperialism.

2. The so-called "Co-ordinating Center of the Anti-bolshevist Campaign" (C.C.A.C.) is working for the continued existence of the Russian Empire within the boundaries of the present-day U.S.S.R. This aim is to be realised by denying the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. the right to separation from the Russian Empire by means of national revolutions. Their fight against bolshevism is to be carried on under the slogans of the unity of the present empire. This aim is clearly reflected in the programme and the structure of the "Co-ordinating Center". Above all, the "Co-ordinating Center" denies the legality of the restoration of the national States of the non-Russian peoples effected by the national revolutions of the years 1917/18; thus the free expression of the wills of the peoples in our democratic States is not recognized.

These viewpoints are clearly emphasized in the statutes of the "Co-ordinating Center". In Point 3, admittedly, the fundamental right of the above-mentioned peoples to self-determination by means of a democratic plebiscite is acknowledged. But, at the same time, it is strictly limited by the statement that this right can only be exercised after the destruction of the bolshevist regime in all the territories of the Soviet Union. This means that the non-Russian peoples are denied the right of determining their own fate by the help of national revolution.

It is further mentioned in Point 3 that this democratic expression of will may be made only by means of plebiscite, or by the vote of the national assemblies or of the "All-Russian" Assembly. Thus the Russians will be given the rights of regarding only the decision of the "All-Russian Assembly" as binding on themselves. Point 2 of the political programme refers to the February Revolution of 1917 as the basis of the nations' democratic expression of will. We maintain that the national policy of our peoples is not to be dated from the February Revolution, but has been determined and exemplified by the centuries-old history of our nations. This revolution, incidentally, as seen from the standpoint of the non-Russian peoples, is a denial, on the part of Russia, of the genuine democratic fundamentals, because she refused to recognise the national right of the peoples to order their individual lives. The "Co-ordinating Center's" conception of liberation is, therefore, only to destroy the present regime, and nothing more.

In the statutes and in the Communiqué of the directing body of the Conference of the C.C.A.C. from 10th till 18th, October 1952, it consists, on one hand, of Russian representatives and, on the other, of the representatives of non-Russian peoples. The national organizations are considered to be the representatives of the individual nations. The Russian organizations, on the other hand, speak not

only on behalf of the Russian nation, but also in the name of all the "nations of the U.S.S.R.". They appear to be champions of the liberty of the "peoples of Russia", and not of the Russian nation alone. This arrangement pursues the aim of securing for them the role of overlord of all the other peoples in the Soviet Union. This arrangement, by the way, is reminiscent of the method which the bolsheviks use also: in the U.S.S.R. there exist Communist Parties of every nation, except the Russians themselves—in Russian territory there exists only the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

3. The programme of the "Co-ordinating Center" is, in the sphere of national problems, more reactionary than that of the bolsheviks, as set out in the Soviet Constitution (1936). The bolsheviks do recognise, at least on paper, the right of every nation to self-determination and secession from the U.S.S.R. Under the pressure of the liberation-movements of these nations, the "Unions" and Autonomous States" of the Soviet Union were formed. The "Co-ordinating Center" and all Russian emigré circles are not willing even to put similar formal rights in writing.

4. The attempt of the American-founded "Co-ordinating Center" to deny to the liberation movements of the non-Russian nations the right to political liberation is of great significance, as it is calculated to weaken the liberation campaign and the entire anti bolshevik front.

5. The participation in the "Co-ordinating Center" of five insignificant non-Russian splinter-groups of the Armenian, Azerbaijanian, Georgian, North-Caucasian and Turkestanian emigrés is nothing else than a complete denial, on their part, of the liberation-campaign of their peoples, who will never cease from fighting for their national independence. They would never have come into being if the Americans had not been involved, as the Russians are no longer in the position by their own power to attract anyone to co-operate with them. It runs completely counter to the wishes and the attitude of these nations as manifested by the formation of their independent states in the years 1917/18. In their long struggle against the Russian oppressors, these nations clearly showed their fundamental attitude towards the question of their own political life. The fact that the above-mentioned political sects attached themselves to the "Co-ordinating Center" divests them of the right to be regarded as spokesmen for their nations.

