

THE USSR



UNMASKED

Osyp Diakiv-Hornovy



OSYP DIAKIV-HORNOVY

Born June 21, 1921 Died November 28, 1950

THE USSR UNMASKED

A Collection of Articles and Essays on Soviet Russian Repression in Ukraine

By
OSYP DIAKIV-HORNOVY

With An
Introduction
By
DR. PETRO MIRCHUK

And
MY MEMORIES OF OSYP DIAKIV-HORNOVY
By
VASYL DIAKIV

VANTAGE PRESS
New York Washington Atlanta Hollywood

Translated from the Ukrainian
by
WALTER DUSHNYCK, Ph.D.

FIRST EDITION

All rights reserved, including the right of reproduction
in whole or part in any form.

Copyright © 1976 by Petro Mirchuk

Published by Vantage Press, Inc.
516 West 34th St., New York, New York 10001
diasporiana.org.ua

Manufactured in the United States of America

Standard Book Number 533-01996-6

Contents

Official Announcement	vii
Introduction	xi
My Memories of Osyp Diakiv-Hornovy, by Vasyl Diakiv	xxiii
1. The USSR—The Land of the Most Brutal Oppression of Peoples and Exploitation of Workers	1
2. On the Bolshevik Ideological Front	56
3. On the Freedom of the Press in the USSR	96
4. Chauvinistic Frenzy and Russification Fever of the Bolshevik Imperialists	119
5. The Scourge of the Twentieth Century	163
6. Attitude of the Ukrainian Resistance Toward the Russian People	220
7. The UPA—The Standard-Bearer of Liberation and Friendship of Peoples	231
8. Contribution of the OUN in the Formation and Expansion of the UPA	266
9. Why We Shall Be Victorious	275
10. Why in Our Struggle We Rely Exclusively on Our Own Strength	281
11. Summing Up of Our National Liberation Struggle	287
12. Perspectives on Our Struggle	296
Glossary	311

Official Announcement*

OSYP DIAKIV-HORNOVY DIES A HERO'S DEATH

THE UKRAINIAN SUPREME LIBERATION COUNCIL, THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALISTS AND THE SUPREME COMMAND OF THE UKRAINIAN INSURGENT ARMY announce to the cadres of the Ukrainian national liberation movement tragic and painful news:

OUR COMRADE-IN-ARMS OF GLORIOUS MEMORY
OSYP DIAKIV-HORNOVY
(ARTEM, A. OSYPENKO, O. HONCHARUK)

Deputy President of the General Secretariat of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council, Member of the Supreme Council of the OUN and Provincial Leader of the OUN of Lviv Province, Captain and Political Educator of the UPA, died on November 28, 1950, in the forest near the village of Velyke Pole, Raion of Ivano-Frankivsk in Lviv Province, the death of a hero in armed encounter with the Russian Bolshevik occupiers.

The late O. Diakiv-Hornovy was born in 1921 to a family of farmers in the village of Olesyn, *Raion* Kozova, *Terнопil Oblast*.

In the early years of his life he fully realized the whole

*In place of a biography.

tragedy of the status of enslavement of the Ukrainian people and firmly espoused the revolutionary road of struggle toward the liberation of Ukraine from the foreign enslavement.

As a student in the *gymnasium* in the city of Berezhany, he joined the ranks of the Youth of the OUN and took active part in all the revolutionary activities of the youth. For these revolutionary activities he was arrested in 1940 by the Bolshevik occupiers, and it was only because of the war and wartime conditions that he missed certain death by escaping from the prison in Berdychiv in July, 1941.

Despite his poor health as a result of being tortured in prison, O. Diakiv immediately after his escape to freedom actively engaged in the revolutionary life of the OUN, working tirelessly and performing various functions and tasks until the end of his life.

In 1941 the late O. Diakiv became a member of the District Center of Propaganda for the Berezhany area; in 1943-44, a member of the Provincial Council of the Youth of the OUN in the Ukrainian lands; a member of the Editorial Board of the review *Yunak* and editor of *Visti* under the pseudonym of "Yuriv"; in 1945-48, a member of the Principal Center of Propaganda under the Supreme Council of the OUN; editor of underground revolutionary reviews, publications, appeals and postcards; in 1948, Provincial Leader of the OUN for Lviv Province; in 1949, a member of the Supreme Council of the OUN in the Ukrainian Lands; and finally, in 1950, a member of the UHVR and Deputy President of the General Secretariat of the UHVR.

Through his many-faceted activities the late O. Diakiv made a great contribution to the Ukrainian National Revolution and to the cause of liberation of the Ukrainian people. For these he was awarded the two highest decorations—the Gold and Silver Crosses of Merit.

Of especial value for the Ukrainian movement were his ideological-political works and articles, which constituted a prime weapon in the struggle against Bolshevism and which made his name famous not only in Ukraine, but also across the frontiers of the USSR. The strength of the arguments expounded in the ideological-political works of the late O.

Diakiv is so evident, logical, and unassailable that it convinces any man of good will, setting him on the side of the Ukrainian liberation movement.

With the death of the late O. Diakiv-Hornovy, the Ukrainian liberation-revolutionary movement has lost not only a talented journalist, a propagator, and a tribune of the ideals of the Ukrainian Revolution, a deep-thinking political leader, a capable organizer, educator, and inspiring mentor, but also a deep friend, a man of sensitive and modest heart, a dedicated and determined person of life-radiating and cheerful disposition.

The glorious figure of the late O. Diakiv-Hornovy, his illustrious name, his revolutionary thoughts and deeds—all will remain forever in our memories and will inspire our hearts with the fire of sacred dedication and will, above all, provide strength in the further struggle for Freedom, for a Ukrainian Independent and Sovereign State.

**ETERNAL GLORY TO THE HERO OF THE UKRAINIAN
NATIONAL REVOLUTION**

**SUPREME COMMAND OF THE UKRAINIAN
INSURGENT ARMY**

**UKRAINIAN SUPREME LIBERATION
COUNCIL**

**SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION
OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALISTS IN
UKRAINIAN LANDS**

**In Ukraine
December, 1952**

Introduction

"Everyone should know the truth about the USSR."

The above statement became the slogan of the dissidents in the USSR, like Solzhenitsyn, Medvedev, Amalrik, and others, who, since the late 1950s, revealed and exposed the horrid crimes committed by the Soviet Russian government upon the citizens of the USSR.

As a consequence of their daring activities, the Iron Curtain, created by Stalin and successfully maintained until his death, was torn down, and a stream of truth about what is really happening inside the USSR began to flow to the West.

As a matter of fact, it was not the dissidents who started revealing the horrors of the Communist regime in the USSR and the bloody crimes committed by the Soviet Russian police, the NKVD, on millions of Soviet citizens. Actually it was one of the closest and most trusted of Stalin's co-workers, Nikita Khrushchev, trying to place all responsibility for all those hideous crimes on Stalin alone, who surprisingly created a frontal attack on Stalin at the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956.

In his speech about "the cult of the individual leader and its harmful consequences," delivered February 25, 1956, Khrushchev produced a long list of Stalin's misdeeds: the creation and application of a bloody terror not only against everyone in the USSR who could be somehow suspected of being a "people's enemy," but also against many leaders of the Soviet Communist Party. In order to support his accusation, Khrushchev presented a long listing of formerly prominent Communist leaders who had fallen victim to Stalin's terror.

True, this was a "secret" speech, delivered at a closed session of the Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. But there is, and was then, no doubt that Khrushchev's attack on Stalin was not motivated by Khrushchev's pity and sympathy for the victims of Stalin's terror. Actually this was nothing more than a tricky tool in his hands by which he could divert the hatred of the oppressed population of the USSR toward Stalin, and establish himself in the public's opinion as a "*tribunus populi*," a protector of individual freedom. For this purpose it was necessary to make a condemnation of Stalin's misdeeds and to prove Khrushchev's own proclaimed struggle for freedom by some acts. Therefore, he ordered many victims of Stalin's terror, held in concentration camps, released, and invited some of them to publish their memoirs and literary works, depicting the horror of Stalin's regime.

This is why one of the "people's enemies," Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, was freed from a concentration camp in Siberia and encouraged by Nikita Khrushchev to publish in both the USSR and abroad his sensational *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. The young and gifted poet, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, who, in Stalin's era, glorified Stalin as the greatest genius and the wisest leader of the world's proletariat, was encouraged by Khrushchev to write new poems condemning Stalin as the worst tyrant and sadist. Solzhenitsyn and Yevtushenko were followed by many others.

But after a few years of "de-Stalinization" Khrushchev's goal was reached: Stalin was definitively removed from his pedestal as a leader of the USSR equal to Lenin, making room for Khrushchev, and was accepted in the world's opinion as the sole perpetrator of the terror and of all the crimes committed by the GPU-NKVD-KGB. There was no need anymore for revealing more of those crimes. Further details would, on the contrary, reveal that not only was Khrushchev Stalin's accomplice, but also that the huge concentration camps continued to exist in the USSR and that the infamous NKVD-KGB continued to persecute "dissidents" in Khrushchev's era, as it did the "people's enemies" in Stalin's. Therefore, the "de-Stalinization" was stopped and, especially when Khrushchev was replaced by Brezhnev and Kosygin, those who performed the "de-Stalinization" were put under growing criticism by the "orthodox Communists." Finally,

the stubborn "de-Stalinizers" came under the "protection of . . . the KGB."

However, what Khrushchev did with his frontal attack on Stalin cracked the dam. It was no longer possible to stop what he started. Neither Khrushchev nor his successors felt strong enough to reapply the total terror. "Everyone should know the truth about the USSR," the stubborn dissidents continued to profess and, when they were forbidden to do so by the government, they continued to do it secretly—by sending their writings to be published abroad, and by publishing the underground journal *Chronicle of Current Events*. Thus the book *Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?* by Andrey Amalrik, strongly critical of the USSR and of Soviet society, and in 1973, Solzhenitsyn's *The Gulag Archipelago*, were published in the West.

Nevertheless, all that had been revealed by Khrushchev and all the Russian dissidents is not the entire truth.

Khrushchev revealed only the wrongdoings of Stalin to the leading members of the Soviet Communist Party: "the practice of mass repressions through the state apparatus . . . first against the enemies of Leninism—Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, long since politically defeated by the Party—and subsequently also against many honest Communists." The Russian dissidents added thousands of Russian people who were not members of the Soviet Communist Party to the list.

However, neither Khrushchev nor the Russian dissidents revealed and exposed the horror of the Soviet Russian terror and oppression of the non-Russian nations forcibly included into the "USSR": Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, and many others. The members of non-Russian nations have been mentioned by Russian dissidents only as individuals they personally met in concentration camps. Only individual terror, the persecution of individuals, has been exposed. The ugly oppression of the non-Russian nations, the genocide, remains unexposed.

Therefore, everyone who wants to know the entire truth about the USSR, who wants to see the USSR totally unmasked, must become familiar with the non-Russian underground writings as well. Only here, in these writings, will one find the exposure of yet another category of brutal

crimes against humanity committed by the Soviet Russian government—the national persecutions, the oppression of the captive nations, the most brutal persecution of individuals because of their nationality. Only here will one learn that in the USSR there are two categories of dissidents: one, the real dissidents, the Russians, who disagree only with the form of the regime and expose the outgrowths of totalitarian and terroristic Communism, or, officially, the socialistic system; the other, the nationalistic freedom fighters who expose the “Red Russian” chauvinism and imperialism, which surpass the historical “White Russian” chauvinism and imperialism of the late Czarist Russia in their aggressive hostility toward the captive nations.

There is also a substantial difference in what they are struggling for. The Russian dissidents do struggle for individual freedom and for the moral revival of man in Russia. “It is, finally, time to call a lie a lie, oppression oppression, and tyranny tyranny,” declares a leading Russian dissident, Vladimir Maksimov. “But,” he continues, “we categorically refuse all kinds of political extremism and do advocate moral extremism. We are opposed to war and wish only to struggle morally. We are against any revolution in principle, but are prepared to take an active part in a moral revolution.” The other group, the national freedom fighters, advocate and struggle for the dismemberment of the USSR, for the liberation and reestablishment of freedom and the independence of all captive nations now forcibly included in the USSR. In order to achieve this goal, they are prepared to accept and apply any means: peaceful struggle, political revolution, or even war. The activities of Russian dissidents began after Stalin’s death. The activities of the nationalistic fighters started at the very beginning of the Soviet Russian “protection” of their nation.

It was through ignorance that both groups were placed under the same label of dissidents by the West.

This is why we call the writings of O. Diakiv-Hornovy, who represents the group of non-Russian national freedom fighters, an indispensable companion to Solzhenitsyn’s *The Gulag Archipelago* and to the writings of all other Russian dissidents.

O. Diakiv-Hornovy’s biography was given in the Official

Communique about his death, issued by the highest command of the Ukrainian Resistance, which preceded this introduction, and in Vasyl Diakiv's, his father's, memoirs, as included in this publication. Therefore, here we merely summarize it: Osy Diakiv (pronounced Dyá-keev), born June 21, 1921 in Western Ukraine, occupied in 1919 by Poland, joined the Ukrainian resistance when still in high school and fought against the Polish invaders. In 1939-41 he fought against the Soviet Russian invaders, in 1941-44 against Nazi Germany, and from 1944 again against the Soviet Russian "liberators," until November, 1950, when he fell in battle with the armed forces of the KGB.

O. Diakiv, known as a member of the Ukrainian resistance under the pseudonym of Hornovy (pronounced Hornovay) was active as a prominent member of the Ukrainian liberation movement, the OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists), as a commissioned officer of the UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army), and as a member of the UHVR (Ukrainian Liberation Council, the revolutionary government of the Ukrainian nation) as well. But the most important contribution he made to the cause of Ukraine's liberation were his political writings, published and distributed all over Ukraine by the underground network.

