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EDITORIAL

YOUTH IN THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY

1960, an eventful year that has now become history, was marked for good and ill by the emerging role of youth on the world political scene. The Communist-influenced student riots in Tokyo which forced the cancellation of President Eisenhower’s projected visit to Japan, the appearance in a turbulent Africa of a number of newly independent states under the leadership of men and women who in general are much younger than European—or Soviet—heads of government, the obvious eagerness of Moscow to win over the youth of the so-called “uncommitted” nations—an eagerness which is belied by the unpleasant experiences which students from such countries meet with in Russia (see Mr. Okonkwo’s letter elsewhere in this issue of Horizons), even the accession to the Presidency of the United States of the youngest elected President in American history—these are but a few tokens of the world-wide ferment among young people. Apparently the apathy and political unconcern which characterized so many of the young in the 1950’s have been replaced by a new spirit. There is every evidence to indicate that this ferment will pervade 1961 and the succeeding years.

The Ninth International Student Conference which was held last August in Klosters, Switzerland, reflected the problem which most concern students throughout the world. The responsibilities of youth in preserving world peace, maintaining high standards in academic institutions and securing equal opportunity for education for all young people regardless of race, religion or national origin were uppermost in discussion at this Conference. Also on the agenda at Klosters were the responsibilities of youth in furthering the liberty of nations and human liberty in general and in helping to abolish all forms of colonialism and cultural oppression.

We as American students of Ukrainian descent are particularly pleased that the problem of the basic rights of men and nations is now engrossing students of all nationalities. Throughout modern Ukrainian history this problem has been of life-and-death importance to Ukrainian students. For the history of the Ukrainian independence movement cannot be divorced from the annals of Ukrainian student life. As early as 1848 Ukrainian students organized in the “Methodiyivske Bratswo” began the struggle of our youth against the Russian oppressors. Those who perished fighting to the end for Ukrainian freedom at the battle of Kruty in 1918 were all students. The Ukrainian Insurgent Army which
during and after World War II fought against both Hitler and the Bolshevik oppressors was partly composed of students. In the free world Ukrainian students born in Ukraine have joined with American-born students of Ukrainian descent to continue the struggle against the Russian oppressor, who has not only enslaved the non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Empire and the nations of Eastern Europe but also now threatens to enslave free men everywhere and to deprive the peoples of the newly independent ex-colonial countries of all their hard-won liberties.

In this country more than 1,000 students of Ukrainian origin, united in the Federation of Ukrainian Student Organizations of America (SUSTA) stand ready to devote their efforts to furthering the ideals proclaimed by students from all over the free world at the International Student Conference in Klosters.

Horizons is concerned to coordinate its own efforts with those of the Ukrainian-American student community. The Editors welcome and eagerly solicit contributions in the form of poems, short stories, book reviews, scholarly articles, discussions of current and historical political, social and economic trends and events. Looking to the future, your Editors hope that informed American students of East European as well as purely Ukrainian affairs who take seriously the Wilsonian ideals of freedom and national self-determination for which this great country once stood and will, we believe, stand once again will join contributors of strictly Ukrainian origin in the pages of Horizons. For we publish Horizons in English because we believe that the truth about Ukraine and other nations that are under the yoke of Soviet tyranny, the direct successor of the oppressive Great Russian tyranny of Muscovy which grew into the Tsarist Empire, is certain to be of increasing interest not only to American scholars in the East European and Soviet fields, but to all serious-minded and patriotic Americans.

Ukrainian young people know the truth about Soviet Russian tyranny through bitter, tragic experience. In a calm, objective way they believe it to be incumbent upon them to share the facts about Soviet colonialism and cultural oppression—a colonialism which puts the doings of the Western colonial powers in the shade—with other young people, students and scholars, throughout the non-Communist world and especially with the youth of America.
A PHILOSOPHER OF REVOLT AND MODERATION

by YURY MACYK

The recent Ideological Congress of the Ukrainian Students Organization of America showed our marked tendency to live in the ideological climate of the early 20th century. There appears a certain lack of understanding of the current position of leading non-Communist thinkers and a definite need exists for further study of their political philosophies.

Among them we cannot but select the late Albert Camus as one of the foremost spokesmen of our epoch. Virtually unknown in France before the war, he became one of the most prophetic, persuasive and hopeful moral philosophers of the mid-20th century. One of the greatest French novelists—the youngest winner of the Nobel Prize for literature since Kipling—he became a living legend during his life.

An idol of French and European youth for some time, he is becoming a legendary figure for many Americans. Camus' sudden accidental death early last year started a never-ending flurry of articles and books about him as well as translations of his works. The hypnotic, almost hysterical admiration shown at performances of his play "Caligula" is a further indication that American intellectuals belatedly discovered that he was a man who was successful in his effort to overcome the contradictions of post-war existential thought and found a positive moral philosophy which for many sounded like a restatement of some traditional American ideals.

In spite of his continued refusal to use hope as a remedy for human misfortune and in spite of his preoccupation with the ugly side of existence, he was one of the few contemporary French writers who acknowledged that his personal inclination was to happiness and in
an assertive age in which declarations of rights abound, he was among the very few thinkers to remind us of one of the most fundamental but most easily forgotten rights—the right to the pursuit of happiness.

Nevertheless "happiness" is not the central theme of his thought. A constant search to understand the essential dimensions of human experience and his understanding of revolt are the themes which dominate Camus' philosophy.

Germaine Bree defines his concept of revolt as: "An impulse that drives an individual to the defense of a dignity common to all men. It involves the idea of a measure of liberty and a measure of justice, it contains an affirmation of human solidarity which in its turn serves as limit for revolt itself."

To understand revolt is to understand man in the world. This is the theme and feeling which dominates Camus' thought, with its tension between liberty and justice, between an uncertain universe and certain death, with its protest against gods and tyrants and its struggle to create unity and values, with its ceaseless change, contradiction and surpassment, with its intense fidelity to the human condition. As one of his best critics said: "He is both a spokesman and a symptom of his times. Thus by typifying his age in this particular way he has reflected its intellectual habits, dramatized its political experience and laid bare some of the main sources of its moral unrest. It is for this reason that he is regarded as an important writer by his contemporaries."

His moral and political philosophizing, Camus outlined in two collection of essays, "The Myth of Sisyphus" and "The Rebel." "The Myth of Sisyphus" was written before the war and first published in 1942. It was an attack on the position of the dominant nihilistic thinkers of the last two centuries. Here Camus formed his particular idea of absurdity; absurdity being for him a state of tension between man's natural inclination to happiness and the cold, unresponsive, even hostile nature of the world itself. About his book, Camus declared in the preface to the American edition: "Written in 1940, amid the French and European disaster, this book declares that even within the limits of nihilism it is possible to find means to proceed beyond nihilism."

"The Myth of Sisyphus" is concerned primarily with the question of the individual man's existence. His second collection of philosophical essays, "The Rebel," dealt with man's relationship to his fellow men. What makes him so attractive a companion throughout this long voyage of exploration on which he embarks in "The Rebel" is that his world is always recognizable as the world we also live in and in which
he likewise always remains. He does not allow any screen of learning or pretension to separate him from his readers when he challenges philosophers, economists and historians on their own ground. At the root of his thought is the obvious truth that the act of rebellion or protest presupposes the existence of something worth rebelling for. It is an affirmation of a belief in life, even when it entails the risk and sometimes the certainty of death. Yet it was the fate of many not to know for what they were rebelling. Because they were unable to see where they were going, they often later fell into error and so forfeited the value of their revolt.

A man rebels to assert his rights and the rights of his fellow man and Camus believes that all revolt to be justifiable should be based on this common human unity. It is possible, then, for the rebel to know his limits, when to stop as well as to start. He is not seeking complete freedom, partly because as a human being he knows he is incapable of standing the strain of the responsibility it involves, and partly because he knows he could achieve it only by lifting himself out of the ranks and the reach of ordinary humanity and wrongfully usurping the position of a deity. He is content, once his revolt is successful within its limits, to settle back into respectability as an ex-rebel, knowing that the seeds of rebellion are still in him as in every man if needed again, content and able to take stock and advantage of all that the world around him has to offer. After this discovery Camus proceeds to study, starting with Sade, most of the great men, movements and moments of revolt to the present day. He reviews the history of the French Revolution, of the regicides and deicides, and shows how inevitably, from Rousseau to Stalin, the course of revolution leads to authoritarian dictatorship. All the revolutions in modern times, Camus points out, have led to reinforcement of the power of the state. By a wider use of the word “rebellion” than would ordinary occur to most people, Camus extends it to the field of creative art. The rebellion in this case is purely metaphysical. The tyrants against whom the artist is rebelling are death and oblivion, and the counter weight of modification is imposed by the necessary realization that even in revolt, the beauty of the world goes on existing.

Camus shows the real quality of his thought in the final pages of the book. He remarks: “We know at the end of this long inquiry into rebellion and nihilism that rebellion with no other limits but historical expediency signifies unlimited slavery. To escape this fate the revolutionary mind, if it wants to remain alive, must therefore re-
turn again to the sources of rebellion and draw its inspiration from the only system of thought which is faith put to its origin; thought which recognizes limits.” This tradition of limits belongs to the Mediterranean world, the world which was created by ancient Greece and has been destroyed by the excesses of German ideology and of Christianity otherworldliness — by the denial of nature. To the modern man Camus points out: “He who dedicates himself to history dedicates himself to nothing and, in his turn, is nothing. But he who dedicates himself to the duration of his life, to the house he builds to the dignity of mankind, dedicates himself to the earth and reaps from it the harvest which sows its seed and sustains the world again and again. Finally, it is those who know how to rebel at the appropriate moment against history who really advance its interest.” Not to calculate, to give everything for the sake of life and living men—in that way we can show that “Real generosity towards the future lies in giving all to the present.”

Camus’ works sound more like confessions than philosophical essays. They are disturbing revelations of a man who was painfully involved in the contradictions of our time. The sincerity of his work and strong emotional impact combined with high literary skill have fascinated many thousands of readers, especially the young ones, throughout the world. Perhaps, therefore, his philosophical essays have some intellectual shortcomings. Nevertheless, in spite of his logical shortcomings, the idea of revolt developed by Camus lends itself to a positive general political philosophy. Here lies its immense value.

The major weakness of the Western position in the post-war period can be derived from the fact that the popular philosophical movements of existentialism have been unable to develop a workable political philosophy. For this reason, Sir Herbert Read remarks in the introduction to the English edition of “The Rebel”: “With the publication of this book a cloud that has oppressed the European mind for more than a century begins to lift. After an age of anxiety, despair and nihilism, it seems possible again to hope—to have confidence again in man and in the future.”

Camus’ success stems from the fact that he was ultimately an absolutist, an essentialist in the sphere of morals. His allegiance is given primarily to certain values associated with the ancient world, particularly with Greece. By adhering to a position which puts man as man’s chief concern, the ideal of moderation, stoicism, and trust in nature rather than history—he gives a positive character to his idea of revolt.
He manages to overcome the widespread rejection of those explanatory and unifying absolutes which a more self-confident age was ready to affirm. The values which he stresses are essentially humane. Their influence controls his idea of revolt and gives it an impressive dignity and moral force.

5. Ibid., p. 269.
6. Ibid., p. 271.
7. Ibid., p. 7.
One of the major politico-social phenomena of our century is nationalism. Nationalism may be explained in terms of a natural desire among nations and races of the world to secure a right of economic, religious, social, and, most of all, political and cultural self-determination.

The responsibility for the sudden outbursts of nationalism rests on the practices of the colonial powers of the world and their treatment of the subject peoples as untermenschen.

Today the nationalist movements of Africa, Asia, and especially those of the Arab World, receive both the financial and moral support of the Soviet Union. The official organs of the Communist Party machine, its newspapers and communications media such as Radio Moscow are the chief promoters of the right of all subject peoples of the world to realize their national aspirations in a sovereign state. Hence, Communism, and with it, the Soviet Union, appear to be the sole protector of the rights of nations to political and cultural self-determination.

However, the principle of self-determination, which is being promulgated by the Soviet Union in the colonial areas of the world, finds no practical realization in the Soviet Union itself. On the contrary, the Soviet Union in itself is a colonial empire, while the advocacy of the principle of self-determination is linked with capitalism and “bourgeois nationalism.” Such deviations from “Russian internationalism” toward national aspirations are not tolerated and receive the special attention of the Politburo.
In Russia, the original non-Russian Marxism with its international outlook, transformed itself into a Russian style and character. Nicholas Berdyaev in his book, The Origin of Russian Communism, notes that “the fact that the Third International is not international but a Russian national idea” is “very poorly understood in the West.” The transformation of Russia from an autocratic system of tsars who dreamt of establishing a “Third Rome” realized itself in a transformation of Russian messianism and patriotism to the Comintern, and later to the Cominform.

The theoretician of the Russian Communist ideology, Vladimir Illich Lenin, in his booklet on The Right of Nations to Self-Determination, allows self-determination only when it serves the Party interests. Thus, national revolutions in many instances may help the Communists to gain control; in such cases, the Communists usually identify themselves with self-determination of nations in an international political structure.

Lenin was well aware of the dominating position of the Russian ethnic group in the Russian Empire. But he also realized that an open Russian chauvinism might lead to national revolutions and to a complete political separation of the former members of the Tsarist Empire. Therefore, Lenin proposed a number of tactics in order to combat the nationalism of any one nation. In regard to the Russians, Lenin foresaw their political domination by pointing out the following: “Even now, and probably for a fairly long time to come, proletarian democracy must reckon with the nationalism of the Great Russian peasants (not in the sense of making concessions to it, but in a sense of combating it).” Nevertheless, after Lenin’s death the triumvirate of Kamenev, Stalin, and Zinoviev failed to realize the importance of the national question, and if any separatist tendencies occurred, they were brutally suppressed.

It may be of interest to note that the problem of federation as a form of international relations in the future (1922) and as the idea of the Soviet Union was, until 1918, entirely in harmony with the theoretical aspirations and political plans of the All-Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks.

The problem of federalism as a principle of political organization in Marxism and Communism is a unique one. Russian Bolshevism, which had adopted from the ideological heritage of early Marxism the thesis of dictatorship as the basic and most characteristic feature of State organization, abandoned the ideas of self-determination and decentralization.
The national revolutions in the Russian Empire convinced Stalin of the impracticability of establishing the political system of autonomy. As a result, the next best form of political system to suit the Communist Party, the federation, was employed in order to preserve the integrity of the former Tsarist Empire.

Although the “Russian type” of federalism provided for an “exclusively voluntary Union,” the federation was nevertheless realized solely because of a compulsory Union of multinational components within the borders of the Federative whole.