Against this political background we may justly affirm that the "Co-ordinating Center" does not truly represent the above-mentioned nations and their liberation movements, but the imperialist interests of the Russian emigré organizations.

6. The co-operation of American political circles in the founding of the "Co-ordinating Center" reveals that their political understanding is incorrect. This is clearly shown by their support of Russian imperialist tendencies and in their mistrust of the liberation movements of the non-Russian peoples. Such an American policy

renders impossible any co-operation between the American anti-bolshevist forces and the liberation movements of the non-Russian peoples.

7. Our attitude towards the "Co-ordinating Center" is completely negative. We condemn and combat all its attempts to divert our liberation campaign from its true course or to pass itself off as representing this campaign.

8. We declare: we will carry on our struggle against bolshevist, and every other kind of imperialism, regardless of all obstacles that may confront us on the way.

9. We summon the non-Russian groups who have joined the "Co-ordinating Center" to sever their connection with the Russian imperialists and to tread the path of real liberation for their nations.

10. We appeal to American political circles to give up their policy of supporting Russian imperialist tendencies and to turn their serious attention to the national liberation movements of the nations subjugated by Moscow.

We wish to express our earnest hope that the fundamentals of freedom, independence and equality, which have played such a prominent part in the history of the American nation, will not be denied to our peoples and that, in their struggle for human liberty and independent national political life, they will be accorded the full support of the entire world.

(*A. Wanickt*)
for the Presidency of the
Byelorussian National Centre

(*E. Pataridze*)
Chairman of the Georgian
Democratic Party

(*Veli Kajum Khan*)
President of the National
Turkestanian Unity Committee

(*A. Magoma*)
President of the North-
Caucasian National Committee

(*W. Glaskow*)
President of the Supreme
Cossack Representation

(*Yaroslav Stetzko*)
Chairman of the Units Abroad of the
Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists

(*M. E. Resulzade*)
President of the Azerbaijanian
National Centre

(*R. Gabashwili*)
President of the Georgian
National Political Centre Abroad

(*Prince Niko Nakashidse*)
for the Presidency of the
Georgian Political Organization

(*Garip Sultan*)
for the Presidency of the New
Union of Fighters for the
Independence of Idel-Ural

(*A. Kmeta*)
for the Union of
Ukrainian Monarchists

December, 14th, 1952

The Byelorussian Central Council declares herewith its solidarity with the Declaration of the national-political centres and national-liberation movements of the peoples subjugated in the U.S.S.R., of December 14th, 1952, and undersigns it.
February 1, 1953

(*R. Ostrousky*)
President of the Byelorussian
Central Council

Statement of Solidarity

Munich
February 12th, 1953

The Cossack National Liberation Movement, under the leadership of the Supreme Otaman *Ihnat Arkhyovych Bily*, are in complete agreement with the Declaration of the National-political Centres and National Liberation Movements of December 14th, 1952, and have accordingly signed it.

They wish to state, for their part, that there is no difference between the present Russian communism and Russian imperialism in general. The Cossack nation carried on throughout the three years, when the Russian empire was disintegrating, an armed struggle against both the Russian communists and the White-Russian imperialists simultaneously. During the period of this military campaign, the Cossack nation set up their own independent State.

In a future decisive campaign against Russian communism, the Cossack Nation—in alliance with all other nations who value the freedom and independence of their peoples—will fight, without the compromise, for its liberty and political independence against Russian imperialism of every colour and description.

For the Cossack National Liberation Movement:

(*Uvarov*)
(*Kozlov*)
(*Molchanov*)

January, 30th, 1953.

Meanwhile on the 20th January, 1953 the new President of the United States, D. Eisenhower, moved into the White House. The non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. ask themselves: what will be the policy of the Republicans towards them? Such names as J. F. Dulles, H. Stassen, W. B. Smith, Taft inspire them with new hopes.

* * * * *
* *