During the German occupation it was necessary to explain that under no circumstances could Ukrainians expect sincere support from Nazi Germany for the reestablishment of Ukraine's independence, since, according to Hitler's plans, Ukraine was to be made a German colony. After the German retreat it was necessary to alarm all Ukrainians that the Soviets were not at all the liberators they pretended to be, but only the new invaders who desired to replace the Nazi Germans in the capture and colonial exploitation of Ukraine and the Ukrainian people. In the total war raging in Ukraine and for Ukraine, the political and ideological struggle was of the utmost importance.

This is what O. Diakiv-Hornovy, the prominent champion of the Ukrainian national idea, did: he authored political writings.

In his *USSR-The Land of the Most Brutal Oppression of People and Exploitation of Workers*, Hornovy reveals how the Russian Bolsheviks started, in October, 1917, the extremely

bloody revolution in Russia with slogans and solemn promises to build a Communist "paradise for all working men," and then built a perfect inferno. He recollects how Lenin officially, as the leader of the "proletarian revolution," promised to respect the right of any nation to be sovereign and independent, then immediately after sent the Red Russian armies into Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, Byelorussia, and all other non-Russian territories of the just-dissolved Czarist Russian Empire in order to drown their reestablished national independence in streams of blood and, with the bayonets of Russian soldiers, to force them back into the Russian prison of nations, now called the USSR, and to impose upon them the Russian system of Communism. He calls to memory how the Russian Bolsheviks perfidiously lulled the population of the occupied Ukraine with the "Ukrainization" and the NEP (New Economic Policy), and then, by a police action "against the nationalistic elements," executed thousands of prominent Ukrainian writers, scientists, artists, scholars, and politicians. By an artificially created famine in 1930-31, at least six million Ukrainian peasants, who refused to join the "collective farms," were allowed to die. Hornovy brings to attention the scorn of democracy by the USSR, where "the most democratic elections" are regularly held with only one list of candidates, prepared by the Committee of the Communist party, where there exists only a Communist press, radio and television, carefully controlled by the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the KGB, and where everyone who dares to somehow express a critical view immediately will find himself in the "kingdom" of the KGB, in a concentration camp, or at least in an institution for the mentally insane. Finally, he exposes the most brutal exploitation of all workers in the USSR by a "new class" of Communist Russian lords.

The scorn of the freedom of the press has been exposed by Hornovy especially in his *On the Freedom of Press in the USSR*.

In his *Chauvinistic Frenzy and Russification Fever of the Bolshevik Imperialists*, Hornovy reveals the fact that the Russian Communists are actually stronger Russian chauvinists and more persevering Russifiers than the Czarist Russian "*bourgeoisie*" had been. Under the slogan of

internationalism the Russian Communists bring the extermination of all captured nations, melting them consequently into one Russian nation.

In the critical years of the war with Hitler's Germany and after, the government of the USSR repeatedly declared its "sincere will" to peacefully coexist with all nations of the world, socialistic as well as capitalistic, and to adopt real democracy with an unqualified respect for human rights and the freedom of all its citizens. However, all those bombastic declarations were nothing more than propagandistic tricks aimed at confusing and duping the capitalistic world whose economic and political support the USSR badly needs. Actually, concludes Hornovy in his article *On the Bolshevistic Ideological Front*, in the USSR there has not been the slightest change in the Soviet Russian attitude toward "world revolution," and in the oppressive system of its Communist government.

Russian chauvinism and russification did not at all subside. On the contrary, it has increased enormously. The intensified russification, camouflaged with the slogan of "internationalization," became the basic principle of the national policy of Soviet Russian government in occupied Ukraine.

The Scourge of the 20th Century is not only a documentary report about the ruthless genocide systematically committed on the Ukrainian nation by the Red Russian government since the "liberation" of Ukraine by the Red Army in 1944. It also is an extremely serious indictment of the governments of Western nations, and especially of the USA, who stubbornly ignore the reports about the hideous crimes committed by the NKVD-KGB in Ukraine, and instead did and do continue to give the USSR an unqualified support for the consolidation of the Russian occupation of Ukraine and of other nations of eastern and central Europe. Finally, it is also an urgent appeal of the brutally oppressed people to the conscience of all freedom-loving people as well.

In six articles dealing with the national resistance in Ukraine against the Soviet Russian invaders, Hornovy analyzes and explains all aspects of this gigantic "David against Goliath" struggle. Here we learn to understand the structure of the Ukrainian resistance: the Ukrainian Insur-

gent Army, or UPA; the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, or OUN; the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council, or UHVR; and the ideological, political and structural interrelation of these three bodies of the same liberation movement. The reader of these articles learns to see how and why the political and social ideas as a weapon are so important not only for OUN and UHVR but also for the military formation, UPA.

According to Soviet Russian propaganda, the USSR has been the liberator of enslaved nations and "working classes," and the Ukrainian nationalists are "Nazi collaborators," "Fascists" and "cruel enemies of the Ukrainian people." Osyk Diakiv-Hornovy, one of the leaders of the Ukrainian nationalists who voluntarily dedicated and sacrificed his life to fight the Nazi German and Soviet Russian invaders, reveals that reality is precisely contrary to what the Communist propaganda insists. Actually, it is Soviet Russia who enslaves and oppresses many non-Russian nations and the peoples of the occupied countries, committing a deliberate genocide; and the Ukrainian nationalists, the members of UPA-OUN-UHVR, sacrificing their lives, are fighting against the invaders for freedom for Ukraine and for other oppressed nations, and for freedom and prosperity of all individuals.

Of special value is the article *Attitude of the Ukrainian Resistance Toward the Russian People*. It was checked and approved by the leadership of the Ukrainian resistance and published in its bulletin; therefore it really reflects the title of the article.

The Bolsheviks picture the Ukrainian nationalists as extreme russophobes who hate everyone Russian and plan to destroy Russia and to exterminate all Russians. In Hornovy's article we find no sign of a national hatred. On the contrary, the Ukrainian nationalists acknowledge that the Russians have the same right to be free and independent as do all other peoples in the world. What the Ukrainian nationalists swear to destroy is the Russian colonial empire, the Russian prison of nations, the Russian enslavement of non-Russian peoples. The Russian state must include only the ethnic Russian territories. What the Ukrainian nationalists demand is: "Russians, go home!" "Russians, hands off Ukraine!"

A prominent American journalist, a retired teacher of European history at American universities, after reading the manuscript of this book wrote to me:

"The account of conditions in the USSR by the martyred Diakiv-Hornovy would have hit with terrific impact 25 years ago—at a time when the United States was at dagger's point with Stalin. It is excellently written. Hornovy's writings have a blow and an impact that is beyond criticism.

"But American readers are going to demand that you relate all this to the situation today. And today . . . the mere passage of years has made an entirely intolerable and vicious regime reconcilable to a valiant but conquered group. The elder generation fought like heroes and in dying hoped that their children would avenge their sires. But the children, desiring only quiet, accepted what their fathers fought, hoping, perhaps, that intrigue and persuasion would soften what their elders had considered an intolerable yoke."

Is this opinion correct?

Not at all. This is exactly what Americans used to say in 1944-45 to Ukrainians who warned them that Stalin was a moral twin brother of Hitler and Soviet Russia a twin sister of Nazi Germany. "Soviet Russia is now a democratic country," the Americans insisted. "There is now freedom of religion and freedom of press. The government and all its officials respect the civil rights of all Soviet citizens. Stalin himself proved his respect to national freedom by making Ukraine and Byelorus (Whiterussia) members of the UNO." But the reader will find the account of the real situation in post-war USSR in this firsthand report by Diakiv-Hornovy.

It was said that after Stalin's death, those advertised radical changes for better really did take place in the USSR. Well, no doubt that many changes came in the last 30 years since 1945. The government of USSR, and especially KGB, changed their methods of persecution. The simple execution by shooting has been replaced by a poisonous injection in a psychiatric institution, and the freedom fighters changed their methods of resistance. However, the brutal persecutions and the adamant resistance continue. So, for instance, the

Ukrainian underground paper *Ukrainian Herald* reported these arrests and trials of Ukrainian intellectuals during the first two years of the 1970s:

Yuriy Shukhevych, freed in 1968 after twenty years of imprisonment, was arrested once more and sentenced to an additional fifteen years in prison, concentration camps, and exile in Siberia.

Valentyn Moroz, the university professor, writer, was sentenced to fourteen years.

Viacheslav Chornovil, a journalist, author of *Chornovil Papers* published in the West, was sentenced to twelve years.

Ivan Dziuba, literary critic, author of *Internationalism or Russification?*—five years.

Ivan Svitlychny, writer and literary critic—twelve years.

Ihor Kalynets, writer—twelve years.

Mrs. Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets, poetess—twelve years.

Mrs. Nina Strokata-Karavanska, microbiologist, writer—twenty-five years.

Mrs. N. Svitlychna, scientist—four years.

Mrs. Iryna Senyk, artist—eleven years.

Mrs. Stefania Shabatura, artist—eight years.

Euhen Sverstiuk, literary critic—twelve years.

Prof. Leonid Plushch, scientist—life imprisonment in a psychiatric institution.

Mychajlo Osadchy, university professor, writer—ten years.

Oleksander Serhienko, teacher and writer—ten years.

Ivan Kovalenko, teacher—ten years.

Zinoviy Antoniuk, philologist—ten years.

Vasyl Stus, poet and literary critic—eight years.

In all, more than one hundred persons were arrested in 1971-72 and held in prisons for trials.

This is the account of nationally known, leading Ukrainian intellectuals. The number of all Ukrainian "dissidents" held in Soviet Russian prisons and concentration camps today is in the tens of thousands.

This is the real situation in Ukraine today which categorically denies the opinion that "the children, desiring only quiet, accepted what their fathers fought." Actually, the

present generation of Ukrainians refuses to accept the Russian occupation of Ukraine, as their fathers did. Therefore, Hornovy's writing presents a documentary account of the situation in occupied Ukraine in 1944-1950, and reflects the essence and the problems of national resistance in Ukraine today as well.

The present leadership of Soviet Russia has no illusion that the Ukrainian resistance in 1944-1950 is now nothing more than a forgotten episode of history and that the children of the members of the Ukrainian resistance of the above period "desiring only quiet, accepted what their fathers fought." Therefore, Soviet Russian propaganda neither stopped nor even slowed down its vicious attacks in the press, in literature, in radio and movies against the Ukrainian nationalists. Therefore, Yuriy Shukhevych, son of the late Commander-in-Chief of UPA, Roman Shukhevych-Chuprynka, after serving twenty years in Russian concentration camps and twenty-two years after his father's death, was again arrested in March, 1972 and asked to publicly deplore activities of his father and to condemn Ukrainian Nationalism. When he stubbornly refused, he was for the third time sentenced to ten years in hard prison and concentration camp and five years in exile in Siberia. This is, too, why the leadership of Soviet Russia sent into exile to the West more than a dozen Russian dissidents but not one member of the Ukrainian national resistance. The Soviet Russian leaders realize extremely clearly that Russian dissidents cause trouble only to the leadership of the Russian Communist Party, and the Ukrainian freedom fighters endanger the very existence of the Russian colonial empire.

So we conclude, Osyp Diakiv-Hornovy's writings, presented in this collection as a documentary account of events in Ukraine in 1944-1950, have a special value for one who is interested in the history of Eastern Europe of that period. They reveal how Ukraine, an East-European nation with population of over 40 million (in 1944) was "liberated" by the Red Russian army and NKVD-KGB and how the colonial system called the "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic" was reimposed there. But at the same time these writings do reveal the roots, the essence, and the aim of struggles of present Ukrainian resistance in the USSR. Because of this, this

collection is an indispensable companion to the writings of Solzhenitsyn and of other Russian dissidents for everyone who desires to see the USSR totally unmasked and to know the whole truth about the USSR.

Dr. Petro Mirchuk

My Memories of Osyp Diakiv-Hornovy

by Vasyl Diakiv



Early Youth

Osyp Diakiv-Hornovy was my son.

My wife, Justina, nee Kornyk, gave birth to him on June 21, 1921, in the village of Olesyn, Berezhany County, in Western Ukraine. He was our first child, for we had got married the year before (September 20, 1920) after my return from the war, in which I had fought for a number of years. First I had served with the 7th Regiment of *uhlans*, stationed in Berezhany (the Austrian army); then I had joined the Ukrainian Galician Army (UHA), participating in a series of combat campaigns with its 3rd Berezhany Brigade.

Six years later we were blessed with a daughter, Anna, only to lose her at seven years of age, in 1934, from meningitis. Osyp, then only thirteen, felt her loss very deeply; they had been very attached to each other.

Osyp was our only child thereafter. From the early years of his childhood, and especially after the death of his sister, he displayed a strong inclination for solitude. He communed with nature. As a child, and especially in the summer, Osyp spent many hours in the orchard, sitting and meditating on

a bench under a large guelder-rose tree. He listened to the birds and their songs, losing himself in wondrous childhood reveries. At dawn, in summertime, he rose early to watch the sunrise in awed contemplation.

When he was only five years old, Osyp learned to read and write, thanks to a neighbor's older daughter, who, at the time, was in the third grade in school. We did not learn about this accomplishment from Osyp himself.

One day, when my wife was away, we were paid a visit by an inspector from the county cooperative office with which I was connected. When I went to the kitchen to prepare a cup of tea for our guest, Osyp approached the inspector and began talking with him. A few minutes later I heard the inspector call.

"Mr. Diakiv, would you come here, please?"

Leaving the tea kettle, I joined the inspector in the living room. He looked at me strangely.

"What are you trying to do?" he sputtered suddenly. "Do you want to spoil your child? Why do you teach him to read at this early age? It is absolutely premature to teach a child of five years to read. It may prove detrimental to the child's natural mental development. . ."