The first opposition to the centralization of political power in the hands of the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks occurred during a session of the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks in Moscow, when a Ukrainian Communist leader, Zatonsky, warned his comrades “that the Ukrainian masses are aware of their national consciousness and would not tolerate a new Russian oppression.” Zatonsky went on to declare: “... We have to erase from the minds of our comrades the image of the Soviet Federation as a Russian one, since the question is not whether it is a Russian but whether it is a Soviet Federation...”

At the Eleventh Congress of the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks, Lenin voiced disapproval on the dismissal of Ukraine’s Kremlin-appointed Politburo. Moreover, their dismissal by the members of the Communist Party of Ukraine, and their substitution by a local group was not to be tolerated.8

The delegates who ratified the Constitution on the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were in the majority Russians, although the ethnic composition of the Russian Empire contained more than 54 per cent non-Russians. The ethnic composition of the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks9 was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Background</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvians and Estonians</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgians</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirghiz</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussians</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tartars</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be deduced from the above figures that at the Twelfth Congress,
the Russians had full political control over the non-Russians. Therefore, it is more likely that the Constitution was superimposed on the non-Russians, and the “voluntary” nature of the Union was cast aside.

It was at the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party that several elements of the so-called national republics attempted to retain in the newly-formed Soviet Union a confederative type of government in their relations among the contracting Soviet republics.10

Thus, the President of Ukraine, and a member of the KP(b)U (Communist Party of Bolsheviks of Ukraine), Christian Rakowsky, together with Mykola Skrynyk staged an open opposition to the centralization of power in Moscow. This centralization was proceeding along the lines of national inequality. The accusations by the “Ukrainian Titoists” were refuted by Stalin, who stated that “before the nations will have the right to self-determination . . . workers have the right to consolidate their power in the dictatorship of the proletariat.”11 This, of course, meant complete subordination of the national ideal to the aims of the Party.

Still another phase of opposition was led by Skrynyk to retain the ministries of foreign trade and foreign affairs on the Republican level. His attempts to organize the Communist Party of Bolsheviks of Ukraine to be separate and “different from Leningrad and Moscow,” were fruitless. Moreover Skrynyk and Rakowsky were accused by Stalin of “national fetishism.”12

The center of the Ukrainian controversy was the Ukrainian counterdraft of the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR. The Russian draft read that the Soviet Republics are forming a “Single Union state,—the USSR . . .”, while the Ukrainian counterdraft read that the Soviet Republics are “forming a Union of Soviet Republics.” The Ukrainian counterdraft was identified with the “bourgeois nationalist” and confederative tendencies, and was rejected.13

The last open opposition from the Ukrainian Communist government against the centralization of political power in the Kremlin occurred between the years 1925 and 1927. The counter force was led by such “national” Communist members of the KP(b)U as Skrynyk, Shumsky, Maximovych, Khvylovy, Volubeev, and others. The Ukrainian Communist leader, Volubeev, went so far as to say “that the Soviet Russian economic policy was nothing but a colonial exploitation of the Ukrainian people.”14

In 1928, a number of purges were initiated in Ukraine to suppress the “Titoist” tendencies among the Ukrainian Communists. The mass
executions and deportations continued during the period of Yezhov and were brought to a climax during the reign of Beria. The two most prominent Ukrainian Communists, Khvylovy and Skrypnyk, committed suicide in 1933, while Nikita Khrushchev was slowly gaining control of the Ukrainian Communist state-apparatus, reducing all traces of "nationalism" and "capitalism."\(^{15}\)

The three Soviet Peoples’ Republics of Bukhara, Khorezm, and the Far Eastern Republic were reunited with the new Russian Empire between the spring of 1921 and the fall of 1923. In 1923, the influence of the Russian Communist Party reached the point of domination, and the three independent Soviet Peoples’ Republics were incorporated into the Russian Federation. The purges in Bukhara (a nationality of the Turko-Tartaric race and Islamic denomination) resulted in a purge of 15,000 of the "16,000 members who were registered in the Party..." Speaking of Khorezm (also a Turko-Tartaric people with Islamic religion), Stalin declared that "the nationalist factions must be purged before there can be talk of a Communist Party of Khorezm."\(^{16}\)

Quite an extensive opposition existed in Georgia. At the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks, Orekhelosvili tended to the Congress a resignation of the whole Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party, including the leader of the Georgian Communist Party, Makharadze. The resignation was a protest against the formation of the Transcaucasian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan) without the approval of the Communist Party of Georgia. The formation of the TSFSR may be explained in terms of the political manipulations of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee which considered that it would be easier to unite the Transcaucasian Federation into the USSR than each Caucasian state separately.

The opposition of the Islamic Tartars to the centralization was realized in a number of attempts of Sultan Galiev (who held a high position in the Narkomnat, the National Commissariat for Nationalities) to break away from the rule of the Russian Communist Party and to establish an independent Moslem Communist Party. However, his attempts proved unsuccessful. At the Fourth Conference of Stalin with the Responsible Workers of National Republics and Regions on June 9-12 in 1923, Sultan Galiev was condemned and purged.

Such was the opposition of the non-Russian nations to the centralization of the political power under the leadership of Moscow. Their only crime was a longing for the expression of their political and cultural maturity in an independent, sovereign, and national state.
The development of the Soviet Federative structure followed the line of steadily-increasing Union competence and the swallowing up by the Union of the political and legal power of the separate Soviet Republics. Today, the scope of the powers of the Union Republics is defined only by declarative norms. The 1936 Constitution of the Soviet Union (also known as Stalin’s Constitution) does not place limits on the powers of the government of the Union; rather, it regulates its structural details strictly on the basis of Lenin’s statement that “in the government of the Soviet Union, the unified state direction requires the greatest uniformity in structure of state organs in the entire country.”

While recognizing the indisputable primacy of the powers of the Union over those of constituent republics (Article 15 of the Constitution), the Soviet lawmakers did not provide guarantees for the defense of the rights of the individual National Republics, with the exception of the declarative Article 17, which states: “The right freely to secede from the USSR is reserved to every Union Republic.” This, however, is practically rendered impossible by Article 25 of the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR, which states, that the “Ratification, alternation, and supplementation of the Treaty of the Union is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress of Soviets of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics.” As a result of this sort of legislation a Georgian, Turkman, or Ukrainian secession would have to be approved by the Russian majority of the Congress of the Soviet Union and by the other ethnic delegates. Thus, the Georgian, Turkman, or Ukrainian governments are rendered politically and legally powerless to realize the act of secession from the Union.

Some other provisions of the Constitution reflect the extent to which autonomy or sovereignty realized itself. Article 18 states: “The territory of the Union Republic may not be altered without its consent.” This provision, however, was never carried out; in the Union Republics of Bukhara and Khorezm, not only were their territories altered, but the Republic themselves were dissolved and became component parts of the newly-formed Soviet Republics of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Tadzhikistan.

Article 18(a), giving to each Union Republic the right to establish foreign diplomatic relations and conclude agreements, finds no practical realization. Although the Soviet Republic of Byelorussia and Ukraine are members of the United Nations, they are not permitted to establish diplomatic relations with foreign states.

In regard to cultural self-determination, Article 121 legislates for
the “instruction in schools” to be “conducted in the native languages.” Here again, we find this article to posses only declarative value. Before 1926, the Russian language as well as the Ukrainian was compulsory in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Prior to 1937, some 240 hours of Russian language study was required in the Ukrainian language schools. By 1938, the allotment of Russian increased to 390 hours in urban centers and to 429 hours in rural areas of the Ukrainian SSR. In the minority schools of the Ukrainian SSR (such as Yiddish and Uzbek), more time was allotted to the instruction of Russian than Ukrainian.17

In June, 1938, the Russian language once again was introduced in most schools of the non-Russian Union Republics. At the Fourteenth Congress of the KP(b)U, Khrushchev declared that “now all the peoples will study one Russian language.” Furthermore, Khrushchev accused the Ukrainian nationalists of driving the Russian language from the schools of Ukraine because the “Russian language was synonymous with Bolshevism.”18

Article 123 on “Equality of rights of citizens of the USSR irrespective of their nationality or race” states that “any direct restriction of the rights of . . . or indirect privileges for citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law.” The same value which is attributed to the other articles of the Soviet Constitution may be given to Article 123. The guarantee of equalities is mere declaration if national discrimination continues in practice throughout the the Soviet Union. Joseph Stalin, in a speech to Soviet generals on May 24, 1945, openly voiced his preference for the Russian people. In the same speech, Stalin praised the Russians as the only true patriots of the Soviet Union. In proposing his toast to the Russian people, Stalin declared: “I drink first of all to the health of the Russian people because it is the leading nation of all nations belonging to the Soviet Union.”19

The primacy and privilege of the Russian language is evidenced in the Uchitel’skaya Gazeta (The Teachers Newspaper), which declared that not only the peoples of the USSR study the Russian language, but also that the Russian language has received “universal recognition.” The paper further stated that “by mastery of this language, they (meaning the people of the world) obtain access to the treasury of the most advanced culture and science of our age.”20

The self-determination of religious belief is also guaranteed by
the Soviet Constitution. Article 124 guarantees "freedom of worship" to all religious groups. This article finds no practical application. The belief in a Supernatural Being is simply denied to the citizen of the Soviet Union. In Article 13, of the Constitution of the Communist Party of Bolsheviks, it is made mandatory for each member of the Party to be a practicing atheist. Since the Communist Party is the only legal party in the Soviet Union, how is it possible for the same party to tolerate the provision which guarantees the freedom of worship and the right to believe in Our Creator?

The fact remains that there is no religious toleration or freedom in the Soviet Union. The Orthodox, the Moslems, the Catholics (both Byzantine and Latin Rites), the Buddhists, the Protestants, the Hebrews, the Shamanists and the Lamaists are all persecuted alike.

The Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches were severely persecuted, as they were identified with the nationalistic, capitalistic, and other non-Communist movements.

The religious self-determination of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church materialized on October 14, 1921, when at a conference in the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev, the Ukrainian Orthodox clergy demanded severance of relations with the Metropolitan See of Moscow. Moreover, the Conference demanded immediate re-establishment of the Metropolitan See in Kiev, and an *autocephalous* status for the Ukrainian Orthodox Church.21

The swift growth of the organization of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church resulted in counter-activity by the Bolsheviks. In 1923, the late Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkiwsky was arrested, imprisoned, and in 1938, murdered by the NKVD. The destruction of Ukrainian Orthodox life was completed in 1936. As a result of the persecutions and purges by the GPU, a total of four Metropolitans, 13 Archbishops, 10 Bishops, and over 2,500 priests were imprisoned, executed, or murdered.22 All the churches and other church property were confiscated. Some were destroyed and others turned into clubs, theaters, warehouses, shops and even concentration camps. The Bolsheviks even refused to spare the churches of the ancient Kievan-Rus' (Ukraine), Zaporizhian Kozak, and other eras of Ukrainian history. The Bolsheviks demolished such ancient architectural monuments as St. Michael's Monastery, St. Nicholas Cathedral, Mazepa Cathedral, Mykilsky Monastery, Holy Trinity Church, St. George's Church, and many others.23

Following the Molotov-Ribbentrop Agreement for the partition of Poland in 1939, the Western Ukrainian territories were "liberated"
by the Soviet Army. With the Russian “liberation” came also the “liberation” of the Byzantine Rite Ukrainian Catholic Church from the “papal yoke.”

The first open attacks on the Ukrainian Catholic Church and her Metropolitan Count Andrew Sheptycky, OSBM occurred during the first period of Soviet occupation, between 1939-1941. The refusal of the hierarchy and clergy to accept the Bolshevist suzerainty over Church affairs resulted in mass deportations and executions of the ecclesiastics.24

The second Soviet occupation of western Ukraine commenced with the Soviet Russian press attacks on the Bishops and clergy.25 The last offensive opposition to atheistic Communism came from approximately 300 Catholic priests, who on June 1, 1945, signed a petition addressed to Molotov, Vice-President of Ministers of the Soviet Union. They referred to Article 124 of the Soviet Constitution (which guarantees freedom of worship), and asked for religious toleration. The petition was ignored, and was followed up by a decree forbidding all religious practices.

The next step taken by the Bolshevists was the destruction of the organizational structure of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. Thus, in order to speed up the process of destruction, a “Movement for the Reunion of the Ukrainian Catholic Church with the Orthodox Church” was initiated. The “reunion movement” proved to be a complete failure. The Bolshevists deported the rest of the hierarchy and over 800 clergy. The deportations were followed by a Synod (a pseudo-Council) for the “reunion” held in Lviv between March 8 and 10 in 1946. The whole affair was a state-staged show and there is no evidence to verify attendance by Catholic clergy. Nevertheless, messages of homage were sent to Stalin and to the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church in Moscow, announcing the success of the “reunion movement.”26

Although two Metropolitans, nine Archbishops and Bishops, and over 2,900 Byzantine Rite Catholic clergy were purged27—the efforts of the Bolshevists to destroy the religious life of a people could hardly be considered a success.

Theoretically, the Union Republics have their own statehood: they have a government apparatus, their citizenship, their territory. However, under the centralized Communist dictatorship, they do not have at their disposal the necessities for the realization of their sovereign rights.

Such is the nature of Russian sovereignty, self-determination, and
equality of nations and races. It may be of the utmost importance and benefit to the leaders of the nationalistic movements of Asia, Africa, and the Arab World to study thoroughly the Soviet policy toward self-determination. The elimination of British, French, Belgian, Dutch or other forms of imperialism may not be the solution of their problems if they fall into the hands of a new, and a more brutal and totalitarian colonial system, the centuries-long colonial system of Russia.

For Americans, the suppressed nations and races of the Soviet Union should serve as an indication of what may take place in our own country if we remain ignorant and indifferent to Russian tactics on the road to world domination.

6. Quoted from Michael S. Pap's: “Soviet Difficulties in the Ukraine,” Review of Politics, XIV, (April, 1952). Dr. Pap's statement is based on a speech delivered by Zatonsky to the X Zvyez Rossiiykoi Kommunisticheskoi Partii (B), March 8-16, 1921, printed in Stenograficheski Otchet, Moscow: 1921, p. 110.
7. Ibid.
8. XI Zvyez Rossiiykoi Kommunisticheskoi Partii (B), March 27-April 1922, (The XI Congress of the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks), Moscow: Partizdat, 1922, p. 31.
9. XII Zvyez Rossiiykoi Kommunisticheskoi Partii (B), April 17-25, 1923, Moscow: Glavpolitprosvet, 1923, pp. 528-534.
11. Ibid., p. 265.
15. Ibid., pp. 221-222.
17. “Ruskii Yazyk v Shkolakh Ukrainy,” (Russian Language in the Schools of Ukraine), Pravda, (March 26, 1938)
20. Uchitel'skaya Gazyeta (The Teachers Newspaper), April 7, 1954).


