
◆ ◆

THE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN THE U. S. S. R.

FOCAL POINT IN AMERICA'S POLICY OF NATIONAL LIBERATION

◆ ◆

Address by
Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky
Georgetown University
Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

Extension of Remarks of
Hon. Brien McMahon
of Connecticut
in the
Senate of the United States
Thursday, May 15, 1952

*Not printed
at Government
expense*

United States Government Printing Office, Washington : 1952

208216--43301

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University, and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, at the conference on psychological strategy in the cold war, held in Washington on Friday, February 22, 1952.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**THE NON-RUSSIAN SOVIET PEOPLES
IN AMERICA'S PSYCHOLOGICAL
STRATEGY**

One could scarcely hope for a more fitting occasion than this to present the tragically neglected case of the non-Russian Soviet peoples for America's psychological strategy in the cold war. Throughout the Nation, as Americans, we honor today one of our greatest patriots who fought with fearless determination for the freedom and independence of our country and who in the earliest years of the Republic defended it with an unswerving conviction in the natural and universal principles on which it was securely founded. However, the undying greatness of Washington as a human monument to truth, justice, charity, and victorious hope has been an object of veneration not only to successive generations of Americans but also, for over a century, to many of the tyrannized peoples of the world. So human and inspirational is the practical idealism of Washington that among the non-Russian peoples in eastern Europe, the most celebrated bard of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko, drew heavily on it in the nineteenth century to inflame the aspirations of his people for

the dignity of their national independence as so magnificently symbolized by the "Land of Washington" which this immortal figure called America. The tremendous significance of this and similar facts must certainly not be allowed to escape our deliberation here on America's psychological strategy in the cold war.

* * * * *

If our strategy is to be girded to truth, then the undiluted facts about these peoples, their glorious histories and their valiant struggles of the present, must be made widely known and duly appreciated. Without a working knowledge, a guiding perspective, and a warm feeling toward the centuries-old struggle for national freedom on the part of these first victims of Soviet Russian imperialism, our efforts in effective psychological strategy will be perilously impaired. If our strategy is to be oriented toward justice, then a more appropriate field of application cannot possibly be found than in the direction of these peoples who for centuries have sacrificed lives and blood to realize the very principles that have made our Nation great and prosperous. If our strategy is to be blessed with genuine Christian charity, then the incredible sufferings of these unbefriended peoples under the weight of foreign Moscovite rule and its genocidal oppressions render them most deserving. And if our strategy is to bathe in victorious hope, then by penetrating the weakest sector in the structure of the Soviet Empire, America may well strike on the determining key to the defeat of Soviet Russian imperialism. All four of these sources of motivation for sound strategy find their remarkable point of confluence in the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union.

A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE INVINCIBLE NON-RUSSIAN WILL FOR FREEDOM

Obviously within the limits of this address only the essential highlights of the composite non-Russian picture can be treated here. First, as to the majority status of the non-

Russian population in the Soviet Union. In conservative accord with G. M. Chekalin's disclosures in 1941, a carefully prepared analysis by our governmental demographers revealed recently, on the basis of reasonable extrapolations of the 1939 Soviet census, that of the estimated total population of 202,000,000, over 54 percent, or 110,500,000 are non-Russians. In 14 of the 16 Soviet republics the significant majority is non-Russian. No doubt, with the current mass deportations from Central Europe the non-Russian aggregate is being further augmented.

It must be emphasized, therefore, that there is no such breed as "the Russian peoples" or any ethnically valid political designation as "the peoples of Russia." Instead, there are in reality Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Georgians, Azerbaijanis, and numerous other non-Russian peoples with their respective and distinct histories, languages, national cultures, and traditions nurtured, even under the most oppressive conditions, in their individual countries. For our purposes it must also be stressed that in those non-Russian parts of the Soviet Union, where meaningfully large nations consciously aspire to independence, the richest and most valuable economic assets exist. Coal and iron in Ukraine, Turkestan, and Caucasia; manganese almost entirely in Georgia and Ukraine; almost all the oil in Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, and so with copper, lead, zinc, mercury, sulfur, and other goods.