To my astonishment, the inspector proceeded to tell me that when Osyp had entered the living room, he, the inspector, had wanted to treat Osyp with candy. My son, however, disregarded the candy and, instead, ran to the table and picked up the newspaper lying there. The inspector saw the child's lips move.

"Do you know how to read?" he asked Osyp.

"A little," was the answer.

The inspector had then pointed to the paper and asked,

"What does this big line say?"

"Far-mers E-co-no-mic Week-ly," replied Osyp, slowly pronouncing each syllable. It was then that the inspector, in a state approaching alarm, had called me.

Unfortunately, I was innocent of the charge. As was true of so many other families, we had little time to devote to our child. Upon my return from the war, which had claimed almost six years of my life, I found our village, including our house, wholly destroyed. The fields around the village were gutted with trenches and blighted with barbed wire. There

were no horses and no farm implements. We had to start again at the beginning. Moreover, we also had to devote a great deal of time to our community and our cultural life, a task that fell squarely on the shoulders of the veterans of the Ukrainian armies.

Toiling manually in the field and spiritually with the survivors in order to rebuild our lives, we were only too grateful that Grandmother was there to help look after Osyp. It was only on Sundays that we were truly together as a family.

I dismissed, of course, the inspector's concern about Osyp's precocity. But to this day I thank him just the same, for at that moment a great resolve took shape in my mind, namely, to make every effort to help our only offspring acquire a higher education. This resolve lightened, as I look back, the tasks confronting my wife and me.

In the school year of 1927-28, Osyp entered the grade school in our village. From what I could see, his premature acquaintance with reading and writing harmed him not at all. At that time, for reasons of expedience, the decision was made to merge the first and second grades. Osyp subsequently sailed into the third grade, and then through the fourth. School regulations now held him up: since a child had to spend four school years in grade school, Osyp found himself in the fourth grade for two years. But this, too, was not harmful. Osyp took the opportunity to prepare himself well for his entrance examination to the *gymnasium* in Berezhany.

From 1931 to 1939 Osyp attended the state *gymnasium* in Berezhany, attaining the grade of excellence in all his studies, and at every teacher-parent conference he was praised by his teachers.

His attainment in 1939 of the "certificate of maturity" from the *gymnasium* with honors and distinction was an occasion for elation on the part of our family, extending in this regard even to distant relatives.

Despite Osyp's early inclination to solitude, he did not hold himself aloof in these years. On the contrary, he not only had many friends, but also, even then, exhibited leadership qualities. During his summer vacations, spent in our village, I saw him assume the role of leader in play with his

schoolmates. The game was always an "army game," in the course of which Ukrainian army commands were constantly on the youths' lips. This was nothing strange, of course; the memory of the short-lived Ukrainian Independence was still very fresh in people's minds. Moreover, many a parent had served one time or another in the Ukrainian army; these were sure to pass on their experiences to their children.

Osyp blossomed into a good speaker, enchanting with his gifts of colloquy not only his contemporaries but older villagers as well. Yet he was humble in his bearing. He never talked down to people, nor was he too quick to answer the many questions people directed to him. He tried to express himself precisely yet simply so that everyone, even the village people not versed in political affairs of the time, could understand this meaning.

During his junior year in the *gymnasium*, Osyp, encouraged by the teacher of the Ukrainian language, developed an abiding interest in Ukrainian folk songs, fables, narrations, stories, popular beliefs, and customs. He put into writing many personal accounts of the Ukrainian liberation war readily given him by those who had fought and lived through it. By 1939 he already had collected in Olesyn three thick stacks of manuscript which he wanted to see published in three volumes. But the outbreak of war in 1939 checked this project; and Fate soon doomed it.

In 1944, during the German occupation, a "special" German army formation soon became known throughout the area for its brutality. The members of this unit mercilessly pillaged the households of the villagers, whom they scornfully called "bandits" and "partisans." They constantly conducted searches for arms and underground literature. It was in the course of one of these searches that the Germans found Osyp's collection hidden in our barn. Because I was actively combating the Gestapo, I was not at home. As a result, my wife, who tried to save her son's writings, was brutally beaten by a German "culture-bearer" (*kulturträger*). They finished by burning the barn.

Osyp possessed another outstanding trait in his make-up which greatly affected both his behavior and his world outlook. This was his profound respect for the dignity of man regardless of his social or ethnic origin.

I remember an altercation I had with our handyman. Irritated as I was by some difficulties in our cooperative store, I berated him at supper for something he had neglected to do. His face flushed, the handyman jumped up and left the room without finishing his supper. Osyp, who had been reading a book, looked up after a while and gently said:

"Father, you shouldn't let yourself go like that. It's not good for you to berate a servant simply because you are master in your home. Suppose the situation had been reversed. After all, he also is a human being. If he failed to do something, he will make up for it another time. I think more can be accomplished with a good word rather than verbal abuse and vituperation."

He added that he was sorry for rebuking me, but that he felt it his duty to speak up in defense of human dignity.

In my own heart I knew I was wrong and my son was right.

At the time Osyp was in his school years, Western Ukraine was caught up by an all-national revolutionary élan, sweeping along with it hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian youth. Students of both sexes, especially those at the *gymnasium* and university levels, joined the Ukrainian underground organization. Fired by youthful romanticism and genuine patriotism, they wanted to be trained physically and to be psychologically and intellectually prepared for the coming struggle for a free and independent Ukraine. They managed this with astonishing secrecy.

Indeed, it was only much later that I found out that our son Osyp, as a mere 13-year-old, had joined the junior cadres of the OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists). It was on behalf of the OUN that young Osyp organized soccer teams in Olesyn and in the neighboring villages. The teams competed on an organized basis leading to a championship, but the sport was only a cover for the extensive political and ideological training these youths were undergoing in these sports clubs. In addition to practice that made them physically fit, these peasant boys attended clandestine and semi-clandestine lectures and information talks on a variety of themes, mainly on Ukrainian history and literature.

World War II spread to Ukraine almost immediately after the outbreak of the German-Soviet war in June, 1941. At

that time there were several thousand well-trained and nationally conscious Ukrainian youth who soon swelled the ranks of the OUN and the UPA.

I found out about Osyp's OUN membership quite accidentally. When he was in the sixth class in the *gymnasium* in Berezhany, I visited him. He took me to the "students' reading room," of which he was president. He went to his desk, disclosed a false bottom, and took out a batch of what he identified as "underground literature" and handed it to me. I was shocked. How dangerous it was for him to be playing with such stuff!

"Couldn't you have waited with this until you had your *matura* (certificate of maturity, or final diploma)?" I asked him.

"Don't worry, Father, everything will be fine," he replied.

He asked me to take the "underground literature" package home and hide it until he came back for his summer vacation.

Arrest by the NKVD

Osyp was arrested for the first time during the Soviet Russian occupation of Western Ukraine, when he already was at Lviv University as a student in the faculty of Ukrainian language and literature. The arrest took place on September 20, 1940, in the student dormitory on Copernicus Street in Lviv.

My wife and I had no knowledge of Osyp's arrest by the NKVD. I am neither a superstitious nor a clairvoyant man, but during the night of September 22, 1940, I was awakened by a strange and terrifying dream. In it I was running desperately from the pursuing NKVD, and there was no place to hide. I awoke in a sweat. I went outside, smoked several cigarettes, and then climbed up the haystack, where I finally fell asleep. At dawn, the dream became a nightmare: I was in the hands of the NKVD.

I went to the barn where my wife already was milking the cows. She, too, looked perturbed, saying she could not get our son out of her mind.

"I think you must go to Lviv, and find out how our son is faring," she said. "I am terribly afraid for him."

At this very time I was having these macabre dreams about our son, he was only five kilometers from us, being transported by the NKVD through Berezhany to the prison in Ternopil.

I agreed with my wife that I had to go to Lviv to visit Osyp. The railroad connecting Berezhany and Lviv was shut down, the Soviet government having decided to replace the existing rails with wide-gauge ones, so as to integrate the line with the railroad system of the USSR. The only way to get to Lviv was by bus. Hence, by horsedrawn cart, I got to Berezhany.

At the bus ticket window I was told that in order to purchase a ticket to Lviv, I had to have an official "commandeering order." So much for the bus.

I went to the *rynok* (city hall square), where I saw several trucks parked, their chauffeurs Red Army men. I spotted a young man who was lounging around his truck, who looked at me and smiled in friendly fashion. He turned out to be a Ukrainian and he was soon leaving for Lviv.

Soon we were going through the town of Pomorany and the city of Zolochiv and rolling into Lviv's suburb of Lychakiv, where I caught a streetcar that took me to Copernicus Street.

In the office of the student house where Osyp was living, I asked to see my son. The woman secretary looked sternly at me, and tersely told me to go to Room 65 on the second floor. This was the room in which I knew our son lived with a few roommates. The roommates could only tell me they had last seen Osyp on Tuesday. I gave the students all the foodstuffs I had brought for Osyp and waited all night in the room in the vain hope he would come back.

In the morning there was no other helpful source I could think of. Everyone seemed to be reluctant to speak to me. I went back to Lychakiv, where the Soviet army truck had brought me. There I found another army truck, but the driver was heading for the city of Ternopil, some 35 kilometers from my village. This time I had to pay. The price was 10 *karbovanets* (this illegal trafficking of civilian personnel by the Soviet army seemed to be widely practiced). There was a

woman passenger whom the driver seated beside him in the front, while I was told to climb on in the back. No sooner had we left Lviv than I noticed that there were two young boys in the corner, covered with tarpaulin. By the look of their dress I saw at once that they were not from Western Ukraine. Shortly, they told me that they were both 16-year-old Ukrainian boys from the Zhytomyr area who had been conscripted to work on the fortification of the new German-Soviet frontier. They had run away. The driver had consented to take them back to Zhytomyr free of charge.

In Zolochiv the boys, now hungry, wanted to buy some bread but the innkeeper would not sell them bread unless they also bought whiskey (*horilka*). Since they did not have enough money for the liquor, they went breadless.

I shared with them the food I had left. They enjoyed, I recall, my wife's cake. They enjoyed it so much they said, "You must be a bourgeois, since you have such tasty food."

"By no means. I am a farmer," I replied. "The cakes were prepared by my wife for our son who is at Lviv University, but I was not able to see him. He has disappeared."

I further explained to the boys how the Ukrainians had lived under Polish rule before Western Ukraine was seized by the Soviet troops.

"We had been persecuted by the Polish government," I stated, "but we did have our farms, businesses, and private enterprises."

"You see," said the first boy to his friend, "they were slaves of 'nobility-minded' Poland. They were persecuted, beaten, starved, and forced to perform slavery for their masters. But yet, after all this, they wear good boots, eat tasty cakes, and are able to send their sons to university. But now, when they have to taste a little bit of Socialism, they will not see good boots and tasty cakes . . .

"And they no longer will see these well-bred cows we have seen. Oh, if my mother saw these cows, she would have fainted from jealousy. Our cows that roam famished through Socialist pastures are true monsters, barely standing on their feet."

"You are surprised," continued the second boy, directly addressing me, "that your son has disappeared? Your son is one of thousands at universities who have vanished without

a trace. Above all, beware of the NKVD, of which we speak: 'Ne Znayesh Koly Verneshsia Dodomu.' " (The initials are of the Ukrainian phrase: You don't know when you will return home.)

I was taken with the maturity of those two teenagers who talked like grown men.

We arrived in Ternopil. Parting with the driver and the two boys, I caught a ride back home, entertaining the hope that I would find Osyp, that he had left Lviv to visit us.

Osyp was not at home. We now knew for certain that he had been arrested. As we found out later, he was arrested by the Berezhany NKVD in the students' home in Lviv; not directly, of course. He was flushed outside by an informer, and then was driven in an NKVD car to NKVD headquarters in Berezhany, and finally transferred to the NKVD prison in Ternopil.

I decided to return to Lviv to search for our son. This time I got a bus ticket in the town of Kozova through a friend who furnished me with an official travel order.

On the bus I met a Ukrainian student who lived in the same students' home as my son. Osyp, he said, had been summoned by a student by the name of Nartiuk, who hailed from the Eastern Ukrainian lands and who was suspected of being an NKVD *sek-sot* (informer or secret agent). This student advised me to contact Nartiuk and ask him what had happened to Osyp.

In Lviv, Osyp's student friend took me to the university, pointed out Nartiuk, and swiftly disappeared. I approached Nartiuk.

"Are you comrade Nartiuk?" I asked.

"Yes, I am. What do you want?" he replied.

"My son was living in the students' quarters on Copernicus Street while attending university courses. Last Tuesday you called on him in his room and he joined you. Since then no one has seen him. I am his father and have a right to ask what has happened to him."

Nartiuk was silent as we descended the stairs. He met a girl student, took her aside, whispered something into her ear, and came back to me.

"Tell me just what you want from me," he muttered.

"The whereabouts of my son," I replied.

Nartiuk looked at me dimly, and said, "Yes, I went to his room to notify him he was wanted at the university. We walked together to the gate, and then he went his way and I went mine. Perhaps he is having a good time or he has joined the hooligans."

This was too much for me to take.

"Don't talk nonsense and don't act the fool," I exploded. "Tell me what happened to my son."

"I don't know what happened to him. Perhaps you should go to the headquarters of the militia, and they can tell you."

Later on, Osyp told me that Nartiuk had come to his room and told him he was wanted at the university office. They both went as far as the gate, where Osyp was grabbed by the NKVD men. He was handcuffed, thrust into a police car, and driven away. Nartiuk was an eyewitness to all this.