The problems of war and peace constitute an important part of the theory of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin, following Clausewitz’s definition of war, taught that war is but a continuation of a national policy by other (forcible) means. He spoke of the two kinds of war: just and unjust. Stalin, who considered himself Lenin’s disciple, made some contributions in this field of Communist theory. His ideas on this subject, however, do not represent a systematic doctrine; there is no treatise by Stalin on just and unjust war. His opinions concerning the matter are scattered throughout his writings, and if one wants to know them one must look at several of Stalin’s works; in this way the late dictator’s views on war as a problem of political ethics and international law may be ascertained. This is an attempt to do just that.

More specifically, the purpose of this essay may be stated in the following terms. First, Stalin’s notions concerning the nature of just and unjust war will be discussed. Secondly, by way of comparison with Stalin’s view, the Catholic doctrine about just and unjust war will be briefly mentioned. Thirdly and lastly, criticism will be made of Stalin’s view of just and unjust war.

1. STALIN’S CONCEPT OF JUST AND UNJUST WAR

The Bolsheviks never regarded themselves as pacifists. Although calling themselves friends of peace they often spoke in favor of war, that is, in favor of what they considered a just kind of war. In the book attributed to Stalin it is stated that there are two kinds of war:

a) Just war, war that is not a war of conquest but a war of liberation, waged to defend the people from foreign attack and
from attempts to enslave them, or to liberate the people from capitalist slavery, or, lastly, to liberate colonies and dependent countries from the yoke of imperialists, and

b) Unjust war, war of conquest, waged to conquer and enslave foreign countries, and foreign peoples.\(^2\)

Stalin says that the Bolsheviks supported wars of the first kind. The second kind of wars, on the other hand, the Bolsheviks opposed. They were of the opinion "that a resolute struggle must be waged against them even to the point of revolution and the overthrow of one's own government."\(^3\) Stalin wrote that

... We, of course, are not opposed to every kind of war. We are against imperialistic, counter-revolutionary war. But we are for wars of liberation, for anti-imperialistic, revolutionary wars in spite of the fact that such a war, as it is known, not only is not free from "the horrors of bloodshed," but even abounds in them.

War is a problem of political ethics and international law. It may be just or unjust. But war is a complicated phenomenon and it is sometimes hard to determine which one is just and which is unjust. No country that is waging war against some enemy would say that its war is of an unjust nature. On the contrary, the states engaged in war never lack arguments proving that their struggle is morally good and justifiable. Who, then, can decide which war pertains to a just category and which does not? In other words, what is the criterion, with the help of which, the distinction can be drawn between just and unjust war?

Stalin's (and Lenin's) answer here is well presented by P. Chuvikov.\(^5\) But before the answer is given reference is made to the non-Marxist approach on this subject, and, as usual, it is criticized and then rejected. The idea expressed in terms "who first attacked" as the criterion with which one can establish the just or the unjust character of war is deemed to be inadequate and, therefore, promptly dismissed. Why is it inadequate? Simply because history teaches that some of the peaceful countries seeing the inevitable forthcoming attack on their territory by the enemy, start a war. Here the country which started the war is in the right; its initiation of hostilities was provoked by the other country's bellicose attitude and desire for conquest. In this case, therefore, the state which attacked first, thus beginning the war, has a just cause; its war, then, is just. The state which was attacked, consequently, is in the wrong; it lacks the just cause; its war, then, is unjust. To conclude, the criterion of "who attacked first" with which one can dis-
tistinguish between just and unjust war is untenable, since the country which first starts military operations against the enemy state does not necessarily wage an unjust war.

On the other hand, of course, there are examples which clearly show that the states which first started the war, with the intention of seizing foreign territory, do not represent the morally good cause. Their war is an unjust one. Stalin regards the war of Hitler’s Germany against the Soviet Union as belonging to that category. He says that “the predatory hordes of the German usurpers” invaded the USSR with the clear purpose of conquering its lands and subjugating its peoples. “Not a single German soldier can say that he is waging a just war, because he cannot fail to see that he is forced to fight for the plunder and the oppression of other peoples.” The Red Army, however, fighting in defense of the Soviet Union, which was attacked by Hitler, “... is waging not a war of conquest, not an imperialistic war, but a patriotic war, a war of liberation, a just war.”

Another criterion of just and unjust war which appears in the non-Marxist literature is mentioned by Chuvikov. This principle tries to determine the character of the war by finding out “where the troops are situated.” If the armies are fighting on the territory of their own country such a war, because of its defensive nature, is just. If the armies, on the other hand, enter foreign territory, the war becomes unjust. Such reasoning is dismissed by Chuvikov. He contends that just war, a war of liberation, does not have to be fought on the soil of one’s own country. In order to destroy the enemy it is sometimes necessary to wage war on the enemy’s territory; this does not make it less just. Take, for example, the war of the Soviet Union with Nazi Germany and her allies. “After the liberation of its native land from Hitler’s filth, the Red Army” entered foreign countries with the aim of helping them “to break the chains of the fascist slavery and to restore their freedom and independence.” Such war, of course, is just. The second non-Marxist criterion of just and unjust war, then, is also false; it fails to take notice of the fact that the state which conducts war on the foreign territory may have a justification for it.

At last the true, Marxist answer is given by Chuvikov. To determine whether the war is just or unjust one must study the pre-war policy of the government which is engaged in the military struggle. The sacred words of Lenin are quoted:

War is a continuation of policy. One must study the policy before the war, policy which led to, and brought about, the war.
If the policy was imperialistic, that is, defending the interests of financial capital, and engaged in plundering and oppression of the colonies and foreign countries, then, also the war, which follows from such policy, is an imperialistic war. If the policy was directed toward national liberation, that is, expressing the mass movement against national oppression, then the war, which follows from such policy, is a war of national liberation.10

The imperialistic war is obviously an unjust war; the war of national liberation, on the other hand, is a just war.

Now, one may ask, what does it mean to know the policy, which resulted in war? The answer here would lie in understanding the social conditions and the policy of the ruling classes which brought about the war. Samedov points out that Stalin made it clear that the war between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union reflected the domestic policy of both sides. The war constituted a continuation of the policy conducted by these states and their ruling classes, before actual hostilities started. There was an undeniable connection between the war and the aggressive policy of Germany’s rulers before it as well as between the war and the pre-war peaceful intentions of the Soviet government.11

According to the Communist interpretation of war, as developed by Lenin and Stalin, just wars are considered to be beneficent agents of world history. Wars that have just aims, that is to say, wars of liberation, defense of one’s own country, and wars directed against imperialism and capitalism, play the progressive role in the development of human society. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with war; it only depends what kind of war is being fought at the moment. If the war “... is being conducted in the interests of the proletariat, the working masses, and in the interests of the nations, which are fighting for their national independence against the foreign usurpers,” then such a war “... is regarded by Marxism-Leninism as progressive, just, and, therefore, lawful ...”12 Also just are the wars “... that the Soviet Union is forced to wage against the imperialistic aggressors, defending its freedom and independence.”13

But the unjust wars, e.g., the wars of conquest waged by the imperialists against foreign countries, represent the reactionary aspect in the evolution of mankind. They are to be condemned and resisted. They must be opposed by the just progressive wars. Special attention must be paid to the reactionary wars directed against “the forces of socialism and democracy.” These latter wars constitute a backward movement in human history. But why? The answer is easy. Consider, for
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instance, the war between Nazi Germany and the USSR. According to Samedov, Stalin showed that
the unjust, doubly reactionary war on the part of Hitler’s Germany was determined by the fact that it was a war against
the socialist state, that is, the state with the higher social order embodying the future progressive development of the
whole mankind.\textsuperscript{14}

Both Lenin and Stalin maintain that war has its own dialectic. In the course of war its character may be profoundly and essentially altered. This may be due to the changes that had taken place on the domestic or international scene of politics. Thus a war which originally was unquestionably just may become in the course of time an unjust war. The wars which the revolutionary government of France waged at the end of the eighteenth century demonstrate the point in question. At the start these wars were just, since they were fought in the name of the more progressive order; later, however, when Napoleon became the ruler of France, they quickly degenerated into wars of conquest thus assuming a distinctly unjust character. This is not to say, of course, that all just wars necessarily deteriorate into unjust ones.\textsuperscript{15}

2. STALIN’S VIEW COMPARED WITH THE CATHOLIC VIEW

The Church of Rome, like the Bolshevik Party, has never regarded war as intrinsically wrong, and therefore unjust. The eminent Catholic philosophers and theologians did not absolutely condemn war. St. Augustine maintains that it is not true to say that one who takes part in war cannot satisfy God. St. Bernard is of the opinion that Christian soldiers who destroy their enemies do not commit a sin; they also do not lose their souls while being killed in battle.\textsuperscript{16} The Roman Catholic Church, again like the Bolshevik Party, finds a justification in war which is being waged in the name of a moral and just cause. But here the similarity between the two views ends, and the difference begins.

Stalin asserts that wars are just when they pursue the policy of liberation, that is, liberation of peoples from the “capitalist slavery” and “imperialist yoke.” He also states that wars which defend the countries from foreign invasion are morally good and just. While the Catholic doctrine about war would raise no objection to Stalin’s assertion that wars which defend countries from the foreign attack are just, it would not agree, however, with Stalin’s view that wars directed against the “capitalists” and “imperialists” are just wars. As a matter of fact, the Catholic concept of war is different from the Bolshevik.
True, the Catholic writers also speak of two kinds of war: just and unjust. But the meaning they attach to these terms is significantly unlike that understood by Stalin and the Bolsheviks. According to Stalin, the moral nature of war is determined by who is waging it. If the war is conducted by the proletarian or revolutionary class, that is, by the Communists and their allies, such a war is just. Needless to say, Stalin regards any war against the Communists as unjust. This notion, of course, is highly subjective; it represents the interests of only one segment of human society. It considers all the wars waged by the capitalist states against the Soviet Union as unjust. The Catholic view, on the other hand, constitutes an objective approach. It defines war as a conflict between the armed forces of two or more sovereign states17 having equality of rights. In any war, then, the arguments justifying the outbreak of hostilities of two or more contestants must be taken into consideration. It does not matter to this theory whether the particular war is fought, for example, by the Communists, capitalists or Fascists. Any one of them may be guilty of an unjust war. Also, it is true, anyone of them may wage a just war. Why does this theory assert it? In other words, what are the Catholic criteria of a just war?

The Catholic doctrine teaches that war in order to be just must meet several requirements. First,

...it should be declared and conducted by legitimate sovereign authority. 'Sovereign' in this sense means, as Vittoria, Suarez, and Bellarmine say, that the contestants have no possibility of appeal to a court of arbitration for settlement of their dispute or for the reparation of an injury suffered.38

Secondly, the war to be just must have a just and sufficient cause taking into account the common good of the international community. Thirdly, "the justice of the cause must be certain. The authority that declares war must be certain of its right and of the objective justice of its cause."19 The mere mention of these three requirements—and there are some more—indicates that to determine the moral character of war is not an easy matter. It is clear, I suppose, that according to the Catholic doctrine each state waging war would have a considerable chance of advancing its justification for it. Stalin's notion, on the other hand, simplifies the problem. He maintains that all wars conducted against the "capitalist slavery" are just wars. Simple enough, but is it true? It is said that the truth is often complicated, and those who try to simplify it commit the error of falsification.
3. CRITICISM OF STALIN’S VIEW

Stalin’s contention that wars waged against the “capitalist slavery,” by which is meant the capitalist states, are just wars, is, of course, not true. To begin with, the phrase “capitalist slavery” is a demagogic device created to confuse. Although, one would say, there are some capitalist countries in which life is not altogether pleasant, to identify capitalism with slavery is false. Then again, each capitalist state is a sovereign and independent institution which has a right to defend itself. Not to defend itself would be a self-contradiction for the capitalist state (or for any other state), since one of the reasons why it exists lies in the fact that it has not only the right but also the duty to defend its people from foreign attack. In case of attack, the capitalist state has a duty to protect its own citizens, the political form of whose existence it represents. Its war would be of a purely defensive nature and therefore just. But its opponents’ war, since it would be clearly of an aggressive character, would represent the kind of an unjust war. Consequently, Stalin’s assertion that just wars are those which are directed against the capitalist states for the purpose of liberating their peoples, is not tenable. On the contrary, since these wars undoubtedly violate the rights of sovereign states, they must be regarded as unjust and unlawful.

One can agree, I think, with Stalin’s statement that the moral nature of war should be determined by studying the policy of the regime which is conducting it. Here, however, Stalin’s judgment is always the same and prejudicial; he considers the “capitalist” regimes as the bearers of an unjust war, implying, of course, that only wars waged by the colonial and “socialist” countries have a rightful claim to be called just. To put it more bluntly, Stalin is a relativist, and since he is a Communist, all wars which are being fought by the Communists and their friends he deems to be just; wars directed against them he condemns. This approach is very helpful to the Communists, but, obviously, it does not serve the cause of justice. That the Communists are actually using this approach cannot be doubted; their actions on the arena of international politics indicate that.

Stalin is of the opinion that just wars play a progressive role in the development of humanity. Perhaps they do. One must bear in mind, however, that by just wars which help mankind in its march toward the future, Stalin means wars fought for the furtherance of the Communist cause. The rejection of this view is provided by the Communist
wars themselves; they are too destructive to be of any progressive value to mankind.

On the whole, Stalin's concept of just and unjust war, although helpful to the Communists, cannot be considered as a positive contribution to political ethics and international law. But it is good Communist propaganda.

AFRICAN STUDENTS IN MOSCOW
Open Letter Of The Executive Committee Of The African Student Union In Moscow To All African Governments

Incidents of racial discrimination suffered by Afro-Asian students in the Soviet bloc were widely reported last summer in the world press. As a service to our readers, we print the full text of an open letter of the Executive Committee of the African Students Union in the USSR. These events have received wide publicity in Afro-Asian countries, which are so frantically courted by World Communism today.

In the name of all loyal Africans, the Executive Committee of the African Student Union in Moscow wishes respectfully to call the attention of all African governments to the deceits, the threats, the pressures, the brutality and the discrimination with which the Soviet administrators and strategists have so often handled African and other foreign students in the USSR. We further wish to stress the great danger Communism is to true Africanism. We hate colonialism and racial discrimination in any form, wherever it may appear. New and dangerous forms of colonialism and discrimination are being fostered by the Communist system and by Soviet strategists and are a grave threat to the future of Africa. This new colonialism is being advanced subtly by Communist-caused violence and efforts to cause chaos in Africa. For Soviet leaders to pose before the world as champions of oppressed Africa while they oppress millions in their own country and their satellites is hypocrisy at its worst.

During the past year, there have been a series of conflicts between Soviet authorities and African students following which Soviet propagandists have presented their own perverted story to the world through their tremendous propaganda apparatus. In their effort to obtain credence for their falsehoods and to mislead African leadership they tried to buy the endorsement of African students in the USSR and to exert other pressures on African students to attest to falsehood. The Soviet authorities have unfortunately succeeded in a few cases, but the great majority of African students in the USSR have preserved their integrity and loyalty to their land of birth.