In the basic framework of historical development and from the experienced viewpoint of the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union, the series of Soviet imperialist aggression did not commence at the end of World War II, nor in 1939-40, but at the very inception of bolshevism over 34 years ago. Their large independent and democratic states, for which some fought for centuries, were ruthlessly crushed by the imperialist hordes of Russian bolshevism in the period of 1918-22. Under the force of cold and bloody events, for them the institutional continuity of traditional Russian imperial-

ism was well and unmistakably established years before many statesmen, scholars, and writers of the west came to realize along with that venerable Russian philosopher, N. Berdaev, that bolshevism is essentially the third form of Russian imperialism. But the most significant context of sound understanding, which finds abundant validation in the histories of the non-Russian peoples down to the very present, was offered last June 26 by our Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, when among other things he forthrightly declared:

"Historically, the Russian state has had three great drives—to the west into Europe, to the south into the Middle East, and to the east into Asia. * * * Historically, also, the Russian state has displayed considerable caution in carrying out these drives. * * * The Politburo has acted in the same way. It has carried on and built on the imperialist tradition. What it has added consists mainly of new weapons and new tactics * * * the ruling power in Moscow has long been an imperial power and now rules a greatly extended empire. This is the challenge our foreign policy is required to meet. It is clear that this process of encroachment and consolidation by which Russia has grown in the last 500 years from the Duchy of Muscovy to a vast empire has got to be stopped."

Let us take a glance, then, at those relatively unknown but important non-Russian nations that fell under this process of encroachment generated by Muscovy, then extended by Czarist Russia, and later revived by Soviet Russia. The Georgian nation which numbers today about 3,000,000 people in the Caucasus region extends back 4,000 years in a land, as its poet, Wakjeli, put it, "of eternal strife, a garden under a sun whose rays were Georgian blood, shed in the cause of freedom." This Christian nation was subjugated by Russia in 1801, regained its long-sought independence on May 26, 1918, and 1 month after its recognition by the Entente Powers in January 1921, Trotsky's Red army invaded the Georgian state to inaugurate a new chapter in Georgia's fight for freedom which manifested itself strongly

in the uprisings of 1929 and 1930, the purges of 1935 and 1937, desertions in World War II, and passive resistance to this day.

A similar story is witnessed in the history of the Byelorussian nation of some 10,000,000 whose national and cultural background is distinct from the Russian. Victimized by Russian imperialism at the end of the eighteenth century, it seized the opportunity to determine its independence on March 25, 1918, only to lose it in 1920 under the force of Bolshevik aggression. The extensive purges and deportations of 1944-46 have not curbed its present underground activities about Lida, Minsk, and Grodno near the Baltic region. The Moslem Turk peoples of former Turkestan, which was divided by their Soviet imperialist rulers into the five Republics of Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tadzhikistan, Kazakhstan, and Kirghizistan, have a colorful history and culture of 1,500 years, marred in modern times by the dark intervention of Russian imperialism in 1730 until the entire process of encroachment was completed by 1842. After a long and courageous struggle for its independence, this major area of 25,000,000 Moslems seized upon it in December 1917, but with only a tenuous hold in the face of marauding Red army forces, it quickly succumbed in February 1918, renewed its fight and redeclared its independent Turkestanian-Turkish-Islamic Republic on April 4, 1922, only to be overwhelmed again by 1924. This strategic region bordering on the Caspian Sea, Iran, and India has been a cauldron of unrest seething with large uprisings in 1933-36, the flight of thousands of young Turkestan into the mountains to join the underground Basmachi during 1935-41, revolts in 1950, and recent peasant hostilities and open resistance in the Pamir Mountains.

The proud history of the 3,000,000 Moslem people of Azerbaijan relates the same gory record of imperialist Russian aggression and tyranny begun in 1828, ended momentarily on May 28, 1918, when Azerbaijanian independence was proclaimed, and renewed under Soviet auspices in 1920, soon after the Allied Powers recognized this hard-won free-

dom. The picture of national resistance, especially the armed revolts of 1922, 1925, 1929-30, and 1933 and the widespread passive resistance of the present, repeats itself in this extremely vital area of the Baku oil fields. The over 1,000,000 people of adjacent Armenia, with its rich and noble background, paid dearly for the independence won on May 28, 1918, after six centuries of foreign rule. And tragic, indeed, was its further enslavement by Soviet Russian imperialism in May, 1920. Yet similar evidences of passive resistance demonstrate Armenia's determination to declare again its independence when the proper moment affords itself.