I looked up Osyp's friend whom I had met on the bus, and together we went to the headquarters of the militia. At the gate was a guard. When he left his post for a few minutes, I entered a long corridor of the building and opened the first door to the right. I saw a man lying on the floor, covered with blood. Over him were three people, pouring water on him. One of the inquisitors spotted me and shouted obscene Russian words at me. I ran out as fast as I could and into the militiaman, who was terrified at having allowed me to slip by his post. Apparently a local Ukrainian, he asked me what I wanted. When I told him the purpose of my quest, he brought me to a waiting room where I repeated my story to a militia officer. He told me that the militia commandant was due to arrive soon, and that he would ask him the whereabouts of my son.

In a few minutes a leather-jacketed officer entered. When the militiaman told the officer about me, he said in Russian, "Tell him to go to the investigating officer."

The militiaman, a Ukrainian, translated his remarks to me, and motioned me to follow him to the first floor.

But the investigating officer was not much help, either. He looked into a thick register and declared that it contained no "Diakiv."

I went outside where Osyp's friend was waiting for me. He proved a great help to me since I didn't know Lviv at all.

We visited the *oblast* District Attorney's office and the *oblast* NKVD headquarters. There I was told to go to the *oblast* headquarters of the militia; an NKVD official promised to telephone there to aid me in my quest.

At the entrance to the militia headquarters, a young militiaman, a Ukrainian, warned me, "Citizen, I would not advise you to go in; only an old lady might venture to go in."

But I insisted, as I was so anxious to find out about Osyp.

"If you wish, but remember what I said."

I went inside nevertheless. The corridor was covered with a thick rug. I passed by about eight rooms, of which five had their doors open. All the rooms were exquisitely furnished: the well-fed and well-dressed NKVD officers were sitting at their desks. I entered a waiting room and sat down in a soft armchair. An elderly woman was sitting in another soft armchair. In the next room sounded the laughter of a woman. A little while thereafter, a young woman with heavy makeup came out. An NKVD officer appeared in the door and called in the elderly woman. In a moment I heard her screaming behind the closed door, and then the woman emerged with tears in her eyes. The NKVD followed and, without asking me in, shouted in Russian, "What do you want here?"

I told him my story, being sure to mention that I had been directed by the *oblast* NKVD office and that I had been told that his headquarters would surely know the whereabouts of my son. But he continued to rant, "Beat it, you nationalist scum! If you were not so stupid, I would order you to the cellar and do you over. Out!"

Outside, the friendly guard asked me how I made out, and then commented that I should consider myself lucky that my visit merely ended with my being ejected. Many people, he added, never came out of the building.

We also visited four city hospitals, including a Jewish one, looking for Osyp. A man in the streetcar advised us to visit State Attorney Prokopenko, who represented the Attorney General's office of the Ukrainian SSR in Lviv, and Professor Kyrylo Studynsky, a deputy to the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

In the office of Attorney Prokopenko I found a mob of

some two hundred persons who were waiting for an "audience." When Prokopenko finally arrived at the office, he told the people to form a line, and said he would see each of them. Somehow I found myself second in line.

When I entered his office, he was sitting behind a desk, cleaning his fingernails. After hearing my story, he said, "So you don't know where your son is. So I don't know, either. There are now two of us who don't know where he is. Good-bye."

My "audience" with Deputy Studynsky was even shorter. "Aha, the nationalist! What he wanted he has gotten! You may come in a month; perhaps I might do something about him."

"But you don't even know for whom you would have to ask," I said.

"It's not necessary. If I learn something in a month, I will let you know."

After this last "audience," I realized the hopelessness of my search for my son. I returned to the students' home to pick up Osyp's personal effects. But a Jewish student, in charge of the room in which Osyp lived, stated that Osyp most probably had been arrested and that his effects would be impounded. He advised me to go to the rector of the university for permission to take my son's belongings. But the rector refused it. Upon my return to the students' home and in the absence of the room leader, I proposed to exchange some of the new clothing of my son for old clothes of the students. This offer was gladly accepted.

Some agonizing weeks passed. One day I was visited by the secretary of the local village council. He wordlessly handed me a note. The note was terse:

"I am in the prison in Ternopil. I am well. Osyp."

The village official then handed me another note, which said in Russian that I had to report to "NKVD Investigating Officer Galagin, NKVD headquarters, Room 21, in Ternopil."

As fast as we could, my wife and I rushed to Ternopil, bringing some clothing which we knew Osyp would need. Already there were four Olesyn boys in the Ternopil prison, and we knew that packages were being accepted by the prison guards for the arrested persons. As a rule, these packages consisted of clothing, shirts, underwear, and bedding.

Food was not allowed.

In Ternopil we reported to the office where packages were deposited for the inmates. There was a great crowd of people, and we had to stand in a long line. When our turn came and we faced a stern-looking NKVD guard, I stated that my package was for Osep Diakiv. The guard looked at some paper on his desk and curtly replied, "I don't accept it."

"Why? Comrade, please tell me. Perhaps he is not here?" I pleaded.

"He is here all right. The devil has not taken him away. But I will not accept the package. Period."

We left the "collecting point" and went out into street. My wife suggested that perhaps the note from the NKVD would help in forwarding the package to our son. We debated and talked: perhaps the NKVD business was a trick? But we had to act, and I showed the note to a passing NKVD guard:

"Comrade, I received this note, but truly I don't know what this is all about."

The NKVD man, reading the note, said, "Don't you understand? You are summoned to the NKVD. What business do you have with the NKVD?"

"Nothing, or at least, I don't know," I replied.

"What do you mean, 'I don't know'? Then why are you summoned to the NKVD?"

"Our son has been arrested," I admitted.

"Aha, your son has been arrested. In that case, you must go to the office for a pass, which you'll get when you show your summons."

I was apprehensive about what I was getting into, but my love for my son prevailed. I went inside the building.

They asked for my passport, but we hadn't gotten our passports in time, so I showed them my Soviet military discharge papers with my photographs. They promptly took these from me, gave me a pass, and told me to wait. I went out to the street and whispered to my wife that if I did not come out within an hour or two, she should go home at once. Alarmed, she began to cry and begged me not to go back.

"It's too late now," I told her. "They have taken my military papers, and they will know that I was here, and therefore I must return."

I went up the stairs. At the beginning of the corridor

there stood two guards with fixed bayonets. I showed them my pass. One of them tried to use the telephone on the wall but could not get any connection. Another military man came out, and said loudly in Russian, "My telephone is not working."

Turning to me, he asked, "Are you Diakiv?"

"Yes," I answered in Ukrainian.

"Your son is in this prison?"

"Yes. He is here."

"Did you look for him in Lviv?"

"Indeed, I did."

"But he is with us, in jail."

"I know that, and therefore I came here to see him," I replied.

"As I understand, he is the only son you have, and there is a great father-son bond between you?"

"Of course. He is our only son."

"I understand it well. I also have only one daughter, and I would give everything to save her. Therefore, I suggested to your son that he write to you. Evidently you received his note and were not afraid to come here."

"Why should I be afraid? I have committed no crime, nor have I done any harm to anyone. Why should I be afraid?"

"Quite right, we know all this, and we feel sorry for you. We also feel sorry for your son. He is an intelligent boy. I have been telling him that he should confess everything and then he could have a good life ahead for him. You should realize that he is very young and that he has to continue his studies, because he is a very talented young man. You would not have to pay for his studies, as was the case in bourgeois Poland. He could not only pursue his studies for free, but he can receive special scholarships."

"But that's exactly what he wants to do!" I exclaimed.

"I have been talking to him about it the whole time. You should be a wise father and talk some sense into him. Tell him to confess everything. He loves you and he will listen to you. If he confesses, I will release him immediately and you will both go home today."

"But to what does he have to confess?"

"He is a nationalist!" he shouted.

"This is a lie, comrade. Someone has certainly made false denunciations of my son. Look at my hands: I worked all my life very hard to send our son through school. He wants nothing else but to attain his education."

"Yes, it's true. He possesses outstanding qualities. But he has already confessed to belonging to a nationalist organization."

"How could he confess to something which is not true? On the other hand, if he has already confessed, then what can I advise him? I did not know and I do not yet believe that he is a member of some nationalist organization."

The investigator, whose name I found out later on was Galagin, pierced me with his penetrating eyes and said, "But I will tell you that he stubbornly refuses to talk. To all our questions, he has a standard reply: 'I told you everything and I know nothing more.' You are his father and you can talk to him sensibly, and everything will be all right. If you agree to talk to him, I will bring him over here to see you."

"Of course. Of course, I will talk to him," I said haltingly.

Galagin took me to Room 22, where an NKVD guard was posted. Galagin told the guard to keep an eye on me. I was told to sit down on a stool in the corner of the room. In the center was a large table with a mass of torturing implements; there also was a bucket of water under the table. Upon seeing these instruments of "Soviet justice," I shivered and almost burst into tears.

The young NKVD torturer looked at me and asked, "Are you crying?"

"No, I am not crying," I said.

"Are you arrested?"

"I really don't know."

"Then what the devil brought you here to the NKVD?"

"I understand that my son is arrested and remains in this building."

"What's his name?"

"Osyp Diakiv," I said.

The NKVD guard opened a thick register which apparently listed all the prisoners and after a few minutes said, "Yes, he is here. He was at the university and would have

been a decent young man. But he wanted independence. We have both a 'Union' and an 'Independent' state. Everyone may have what he wishes."

The door opened suddenly and Galagin loudly called, "Come over here!"

I ran to the door of Room 21, and saw our son Osyp. My heart started to beat rapidly and I almost fainted from the sudden shock.

"Father, please behave properly and do not talk!" exclaimed Osyp. "Don't talk for there is no one to talk to," he added.

Galagin became furious, his mouth twisting as he heard Osyp's words. But he kept silent, obviously waiting to see what I would tell my son.

On seeing Osyp, I came to, and I looked at him. His shaven head was covered with dried blood and his face was swollen and marked with heavy blue blotches. I saw he had been beaten, perhaps tortured.

We embraced and he kissed my hand, while I kissed his battered head. Galagin was watching every movement of my hands, even of my lips.

"Is Mother well?" Osyp asked.

"Yes, she is quite well and is waiting outside."

"How about Grandmother, my uncles and aunts, and other members of the family?"

I told him briefly that all seemed to be in good health, and added: "My son, please do everything possible so that everything will be all right."

"Of course, I am doing everything that is possible to attain just that," replied Osyp.

There was silence. Neither he nor I could say anything more, for there was nothing more to be said. I was afraid that any further questioning on my part might incriminate him. He probably was thinking the same thing, for he did not press any further colloquy.

"Have you finished?" shouted Galagin in Russian.

"Yes, we have finished," I answered.

Obviously irate, Galagin asked me whether I had brought anything for my son. Indeed, I'd brought some things for him, I said. I enumerated the articles, but it soon became evident that this official of the Ukrainian SSR did

not understand the Ukrainian language, not knowing the common Ukrainian words for suits, shirts, and underwear. Osyp had to translate them into Russian. Galagin made a list of these effects and told me to hand it to the officials in the office. Osyp and I embraced and I left.

My wife was happy to see me. I told her briefly what had occurred and then we went to the office at the entrance to the building to leave the things I had brought for Osyp. The guards took the bundle and the list, but barely had we reached the steps to the street when they threw the bundle after us, shouting in Russian, "You nationalist scum, you told us that you had permission to deliver the bundle, but you don't have permission."

When the German-Soviet war broke out and Osyp returned from the prison in Berdychiv, we finally learned more about our visit to the Ternopil prison. Osyp told us that Galagin was enraged at my failure to convince Osyp to "confess," and he exacted a brutal revenge. Galagin personally beat Osyp several days, using heavy ropes and canes. He would throw our son to the floor and kick him in the stomach and chest.

Eventually, we received permission from the *oblast* district attorney in Ternopil to forward to Osyp periodically some personal effects.

We also learned that shortly after my visit to the prison, Osyp was placed in a cell with a young Ukrainian lieutenant from the Soviet army, who had been arrested for some infraction of military discipline. His appearance was bedraggled, yet he refused to accept some clothing that Osyp offered him. In a few weeks he was tried and sentenced to one year of prison with the "right of appeal." The officer made another "appeal" and castigated the Soviet court for its inhumanity. As a result, the court of appeals in Kiev sentenced the same lieutenant to ten years at hard labor with, again, the "right of appeal." Again, the lieutenant appealed to the court in Kiev and promptly spared no words in condemning "Soviet justice" and the Soviet courts. This time, he was sentenced to twenty-five years at hard labor with no "right of appeal."

But fortune was on the side of this young and brave lieutenant and on the side of our son as well.

When the Nazi troops attacked the Soviet Union and

made swift advances through Western Ukraine, reports quickly spread that the NKVD was murdering Ukrainian political prisoners in the prisons. When the first German patrols entered our village of Olesyn, people began preparing to go to Ternopil to look after their arrested kin. The next day my stepmother and I joined two women whose sons were in the Ternopil prison. The day after, we were stopped by the Germans in the village of Yanivka because the front was only a few kilometers ahead. In a few hours, however, we were told that German troops from the city of Zbarazh had entered Ternopil, and we were allowed to follow the troops into the city.

When we reached the prison we found a dreadful and unforgettable sight: the entire prison yard, the cells and cellars—all were filled with corpses; the stench defied description. The corpses bore witness of inhuman torturing and sadistic forms of execution practiced by NKVD. There was loud and piteous lamentation as many recognized their sons, husbands, and brothers. In many cases identification was made through the clothing alone, the faces of most prisoners having been mutilated. I heard that in Ternopil prison alone over five thousand Ukrainian political prisoners were massacred by the retreating NKVD, a slaughter that took place in every prison. German army and newspaper photographers were busy taking pictures of the corpses.

Despite a long search among the dead bodies, we could not find the body of our son Osyp.