The decision to present the case against Communism to African and world opinion was taken in secret executive session in Moscow by
representatives from Algeria, the Cameroons, the Congo, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, the Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, the UAR, and Uganda — members of the Executive Committee were given the duty of presenting the case when they got out of the Soviet Union.

Our accusations are directed against the Communist rulers, not against a friendly Russian people we met, and some of whom we came to love, not against the mother of four who ran out in the streets to welcome African students on a controlled tour and in parting said “tell your people in Africa that there are more people here to be liberated than in Africa,” and not against the Pasternaks, great and small, of Russia who compassionately seek the brotherhood of man. No, we accuse the disastrous ambitions of Communist dictatorship and its bureaucracy that have brought terror and fear to much of the world. The cases that follow show the true nature of Communist friendship for African peoples.

COMMUNIST TACTICS OF DECEIT AND VILIFICATION

The story of Mr. S. Omor Okullo of Uganda, has been written in some detail by his friends who remained behind in the Soviet Union and who saw the great lengths to which the Soviet administrators would go to vilify anyone who tried to tell the truth about the Soviet Union. In the first place, Mr. Okullo and other African students have made statements to the Western press not because they had joined the imperialist camp as the Soviet propagandists claim, but instead because free opinion is muzzled in the Soviet Union, because the servile Soviet press cannot publish any dissenting point of view, and because the mockery of democracy that operates in this totalitarian dictatorship does not recognize the individual.

When Mr. Okullo was expelled from the Soviet Union, African students who remained demanded an explanation from the Soviet authorities who claimed that Mr. Okullo was expelled for stubbornness, reaction, spying, and for association with Western diplomats. The Soviet authorities could not substantiate these charges — nevertheless, they wanted Mr. Okullo out of their country. Mr. Okullo left the Soviet Union and told the world what he saw there.

The Soviet press then came up with the fantasy that Mr. Okullo was expelled for failing his exams and for immorality. The charge of immorality in whiskey drinking is simply not true. As all of Mr. Okullo’s friends know, he never drinks anything but an occasional glass of beer. Furthermore, Mr. Okullo passed all his exams he took last year, and this year had had no exams before he was expelled. It is true that Mr.
Okuno, along with many other Afro-Asiatic students, appealed to African and Western embassies for help to leave the Soviet Union. This could scarcely be otherwise considering the threats, denial of freedom and insults to which they were subjected. Out of respect for the Soviets, however, no Western representative has granted scholarships directly to Afro-Asiatic students in Moscow — instead they advised them to apply from their own countries. Yet the Soviets have illegally brought many people to the Soviet Union in the name of help to Africa. Many of these people cannot leave now that they want to and Soviet propagandists exploit them against their wishes.

The Soviet propaganda machinery followed up their false charges against Mr. Okullo with several letters to African leaders and organizations in an effort to cover up the truth. Moscow radio officials came to the university offering large sums of money to buy the consciences of African students against Okullo. These officials were angrily rebuffed by students from the Congo, Kenya, the Sudan, Mali, Togo, Uganda, Guinea, the Cameroons, Ghana, the UAR, and Nigeria who knew the truth, and who accused the propagandists of wanting to broadcast more falsehoods to the African peoples to cause still more divisions in their ranks. The propagandists finally found a fellow traveler in Abdel Halim of the Sudan who hardly knew Mr. Okullo, and who was pressured into making false accusations against him. Then the so-called Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, an instrument of Soviet propaganda, came up with a vilifying “press conference” after bribing a few Arab students. In this conference everything Soviet was the best in the world, yet many of those students the Soviet propagandists used to “testify” were even then trying to escape the Soviet Union and get scholarships in the West.

Finally the Soviet propagandists paid two Somali students, Mr. M. A. Dunkaal and Mr. A. M. Omer (who themselves had tried unsuccessfully to get scholarships in Great Britain where they would prefer to be) to go to London and make a false statement to the Daily Worker (27 July 1960) against Mr. Okullo.

There are many cases we could cite of Communist deceitful exploitation of African students without their knowledge or consent. We choose one that occurred recently to Mr. Theophilus Okonkwo who has just gotten out of the Soviet Union and tells this story. In early July he was exercising in the Moscow University gym and a Russian student took a picture of him in a boxing pose. Perfectly innocent so far. But then a few weeks later a friend put the August issue of the New Times in front of him and said, “Look what they’ve done to you.” There in
a full page picture was Mr. Okonkwo in the boxing pose. But now the Soviet propagandists had blatantly dubbed in broken chains on his wrists and a white man with a whip falling back in terror. Without Mr. Okonkwo's knowledge or consent, the Communist had spread this propaganda construction in a number of Communist magazines through the world. Mr. Okonkwo's protests to the Soviet authorities were, of course, of no avail.

COMMUNIST CALLOUSNESS AND BRUTALITY

Mr. Benjamin Omburo from Kenya, who is still in the Soviet Union, has courageously asked us to tell his story to the outside world. He wrote a letter of complaint on 19 August to the Soviet authorities, but they showed callous indifference.

Mr. Omburo was at a bus stop with a Russian girl when, in Mr. Omburo's words written in the above letter, "a policeman approached us and asked the girl to give him her address. Being astonished at this, I demanded that the policeman ask me for the right to speak to the girl. I explained that I am a student at the Moscow University. I gave him my address and telephone to check, but I refused to let him put questions to the girl unnecessarily. After all, the girl had committed no crime. The girl is a student. The police used force to drag us to the telephone room, took the girl's address and called for more police. The police who came were hostile, primitive, and completely inhuman. When I claimed I was concerned in the affair and that I should also go to the police station with the girl, they mauled me, beat me, pushed me, and left me wet and muddy on the road. I feel that the police demanded the girl's address because she was with me, a black man. If not for this reason, why then don't the police stop every girl with a boy and inquire of their address."

Mr. Omburo's is not an isolated case of Soviet brutality. There was, for example, the case of the Somali student who got into an argument with a Communist student at a party. The student mobilized the help of three friends, who made friendly gestures to the Somali student, at the end of the party they invited him to their rooms. Unsuspecting, he followed. They led him downstairs where there was no light, and beat him unconscious.

COMMUNIST DISCRIMINATION

On arrival, many of us were lavishly welcomed and feted, as a result of which some of us were impressed and made statements and broadcasts favorable to the Soviet Union that we came to rue. Initially a
number of us, embittered by the ignoble aspects of colonial rule, had looked upon Communism, before we knew it face to face, as a panacea for all of our ills. Under such conditions, the so-called Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee extorted promises from African students and took many of the photographs which were sent to African peoples to sway their sympathies. But the scales gradually fell from our eyes. We saw how the attitudes of the Soviet administration changed toward us if we said “No” to anything, or suggested that everything in the land of Marxist Leninism was not perfect.

More important to Africa, we saw many and deep forms of discrimination under the Soviet system. Foreign students, especially Afro-Asiatics, have encountered shocking humiliations. Hundreds of fine Soviet students have been punished for their association with foreigners. At Moscow University, a chemistry faculty member, Irina Alexandrovna, told Soviet students they should be ashamed of themselves for intimacy with African people who are “low down in the West” and who had been brought to the Soviet Union to be impressed with the Soviet way of life. It was unthinkable that the Soviet students should allow themselves to be influenced by such people. At the First Medical Institute, Dekan Kuzin and the head of the Russian Language department told foreign students that they could not study in the Soviet Union as in capitalist countries where students study at their own expense and therefore do things on their own initiative. The Soviet Union finances its students to do what they are told to do. The Soviet Union finances the African students so they, too, should do what they are told. They pointed out that foreign students were taking the places of many Soviet students, but despite this and their colonial oppression, the foreign students still held to their “capitalist” ideas. This, of course, meant freedom to disagree. Soviet wives of nearly all Asiatic students, and even those of some students from Czechoslovakia and Poland, were refused certificates on graduation and were not given employment. Those who applied to leave the Soviet Union were subjected to so many pressures, including penalties on relatives.

There is hardly any foreign student who has not come to grips with the intransigence of the Soviet administration, especially in his relation toward Soviet citizens. Soviet women married to foreigners are often not allowed to return to their country again. Afro-Asiatics married to Soviets remain in the Soviet Union. An African student and a Soviet girl in love applied for a marriage license—the Ministry of Higher Education ordered him to leave the Soviet Union within three days and the girl disappeared.
Students from Ghana and the Cameroons received threatening and insulting letters from Russian students. When consulted, the University authorities did nothing about it. Another Ghana student was so ridiculed and disgraced by student hooligans belonging to the Communist Youth Organization, Komsomol, that he lodged an official complaint with the Ghana Embassy in Moscow.

We have also observed that the Soviets have not accepted the Chinese, and vice versa, except as “political brothers.” The many thousands of Chinese here seldom go in the company of the Soviets—they hardly fraternize except in anti-Western gatherings. We fail to see any deeply-rooted feelings in their relations, and what is more, the Chinese know it.

Soviet writers en Africa paint false pictures of the African situation to the Soviet people in an attempt to strengthen their system. Professor Potechin, the so-called Soviet Africanist, in his book on Ghana, written after a fortnight’s visit, painted such a false picture of Ghana and displayed such ignorance of the African situation that West African students came to Moscow from Britain to correct him. Neither the Soviet press nor Mr. Potechin himself took any notice of their comments. The same Soviet correspondent freely toured in Senegal, and Mr. Volovich, in Vechernaya Moskva of 10 August, compared Senegalese Africans to chimpanzees he had seen at the zoo in Dakar and described the masses as poor and diseased. Yet the Soviet authorities do not allow visitors into the stinking slums in their country where poverty, disease, and ignorance are rampant. They prepare showcases for visitors, who go home without seeing the Soviet Union as it really is. The Soviets export propaganda sheets to every country in the world but refuse free import of foreign literature. . . ! “coexistence” indeed.

The height of discrimination was reached when the Soviet authorities announced their “Friendship University” plans. To build a separate university for Africans, Asiatics and Latin Americans is an insult to these people — it violates the traditional concept of a university as an open institution for learning, irrespective of race, religion or origin. We not only see this as an attempt to segregate these students and offer them lower standards of education, but we also see in this a further attempt to insulate Soviet people from contact with foreigners. We see in this proposal a propaganda stunt which has ignored the opinion of African leaders. Africans want universities in their own lands — universities with African traditions and African outlook. We cannot continue indefinitely to travel to cold countries and stay for long years away from home. If African Governments must send their students to the Soviet Union, they should stipulate the conditions under which these stu-
...ents study and ensure that their people are not subject to undue or humiliating pressure from Soviet authorities.

THE COMMUNIST DANGER TO AFRICA

Look around the world today — wherever Communist guns have thundered, they have stayed and exploited. Communism has never been voted freely into office in a single country. The new Communist brand of “colonialism” is well-marked in its European satellites. East German and Hungarian courage against Soviet tanks is well-remembered. The Communist hand in the Congo chaos, and exploitation of it, has been clear.

We consider it our duty to warn African leadership against Communism and its dangers. Communism is subtly trying to penetrate Africa — the infiltration is going on vigorously, and it must be countered now. It must be admitted that for long Africa had few encounters with the Communists — it is only natural, therefore, that before we deal with them we must study their history, know their methods, read their language, and be prepared to match them. We have had glaring examples of what dangers there could be in dealing with the Communists on the basis of their propaganda rather than on the basis of what they really are and what motives they are up to.

African students who have studied Soviet strategy have seen how it looks only to its own profit and power interests, and that their “Friendship for Africa” slogans are pure propaganda lacking sincerity and genuineness. To substantiate this, we refer to what happened between President Nasser of the UAR and Premier Khrushchev when the former refused to toe the Communist line. We refer to the Communist reaction against African students when they refused to sign Moscow’s Afro-Asian “solidarity” protest condemning President Nasser. We refer to the refusal of the Soviet authorities to allow African students to demonstrate against the French atom bomb tests in the Sahara. The Communists refused to allow us to demonstrate because at the time Khrushchev was preparing to visit France to try to split the Western line and extort economic and political concessions from France. In all of our home countries and many other countries of the world there were protest demonstrations—we could make none in the land of Marxist-Leninist justice — “The Land of Africa’s Greatest Friends.”

There is little doubt that the Communists cherish the disastrous ambition of world conquest. The questions then arise — shall we allow another partition and domination of Africa by foreign ideologies and interests? For the confidence we need to rebuild Africa, must we be led by philosophies inspired from outside Africa?
One thing is clear — we do not want Communism in Africa — we cannot be loyal to any organization that would pervert Africanism. We require the support of peoples of good will everywhere, in our struggle for freedom, for respect, and for happiness. We want support for the justice of our cause, however, and not in exchange for subservience. Free African states can pull their resources together to help other African countries in bonds to win their freedom. We do not want Korea, Vietnam, Indo-China, and other division lines in Africa. We want to constitute a zone of our own influence and culture. We cannot compromise with colonialism or imperialism in any way or form and we cannot accept force, deceit, subversion, and terrorism as means of spreading ideologies. We do not want cultural exchanges which permit Communists to make propaganda and cause confusion in other countries while insulating their people from contact and free information. We strongly oppose staffing African embassies in the Soviet Union with Soviet agents, whereas Soviet embassies do not employ foreigners. Soviets must not be allowed to handle our secret transactions. This calls for immediate coordination and collaboration among African peoples in matters of diplomacy and foreign relations. Training of linguists and diplomats must be accelerated and must proceed forthwith on a large scale. An African school of law and diplomacy is a sine qua non.

We are committed to the fight against imperialism and colonialism but are we going to do it by allowing the Communists to confuse the issue, create more trouble, and cause us more bloodshed? Are we winning our freedom to sell it to the strategists in the Kremlin? God forbid.

African leaders will judge for themselves the acceptability of regimes which were born by force and bloodshed and which use force and bloodshed to continue in power — they will weigh the profitability of a system that disrespects African philosophy and leadership and that seeks to submerge forever the remains of the sacred heritage of African culture. We reaffirm our faith in African leadership and in the African way of life.

For the Executive Committee of the African Students Union in the USSR

(signed) U. C. Okonokwo
Secretary

*Official Soviet Government weekly devoted to International Affairs published in Russian, English, French, German, Spanish, Polish, Czech and Rumanian.
FREDERIC CHOPIN

by ALBERT KIPA

The year, 1820; the place, Warsaw. Mme Catalani, a renowned singer of the time, sojourning in the aforementioned city, listened attentively to a young pianist. Overwhelmed by his performance, she presented the young musician with a watch as a token of her appreciation and gratitude. The back cover of the chronometer bore the inscription: "Present from Mme Catalani to Frederic Chopin, age 10." This seemingly unimportant event proved to be significant after the death of the pianist-composer: the engraving once and for all resolved his contentious year of birth. Thus last year, 1960, the world celebrated the sesquicentennial anniversary of the great musician.