The non-Russian Cossack peoples of some 10,000,000, who are derived from the Slavonic tribes that inhabited the steppe areas between the Volga and the Don during Kievan Rus, have likewise asserted their desire for national freedom. The political independence lost by the Cossack republics in 1708 was regained on December 10, 1917, and the Don, Kuban, and other Cossack peoples formed a state union named "Cossackia" on January 5, 1920, which, along with the other democratic states, proved short-lived. The Cossack uprisings in the 1920's and 1930's and the desertions in the last war attest to their conscious national sense aspiring for freedom. The Tartars and Bashkirs of the Idel-Ural Republic, established in 1917, also have a tradition of struggle against traditional Russian imperialism. Their revolts in the early 1920's against their new masters, the peasant rebellions of 1920-32, the heavy liquidation of national Communists in 1936-37, and the some 50,000 Tartar-Bashkirs armed against Moscow in World War II punctuate their anti-Soviet record for freedom.

As we know, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, along with Poland, escaped in those postwar years the tragic fate of these other non-Russian peoples. Today, after the events of the past decade and more, the plight of the Baltic peoples is identical with that imposed earlier on the other non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union. And the best indication of this is the shoulder-to-

shoulder struggle of the Lithuanian underground with Ukrainian insurgents against a common traditional scourge.

UKRAINE: THE ACHILLES HEEL OF THE SOVIET UNION

Ukraine, as the second largest nation in the Soviet Union as well as behind the European iron curtain, has come to be the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union. The long history of the over 40,000,000 Ukrainians has been one continuous struggle against foreign rule and oppression. As Voltaire described it, "They always aspire to freedom, though they are still dragging the chains of subjugation." After its period of independence from the ninth to the fourteenth century, Ukraine began its fight for national freedom and realized it in the Ukrainian Kozak State in 1648. Its freedom was crushed by Russia in the eighteenth century, but as "They always aspire to freedom," the Ukrainian people realized it again in the establishment of the democratic and independent Ukrainian National Republic in 1917. The heroic war to preserve this independence against the imperialist forces of both Russian Bolshevism and reactionary monarchism was lost by 1920.

Senate Document No. 41 on "Tensions Within the Soviet Union" accurately states: "The Politburo does not seem to favor leaders of the national groups in its midst. This has been especially true for the Ukraine, long a trouble spot . . . most key Party and police personnel in Ukraine are Russians." How powerfully true this is. For, in the words of that able analyst of east European affairs, William Henry Chamberlin, "No people in Europe have a better fighting anti-Communist record than the Ukrainians."

Let us scan the highlights of this imposing record. This record began in 1918 with the Ukrainian people as one of the first to fight the brutal aggressions of Soviet Russian imperialism. In 1926 the long period of purges of nationalist sentiment commenced. In 1930 the famous monster trial was staged in the Ukrainian city of Kharkiv

where 45 eminent Ukrainian intellectuals were charged with undermining the regime. The brief phase of so-called cultural concessions had passed, and phenomena with no conceivable relation to the meaning or unrealistic objectives of world communism swiftly enveloped the Ukrainian nation. The most horrible features of traditional Russian imperialism—Russification, cultural evisceration, state terrorism, Siberian exile, and national genocide—were now being magnified to destroy every live fiber in the Ukrainian national movement. The pattern of planned Soviet genocide and cultural liquidation witnessed today in central Europe has its model in Ukraine and other non-Russian areas in the Soviet Union. I urge you to examine the massive data on these monstrous events, with specific dates and names, as they appear in the volume on Genocide Hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Among them, the mass deportations, the criminal man-made famine of 1932-33, and the mass murder at Winnitsia in 1937-38, where 9,432 corpses were discovered with three or four bullet holes in the back of the heads, significantly just as in the Katyn massacre, all of these constitute evidence of the vicious and determined attacks made against the sources of Ukraine's traditional spirit for national independence. Little wonder that the Communist Kossior blurted out in 1933, "Ukrainian nationalism is our chief danger."

In this period disillusionment engulfed leading Ukrainian Communists who could no longer stomach the rapid perversion of ideological communism and, as Mr. Acheson intimates, recognized in the Trojan horse of world communism the naked force of traditional Russian imperialism. Ukrainian "Titolsm" spread but was unsuccessful as M. Khvylovy, Skrypyk, Shumsky, Chubar, Richetsky and countless others went to their graves rather than to serve as quislings. In Georgia, Erdely, in Turkestan, Faisal Khodajew, in the Volga Tatar area and elsewhere honor and integrity of principle was similarly defended.