Later on we learned that a few days prior to the outbreak of the German-Soviet war in June 1941, Osyp, along with hundreds of other political prisoners who were to be sent to Siberia, had been transferred to the prison in Berdychiv. When the German planes attacked Berdychiv and the German artillery began shelling the city, the Soviet guards set fire to the prison and retreated from the prison compound. When the inmates began escaping from the cells, the guards returned and opened fire with their automatic rifles, cutting down those prisoners who succeeded in fleeing the burning building. Among those who escaped to the prison yard, as we learned later on, was our son Osyp. As the NKVD guards opened fire upon the fleeing prisoners, Osyp fell to the ground without being wounded and soon was

covered by the bodies of his murdered cellmates. Some 23 prisoners were thus murdered, while the rest managed to get outside. There, however, many of them either were shot on the spot by retreating *istrebitel* (punitive) units or were taken prisoner by the advancing German troops and conveyed to POW camps. Nonetheless, a substantial number of the OUN members who had been sentenced in mass trials in Lviv, Stanislaviv, and Drohobych were successful in getting away.

A few days later many of the Berdychiv prisoners began returning to the neighboring villages, and some of them told us that Osyk escaped from the prison and was alive. But there were other reports to the effect that he had been killed in the prison yard. For days we had no official word to deny or confirm our son's death.

But on Sunday, July 28, 1941, in the village of Vymyslivka, the local Ukrainian community prepared to bless the grave of two soldiers and former members of the Ukrainian *Sichovi Striltsi* legion (Ukrainian *Sich* Riflemen). The band from our village was invited to take part. When the band members came to Vymyslivka they found out that the community was in the process of officially observing the proclamation of the Ukrainian independent state, which was first proclaimed on June 30, 1941 in Lviv, with the act now being repeated in every city, town, and village of Western Ukraine. At the program arranged in the local *Prosvita* reading room, our son Osyk was the principal speaker!

I discovered this from a boy who came by bicycle to Olesyn to notify me and our family that our son was alive.

We were elated at the wonderful news, and I sped off by bicycle to Vymyslivka, some four kilometers from our village.

I found Osyk outside the church, and we embraced, tearfully. Osyk was physically exhausted, but his spirit was undaunted. We attended a mass celebrated by Father Diakon, who was assisted by some ten Ukrainian Catholic priests. A sermon was delivered by Father Radonsky, and after the mass a rally was held at which Osyk was the principal speaker. His speech was brief but penetrating and patriotic. At the close of the program the band played the Ukrainian national anthem, which all of us sang with deep feeling, as

during the Soviet rule it had been a "crime" to play either publicly or privately.

Toward evening, Osyp and I went to our village where my wife, grandmother, and Osyp's aunts and uncles were eagerly awaiting the joyful reunion. We also brought with us a Ukrainian political prisoner by the name of Oleksa, a 45-year-old Ukrainian farmer from Buchach County who had been a cellmate of Osyp. His younger brother, a student, also was a prisoner in the Berdychiv prison, but he was one of the victims of the wholesale massacre by the NKVD in the prison yard.

We talked into the wee hours of the morning, and Osyp slept for several hours in the morning. But neither Oleksa nor I could fall asleep, so we went into the orchard where Oleksa let himself go in relating his experiences in the prison, the bombardment by the Germans, the deliberate firing of the prison building, the escape, and the NKVD massacre. In fact, it was the only detailed story about the Berdychiv massacre that I heard, because our son either did not wish or found not enough time to tell us about it.

Oleksa told me that he and a few other prisoners, including Osyp, had been saved by the local Ukrainian inhabitants. When six of them reached a suburban village, they found out that there were still *istrebitels* (NKVD or SMERSH units) hunting the escaped political prisoners. A villager outside his house spotted them and beckoned to them. When they came to him, he motioned them to hide in his potato storage dugout, and told them to sit there without making a sound. They waited there several hours, finally beginning to feel that a betrayal was in the making, that soon they would be in the hands of the NKVD.

But toward evening two women, one old and one young, came in the company of the man who had sheltered them. They told the six prisoners that they could now come out, for the NKVD had departed from the village.

"I know you were afraid. But the danger has passed, thank God, and the worst is behind us," said the villager.

He knelt, crossed himself and began reciting the "Our Father" and "Hail Mary" in pure Ukrainian. It was the first time, continued Oleksa, that Ukrainians from Western Ukraine heard prayers said in the Ukrainian language (all

church services in the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine had been conducted in Church-Slavonic).

The farmer told them that a cavalry unit of the NKVD troops on their way to Berdychiv had raided the village unexpectedly, and they would have certainly spotted six prisoners. Hence, the farmer's intervention on their behalf.

The women brought some tea, sugar, and pieces of dry bread which they offered the escapees. Later on, the old woman went into a nearby field and brought back sheafs of wheat which she ground into flour and baked pancakes, which they ate avidly, saving some to take along. They spent three days there since the situation at the front was unclear; it was only after the German troops took Berdychiv that the prisoners left for the west.

The first day they had no difficulty, inasmuch as the main German forces were moving on the highways, while the escapees used field paths and shortcuts. They spent the night in another village, where friendly farmers fed and bedded them.

On the second day they ran into a motorized German patrol who "frisked" them. As all the prisoners had their heads shaved, the Germans immediately suspected that they were Red Army soldiers dressed in civilian clothes. Osyp, who knew the German language, explained that they were not Red Army men, but political prisoners. Two of the Germans wanted to let them go, but the third insisted on taking them to the village where a German army unit had bivouacked. The prisoners were taken to a collective farm barn which already housed 64 Soviet POW's. They said that they had willingly surrendered to the Germans because they did not want to fight for Stalin. But the Germans locked them up in the barn and refused to give them either food or water for two consecutive days.

In the evening, a German sergeant, assisted by two guards, entered the barn and called for "that prisoner who can speak German." Osyp stepped up and was taken to the sergeant's provisional office. The sergeant interviewed Osyp in a civil and polite way. He promised that he would secure the release of the six prisoners. Osyp informed him that all the Soviet POW's were Ukrainians who had surrendered voluntarily to the Germans.

About 10:00 P.M. that day another seventeen POW's were brought to the barn. Osyp told them of his discussion with the German non-commissioned officer and told all the POW's to say the same thing when interviewed by others, namely, that they were Ukrainians who refused to fight for the Communist regime.

In the morning, food for the POW's was brought by a group of women, headed by the local village council chairman. The guards refused them entry to the barn, but the *kommandant* came, summoned Osyp, and told him to distribute the food among the prisoners, which Osyp did. There was order among the POW's, despite the fact that all were famished and extremely thirsty. Osyp was the last to receive his ration of food.

It appeared that the German unit in the village was composed of Austrians, who appeared to be more humane than their Prussian brothers. The noncommissioned officer who interviewed Osyp kept his promise as regards the release of the six prisoners.

After the food rations were distributed, a German officer arrived in an army car and summoned Osyp for another interview. In an hour or so an elated Osyp emerged, saying that he was almost sure that all the prisoners would be released.

Osyp told the officer the true story of the prisoners:

"The POW's are Ukrainians and are sympathetically inclined toward the Germans. They all told me that they had surrendered to the Germans voluntarily because they did not want to fight for the preservation of the despicable Stalinist regime."

"But who can vouch for them, who will guarantee the neutrality of these people?" asked the officer. "Tomorrow we are marching eastward, and before then I would have to release you and your prisoner friends, while the POW's would be sent to the POW camp."

Osyp looked around and spotted a group of women with a new village council head (the former one having escaped along with the Bolsheviks), and asked the officer, "Would you kindly allow me to talk to the local people and the new village council head, who is now here?"

"You have my permission," the German replied.

Osyp told the "mayor" that the German officer would release all the POW's if he, the "mayor," assigned three persons to see to it that the released war prisoners would go home and not try to rejoin the Soviet troops or Soviet organizations of whatever sort. The "mayor" quickly replied that the local doctor, a teacher, and a farmer would willingly assume the responsibility for these war prisoners. This was communicated by Osyp to the German officer, who requested that the three "vouchers" as well as the village council head report by 8 P.M. on that day to the POW's enclosure. The officer then departed in his car.

At 7 P.M. the German officer returned with a written "agreement," stating that all POWs were being returned to their families, and that the "mayor," doctor, teacher, and farmer would be held accountable to the German authorities for the POW's living up to the terms of the agreement. After it was signed, the officer removed the guards from the barn and released all 81 of the war prisoners. He then gave Osyp and his prisoners passes and left the enclosure.

Thus, 81 Ukrainians regained their freedom, escaping the fate of hundreds upon thousands of others who found abuse and death from starvation in German POW camps.

Oleksa related that the six political prisoners were entertained royally in the house of the "mayor," and then, toward evening, they took off in a westerly direction. They avoided both the highways and the German troops. In one village in Volhynia, Osyp ran across a friend of his who was a member of the Ukrainian nationalist "field groups" that had moved behind the German troops to organize the Ukrainian national life. It was this friend who had told Osyp about the Ukrainian National Assembly in Lviv, which proclaimed the restoration of the Ukrainian independent state on June 30, 1941.

From that time on, having established liaison with the Ukrainian underground, they were able to move westward without hindrance. Osyp spoke on various occasions in *Pros-vita* reading rooms and clubs. When they reached Galicia, the political prisoners went home their different ways, with Osyp and Oleksa heading for the city of Berezhany.

During his four-day stay at home in Olesyn, Osyp was visited by many of his friends and many members of the

OUN, leaving me no chance even to ask how he had escaped and how he had fared in the Soviet prison. On the fifth day Osyp went to the Berezhany where despite his weakened condition, he plunged into the activities of the District Center of OUN Propaganda. Oleksa, on the other hand, returned to his native area of Buchach, and so we again were alone.

The month of August, 1941 saw a vibrant resurgence of Ukrainian activities throughout Western Ukraine. In every village and town, the graves of Ukrainian national heroes were blessed to the accompaniment of huge national manifestations and patriotic rituals, at which the names of Ukrainian fighters for freedom who had been slaughtered by the NKVD were read and officially engraved on memorial plaques.

There also were memorial services for Ukrainian national heroes who earlier had fallen in the war struggle for Ukrainian independence. One such rally was held at Mount Lysonia near Berezhany to commemorate the Ukrainian *Sich* Riflemen who had given their lives in battling Russian troops in 1916. Some one thousand young OUN members set up a camp and constructed a huge grave (*mohyla*), which was blessed by the Very Rev. Msgr. V. Bachynsky, assisted by some 76 Ukrainian Catholic priests. Over fifteen thousand people attended. The Ukrainian "Boyan" Choir of Berezhany sang traditional Ukrainian church and national songs, while blue-and-yellow Ukrainian national flags were unfurled everywhere. A speech was made by "Osyp Hornovy, a high-ranking member of the OUN." By that opportunity, I found out that my son Osyp was known in the underground movement under the assumed name of "Hornovy."

A few weeks later I visited our son in Berezhany. Noting that he looked not at all well, I prevailed upon him to go home with me for a while, I asked Dr. Manatsky from the neighboring town of Kozova to examine Osyp. The doctor found that Osyp had developed a lung inflammation. Prescribing medication, he advised Osyp to stay in bed for a few weeks.

Soon thereafter, Osyp was notified of the arrest of the leader of the Ukrainian liberation movement, Stepan Bandera, by the Gestapo, along with other leading members of the

OUN. The arrests were made on September 15, 1941.

Subsequently, the Gestapo made large-scale arrests of leading members of the OUN throughout Western Ukraine. Many of them were executed, while hundreds of them were carted away to Nazi concentration camps in Germany. Osyp had escaped arrest by virtue of his being sick and staying in our village.

But when he learned of the fate of his many friends, Osyp left our village to make contact with the other OUN leaders not caught by Gestapo. In the fall of 1941, Osyp was instructed by the Supreme Council of the OUN (*Provid*) to organize relief for the Ukrainian population in the Carpathian villages of Galicia, which had been hit by famine. Thousands of peasants from the hunger-hit areas made their way to Podolia in a desperate quest for food. The German authorities, using the Polish auxiliary policy (*Banschutz*), persecuted these famished people by arresting and beating them and by confiscating any foodstuffs found on them.

Confronted with this situation, the OUN *Provid* issued secret instructions to the effect that the entire OUN network be mobilized for carrying out the relief action, which was supervised by the Ukrainian Central Committee, headed by Professor Volodymyr Kubyovych, and implemented by provincial and county committees throughout the country. Thanks to the Ukrainian Central Committee, the German authorities grudgingly gave approval for the transferral of Ukrainian children from the hunger-stricken counties to Podolia, where some food was available at the time.

Through the efforts of Osyp, Olesyn and the neighboring villages accepted 45 Ukrainian children from the County of Striy who remained until the harvest of 1942. The people of Berezhany County were more than generous in caring for these children until they were taken back by their grateful parents in the summer of 1942.

In addition to his labors in the relief program, Osyp worked systematically in the information apparatus of the OUN, writing various articles and appeals for publication by the Ukrainian underground press. Through our house passed secret couriers and replacements for the Ukrainian nationalist groups that operated in Eastern Ukraine. From casual conversations with Osyp I found out that these young

men were charged with various tasks in the wake of advancing German armies. One such task, I found out, was to prepare detailed lists of the victims of the Soviet Russian and Nazi German terror in Eastern Ukraine.

While preparing for this work these young revolutionaries openly discussed the Nazi terror, which had begun in Ukraine with the arrest of Stepan Bandera. Jokingly, Vasyenko asked our son, "I wonder who will prepare our lists when we are destroyed by the Nazis? As I see the situation, NKVD and Gestapo are moral twins."

These words, unfortunately, were only too prophetic. We found out that Vasyenko and another young revolutionary subsequently were publicly hanged by the Nazis in the city of Mykolayiv on the Black Sea.