Chopin was born in Zelazowa-Wola, Poland, on February 22, 1810. His father, a Frenchman living in Poland since the age of 10, was a teacher of French and German who wrote poetry and played the flute and violin. His Polish mother had received a musical education: she was an accomplished singer and pianist. Such musically inclined parents young Chopin had no difficulty convincing (as had for example, Schumann) to permit him to pursue his artistic ambitions.

At the age of five the precocious Chopin at learned all that his sister, three years his senior, could teach him. Eleven years later he was THE prodigy at the Warsaw Conservatory. Eighteen-year-old Chopin visited and conquered Vienna with his playing. Finally in 1820 he arrived in Paris, the intellectual capital in those years, which had always been his desired destination. Here he resided, except for brief absences, until his death in 1849. From here his fame as a pianist, composer and teacher spread throughout the civilized world.

Aside from Liszt, Chopin was the greatest pianist in Europe. Yet he gave relatively few public concerts. (Chopin himself considered Liszt
the prototype of the virtuoso — aiming at effect and posing as the Paganini of the keyboard.) He was far too sensitive for the concert stage: opposition, coldness and indifference affected him "as touch does the sensitive plant." Instead he preferred the salon type of recital. A reason for this might have been his physical frailty which was constantly undermined by tuberculosis. Consequently he could not always play a fortissimo and had to counterbalance by using a piano with an unlimited range of shading which, of course, required phenomenal and rare control over touch whereby he could conjure a normal forte to sound thunderous. (Chopin liked to joke about this and sometimes used it to his advantage. At a banquet, when asked to perform, he declined jokingly by maintaining that he had not yet sufficiently nourished his body in order to feel strong enough to play.)

Just as Chopin's place as a virtuoso was unique and exceptional (his colleagues admitted that as the interpreter of his music he was unrivalled), so his power as a composer was and remains alone and distinct. His music, composed for piano and romantic in nature, is characterized by exquisite melody of great originality, refined harmony, subtle rhythm and poetic beauty. His contemporaries recognized and admired in Chopin the very qualities which have made him immortal. Wrote Heinrich Heine: "He is a poet in sound . . . at the keyboard . . . he is neither Pole, Frenchman, nor German; he betrays a far higher origin, and seems to come from the land of Mozart, Raphael and Goethe; his true native shores seem to be the dreamland of poetry . . . He occupies the first rank among the elite who seek in music the highest spiritual pleasure. Chopin's fame is aristocratic; . . . it is as distinguished as his person." Franz Liszt commented on his style: "In his works we meet with beauties of a high order, new kinds of expressions and a harmonic fabric which is as original as it is skilled. In his compositions boldness is always justified; his richness, even exuberance, is never allowed to interfere with clarity; originality is never permitted to degenerate into uncouth exaggeration; his sculpturing never wants order; the luxury of his ornaments is never permitted to overburden the chaste eloquence of his melodic outlines." Yes, in about fifteen years of creativity Chopin not only opened the resources of the modern piano but also augmented the harmonic parlance of music and initiated elaborate decorations without debilitating the quality of the product through lack of expressive meaning: no matter how scintillating a passage he wrote, it was never empty.

Chopin was never much of a ladies' man. Yet women do play a conspicuous role in the composer's life and work. Constantia Glodkow-
ska, talented voice student at the Warsaw Conservatory, was Chopin’s first love. She became his ideal and inspiration; the young composer labored intensely and produced his first mature works: concerti, mazurkas, nocturnes. Writing to a friend Chopin commented on his *Piano Concerto No. 1 in E minor* (actually this concerto was composed second but published before the first): “This concerto I composed in my happy days.” The main theme alone buttresses his stand and the compositions of the “Warsaw period” confirm this statement by a lack of tragic elements which are evident in many works of later years.

In Paris, his first passion was Delphine Potocka and then George Sand nurtured the flame. The eight-year relationship with the latter proved to be the most productive period for Chopin. Once they separated, Chopin composed little of importance.

Chopin was educated and fascinated by Polish national literature, folk music and song and consequently drew from them material for his compositions. Many of his works are saturated with Polish music and depict rustic scenes from his native land. Wrote a Polish journalist: “Fate rewarded Poland with Chopin as it had rewarded the Germans with Mozart.” But, Chopin was more than just a gift to Poland; he was a gift to the world: time has proven him to be a cosmopolitan.
The seven authors whose poems appear on the following pages in English translation comprise the youngest school in contemporary Ukrainian literature, known as "The New York Group." The activities of this group center around a journal, New Poetry, which has been coming out since 1939.

The poetry of "The New York Group" has its roots primarily in modern Spanish and French poetry, and to a lesser degree in the modern Ukrainian poetry of the 1920's. It is generally surrealistic in nature, relying heavily on metaphors rather than on regular rhyme and meter.

Bohdan Boychuk

THE BLOOD OF WOODS

There once the wind steeped the oak bark
and lashed it with the hair of bronze women
who warmed the songs in their throats around the bonfires at midnight,
and trampled a dance in a circle on the ground —

_and the bronze grew softer
    the girls weaved fortune into the wreaths
it melted from passion under the young bushes
    the shirts smarted from the ripe spring
_and the bronze grew softer under the gaze of men
    the fruits were forming under the warm braids

then the women
gathered the shadows into bundles,
    and, leaving behind lumps of footprints,
grew on a long journey
with the hearts of grass, of violets, of cherries, and of oaks.
EVENING

The fabric of silence
above the reeds
soothes the stern
face of the evening.

Silent beasts
walk on the shore,
sowing in the water
the powder of light.

And the wily stream,
like a sparkling fish,
vanquished the night
with its silvery scales,

and shines for the willows
that will weave with their leaves
out of the silver splashing
the fabric of silence.

Bohdan Tymish Rubchak

TO HAMLET

Not the first book, and not the last,
And not the wiseness of an arid historian—
The answer to all these questions
Is the skull of old Yorick.

All will be very simple:
Still tired, in your sleep
You will find the long-known
Treasure of yellow bone.

You will rise suddenly from the bed,
Forgetting forever the losses:
Because its terrible smile
Will teach you to live and to die.
AUTUMN

(From “Three Seasons and Anti-season”)

Go for a walk some afternoon,
stroll beside that stream.
The stream withers like a stem,
it scatters its seed like a pod.
Cross the stream, go toward that house:
the shadow of the house rots like ripe, ungathered berries
that fell into the grass from the bush.
Look through the window into the bedroom:
there a young mother finds her infant
dead in the cradle.
So silent is the bursting of a dark puffball.

Vira Vowk

THE RAIN

The tree trunks are sticky with sunlight,
The limp air smells strongly of tea,
The sea is fetid with fish scales.

Sometimes the rain falling from the sky
Beats the rhythm of Negro drums,
Seeping through the mud huts,
And the path bleeds like a vein.

The children with skinny faces
Wait patiently for the pitiless sun
That devours their papayas and bananas.

After the rain the foliage is green like a parrot,
And the rainbow like a ring around the sun.
A tree rains red and black beans
That the children string into long necklaces.

Translated by G. T.
Emma Andiyewska

AN UNLAWFUL MEETING WITH PROPHETS
The beards of prophets are like sheat-fish.
On their heads they wear haloes of watermelons.
When autumn comes they take half the sky
In paternosters in the saddle-bags for the nymphs,
Who put the sky on their backs,
And take the paternosters in their hands, and
Feed the ducks with them, and then the orchard
Thunders with their black and plum-like laughter.

George Tarnawsky

A LOVE POEM
There are no words for it.
Maybe it’s true that we have finished
the difficult school of love:
you remember the square
Sundays, under the heavy cubes of the city.

Do you remember how the rain
coated the roads with phosphorus,
and how the black silt of the day
settled in the tall bottles of streets

All is gone.
Tell me, what happened to the moaning
in the hot lungs of the hotel?
Now whores are being crucified there
on the white Golgothas of beds.

Translated by P. K.
THE NEWS
by VASYL STEFANYK

Vasy! Stefanyk (1871-1936) was born in Western Ukraine. His total literary output consists of 72 short stories that fill a book of some 300 pages. Most of the stories are only a few pages long, but all of them are pregnant with a force and truth such as few writers have ever achieved. Stefanyk wrote in a dialect which differs considerably from the standard literary Ukrainian, often relying heavily on dialogues and monologues, and only occasionally inserting here and there a sentence of his own. Almost all of his stories have as their subject matter the life of peasants of his native Pokuttia, which is a poor and mountainous region in Western Ukraine.

There was news in the village that Hrytz Letiuchi had drowned his little girl in the river. He wanted to drown the elder too, but she talked him out of it. Ever since Hrytz’s wife had died, he lived in misery. He just couldn’t take care of his children without a wife. No one would marry him, for not only were there children, but also there was nothing to eat. For two years he suffered like that with his little girls. No one knew how he lived and what he did, except maybe his nearest neighbors. They said that Hrytz didn’t make a fire almost all winter, and that he spent most of the time on the oven together with his little girls.

And now the whole village was talking about him. When he had come home one evening, the girls were on top of the oven.

“Daddy, we want to eat,” said Handzunya, the elder one.

“Then eat me! What am I going to give you to eat? Here, take some bread and stuff yourselves!”

And he gave them a piece of bread, and they fell upon it like puppies upon a bare bone.
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“She made you and left you on my neck, may the earth spit her out! And the plague is going around somewhere, but it wouldn’t come here! Even the plague would be afraid to come to this house!”

The girls didn’t listen to their father’s words, for this is how it was every hour of every day, and they were used to it. They ate the bread sitting on the oven, and the sight of them evoked terror and pity. God knows how those little bones managed to stay together. Only the four black eyes were alive and had some weight to them. It seemed that those eyes were heavy like lead, and that the rest of their flesh would fly away with the wind, like feathers, if it weren’t for those eyes. And, even now, as they ate the stale bread, it seemed that the bones in their faces were about to crack.

Hrytz looked at them from the bench on which he was sitting, and he thought: “corpses,” and then such terror came over him that he became covered with sweat. Somehow he felt as if a heavy stone had been put on his chest. The girls were chewing the bread, and he fell on the floor and prayed, but all the time he wanted to look at them and to think that they were corpses.

So, for a few days, Hrytz was afraid to stay in the house, and would visit his neighbors, and they said that he was worrying all the time. He grew black, his eyes sank into his head, so that he almost didn’t look at the outside world, but at the stone that weighed on his chest.

One evening Hrytz came home, cooked his children some potatoes, put salt on them, and threw them on top of the oven, so that they would eat them. When they finished, he said:

“Come down, we will go and visit somebody!”

The girls got off the oven. Hrytz dressed them in their rags, took the younger one, Dotzka, on his arm, and the elder one, Handzunya, by her hand, and went outside. He walked a long way through the fields and finally stopped on top of a hill. In the valley below, the river, illuminated by the moon, curved like a thick current of mercury. Hrytz shuddered, for the gleaming river made him feel cold, and the stone on his chest became even heavier. He was panting, and could hardly carry the little Dotzka.

They were going down to the river. Hrytz was grinding his teeth so loudly that the echo of it vibrated in the valley, and he felt how a long, fiery tongue burned his heart and his head. When he came close to the river, he couldn’t keep himself from running, and he left Handzunya behind. She ran after him. Hrytz quickly threw Dotzka into the water as far as he could.

He felt better, and he began to speak rapidly:
“I’ll tell the police that there was no other way—nothing to eat, nothing to heat the house with, or to heat some water for washing the clothes or one’s head, nothing at all. I want to be punished, for I’m a criminal, and I should be hanged!”

Handzunya stood near him and spoke just as fast as he:

“Daddy, please don’t drown me, don’t drown me, don’t drown me!”

“Well, since you ask me, I won’t drown you, but you would be better off dead, and I’ll hang for one like for two. You’ll starve while you’re little, and then you’ll go as a wet-nurse to the Jews, and you’ll starve again. Well, it’s up to you.”

“Don’t drown me, don’t drown me, please!”

“No, no, I won’t, but Dotzka will be better off than you. So go back to the village, and I’ll go and report myself. See, take this path, and go way, way up the hill, and then you’ll come to the first house, and go in and say what happened, and that father wanted to drown you, but that you asked him not to, and he let you go, and that you would like to spend the night there. And then tomorrow ask them if you could serve there, taking care of little children. So go now, for it’s late.”

And Handzunya went.

“Handzunya, Handzunya, here’s a stick for you. If a dog jumps you, he’ll bite you, and you can defend yourself with the stick.”

Handzunya took the stick and went through the fields.

Hrytz rolled up his trousers in order to cross the river, for the city was in that direction. The water had already reached his ankles, when he suddenly stopped.

“In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, amen. Our Father, who art in heaven . . .”

He turned around and went toward the bridge.

—translated by George Tarnawsky
“Vasylko, take Nastia and go to uncle’s, there by the path through the forest, you know. But hold her by the hand gently, don’t jerk, she’s little. But don’t carry her, because you’re still too small.”

She sat down, it hurt very much, and she lay down.

“As if I knew where to take her at night! You die and we’ll stay by you, and in the morning we’ll go.

“You see, Nastia, a bullet came humming and killed mama, and it’s all your fault. Why did you howl when that soldier wanted to hug mama? What was it to you? We were running away, and a bullet came whistling . . . And now you won’t have a mama any more, you’ll have to be a servant . . .

“She doesn’t say anything any more. She’s already dead. I could really give it to you, but you’re an orphan now. What are you good for anyway? When Eavan’s wife died near us, her girls were all crying: mummy, mummy, where should we look for you, from where should we expect you? You don’t know how to cry like that, but I’m a boy, and I’m not going to cry . . .

“See how the army is turning on a light from that side over there, like water from a sieve, and wherever it shines, they can see where a soldier is, and then they go pow! into him with a bullet, and soon he lies down, like mama. Lie quick beside mama, ’cause soon the bullets will start flying. Can you hear them humming?

“And look over across the Nister — the soldiers are throwing up such fiery bullets, they’re hurling them high-high up. The bullet burns-burns and then goes out. They’re playing with them—oh, so many! . . .
“And now, a cannon — *hu, hu, hu*. But it isn’t shooting into people, just into churches, or into houses, or into a school.

“Never be scared of a cannon. Its bullets are as big as me, and its wheels are like mill-wheels. But you don’t know anything, you still just barely know how to walk, but I know how to buck like a horse . . .

“Hide behind mama, oh, the light is going on again, it’s white-white, like a cloth, it’ll move onto us in a minute, look how white we are, and the bullets are whistling again. Oh well, when a bullet hits me, I’ll lie beside mama and die, but you’d never get to uncle’s by yourself. It’s better if a bullet hits you, ’cause I’d get there alone and tell uncle, and he’d bury you both.