Despite the ferocity and villainy of these onslaughts against Ukraine's fight for free-

dom, the record of this undying struggle continued to be written in blood with even greater glories. In 1937 it contributed with other non-Russian peoples a General Yakir, Colonels Prymakiv and Kryvoruchko in the plot to overthrow the Georgian quisling, Stalin. Elsewhere, in 1938, the spontaneous creation of independent Carpatho-Ukraine reflected the same struggle, as certainly did the widely heralded declaration of independence in Lviv of western Ukraine in 1941. Of great significance was the willful mass surrender in 1941-42 of over 2,000,000 Soviet Ukrainians and other non-Russian soldiers about Kiev to take up arms in the centuries-old fight for the independence of their homelands. This, as we well know, failed to materialize due to the arrogant stupidity of the Nazis in what may be truly regarded as the colossal political blunder of the century. But, as a result, what did materialize in 1943 was the Ukrainian insurgent army which throughout the war fought against both Nazi and Soviet imperialism.

It is not possible to recount here the inimitable record of underground Ukrainian insurgence down to the present day. The assembled information is readily available, but for a concise account of its year-to-year exploits and achievements, may I refer you to my address on the anti-Soviet underground in the January 15 issue of *Vital Speeches*.

• • • • •

For the past 6 years the Kremlin's attacks on "bourgeois nationalism" in areas upon areas of the wide non-Russian periphery of the Soviet Union have been increasingly intense. Since the spring of 1951 vast purges of the proportions of 1935-38 have been taking place in Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan, and the most intensive campaign at Russification is under way now. Reliable reports filter through almost daily on this score. In Uzbekistan, the poet Zulfia is condemned for her work *My Uzbekistan*, admiring its national traits; in Azerbaijan, writers like Shirvan and Akhundla are upbraided for their

nationalism; the histories of the Azerbaijanis, Uzbeks, and Kirghizes are distorted to dim the memories of their past independence; in Turkmenistan, writers are severely reproved for writing in the spirit of its national heroes; in Ukraine, a simple poem entitled "Love Ukraine" and written by V. Sossuyra in 1944 suddenly comes under heavy censure, and *Pravda*, on November 25, 1951, sweepingly attacks Ukrainian writers for the use of "nationalist words" and their attempt to wrench the already mutilated Ukrainian language from the Russian language. Similar tragedies have now befallen the non-Russian peoples of the so-called satellite area of the Soviet Empire. For the occupied non-Russian countries of the Soviet Union they measure the ever burning passion of just nationalism without which any nation could not endure, without which the unity of its history, its traditions, its freedom would perish.

MEANS AND ENDS IN AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL STRATEGY TOWARD THE NON-RUSSIAN PEOPLES IN U. S. S. R.

The means to concretize the unique identity of interest that exists between America and these peoples are many. Here I would urge that full support be given to House Concurrent Resolution 84 which seeks to assist in every manner the national liberation movements of these non-Russian peoples. Second, every pressure should be brought to bear for an effective implementation of the Keenan amendment to the Mutual Security Act, calling for the formation of respective national military units integrated into NATO and the material aid of the national underground systems behind the iron curtain. Third, with over 30 free nations having already ratified it, it is high time that we give full expression to our moral leadership in the world by ratifying the Genocide Convention and indicting the Soviet Government for the perpetration of genocide in the non-Russian areas of its empire.

Fourth, an American Committee for the Liberation of the Non-Russian Peoples in the Soviet Union should be formed to assist materially and with intelligent understanding the heavily organized anti-Communist unity of non-Russian groups in Western Europe and in Ankara. Another vitally needed means is the creation of a fully independent psychological strategy agency in our Government, responsible on the executive level only to the President and efficiently equipped with functional control over the Voice of America and other necessary instruments devised to capitalize on the major weaknesses of the illusory Soviet monolith.

By far more important are the ends toward which these and other instrumental means are applied. To simply situate ourselves on an endless defensive with the sure prospect of impairing seriously our own free institu-

tions or to merely "beat Stalin" betrays not only a callous indifference to universal moral values but also an intellectual myopia as to the realities of history. Our future will indeed prove insecure on a mere biologic version of self-preservation and practical expediency. The hour urgently calls for a powerful reassertion of those principles and values treasured in our Declaration of Independence and nurtured in the great American tradition. Not only for our survival, but for the freedom of others. The histories of the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union are in essence a heroic struggle of a substantial segment of humanity seeking the realization of these selfsame rights of national freedom, self-government, and responsible independence. As before, so now, they look hopefully to the living expression of these principles, the Land of Washington.