The participation of Osep in the Ukrainian underground movement and the variety of tasks and chores he had to perform made our home a virtual underground headquarters. He constantly received secret mail, dispatches, and a great deal of printed literature, as well as underground couriers. Osep asked me to find places where the underground literature could be safely kept before being handed to the various messengers. These were parked in steel boxes and buried to escape detection when the Nazi police searched our house and other buildings.

One of the couriers, I recall, was a young man by the name of Ilko, who was killed by the Soviet secret police in 1949.

It must be said that the OUN underground mail system was very effective and successful. There existed "main" and "subsidiary" lines of communication in the Ukrainian underground. Later on, when the UPA controlled vast areas of the Ukrainian territory, this "field post office" conveyed a huge volume of packages to various underground units of the UPA without their being intercepted by either the Nazi or the Soviet authorities. Indeed, this service was so effective that it not only handled such inevitable articles of daily life as food, clothing, and medical supplies, but arms and ammunition as well. It also must be added that the Ukrainian population, as demonstrated by the Ukrainians of Berezhany County, was wholly loyal to the Ukrainian underground authorities, executing all its decisions with no resistance or

hesitation whatsoever, although detection by the enemy entailed severe reprisals and even death. But everyone knew well that these were exceptional times and that no sacrifice was too great in enhancing and strengthening the struggle for the independence of Ukraine.

Although I often saw Osyp opening and reading these underground instructions, I never asked him to share them with me nor did he ever volunteer to communicate them to me, except on one occasion. After reading a long dispatch from Eastern Ukraine, Osyp began pacing the room very nervously. I asked him why he was so upset.

"Naturally," he said, "you and all Ukrainians should know about it. According to various reports by our intelligence services in occupied Eastern Ukraine, the German occupiers are proceeding to organize a German-sponsored Ukrainian police force for which they are recruiting all sorts of criminal elements. Also, the Bolsheviks have been infiltrating their secret agents into the Gestapo, so that through the German secret police and other German security organs, the Kremlin could conduct an extensive process of eliminating the Ukrainian nationally conscious intelligentsia. These secret NKVD *agent-provocateurs*, posing as loyal servants of the Gestapo, already are denouncing hundreds of Ukrainian intellectuals and other leaders and accusing them of being former Soviet activists and therefore being dangerous to the German authorities. They also accused vast numbers of prominent Ukrainians in Eastern Ukraine of maintaining secret liaison with the Soviet partisan movement throughout all the occupied areas of the USSR. On the basis of these reports the Gestapo already has executed 340 Ukrainian professors who had succeeded in surviving the many purges that Stalin had conducted in Ukraine."

These depressing reports conclusively proved that Nazi Germany was no friend of the Ukrainian people and that the Germans had come to Ukraine merely to replace the Soviet Russian totalitarian rule with an oppressive Nazi domination.

Despite the fact that Osyp performed a variety of important underground functions in the OUN network, he did not neglect his education. In 1941 he registered for correspondence courses in journalism and in economics with the

Ukrainian Free University in Prague, and remained a student until the return of the Soviet troops in 1944. I paid his tuition regularly and he was a diligent student, systematically submitting his term papers and examination assignments. He was to receive his diploma in June, 1944.

In this period, when Osyp lived in Olesyn, that is, the second half of 1941 and the first half of 1942, we became very close to each other. I as well as my wife spent much time in his company, and we both learned a great deal from him through various discussions. We got to know intimately his views on the Ukrainian liberation movement and the ultimate objective of this movement—the establishment of a free and independent Ukrainian state.

Osyp was a very religious young man. In the *gymnasium* he attended low Mass in church every day, frequently serving as altar boy. He was an active member of the Sodality of the Holy Virgin Mary and the Apostleship of Prayer. His religious dedication manifested itself not only at church services and church holidays, but also in reverence of church traditions and in his deep conviction that the Ukrainian independent state could only be a Christian state. He never mentioned Marxism in terms other than "pseudo-science" and "pseudo-philosophy." He especially strongly denounced Marxist policies with respect to the peasantry, a policy which he considered to be wholly inimical to the proletariat itself.

Osyp firmly believed in the concept of private property, especially the ownership of land. He believed private property in the Ukrainian independent state should be the cornerstone of the social order. Agricultural production could be enhanced only through farmer ownership of land, he contended. The farmer attached to his land cultivates it effectively and rationally. There is no collectivism nor collectivized serfdom. The Society "Village Farmer" (*Silsky-Hospodar*), he said, is worth incalculably more than the "mechanized" production of the party, which leads agricultural production straight to decline and the degradation of the farmer.

Although against Soviet Russian collectivism, Osyp was in favor of agricultural cooperatives as advocated by M. Levytsky, believing that such cooperatives (*artels*) are but a different form of private ownership on the part of peasants,

organized by them on a voluntary basis.

Osyp also was an opponent of the concept of the "class struggle," which he considered detrimental to the national development of the people, especially during the struggle for national liberation. He stood for the solidarity of the classes in the struggle for Ukrainian national liberation, placing this struggle above that for social liberation. He contended that it was the foreigner who had brought social enslavement to Ukraine. Consequently, the struggle for national liberation entailed the struggle for social liberation. Seen thus, social slogans, Osyp believed, were necessary and vital for the strengthening of the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people. Indeed, the establishment of a free and independent Ukrainian state is indispensable in an all-sided development: national, political, cultural, and economic.

Osyp and his close political associates maintained that the future Ukrainian independent state should be ruled by law and order and that all citizens of this state should be equal before the law. They rejected any notion that some privileged classes or groups should exist in the future Ukrainian state, people who would interpret the law to suit their particular group interests. As far as the "elite leadership" was concerned, Osyp thought that in the struggle for national liberation the leadership should be drawn from all strata of Ukrainian society, regardless of their social backgrounds or political convictions, and then consolidated, because only a well-coordinated leadership could effectively conduct the liberation struggle. In this way, he likened this leadership to army command, which has to concentrate leadership into one united and consolidated power.

Likewise, Osyp believed that an excessively mosaic political party makeup cannot lead an enslaved nation to its liberation, because party interests do not always coincide with the all-national interest. In this period Osyp worked on the project of creating a "Social Chamber," a sort of all-national senate in which the many strata of Ukrainian society would be represented and which would be guided by the interests of all classes of the Ukrainian people.

As early as 1942 Osyp became thoroughly convinced that Germany would lose the war against the Soviet Union, a conviction which for all practical purposes became a mere

recognition of reality after the German defeat at Stalingrad. He saw the reasons for the German defeat in the contradictions between the military and the political qualities of Nazi Germany. He believed that Germany was very strong from a military standpoint, but very weak from a political one. Osyp and his political associates hoped and believed that the two imperialists and totalitarian powers—Nazi Germany and the USSR—would become so exhausted by prolonged war that the emergence of a "third force" (the enslaved nations) would be inevitable. This "third force," they believed, would become strong and effective enough to be decisive in the political settlement in Eastern and Central Europe. Regrettably, they did not foresee or even consider the possibilities of the rapid disintegration of Germany and the abject surrender of Central and Eastern Europe to the Soviet Union by the Western Allies.

Osyp never believed in the strength of the Soviet Union, scorning Soviet propaganda about the "invincibility" of Soviet power. "The strong one need not lie about his strength," he used to say. In his opinion the Nazi regime had long studied the Soviet system of exploitation and enslavement (genocide, concentration camps, economic pillage, etc.), recognized it as "genial" and applied it to peoples it conquered, while in Germany itself it imposed "National-Bolshevism."

He knew of and openly deplored the orientation of some Ukrainian political groups toward Germany in the hope that Hitler would understand and support the genuine aspirations of the Ukrainian people to freedom. Such orientation, he contended, already had led to the tragedy of Carpatho-Ukraine in 1939, and to the division within the OUN. Osyp firmly believed that the Ukrainian people themselves had to fight actively for their liberation: that this struggle, as it was in 1648, must be all-national, and that in the struggle against two totalitarian systems, the Ukrainian people must of necessity exclusively rely on their own strength and resources. Osyp saw clearly the great obstacles ahead along this road, but he was convinced that this was the only way. On this subject he wrote a lengthy article.

Such, in brief, were Osyp's views on the various problems entailed in the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian

people. As his father, I felt it my duty to explain these things in which our son believed and which he tried to implement, for later on destiny had him play a vital role, that of outstanding underground leader and writer.

Toward the Final Embrace

Beginning in the fall of 1942, Osyp began to disappear from Olesyn for periods of time, often not returning for several weeks. At the beginning of May, 1943, he returned from a long stay away from home, stating he had enrolled in the medical faculty at the University of Lviv and consequently would have to move to Lviv. The next day I took him to the railroad station, but no sooner had we left our village in the direction of the village of Hynovychi then Osyp admitted that he was not thinking of studying medicine, but had said so only not to alarm his mother. He added that he had been given an important underground assignment that precluded his staying in one place, especially his native village.

It was only much later that I learned from an official announcement printed in the Ukrainian underground organs that Osyp at that time had been named a member of the underground National Council of Youth of the OUN, a member of the editorial board of the underground review *Yunak* (Young Man), and the editor of the review *Visti* (News).

Osyp declared that at least for six months he would not be able to return home, and asked me to tell his mother not to worry. He also begged me not to visit Lviv, as in the time of Bolshevik occupation, but to assure my wife that everything was quite in order and that I was being informed through underground channels about his whereabouts and his safety. He told me myself not to worry because he would be guarded by the security organs of the Ukrainian underground especially because he was now a member of the preparatory committee for the convocation of the Third Extraordinary Great Assembly of the OUN, which was slated to be held in August, 1943. As became known later on, this Assembly was held at the designated time somewhere near Lviv.

At the beginning of March, 1944, the Bolsheviks

launched a sudden offensive from the area of Shepetivka, moving through Proskuriv with the city of Ternopil as the immediate objective. They succeeded in encircling the Germans in Ternopil, and it seemed that they would reach our village of Olesyn in a matter of hours.

On January 15, 1944, he asked me to take him in a horse-drawn sled to the village of Koniukhy to meet a courier. It was a cold wintry day. Although the snow fell heavily, we managed to reach our destination an hour before the designated time. The courier, however, was not to be found. Osyp then asked me to proceed to the village of Zakhvorostets in Zboriv County. The sky cleared and the journey became much pleasanter. Osyp's mood lightened and for a time we talked about his future. He soon changed the subject, but not before telling me that in two weeks he would come home.

He did appear on February 5, 1944, to spend five days with us. The German-Soviet front was moving westward and we could hear artillery barrages distinctly. When Osyp left us again, he told me that if the war situation did not change, I should look for him in the village of Bozhykiv, in Pidhaitsi County. At the beginning of March, 1944, the Bolsheviks launched a sudden offensive from the area of Shepetivka, moving through Proskuriv with the city of Ternopil as the immediate objective. They succeeded in encircling the Germans in Ternopil, and it seemed that they would reach our village of Olesyn in a matter of hours.

In the night of March 3, 1944, two neighbors and I set off for Bozhykiv, situated on the Zolota Lyna River. As we had found out, an UPA base was located in the Trostianets Forest between the villages Trostianets-Bozhykiv-Saranchuky. It contained various field staffs of the UPA, an insurgent hospital, ammunition and food supplies, and so forth. The base was guarded by strong UPA units.

After presenting proper identification, or more specifically, the proper password, we were admitted to the base, only to find out that Osyp was not there. He did appear, however, two days later. He sent my two neighbors to the area of Peremyshl and assigned me to work in the office at the base.

The Soviet forces had already advanced to the Strypa River, but I was told that there was no solid German-Soviet

front. The UPA units operated at will behind the fluid German and Soviet lines. I was told by Osyp that in the event of Soviet assault, I was to gather up important documents, proceed with a group of young fighters to another village, and hide the documents in a designated bunker situated behind the house of a certain peasant woman. There I was to wait until further notice.

The next day a Soviet advance unit of some 150 men appeared in the neighborhood of our base, and it looked as if they would attack us. Osyp was not at the base, and a young UPA fighter, assigned as my escort, came up and said that we ought to move out and head for the assigned bunker in a designated village. But guided by some inexplicable sense of intuition, I refused to go, stating I would take full responsibility for disobeying Osyp's order. And as it turned out, the Soviet unit bypassed our base and attacked the very village to which we were supposed to go. For several hours they ransacked the village and found several bunkers, including the one in which I was to hide. Fortunately, there were no personnel in any of the bunkers. When Osyp came back, he cried, "I almost sent you to certain death, Father!"

As the front now was somewhat stabilized and Easter was approaching, I decided to return home, a decision which Osyp promptly approved.

When I was returning home, Osyp embraced me and said that he would try to visit us on Easter, to be together with his mother and father and his beloved grandmother, as he knew how much all three of us loved and treasured him.

Once I reached our native village, I had to hide for several days in the house of my friend, as the Germans were everywhere, in the village and in the fields, especially near the village of Denysiv some ten kilometers from our village, where the German-Soviet front became stabilized. It was in this area that UPA fighters established points through which they could penetrate into the Soviet *hinterland*. Also, my friend's house had become a headquarters at night and a last outpost before the front for those UPA soldiers who tried to reach the rear areas behind the German-Soviet frontline. Another such outpost was located in the house of a farmer whose homestead was situated about a kilometer away from the village, in the so-called "Ravines."

When Easter morning came, we had the traditional Easter breakfast with the family of my brother; my wife also joined us and brought some of her *paska* (traditional Ukrainian Easter bread), but we all were sad, because our son was not with us. Both my wife and I gave way to tears.

After the modest Easter breakfast, my wife went home, while I stayed with my brother and his family. About four o'clock in the afternoon Ilko appeared suddenly (he was the only one outside the family of my brother who knew that I had returned to the village), and told me the cheerful news that Osyp had come and was now visiting his aunt and that he would come to see me soon. Ilko disappeared as inconspicuously as he appeared.