“You’re crying now, as if it hurt when a bullet hits. It’ll go *zing!* and make a hole in your chest, and the soul will fly out through the hole, and that’s the end of you. It’s not like at home, when you’re sick and they rub you with likker . . .

“I want to eat . . . well, finally! What’ll I give you to eat, since mama’s dead? Go and ask her. Go on, ask her . . . go on, I tell you. Well, what does she say? Go on, take her hand and it’ll fall. What’d I tell you? Boy, how stupid you are. The soul has gone away, and it’s the soul that talks and gives bread and beats . . .

“Nastia, I swear I’ll beat you, what’ll I give you to eat? You look at the war and see how nice it is, and in the morning we’ll go to uncle’s and have some soup. But wait, I think mama has bread under her blouse. Shh! There is bread there, here, go ahead, eat it, you always want to eat . . .

“They’re moving the cloth again, it’s white as snow. It’s coming onto us, oh Nastia, what happened to you? God, is your mouth all bloody, and your hands? Did a bullet go through you? Oh, poor Nastia, lie down by mama — what else can you do?

“Aww, that wasn’t a bullet killed you, that bread got soaked in blood inside mama’s blouse. But what an awful girl, she eats everything like a pig, oh, she’s smeared her face and hands with blood. How’ll I take you into the village in the morning, such a bloody thing? But wait, I’ll go to the creek with you and wash you in such icy water that you’ll roar, and then I’ll really beat you.

“So you’ve had enough, now lie by mama, and I by you, you in the middle, the wolf won’t eat you, go to sleep, and I’ll look at the war, keep warm beside me.

“But maybe a bullet already killed daddy in the war, and maybe
in the morning one'll kill me, and Nastia, and then there'll be nobody...”

He fell asleep. Until the pale day came, the white luminous shroud trembled over them and fled away again and again across the Dniester River.

—translated by Patricia Kilina

1 traditional words for mourning in Ukraine.
2 the Dniester River
LET'S TALK ABOUT IT
An Open Letter To Ukrainian Students In The United States

This message was delivered by Ivan Posypaio, a former Ukrainian college professor, on the occasion of the fifth anniversary night celebrated recently by the Syracuse University Ukrainian Club. Mr. Posypaio had fled from Ukraine during the chaos of the World War II years.

We—Ukrainians of the United States—are a very important part of the American people, who consist of so many different nationalities but we, as well as you—American students of Ukrainian heritage—are also a very significant segment of the nation from which derive our parents, grandparents and forefathers, that is—from the Ukrainian people.

It is evident that in such a country as the United States, diverse nationalities create a certain kind of universality. The aim of life here regardless of the particular desire of a certain nationality is to strive toward that universality, to a sort of universal culture, to its perfection, and to a cosmopolitanism or "one-world."

No nationality group which is part of the American people ought in this country to isolate itself within its own national background. Otherwise, the dire consequences of such isolation for this nationality would be exclusiveness, self-limitation and a one-sided development. It also would harm a harmonious development of the American people in general.

This phenomenon is applicable not only to individual nationality groups within the American nation but even more significantly to the different countries which make up the people of our world.

World history demonstrates the example of ancient China and the
Great China Wall; and what good was all this? Another example is
the great and powerful Persian Empire and a more recent example is
Germany. What happened when the Germans isolated themselves into
the exclusiveness of the “super race”?

The creative genius of each national culture is the harmonious
developer of universal culture. The opposite is true too, that is that
world culture proportionately influences and helps develop all of the
different national groups which are an integral part of the people of a
given country as well as the different countries of our world.

This applies especially to you, university and college students, be-
cause you associate with young people from many foreign lands and
these people are representatives of their countries and their people. Uni-
versality unavoidably meets your eye.

Under your present day-to-day circumstances, you as well as others
take the road which leads toward the development of world culture
and cosmopolitanism.

This is particularly true for you as students of Ukrainian heritage,
because a very great and very responsible task is yours, namely to search
out the right interrelationship of our Ukrainian individuality within
the universal culture, that is to discover ourselves in this one world.

But every cultured nation has its own famous people and recog-
nized authorities whose memory over the centuries is treasured and is
honored. Our Ukrainian people also have produced their great men.
Every student of Ukrainian heritage, wherever he or she may be, must
know these great people who struggled for liberty and abundance and
justice for their people, for whom they sacrificed their lives. It is very
meaningful for each nation to have a cult of these great people and to
highly cherish such great men among that nation wherever that people
may reside.

Therefore, along with Washington, Lincoln and other great men.
Americans cherish also great Ukrainians such as Queen Olha, Vol-
dymyr the Great, Hetman Bohdan Chmelnytsky, Hetman Ivan Mazepa,
Hetman Ivan Vylovsky and our first president, the historian Michael
Hrushevsky as well as Simon Petlura and all other great Ukrainians.

Share your heritage with your fellow students of other national
backgrounds, particularly with students who are at your campus and
international students who will return with such knowledge to their
own countries and to other parts of the world. Remember to tell them
about our classical literature with such writers as Kotlyarevsky, Shev-
chenko, Franko, Kotsiubynsky, Hrabovsky and many others. Do not
forget to tell them about our outstanding composers such as Lysenko, Penutsky, Leontovich and all the others. Let your fellow students of other national backgrounds learn from you that the great Tchaikovsky and the great Hohol were Ukrainians and not Russians and that the world-famous Repin was a Ukrainian and that his real name was Ripal.

Remember to tell your fellow students that Ukrainians long ago had institutions of higher learning such as the Kiev Academy which was the zenith in learning and education for all of Eastern Europe. It was here that were trained Hryhoriy Skovoroda who was later our leading Ukrainian philosopher and Ivan Vyhovsky who became a Hetman of Ukraine and many others whom Moscow in various and devious ways seduced and assimilated such as Teofan Prokopovych who was the Metropolitan of Ukrainians and of Moscow. And also many others in more recent times.

Let your fellow students learn from you about our great pedagogue Ushynsky, about our theatrical playwriters, like Kropianytsky, Sadovsky, Zankovecka and others. Tell them also about our famous opera singers, Patorzynsky, Kozlovsky, and others. But before you can tell them all that—you, yourself, must know about your Ukrainian heritage thoroughly.

Life in these times, dear students, is so uncertain and transient that no one today knows where we may be tomorrow. None of us foresaw that we would be in America and that we would have the opportunity to tell the outside world about the past history of our Ukraine, occupied now by Moscow. We didn’t foresee this and therefore we have a great shortcoming because we are not proficient enough in English, the language of communication in this country.

Who knows but that in a very short time, you yourselves might become those who will educate others about the soul and heritage of the Ukrainian people.

The English language is a bridge for mutual understanding. And for this scholarly and very probable future, you must learn thoroughly the language of your ancestors.

History may repeat itself as in the case of European refugees who returned to Israel where the official language was Hebrew which these refugees didn’t know and had to learn after they arrived in the homeland.

It is for you to take our place before other national groups. Tell them about the Ukrainian people, about their culture, because you know the English language better and do not be embarrassed about
the Ukrainian language of your ancestors. You should read the original works of our great authors and translate such into other world languages and especially into the English which you learned here, a language common to all nationalities in this country. In this way, you are able to bring a part of your Ukrainian national culture into the world culture. This enriches the American culture in which you live and through which you shall have given the Ukrainian culture into the world classics.

Learn and cultivate Ukrainian songs, music, dances. Spread the truth about Ukraine among your fellow students and among your fellow professionals after you have graduated from college and begin your career.

Be active in behalf of the Ukrainian people from whom you are derived and whence you will lead us into the world culture.

Let other nationalities see that you are the sons and daughters of a cultured nation, upon which looks and will look the whole world which will sympathize with our people in their struggle for freedom—for a life freely selected by that people, a life not forced upon the Ukrainians by their bad neighbors of Moscow-Russia.
REMEMBER THE 29TH!

by WALTER D. PRYBYLA

January 29th of this year marked the 43rd anniversary of a memorable event — the day on which a battalion of the Ukrainian army composed of Kiev University students and of Kiev high school upper-class students inscribed a heroic chapter in the history of the Ukrainian fight for independence — known as the Battle of Kruty. It was a day of tragedy and momentous sacrifice in which about 300 students, who loved their country died for its safety and freedom in a battle against an enemy superior in strength, training, and arms — in an attempt to halt the advance of the Bolsheviks invading Kiev, capital of Ukraine. This Student Battalion fought heroically until it was completely wiped out. The majority of the students died in the battle, and those taken prisoners were inhumanly tortured and shot the following day. The Student Battalion did its duty honorably. It delayed the enemy for several days and thus enabled the freely elected Ukrainian government to carry out an organized withdrawal from Kiev.

STUDENT MARTYRS FOR FREEDOM

In March 1918, when the Ukrainian armies liberated Kiev and the bodies of the student heroes of Kruty were transferred to Kiev for burial, the state funeral which was attended by more than 20,000 people turned into a national manifestation. Students from all schools of the Kiev area took part in the funeral procession and wreath-bearing requiem. In her description of the funeral, L. Starytska Cherniachivska, a noted Ukrainian author, predicted that this "holy tomb" would have great significance to future generations and that in the years to come, the old and the young would be coming to this tomb to draw inspiration and strength in the struggle for human rights.

The second Ukrainian Student Conference held in Lviv on March
21, 1931, proclaimed the anniversary of Kruty an all-students commemoration day. Since then, Kruty and the Student Battalion of 1918 has become a tradition for Ukrainian students throughout the world and the occasion to pay homage and tribute to their forebears as a constant reminder to themselves and to their fellow students to hope and to pray that the Kruty student heroes may not have died in vain, but that their indomitable spirit and readiness to defend freedom may inspire a universal desire to bring God and freedom and fellowship to Ukraine.

The Executive Board of the Federation of Ukrainian Student Organizations of America, proclaimed the day of Kruty — January 29 as Ukrainian Student Day in the United States and called upon its member Ukrainian Student organizations and campus clubs to observe the traditions of Kruty and to reassert their belief in the inalienable right of all liberty-loving peoples to live in peace and national independence.

Honorable J. Harold Grady, Mayor of Baltimore, Maryland signed a proclamation designating the 29th of January 1960 as Ukrainian Student Day in commemoration of the heroic free world’s first resistance to Communism at the battle of Kruty in 1918. Mayor Grady welcomed and talked with the representatives of the Ukrainian Student Association of Baltimore. From left to right they are: Orest J. Hanas, president, Irene Traska, Nadia Bendiuk, Lydia Czumak, Oksana Pisetska, Luba Kupchyk, Slava Kupchyk, George Kotyk and Christine Sowhan.
SUSTA CONFERENCE AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

On February 6-7, 1960, the Cultural Affairs Commission of the Federation of Ukrainian Student Organizations of America convoked a Great Lakes area conference to examine "The International Activity of Ukrainian Students and the International Student Movement." Registration and conference sessions were held in the Mart Room of Wayne University Student Center. Ukrainian students in the Detroit area played host to the conference. Volodymyr Popel Belyaew, president of Wayne University Ukrainian Students’ Club, was conference coordinator assisted by committee chairmen: Bohdan Fedorak (program), Marusia C. Pidhurska (information), Roman Lomay (dance), and Irenus Prokopovych (ads).

SUSTA Cultural Affairs Commissioner, Bohdan Fedorak invoked the opening prayer and then introduced SUSTA president Konstantyn Sawczuk of Columbia University who welcomed over 80 delegates representing student organizations from Chicago, Cleveland, Ann Arbor, Detroit, Youngstown, New York City, Newark, and Syracuse.

Looking forward to the World Ukrainian Student Congress, President Sawczuk called upon all students “to participate in the greatest endeavor challenging us: the future of the Ukrainian student movement and its international representation in the free world’s student environment.” Other keynote speakers discussed specific periods of the international activity of Ukrainian students and the international student movement. Bohdan Fedorak read a paper on the beginnings and pre-World War II period, a delivery prepared by Zenon A. Kravetz of the Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute and former SUSTA president. Michael Pochtar of the Newark School of Engineering presented details on the post-World War II period of Ukrainian student activity. SUSTA international affairs vice-president, Walter D. Prybyla, Jr. of Syracuse Uni-
At the Hall of Nations Lounge in the International Institute in Detroit, there is time-out during the Student Ball for taking a picture of all the participants attending Wayne University SUSTA Conference on the international activity of Ukrainian students and the world student movement.
University presented the final talk on present projects and future modes of action in the United States and beyond its borders.

The Hall of Nations Lounge in the International Institute was the site of a student dance and vechnytsi.

The second session of the conference was dedicated to Hetman Ivan Mazepa. The status of education and student life during his era were discussed in a series of talks presented by SUSTA vice president for publications, Adrian Karmazyn of John Carroll University; president of the Chicago Student Association, Michael Myhal; secretary of the Michigan University Ukrainian Students Club, Tetiana O. Rohatynsky; and Bohdan Hnatczuk of Detroit.

The success of the conference was attributed to the teamwork of such committee workers as Bohdan Fedash, Taras Hnatczuk, Mary Bobiak, Daria Huliak, Luba Klymysyn, Olena Romach, Switlana Susan Honcharenko, Marie Christine Pidhurska, Bohdan Kazievich, Roman Lomay, Bohdan Fedorak, Volodymyr Popel Belyaew, and Irene Prokopovich.
Before Nikita Khrushchev visited France last March he sent a Mr. Zacharov, chief of the Soviet Secret Police, to clear the way. Zacharov provided the French police with a list of nearly a thousand political refugees from behind the Iron Curtain whom the Soviet regime considered dangerous. The French government did everything in its power to make Nikita feel right at home. French police even adopted the infamous Soviet technique of knocking at the door of these “potential assassins” between five and six in the morning, and informing them that they had 20 minutes in which to get dressed and packed for a trip to Corsica. All refugees remained at Napoleon’s former haven until the visiting Premier had departed for his homeland.

In typical Communist fashion there was no logic to the way these exiles were selected. Among them was one Tamara Hryciuk, the “dangerous desperado” we have pictured above. Time, in its March 21 description of this fiasco, writes: “In Choisy le Roi, near Paris, police ignored Soviet engineer Taras Hryciuk, instead hauled off his daughter, Tamara, whose crime seemingly
consisted of being president of the Ukrainian Student’s Association in Paris.”

Tamara’s only crime is that of being an active participant in the Ukrainian youth affairs of France. Born in Ukraine in the district of Volynia, Tamara came to France as a very young girl. She attended French primary and secondary schools and is presently completing her last year at the Sorbonne with a major in modern languages and a minor in international and corporate law. An extremely popular girl among the young Ukrainian-French, Tamara has been president of the Ukrainian Student’s Association of Paris for the past three years. She led the Ukrainian student delegation of France to the Communist Youth Festival in Vienna last year and proved to be a thorn in the side of the Communist youth with her anti-communist speeches, talks and debates in any of six languages. Tamara speaks French, English, German, Spanish, Russian, Polish as well as her native Ukrainian. Upon graduation from college this semester, Tamara plans to work for the International Institute in Geneva.