Shortly thereafter I looked out on the street through the window, and saw Osyp. In a few minutes I was hugging my son, who was elated and moved by the long-awaited meeting with his father. My brother and his wife, after feasting Osyp with the blessed *paska*, also disappeared, leaving us alone in the room.

I told Osyp about my return home and how I was saved from death by the military gendarmerie, by a man whom I hardly knew. Osyp, on the other hand, told me about what had happened in the command post of the UPA after my departure, as well as of many other developments that took place there.

It was already dusk, and Osyp, looking at his wristwatch, said, "We had some difficulties after you left, Father. Our camp was pressed from all sides, but our men endured it wonderfully. We heard no complaints or gripes. Our young men are disciplined and know what is expected of them."

He said that perhaps he might drop in again tomorrow.

"Right now," Osyp said, "I have to go to a farmer, who is hosting an UPA group and must talk to its commander."

I asked whether I could accompany him, and Osyp said I could go as far as the paved road.

We left through the back door and went through the orchard, bypassing the main village road. On the outskirts we met our friend Ilko, who apparently was a liaison man. On his signal, the UPA unit, consisting of 54 men, emerged from a cornpatch. Osyp met the commander after offering him a

password. They shook hands and continued to march, with Ilko and me at the end of the column. The entire group was led by Ivan Maksymiv, whom I knew well. After a few hundred yards, Ilko, apparently upon previous arrangement, stayed behind, while I continued to trail the unit.

As I marched behind this group of young and enthusiastic men, my head was swirling with ideas and thoughts. If I were a poet, I could write poems about these youths, so eager and so dedicated to the cause of freedom for their country. Their solidarity and discipline, their dedication and combat training were without reproach. These young men left their families and, undoubtedly, on this day of Christ's Resurrection, their minds and hearts wandered to their loved ones behind. They might have thought of the holiday they would have enjoyed in normal times. But now they were marching toward an unknown and dangerous future.

I was awakened from my daydreaming by the sudden halt of the column. Osyp took leave of the commander and shook hands with every fighter. We both looked silently after the disappearing column, and as they were lost to our eyes, we started back.

Osyp took out a revolver from his pocket and checked whether it was loaded. After a few minutes of silence, Osyp said that because of heavy fog and mist, the night was favorable for penetrating the frontline. In an hour or so, our boys would be at the frontline, he said.

In digesting what Osyp had said, I began expressing my doubts as to what would happen soon. It seemed to me that the Germans would be pushed back in a matter of a few weeks. Then, I thought, there was our family to consider: where would we go? Remain under the Soviet Russian occupation, or flee westward?

After a few minutes of silence, Osyp said, "As you can see, our movement for a free and independent Ukrainian state cannot stop, and we are prepared to continue our struggle, and my place is here, in Ukraine. You and mother must make a decision on your own, and whatever you decide, I will abide by it."

I replied, "It is hard for me to make a decision in this respect. I cannot wait for the arrival of the Bolsheviks as this would be tantamount to suicide. As you know, Mother

and I always thought that perhaps we could live with you, or close to you, in our old age. My health is not so good as to allow me to emigrate. Moreover, your mother would never agree to leave you here alone . . .”

Osy, sighing heavily, remarked, “You must convince Mother that she must emigrate. She certainly must be aware of what may happen to her once she is arrested by the Soviet secret police who undoubtedly know about my work in our liberation movement . . .”

Again, I argued, “With knowledge and experience in this struggle, you can do much for the movement from abroad . . .”

“I have been thinking about this possibility for a long time,” Osy replied, and continued:

“My decision to remain here, Father, is irrevocable and my participation in the liberation struggle of our nation is essential. We must mobilize and rely on our own resources, as we cannot expect any help from other nations. All our appeals for assistance are falling on deaf ears. Moreover, both Moscow and Warsaw continue to smear our movement in countless propaganda publications, based on lies and distortions. Regrettably, we do not have any reliable friends abroad, as Poland had France in the 1920s. Both Communist Russia and Poland are endeavoring to divide Ukraine again.

“Therefore, our only alternative is a determined struggle, a struggle which will convince the world that our cause is a legitimate cause, based on the undying desire and aspirations of the Ukrainian people for freedom and independence. Our program, as outlined by the OUN under the leadership of Stepan Bandera, is geared toward the establishment of a free and sovereign Ukrainian state, based on democratic principles. Thousands upon thousands of our fighters have joined the ranks in the struggle for freedom. They all know what they are fighting for. They witnessed the inhuman crimes and atrocities committed by the NKVD: in Ternopil prison alone they found five thousand murdered Ukrainian political prisoners. That is why these young people you just saw marching to cross the the frontline are imbued with patriotism and dedication. How many of them will survive? We do not know.

“We do know that our forces are too small to oppose

those of our enemy. But we also know that on the blood of our heroes a new generation will rise and will continue the liberation struggle. I am a young man and I want to live for you and my mother; I want to live for our people whom I love passionately.

"This is why, Father, I must remain here . . ."

Of course, I understood well why Osyp decided to remain in Ukraine but my heart could not reconcile his decision with our love for him. He was our only son and our only hope. And I told him so again. Osyp was hurt and I saw that in his heart he was struggling between his love for his parents with that for his country. And he stated, "Father, I love you and Mother no less than you love me, and you both know it. But sometimes one has to sacrifice for his country all that one has—personal happiness, material well-being and, indeed, love for his family. My decision to remain here, Father, is final . . ."

We continued to walk in silence. Dawn was already approaching, and the fertile Ukrainian fields emerged in full morning beauty. To break the deadly silence, Osyp spoke of the beauty of the Ukrainian countryside. These immense riches of the Ukrainian land, he said, produce a great quantity of food, while its abundant mineral resources make Ukraine one of the richest countries in Europe. Yet, the Ukrainian people, he continued, cannot freely avail themselves of the fruits of their land, and very often are brought to starvation by the alien master.

Finally, we reached our village, shrouded in mist and fog. We entered it from the side of orchards and gardens, so as not to be seen by villagers. I did not go to my brother's house where I had been hiding, but decided to hide in the attic of our house. Osyp, without resting, went to see his aunt who lived in the center of the village.

He returned about 5 P.M. and took leave of his mother and grandmother, and climbed up to the attic to say "good-bye" to me. He again begged me that we all leave for the West.

After a few minutes, we embraced and he left. My heart beat rapidly, and I felt that it was the last time that we would see each other.

Later I found out that Osyp had also visited his cousin

Sofia Smachylo-Kusen, a former classmate and best friend in childhood, to bid her "good-bye." She and her husband, too, tried to persuade him to go with his parents into exile, but in vain.

Osyp left to follow his insurgent friends, and never came back.

This was on Easter Sunday, 1944.

But fate was equally unkind to us, his parents. Despite our determination to remain close to our son, destiny preordained a different course of events. On July 20, 1944, by the fortunes of war, I was separated from my wife and in the swallowing sea of unhappy humanity I was cast away; after going through the sieve of DP camps in Germany, I found myself in America.

My wife was less fortunate than I was. She remained in the native country, and for over five years she wandered from place to place in fear of persecution and reprisals. Finally, she was arrested and sent to Siberia, where she spent ten years in various concentration camps. Her "crime" was that she did not report her son to the KGB as an "enemy of the people" and had refused categorically to co-operate with KGB in capturing or killing her son Osyp. After serving her sentence, she was permitted to return to her native village where she soon died.

Osyp's Last Letter

In 1948, when I was in West Germany, along with thousands of Ukrainian political refugees, I received a letter from Osyp that was brought by an OUN courier from Ukraine. It read:

Dear Father,

I do not know what has happened to you, although there have been various reports about your whereabouts. I could not tell which are true, which are not. I want to believe that you succeeded in reaching the West and that you are well. Therefore, I take the opportunity at hand to send you this brief note and to let you know a few things about myself. I would very much like

to write more and about many other things a son should write to his father. But I cannot be sure that this note will ever reach you, so it must be short and prudent.

As you undoubtedly know, I am wholly taken up in the struggle. This struggle is intense and assumed proportions you would have difficulty imagining, although you are no stranger to the struggle we wage. Our people have reached such a high level of effort and have put up such a heroic and organized resistance that honor must be rendered them. The struggle which is being waged by us now is the most heroic and most illustrious in our history. As such it will go down in the annals of world history.

At the present time there is an intense pressure to drive out the peasantry into the collective farms. The enemy herein is using the most savage methods, but to no avail. 1946-1947 saw a great famine in Eastern Ukraine; thousands of famished farmers from the eastern areas are a living testimony to what collectivization has brought to our people. This has strengthened the will of the people for continued struggle. On October 21-25, 1947, there were mass deportations to Siberia.

The terror mounted by the enemy in general is so great that it cannot be compared to what you knew during the first Bolshevik occupation. Whole villages are burnt down; thousands have been arrested, deported, and executed. Many of our close friends and acquaintances are no longer alive: they either died in open warfare or were murdered by the enemy.

From a communication which I received this month from O. (he is also in the underground), I learned that mother is still at home; she was not taken in the past deportations to Siberia. Also at home are the aunt and all uncles, with the exception of Uncle Mykola, who has died. My friend Vasyl is alive and has gotten married (I recently saw him and his wife). Slavko, as you may know, was shot by the Nazis as he tried to cross the frontline. Mykolio died a hero's death. I could go on and on, but the rules of conspiracy do not permit me.

Dear Father! I want very much that this note reach you so that you hear a voice from the native country.

I long have thought of communicating with you, but only now has the occasion arrived. I want so much to know about you, but this is almost impossible, I know.

I wish you, my dear Father, the best of luck and health and, above all, I hope that we see each other as soon as possible . . .

Your OSYF

This was the last message from Osyf to his father. On November 28, 1950, he was killed in an encounter with the Soviet KGB forces.



Mrs. Justyna Diakiv

The USSR Unmasked

.

Chapter 1

The USSR—The Land of the Most Brutal Oppression of Peoples and Exploitation of Workers

In the annals of history are recorded not a few instances of brutal oppression of peoples, of exploitation of the laboring masses. The savagery of Hitler's Germany is still fresh in the memories of all of us. But national oppressions and social exploitation have nowhere assumed such brutal force and are of such broad extent as in the USSR. And, indeed, all this is taking place now, in the twentieth century, at a time when mankind is so powerfully expressing its conscious desire for freedom and justice. Today, when peoples are achieving an independent life more and more (in Syria, Lebanon, India, Pakistan, Burma, *et al.*), and when workers in a number of countries are winning more and more rights, today, in the USSR, the oppression of enslaved peoples and the exploitation of workers wax over greater, ever more repugnant, ever more insolent. And what is more, it is spreading to the peoples of other countries—Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Albania, China, and Korea.

To review in brief the Bolshevik system of oppression and exploitation is the burden of this chapter.

The Rise and Development of the Bolshevik Prison House of Peoples—the USSR

In March, 1917 the hated Czarism was overthrown by a powerful revolutionary upheaval of the working masses and the enslaved peoples of Russia. Russia at that time was at war with Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey. Russia's allies were France, England, and America. A decisive role in the downfall of Czarism was played by the army, which rose up in arms against the Czar on March 12, 1917, in Petrograd (Leningrad). The Volynsky Regiment, made up of Ukrainians, was the first to go over. Since this revolution occurred in March, it is called the March Revolution, or February Revolution in reckoning by the old calendar. The March revolution brought about many gains for the people, but even so it did not fully realize all the aspirations of the people, the very aspirations that had stirred them into rising up against the Czar. The revolution had bogged down in mid-course. The Provisional Government, which took over all power in Russia after the fall of Czarism, satisfied neither the peasants nor the workers. This government, standing for the preservation of a "one and indivisible Russia," did everything in its power to prevent new states from being born from the enslaved nations of Russia. It came out, for instance, against greater autonomy for Ukraine. Further, the Provisional Government was for continuing the war against Germany, Austria-Hungary, and their allies, whereas the exhausted people wanted an end to the war, and peace.

All this evoked a new surge of discontent among the seething masses—of which, of course, the Bolsheviks took full advantage. Promising all factories and plants to the workers, the land to the peasants, an independent state for all enslaved peoples, and an end to the war and peace for one and all, the Bolshevik leaders with Lenin at their head, rebelled against the Provisional Government on October 25, 1917 (Julian); November 7, 1917, (Gregorian). Since this rebellion took place in October, it has been called the October Revolution. The Provisional Government was overthrown and the Bolsheviks took over.

When they came into power, the Bolsheviks wrested the

factories and plants away from the capitalists, doled the land out to the peasants, and proclaimed the right of all enslaved peoples to determine their own fate (the right of self-determination, including secession). In March, 1918, the Bolsheviks signed a peace treaty with Germany and her allies, which meant the end of the war for Russia. All this, however, was carried out for the ultimate benefit of the Bolshevik clique led by Lenin, and not in the interests of the people. All this was done to deceive the people. The factories and the land were the means of making Bolsheviks out of the workers and peasants.

The "right of self-determination, including secession" was a necessary measure for again lulling to sleep the aroused enslaved peoples. As for ending the war, it was necessary, not to build up the country for the suffering people, but to gain peace; the Bolsheviks needed a cessation of hostilities with Germany in order to free their hands for the struggle with their own antagonists, to facilitate consolidation of their power in Russia. And so the land, the factories, peace, the right of self-determination: all these were mere bait that the Bolsheviks dangled before the people to keep them content for the time being. But when the right moment came along, the Bolshevik leaders withdrew this bait, bit by bit, and began beating the masses over the head with their hammer and sickle. Thus, in place of the old landowner—or capitalist exploitation—the workers came under a new, Bolshevik exploitation. In place of the landowners and capitalists came new exploiters, new leeches—the Bolshevik lords. In place of the Czar's cruel autocracy came one that was still harsher—Bolshevik autocracy—except that it was now known as "the greatest democracy in the world." The enslaved peoples saw in the Bolsheviks the same old Russian usurpers, only dressed in different garb. The October Revolution, then, brought about not one of the blessings about which the Bolsheviks had crowed so loudly. Every citizen of the USSR sees this today, every phase of life now attests to this.