(Reprint from the Trident Quarterly, Spring 1960).

Here is the long and short of it. These three young ladies are the tallest and the shortest entrants in the preliminaries of the National College queen contest held at the Henry Hudson Hotel in New York City last April 16. Ukrainian coed Marsha Metrinko (left), 18, 5 feet 10 1/2 inches tall, a foreign service major at Georgetown University, who hails from New York City and Judy Thornhill (right), 18, 5 feet 9 inches tall, a freshman at the University of Connecticut at Storrs, Conn., who comes from Ramsey, N. J. were the two tallest entrants. The shortest girl in the contest was Arlene Mars (center), 19, 4 foot 10 inches tall, a junior at Temple University Teachers College in Philadelphia. The national finals in the contest was held in New York in September.
NATIONAL COLLEGE QUEEN CONTEST

UPI Photo
**STUDENT CHRONICLE**

*Summer Semester — 1959*

**Date:** July 3-5  
**State:** Pennsylvania  
**College or University:** La Salle College

The Fourth Congress of Ukrainian Students of America in Philadelphia in a series of resolutions condemned the Seventh World Youth Festival in Vienna, Austria, as a political masquerade of Moscow. The Congress called upon Ukrainian students in the United States to support Ukrainian American benefit causes, especially the Ukrainian Student Fund and the Ukrainian Studies Chair Fund. The Congress called on them to work toward a convocation of a World Ukrainian Student Congress in the future.

**Date:** July 9-11  
**State:** Ohio  
**College or University:** John Carroll University

First Summer Conference on the Major Problems of the Soviet Russian Empire at John Carroll University in Cleveland. Participants on behalf of SUSTA were Adrian Karmazyn, Walter D. Prybyla, and members of the Cleveland Student Association.

**Date:** July 17

President Eisenhower proclaims the nationwide observance of the First Captive Nations Week. This is the first time in the
public legislation of the United States that Ukraine is enumerated as a captive nation whose plight should be the object of study and concern of the people of the United States.

Communist-sponsored Seventh World Youth Festival was held in Vienna, Austria. The United States anti-Red student delegation, popularly called the Chicago group, included Ukrainian student leaders from the United States. Representing the Federation of Ukrainian Student Organizations of America was its President, Konstantyn Sawczuk, accompanied by Volodymyr Bakum, president of the N.Y.C. Ukrainian Student Association. Through their activity and distribution of “Appeals” literature in behalf of liberating Ukraine from Communist-domination, they helped the Chicago group expose and cripple the success of Communist propaganda during the Seventh World Youth Festival, the first ever to take place in the free world.

Illinois

Twelfth Congress of the United States National Student Association (USNSA) at the University of Illinois in Urbana. Representing SUSTA were Konstantyn Sawczuk, Walter D. Prybyla and Marusia Bishko. “Ukrainian Student Publications and Activities” and “Ukraine: The First Captive Nation of Russia” were the themes of two SUSTA exhibits featured at the USNSA congress.

New York

Convention of the Ukrainian Youth League of North America (UYL-NA) in Roches-
ter. Representing SUSTA was Walter D. Prybyla.

**Fall Semester — 1959**

**September 26-27**

New York

Mazepa Study Conference at Soyuzivka, Ukrainian National Estate in Kerhonkson. The SUSTA conference entitled “Hetman Ivan Mazepa and His Era” commemorated the 250th anniversary of the Battle of Poltava and Mazepa’s fight for a free Ukraine. The second session of the conference was devoted exclusively to organizational affairs of SUSTA. Miss Orysia Maczuk, vice president of the Philadelphia Student Association was elected “Miss Soyuzivka” for 1960.

**September 27**

SUSTA Executive Board holds first plenary session at Soyuzivka.

**October 10-11**

SUSK Mazepa Study Conference of the Ukrainian Canadian University Students’ Union was held in Toronto. Representing SUSTA was Konstantyn Sawczuk.

**October 16**

SUSTA memo regarding the registration of member organizations, their officers and addresses was forwarded to member organizations.

**October 17**

New York

SUSTA Executive Board holds second plenary session at the Student Domivka in New York City.

**October 31**

New Jersey

Newark Student Association holds a Ukrainian Student Day Conference in Newark.
November 7-8  

Maryland

The Baltimore Conference featured the SUSTA International Activities Session entitled “Ukrainian Students and the International Student Movement.” The World Ukrainian Student Congress was on the agenda. The second session was the Third Annual Student Forum of the Baltimore Student Association on the topic “Ukraine and Coexistence” at the YWCA International Center in Baltimore.

November 15

SUSTA memo regarding the World Ukrainian Student Congress and the chartered flight plans was forwarded to member organizations.

November 20

New York

SUSTA Executive Board holds third plenary session at the Student Domivka in New York City.

November 22

SUSK Academic Night of the Ukrainian Canadian University Students’ Union was held in Montreal. Representing SUSTA were Konstantyn Sawczuk and Paul Dorozhynsky.

Fall Semester — 1959

December 1  

Maryland

Ukrainian Student Archives Museum appeals to students and student organizations to forward their records and organizational archives to 239 S. Broadway in Baltimore.

December 11  

New York

SUSTA Executive Board holds fourth plen-
ary session at the Student Domivka in New York City. Rochester Student Club petition for SUSTA membership is approved pending the ratification of the Fifth Congress of Ukrainian Students of America. Miss Mary Bishko of the Syracuse University Ukrainian Club is designated as general secretary of SUSTA.

December 17

*New York*

Editorial staff of *Horizons* holds its second meeting.

January 4, 1960

SUSTA memo regarding the commemoration of Kruty Student Heroes and the proclamation of Ukrainian Student Day on campus and in the city was forwarded to member organizations.

January 23

*New York*

SUSTA Executive Board holds fifth plenary session at the Student Domivka in New York City.

January 24

SUSTA memo regarding the action program for the scholarship-student aid fund was forwarded to member organizations.

January 29

**UKRAINIAN STUDENT DAY**

*District of Columbia*

Through the efforts of the Washington Student Association, an article on the Battle of Kruty appeared in the letters column of The Washington Post on January 29.

*Maryland*

Hon. J. Harold Grady, Mayor of Baltimore, proclaims January 29 as Ukrainian Student Day.
New York  Syracuse University

Hon. Anthony A. Henninger, Mayor of Syracuse, proclaims January 29 as Ukrainian Student Day on the occasion of the 42nd anniversary of Kruty and the 5th birthday of the Syracuse University Ukrainian Club.

Spring Semester — 1960

February 1  SUSTA “Official Register 1960” is forwarded to member organizations. The first release includes a mailing directory of all officers of SUSTA and member organizations.

February 5  SUSTA memo regarding the need for a mailing list of every Ukrainian high school, college and graduate student in the United States was forwarded to member organizations.

February 6-7  SUSTA begins to forward to its member organizations a resume of the plenary sessions of the Executive Board.

February 13  Michigan  Wayne State University

Wayne State University Conference in Detroit featured SUSTA International Activities Session. The World Ukrainian Student Congress as well as the First Ideological Congress of SUSTA were on the agenda. The second session explored “Education During the Era of Hetman Ivan Mazepa” in cooperation with student organizations from Wayne State University, Michigan University, Cleveland and Chicago.

District of Columbia

Valentine’s Day Student Ball was sponsored
by the Ukrainian American Student Association of Washington, D.C.

February 20-21

Ukrainian Canadian University Students' Union (SUSK) convokes the Fourth Congress of Ukrainian Canadian Students at McGill University in Montreal. Representing SUSTA were Konstantyn Sawczuk and Mary Bishko. CBC interviewed Sawczuk in a live show regarding SUSTA activities and its relations with students in other countries as well as the World Ukrainian Student Congress and the First Ideological Congress of SUSTA.

February 27

SUSTA Executive Board holds sixth plenary session at the Student Domivka in New York City.

March 1

SUSTA Constitution and Kruty Proclamations are forwarded to member organizations.

Spring Semester — 1960

March 3

Miss Tamara Hryciuk, president of the Ukrainian Student Association in France and a graduate student at the University of Sorbonne is arrested at her home, detained and deported by plane to Corsica in preparations undertaken by the French government awaiting the visit of Khrushchev to France.

March 9

SUSTA forwarded to member organizations “By-Laws of the Executive Board of SUSTA, 1959-1960” and the resume of its sixth plenary session.

March 11

SUSTA dispatches letters of protest to the Hon. Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General
of the United Nations, and to the Hon. Herve Alphand, Ambassador of France to the United States, wherein it expresses deep concern regarding the De Gaulle Government's deportation and internment of French Ukrainians to Corsica under the pretext they constitute a "security hazard" during the visit of Khrushchev to France.

March 12

SUSTA memo is forwarded to member organizations in regard to staging a nationwide protest against the internment of Ukrainians to Corsica. Later, Volodymyr Mayewsky delivers SUSTA letter of protest to the French Embassy in Washington, D.C.

March 21

SUSTA memo regarding the 1960 United States population census was forwarded to member organizations in cooperation with the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America for student distribution of "Recognition of Ukrainians in the U.S. Census" as part of the campaign to rally all U.S. Ukrainians to register their Ukrainian origin and language during the April census.

March 25

Fordham University Russian Institute invited Walter Dushnyck, UCCA editor, to deliver an address on the "Basic Facts on Ukraine and the Ukrainian People."

March 26

SUSTA Executive Board holds seventh plenary session at the Student Domivka in New York City.

March 27

April 2

Maryland University of Maryland

President Eisenhower opens the Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth in a welcome address before 12,000 delegates and guests at the Cole Activities Building in College Park. Repre-
senting SUSTA were Walter D. Prybyla, Mary Bishko and members of Washington Ukrainian American Student Association including Volodymyr Mayewsky, Olya Melech, Tamara Dyba, Olesh Lomacky and Janka Lazechko.

_Spring Semester — 1960_

April 1

Ukrainian Student Fund, Inc., designated April for its annual drive for financial assistance. The fund was organized in 1951 through the efforts of SUSTA. Scholarship awards have been granted each year since 1955. A total of forty-one students have received assistance totaling $7,100. Recent individual awards of $250 each were granted to Miss Lilliana M. Hladys of Hunter College, Miss Marsha B. Metrinko of Georgetown University, Andrew S. Malinovsky of Pennsylvania University, Titus D. Hewryk of the Pratt Institute and Oleh O. Cherniakhivsky, University of Pennsylvania. The Executive Board of the Ukrainian Student Fund consists of Joseph Lesawyer, president; Volodymyr Petryshyn, vice president; Prof. Volodymyr Kalyna, treasurer and Mykola Holinatyj, executive secretary.

April 2

Voice of America broadcast its interview with SUSTA officers Walter D. Prybyla and Mary Bishko made on March 29 at the United States Information Agency. The interview was in Ukrainian and dealt with the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth as well as with the “non-political” activities of SUSTA and Ukrainian students throughout the United States.

April 5

_New York_ Syrachuse University

Syrachuse University Ukrainian Club and
guests hear Mr. Walter Dushnyck, UCCA editor discuss “Colonialism: Western and Eastern” at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs Auditorium.

April 30

New York Columbia University

Columbia University Ukrainian Student Circle sponsors a Student Ball at Baker Field.

Spring Semester — 1960

April 30

May 1

Pennsylvania University of Pennsylvania

First Ukrainian Student Ideological Congress of SUSTA was held in Philadelphia to examine the present position of “Ukraine Between the West and the East.” Coordinating the congress was Teodosiy Onufenko. The keynote paper was prepared by Prof. Ivan Mirchuk, Rector of Ukrainian Free University. Other speakers were SUSTA president Konstantyn Sawczuk who spoke on “Ukraine and the West”; Yaroslav Bilinsky of ODUM on “Democracy, Former Colonial Nations, and Ukraine”; Ann Protsyk of Zarevo on “Alien Ideologies in Twentieth Century Ukraine”; Eugene Fedorenko of ODUM on “Ukraine under Soviet Occupation”; Mykola Pavliuk of Zarevo and Peter Mirchuk of TUSM on “The Evolution and Objective of Ukrainian Nationalism”; and Anatole Bedriy of TUSM on “The Significance of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement.”

The second day of the session was held at La Salle College auditorium. The Philadelphia Student Association and its president Bohdan Hasiuk hosted the Congress. Resolutions were adopted.

SUSTA President Sawczuk was hospitalized during the Congress. SUSTA Executive
Board holds its eighth plenary session at La Salle College.

June 18-19

**New Jersey**  
**Seton Hall University**

SUSTA convokes its sixth Organizational Affairs Conference in South Orange. Prof. Nicholas Chirovsky is guest speaker. The theme of the conference is "SUSTA and You." Newark Student Association is host.

June 19

SUSTA Executive Board holds its ninth plenary session in South Orange, N. J.

June 25-26

Ukrainian Canadian University Students' Union holds a Conference on Student Publications and Press Affairs in Toronto. Representing SUSTA was Konstantyn Sawczuk.

**Summer Semester — 1960**

July 23

**New Jersey**

SUSTA Executive Board holds Eleventh Plenary Session in Newark.

August 22-

Sept. 1

**Minnesota**  
**University of Minnesota**

Thirteenth Congress of the United States National Student Association (USNSA) held in Minneapolis. K. Sawczuk and I. Wiwtchar represented SUSTA. Ukrainian cultural exhibit set up with cooperation of Ukrainian Student Club at the University.

**Fall Semester — 1960**

September 10-11

**Ohio**

SUSTA Conference held in Cleveland. City's Student Association was host. First
day devoted to Shevchenko studies; second, to student affairs. K. Sawczuk, B. Fedorak and A. Karmazyn represented SUSTA executive board.

September 10-18

A number of Ukrainian Student Clubs and Associations were visited by Konstantyn Sawczuk and Stepan Chemych of SUSTA and Ukrainian Studies Chair Fund, respectively. An organizational trip took Sawczuk and Chemych to Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Buffalo, Rochester, and Syracuse. In Buffalo they were instrumental in establishing on September 16th the Ukrainian Student Association.

September 24

New Jersey

SUSTA Executive Board holds twelfth plenary session in Newark.

October 8-9

Washington, D.C. Howard University

SUSTA sponsored Fifth Higher Studies Conference entitled "Political and Legal Status of the Ukraine." Speakers were K. Sawczuk, K. Warwariw, O. Erjkiwsky and P. Potichny (because of absence, latter's speech was read by P. Dorozhynsky). G. Halushchynsky, SUSTA v. p., presided. Washington Student Association was host.

November 4

Pennsylvania

Student Association of Philadelphia held General Membership Meeting and elections. I. Chuma succeeded B. Hasiuk as president.

November 5-6

Maryland

Baltimore Student Association sponsors Fourth Higher Studies Conference; theme of session: "Our Understanding of Present-
Day Ukraine.” M. Pisecka, P. Dorozhynsky, K. Sawczuk and I. Koschman addressed convocation; O. Belaniuk presided.

November 12

New Jersey

SUSTA Executive Board meets for Thirteenth Plenary Session in Newark.

November 13

New York

New York City’s Students’ Association holds benefit concert. Performers included Wadym Kipa, pianist; Hanna Scherey, soprano; Wolowymyr Cisyk, violinist, and Ukrainian male and female Chorus “DUMKA.” Student participants were Natalka Hloba, poetess; Vera Kotylevetz, soprano; Ihor Stefanystyn, dancer, and the association’s president, Albert Kipa, pianist. The latter and P. Dorozhynsky, USH-NY v. p. addressed the 400-strong audience.

December

Maryland

Baltimore Student Association elects Taras Kharchalis president.

January 28, 1961

New Jersey

SUSTA Executive Board assembles in Newark for Fourteenth Plenary Session. Eugene Hanowsky, ZESUS president, attended.

The author's workmanship as a research scholar appears in this positive contribution in the field of diplomatic and legal history of Ukraine between 1917 to 1923.

The originality of Dr. Markus is prominent in the way that he illuminates the uniqueness of the Ukrainian political phenomenon between two opposing tendencies, both equally utilized over the years by the rulers of Moscow who affirm centralization and who recognize regional particularity, both within a conjugation designed to serve the purposes dictated by the principles of Lenin and Stalin. But the qualities of Dr. Markus' workmanship in historical and legal research are rooted in his scientific and sound development of a most complicated period in the political life of the Ukrainian people. The author analyses thoroughly the problems related to the recognition of the Soviet Socialist Ukrainian Republic in the light of its dependence on the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic in order to show that it would be authentic if it had answered the usual international requirements concerning criteria of States. Dr. Markus studies the notion of the continuity of the Ukrainian State, the difficult problems of double succession, the relations of the dismembered Russian empire and later the USSR to the Ukrainian Republic.

We find in this monograph many very original and penetrating views, which impose upon the author an obligation to pursue his scientific research on the subject to project such a study right up to the present.
In July 1959, President Dwight Eisenhower enumerated Ukraine among many countries mentioned in the Captive Nations Week Proclamation, adopted by both Houses of the U. S. Congress and signed into public law by the President. This is a significant milestone, when one considers the following words of President Woodrow Wilson as quoted by Dr. Markus. “The politics of the United States,” said President Wilson, “leave to the future to decide the precise form of relations between Great Russia and Little Russia (Ukraine), but for the moment we must aspire to preserve the principle of complete Russian unity rather than support separatism.”

L’Ukraine Soviétique dans les Relations Internationales 1918-1923 is of indisputable value, because it is a documentary work indispensable to the serious student of the Ukrainian Independence Movement, the Russian Revolution and the history-making diplomacy of Eastern Europe embarking on the modern age.

—Reviewed by Eugene Pawelko
RED WEDDING—by Damon Orlow (Henry Regnery Company, Chicago, 1952), 244 pages.

The setting of this book is captured in the dedication of the author: “To the Memory of My Parents Who Had Been Feudal Serfs.” *Red Wedding* is an account of Damon Orlow, a resident of Xendzovka, a village some 150 versts northeast of Kiev, at the time when “the Tsar was a stern taskmaster.”

Damon Orlow tells of his life as a young boy, taking us through adventure by adventure until we reach his maturity. He tells of his family life, the hardships of a peasant, his common sense, and above all the strong earnest faith which turns the wheel of his daily living. One can not help but admire the strong character and personality of these simple people. He gives many accounts of customs and traditions which were an unwritten law of the village and which could make or break a person’s life, such as a young girl’s “red” or “white” wedding.

There is a spirit of freedom and a feeling for independence all through the book. Although the people were oppressed, many of the decisions were quite democratic.

Part of the charm of the book lies in the fact that the author is able to tell his story through the eyes of a child, later a young boy, and finally a young man. However, there is a definite lack of Ukrainian identity all through the book. One has to read the book to understand this fully. Perhaps it is the Publisher’s preface where Ukraine and Russia are used synonymously, and where “Little Russia” gives a reader of Ukrainian heritage some feeling of dissatisfaction.

On the whole the author leaves a very pleasant taste. *Red Wedding* is full of sentiment, pleasant memories, and love for the people Damon Orlow knew. One learns more than the customs and traditions. There is much more to the book than meets the eye.

—Reviewed by Dionizia Palazij
FROM FLORENCE TO BREST—1439 to 1596—by Oscar Halecki (Sacrum Poloniae Millennium, Rome, 1938), 419 pages.

Prof. Oscar Halecki begins his scholarly tome by considering the events leading up to the Union of Florence (1439), for, as he rightly asserts, only in this light do we arrive at a real understanding of the regional union concluded at the Synod of Brest (1596); a union which was a return to the tradition of general unity between Western and Eastern Christendom, which had been achieved at the Council of Florence.

In Part One, the author discusses the Union of Florence and its aftermath among the Ukrainians. Although the religious problems in this study are of primary importance, the reader, nevertheless, will find them in the intricate picture of the entire process of East European history of that period. Here we follow the Metropolitan of Kiev, Isidor, on his way to Ferrara-Florence, observe his activities and contributions to the success of the Council, and then his difficult journey to Kiev through Hungary and Poland. As soon as Cardinal Isidor returned to Kiev on February 5 in 1441 he was very successful in getting the Union of Florence accepted. "The ancient tradition of unity with Rome, which never had entirely disappeared in the territory of the old Kievan State, and the recent association with a Catholic body politic, certainly contributed to that great success." When, however, Cardinal Isidore came to Moscow to have the Union accepted, he was arrested and confined in the Chudov Monastery at the Kremlin. The author emphasizes the importance of the fact that the Synod convoked in Moscow in 1448, rejecting the Union of Florence, represented the attitude of the Church of the Muscovite State only.

In the pages that follow, we see the entire picture of the Papal Central and East European policy and especially that connected with the anti-Ottoman league. Furthermore, Prof. Halecki shows, in connection with the marriage of Ivan to the niece of the last Emperor of Constantinople, how the "rather confusing terminology affected the correct understanding by the West of the involved situation among the Eastern Slavs... it was the first occasion when Moscow took advantage of the common name of Rus' and of the tradition of the dynastic and ecclesiastical unity of all 'Russia' in the Kievan period, to claim not only the Great Russian lands — Tver being the next goal after Novgorod— but also the Byeloruthenian and Ukrainian territories of the Jagellonian State."

It is interesting to note that in spite of such a strong opposition on
the part of Moscow, the tradition of the Union of Florence and of its acceptance by the Ukrainian Church of Poland and Lithuania did not at all disappear during that long interval of the two unions. Indeed, it served to a certain degree as a basis for the regional Union of Brest.

Part Three deals with the origins of the Union of Brest. It is here we find the two great Jesuits, Skarga and Possevino, preparing the ground for the Church Union. Their work was difficult; however, it became even more complicated after the Patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremiah II, visited the Ukrainian lands of Poland and Lithuania and then proceeded to Moscow where, in 1589, he elevated the Metropolitan of Moscow to the rank of Patriarch.

For Moscow, it was a great achievement, as the Tsar wanted it to be recognized as the Third Rome. Now the new Patriarch of Moscow wanted to have over the Orthodox Ukrainians of the Commonwealth, the same authority which was exercised hitherto by the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Prof. Halecki conclusively shows that it was the Ukrainian hierarchy who, as early as 1590, took that eventful step in the direction of Church Union. It is noteworthy that all the bishops and the Metropolitan of Kiev declared themselves to be in favor of Union.

Part Five covers the climax of the movement for Church Union. In June 1595, the Ukrainian hierarchy assembled in the Synod of Brest and unanimously authorized its representatives to go to Rome to conclude the reunion with the Holy See.

The story of the final act is interesting as the author presents a very vivid and most complete picture of those eventful days. The Union of Rome, the ratification of it at Brest, and the opposition of Prince Constantine Ostrosky to the entire movement present an intricate problem which the author acutely analyses and presents in a coherent form. The final act of the ratification of the Union of Rome took place on October 19, 1596. However, polemics over it were to continue for many more years to come.

A word of criticism is in order. From the very beginning, the reader is confronted with an unnecessary archaism in terminology which runs through the entire work. It is rather unfortunate and surprising, for the author himself stresses the fact that the problem of terminology has added much to the misunderstanding of East European history. It would have been much better to use the term Ukrainian rather than Ruthenian, which the author does explain, for it would show the reader more clearly the relation of the historical act with the result it bore on the people of today — and today they are Ukrainians.
In conclusion, it must be noted that *From Florence To Brest*—1439 to 1596, in many respects is an example of truly scholarly writing. The documentation based on original sources, the depth of thought, the penetrating analysis of the historical processes, and primarily the objectivity with which Prof. Halecki approaches this controversial problem make this volume a great contribution to the treasury of human knowledge.

—Reviewed by *Taras Hunczak*
In this treatise, Professor Smal-Stocki sheds light on an area vital to any true understanding of, or successful dealing with, the Soviet Union. It is tragically ironic that an area of study of such vital importance to both the Captive Nations, of which Professor Smal-Stocki speaks, and to the whole Free World has been so long neglected and ignored by historians and statesmen. This treatise is just one of the works evidencing Professor Smal-Stocki’s dedication to dispelling the false idea the West has of the nature of the Soviet Union. It also evidences his unceasing efforts to defend the rights of non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union.

Professor Smal-Stocki points to the decline suffered by the United States in the field of foreign policy. He can only lay the blame for this at the door of the United States because of our complete misunderstanding of the nature of the enemy we face and helped to create. That the United States helped to create this enemy through aid in the past is a fait accompli and Smal-Stocki does not belabor the point. That the United States is totally unaware of the true anatomy of the Soviet Union and the dynamic forces which could be put to work for the West is the area in which Smal-Stocki is working in this treatise. He carefully presents his factually supported thesis to all who have the courage to accept the view of the Soviet Union he presents and abandon the view generally held because of ignorance and Soviet propaganda.

Smal-Stocki begins to throw light on the true nature of the Soviet Union by establishing the fact that the Soviet Communist dictatorship is a natural outgrowth and true successor of the Tsarist Empire. He shows that the means used by the Tsarist regime to “solve” the nationality problem within the borders of its empire, are the same now used by the Soviet Government to “promote the culture of the proletariat.” Smal-Stocki shows that the aims and methods of the Tsarist Empire and the Communist dictatorship are the same—the latter simply has the benefit of a more up-to-date, appealing and all-embracing ideology to conceal the real nature and purpose of its activities.

Despite all denial, and propaganda to cover up even the existence of a nationality problem in the Soviet Union, Professor Smal-Stocki
shows that this problem has figured largely in the political maneuvers of the Soviet Government from the very beginning. The Soviets' joining of the League of Nations in 1934 and the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939 take on a new logic when viewed from an analysis of the nationality pressures facing the Soviet Government both internally and externally at the time. Hitler could have utilized the dynamic force of the nationalism of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union to split the Soviet amalgam which strove so zealously to present itself to the rest of the world as one giant political monolith.

The way in which the Soviet Government has attempted to conceal, even deny the nationality problems is perhaps the best indication of how important the solution or elimination of this problem is to the existence of the Soviet Communist dictatorship. This dictatorship must maintain the old Russian colonial empire with its submerged nationalities because they are essential and serve as the arsenal from which the Soviet will launch a world revolution.

This is a life and death problem because the Russian Communists understood that the non-Russian nations were not interested in "world wide revolution" but in the contentment of their national cultures and economies, so long forcibly retarded by Russian Tsarism. The nationalities only desired the increase of their political rights to put them on a par with the Russians. This, however, would not only undermine the Communist world revolution, but threatened the centralism of the Soviet Union and challenged the dictatorship and leadership of the Russians.

When the revolution came in 1917, the nationalities through their own Socialist parties attempted the break toward realization of their hopes. The author describes two revolutions: one which was a social and economic revolution in Russian ethnographic territory and another which was anti-Russian, national and social in the non-Russian territories. The tragic failure of the West to understand this situation and give the needed help left the nationalities with no new choice. Faced with either the Communist Imperialism of the Red Army or the Tsarist Imperialism of the White, national aspirations were destroyed in the clash between the two more powerful forces.

The opposition of the nationalities to the Red Army and Communist dictatorship is described vividly but it is also shown how later Western opposition to the attempts of the nationalities at self-determination, especially the attempts of Ukraine, weakened the resistance of all non-Russian nations and encouraged the Communists in their efforts to completely reconquer the whole Tsarist Empire. The West failed to understand the dynamic force of the nationalism of the non-Russian
nations of the Soviet Union 40 years ago and the stand taken by the West a few years ago in relation to Hungary not only shows that the West has learned little more of the true nature of the Soviet Union since then, but has proven again that the non-Russians are completely alone in any stand they might take against the Soviet dictatorship.

The scene the author comments upon is not a bright one, but as he says “there should be no room for cheap optimism about the future.” The question now arises — in view of refusal of the West to take a stand with the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union, is it too late for this nationalism to be the factor used to split the enemy? The author does not and cannot be expected to attempt an answer to this question, but in his analysis of the present level of anti-Russian nationalism, his findings show there is some hope remaining if the West has the moral courage to meet it. Professor Smal-Stocki finds that in spite of old persecutions and restrictions, a new intelligentsia from the peasants and working class has come into being in the Soviet Union and that the members of this group have a distinct national feeling toward their respective republics. The author also feels that the ruling elite in the non-Russian nations are being gradually permeated with the nationalism of their nation and are realizing that, in reality, their present privileges and the future increase of those privileges depends upon this local nationalism.

Apart from the analysis of the new ruling class, Professor Smal-Stocki sees that the non-Russian youth trained in Marxism is deeply aware that there are two classes of nations in the Soviet Union. One represents the Russian exploiter and the other the exploited non-Russian nations. To fight against this is not just a “national” duty, but a Marxist obligation. This factor along with the one presented above, shows that the nationality problem is still a potential crack in the seemingly invulnerable armor of the Soviet Communist dictatorship.

Throughout this treatise, while carefully delineating the action taken by the Soviet government to deal with the non-Russian nations within its borders, the author unfailingly points to the far reaching implications of this action. Before any of this information can be used to the advantage of the non-Russian nations and the West, Western historians and statesmen must first rid their minds of the Russian Imperialist cliches and patterns of thought purposely engendered by Russian propaganda to bcloud the real issues. Professor Smal-Stocki’s treatise is, for this and many other reasons, an important and not to be ignored contribution to the field of Soviet study.

Reviewed by Mary T. Shannon
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