In comparison with the March Revolution, which brought about the downfall of Czarism, the October Revolution was a return to the days of old. The October Revolution

wiped out all the gains made by the people in the March Revolution. The October Revolution brought back the old Russia in a new form—still the old Russian prison house of peoples, the country of unbearable exploitation of the workers.

The Bolsheviks soon showed their true colors in regard to the non-Russian peoples. As early as the beginning of 1918, the Bolshevik leaders, in contradiction of their promises of a short time before about the right of each people to resolve their own fate, launched an aggressive, armed assault against the young non-Russian republics. These republics had just risen up on the ruins of Czarist Russia in voicing the aspirations of their peoples to a life as free and independent states. The whole period of 1918-1921 is but one of the struggle of the Russian Bolshevik usurpers against Ukraine, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Poland, the peoples of the Volga, of the Northern Caucasus, of the Transcaucasus (Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan), of the peoples of Central Asia (Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Tedzhiks, and Turkmens), and of Siberia.

The Bolshevik usurpers covered their attack then as they do now—with the slogan of "liberation." But once they "liberated" a country, they never removed their troops. And what is more, they promptly built up to massive proportions their police apparatus—the so-called Cheka (Extraordinary Commission). This, with its unheard-of terror, extracted obedience from the people.

Before the end of 1921, the overwhelming majority of the lands of Czarist Russia was in the hands of the Russian Bolshevik usurpers. Of the countries which formerly had belonged to Czarist Russia, only Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland managed to remain independent.

The reasons for the fall of the independent states of the non-Russian peoples and the Russian Bolshevik usurpers' victory over them were:

1. The low level of the national consciousness and political development of many of the non-Russian peoples. This was the basic cause of the political and military weakness of the fledgling states.

2. The uncoordinated manner in which the various

peoples responded, the absence of a single, united, anti-imperialist front embracing all the non-Russian peoples.

3. The Bolsheviks managing to lead astray some of the people participating in the national liberation movements, which considerably weakened these movements.

Between 1918 and 1920 the Bolsheviks also were carrying on a war against the White Guards, those Russian leaders who wanted to restore old Russia, along with a Czar and the whole Czarist order. The leaders of the White Guards were Czarist generals and admirals: Kolchak, Yudenich, Denikin, Krasnov, Wrangel, and others. They were aided by the Western powers, such as France, England, and the United States. The Bolsheviks succeeded in overcoming the White Guards, for the latter had no support among the popular masses. Both the non-Russian and the Russian people hated Czarism and did not want a return of the Czarist regime. No one wanted a return of the landowners and capitalists, either.

After destroying the non-Russian independent states and routing the White Guards, the Bolsheviks became the undisputed rulers of the new Russian empire. *Russia, the prison house of peoples, was preserved*, although within somewhat narrowed limits. This period of the reestablishment of the Russian empire (1918-1921) is called by the Bolsheviks the period of "civil war and foreign intervention." Such a designation is not correct. It can only be applicable to the war between the Bolsheviks and the White Guards. During the period, the Bolsheviks were primarily engaged in waging an aggressive war against the non-Russian peoples. For this reason this period should properly be called "the period of aggressive war by the Russian Bolsheviks against the newly founded independent states of the non-Russian peoples," or, in short, "the period of the restoration of the Russian empire."

What Was the Role of the Russian People in the Period of the Restoration of the Russian Empire?

During this period the Russian people became for the most part docile tools in the hands of the Bolsheviks in carrying out their aggressive plans. Trusting in the Bolshevik

appeals, they followed along with the Bolsheviks, supporting them meekly. The fact that the Russian people have always lived in a state of violence and tyranny, plus the fact that they were to a large degree infected with the spirit of chauvinism (a morbid feeling of one's own national superiority and a concomitant intolerance toward other peoples)—both these characteristics made it easy for the Bolsheviks to take advantage of the Russian people. *But in helping the Bolsheviks enslave the non-Russian peoples, the Russian people then and there lost all their own rights and freedoms, won by them with the overthrow of Czarism.* The Bolsheviks cruelly deceived the Russian working masses. The Russian people accepted a still heavier yoke than the one they had borne under Czarism. Life became harder than under the landowners and capitalists.

Already in the years 1918-1921, the working masses were beginning to see through the pretensions of the Bolsheviks. And for this reason, although the Bolsheviks had come out of the war victorious, their status in 1921 was a tenuous one. The workers were dissatisfied, peasant rebellions were flaring up all over Russia and Siberia, and everywhere in the enslaved countries the national liberation insurgent struggle seethed (especially in Ukraine). Terror alone was not sufficient to do away with this menacing dissatisfaction, and the Bolsheviks decided to make certain concessions to the workers (reducing the grain imposition, promoting free trade) in order to strengthen their position. They decided to retreat only that they might strike harder later. This was known as the NEP (New Economic Policy).

The NEP lasted from 1921-1928. It was divisible into two distinct parts—the first from 1921-1925, and the second from 1925-1928. The first period was characterized by mitigation with regard to the masses, but from 1925 to 1928 the Bolsheviks began anew, though moving slowly and cautiously, to apply totalitarian screws to the people. The people actually began to live a more decent life during the NEP, and even today the workers think of this time with nostalgia. But the workers paid dearly in 1929 for the temporary alleviation of the NEP days, and they are still paying today.

What Did the Bolsheviks Gain by the NEP?

By temporarily raising the standard of living of the people, the Bolsheviks relieved the tension caused by the people's dissatisfaction. As a result of this easing up during the NEP, one segment of the populace once again came to have faith in the Bolsheviks, while a second and broader one reconciled itself to them. The third, the irreconcilable segment, could now easily be destroyed by the Bolsheviks, since it now stood alone, since it now no longer had the support of the dissatisfied masses that it had in 1921. In 1921 the Bolsheviks had all three segments of the peoples against them, but during the NEP there was only one, the irreconcilable segment. What is more, those who once again believed in the Bolsheviks supported them. Thus, while people were being soothed by the NEP and pacified by ownership of the land the Bolsheviks distributed and, more, were finding new hope in the Bolsheviks, the leaders in Moscow were busy consolidating their power, intent on wiping out their irreconcilable foes—not only the remnants of the former exploiters and *kulaks*, but all those who saw where the Bolsheviks were leading them, especially those who had the courage to fight against them. The Bolsheviks took the most important branches of the economy into their own hands, consolidated the army, built up the party and administrative apparatus, and set up an all-pervasive police system. And when, in 1928, the Bolshevik leaders judged that they were sufficiently strong, they once again turned to attacking the people. And once again a new sea of woe, of suffering, of want, of hunger, swept over the popular masses of the USSR. It swept over all, over those who had sincerely believed in the Bolsheviks during the NEP and over those who had merely reconciled themselves to the Soviet system. Thus was the NEP the harsh deceiver of the people.

Next, let us review the Bolshevik struggle against the national liberation aspirations of the non-Russian peoples.

During the period of 1918-1921 the Bolsheviks once again subjugated the majority of the peoples that had formerly lived under Czarist oppression, but they did not im-

mediately institute an order such as there is now. They did not immediately apply totalitarian measures to these people, for if they had there would have ensued a new violent struggle on the part of the non-Russian peoples, a struggle which the Bolsheviks could then ill afford. For this reason the Bolsheviks granted the non-Russian peoples a whole series of rights that these peoples had not enjoyed under Czarist Russia. They granted them the right to use their native tongue in schools, institutions, and the press; they permitted them to develop their own national culture and advances in science; they agreed to a certain independence in farming; and they even allowed them to maintain diplomatic relations, although controlled, with other states. For example, Ukraine had its own representatives in some foreign countries. All this built up in the non-Russian nations a feeling of actually being independent states.

But this state of affairs, with the non-Russian peoples pacified with "independence," albeit limited, soon came to an end. When, in 1922, the Bolsheviks finally ended all their wars and overcame all their antagonists, they put an end to the limited independence of the non-Russian peoples. In December, 1922, at the so-called 1st All-Russian Congress of Soviets, the Bolshevik leaders completely subordinated the non-Russian peoples to one center, Moscow, and retracted all the rights which these peoples had enjoyed up to then. Thus we see again the bait and, underneath, the hook.

This complete subordination of the non-Russian nations to Moscow was called "the voluntary union of states of the Soviet peoples into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" (USSR). Thus the USSR was formally formed in December, 1922. But this was not at all a "voluntary union." In the first place, it took place following the forcible takeover of these nations by the Soviet Russian army in 1918-1922 (after the Bolsheviks had reduced them to powerlessness); and in the second place, no one asked the people what they wanted; they sent no representatives for this "union," nor did they give their consent to it. These "united" Soviet republics had nothing in common with the republics already in existence. Such a union was a mockery and nothing more.

In December, 1922, the following so-called Union Repub-

lics joined together to make up the USSR: 1. The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR); 2. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (Ukrainian SSR); 3. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (BSSR); 4. The Transcaucasian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (ZSFSR). Later, the following separate "republics" were formed in Central Asia: Uzbek, Tadzhik, Turkmen, Kazakh, and Kirghiz; further, the Transcaucasian Federation was divided into three separate "republics," namely, Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan. Thus, there were eleven so-called union republics prior to 1940.

In establishing the USSR, the Bolshevik leaders were pursuing the following goals:

1. To deprive the "union republics" of all traces of political independence (the right to enter into relations with foreign states).

2. To subordinate all phases of the economic life of the "union republics" to Moscow (industry, agriculture, trade, finance).

3. To consolidate the military strength of the USSR.

Thus, it is seen that the formation of the USSR was a consolidation of the Russian empire, which the Bolsheviks had effectively restored in the years of 1918-1922.

After the formation of the USSR, that is, after 1922, the Bolsheviks held out as bait a certain degree of freedom in culture and language (schools, science, culture, writing, folklore, music, etc.). This lasted all throughout the NEP, that is, up to 1928-29, but during this period the Bolsheviks infiltrated more and more into the fields of culture and language. They resorted to various stratagems to arrest the cultural development of the non-Russian nations, especially to deprive these cultures of their national spirit, leaving just the bare form (e.g., Ukrainization). This eradication of the national spirit is called, in Bolshevik language, the creation of a "culture that is national in form, socialist in content." In simple language this means: Let there be a Ukrainian language (form), but let it not be used to write about all that is

dear to the heart of a Ukrainian (national spirit, national tradition, history, etc.).

Let us take an example: Shevchenko's poems "The Dream," "The Caucasus" and "The Opened Grave" are works that are national both in form (they are written in the Ukrainian language) and in content (in them every Ukrainian can glimpse his own soul). But M. Rylsky's "From Over the Mountains" and "Over the High Mountains" and P. Tychna's "The Party Leads" are national in form only (written in Ukrainian); in content they are foreign to a Ukrainian, even inimical to him. In content they are "socialist" or, better, Soviet Russian.

In spite of all the hindrances, however, the national cultures did make considerable progress during the NEP. They simply outstripped Bolshevism, so that by the end of the NEP, Moscow decided to do away with freedom altogether in the various phases of culture, the last remaining rights, the last remaining bait.

In the years 1930-39 the Soviet Russian imperialists brought about horrible devastation in the different fields of culture of the non-Russian peoples. Thousands of the best-known poets, writers, and scientists were arrested and then shot or sent to concentration camps (Vlyzko, Falkivsky, Kosynka, Antonenko-Davydovych, Kulish, Zahul, Zerov, Hrushevsky, Rudnytsky, Krushelnytsky, etc.), while still others were spiritually crushed (Tychna, Rylsky, Yanovsky, etc.). A whole series of cultural, educational, and scientific institutions were closed (the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences), as well as journals and newspaper editorial offices. Many literary and scientific works were banned. After such an onslaught, national cultures in the USSR just stopped developing. From that time on up to today culture has been national only in form; in content it has been Russified or Russian. For this reason it is altogether senseless to call it "culture," since such things are determined everywhere and in every respect not by form, but by content. It is not the clothes, i.e., the form, no matter how elegant, that determines what a man is worth; that is determined by the character of the man, that is, the content. *After 1934, then, the Bolsheviks had left the people only their national form, that is, their clothes.* They left them their language, their na-

tional musical instruments, their national costumes (and this mostly in the theater, for Ukrainian girls today do not think about beautiful embroidery work). The living national spirit has been trampled under foot.

But the Bolsheviks did not stop even at this. Even the form offends their sight. More and more, every year from 1934 on, they have tried, with the widest variety of methods, to replace even the national form with an alien form—a Russian form. And what do we see today? Ukrainian cities and industrial centers speaking Russian, many Ukrainians speaking Russian at home and teaching their children Russian, Ukrainians writing in Russian, numerous books, newspapers, and journals appearing in Ukraine in Russian, Russian being used in the schools, and especially in the higher schools, etc. And if, up to now, this assault on the national form has been conducted in a circuitous and somewhat surreptitious manner, it is today carried out directly and openly. Moscow wants with all its might to foist the Russian language upon us, as if it were intrinsically a more cultural language, the language of an “older brother,” the language of Lenin and Stalin.

Thus the complete enslavement of the peoples of the USSR did not come about all at once; it came on stealthily and gradually. It went like this. In the first period (up to 1922), the non-Russian peoples enjoyed certain political rights, limited economic independence, and significant degrees of freedom in the various phases of national culture. In the second period (the NEP), out of all this only certain cultural freedoms were left them, and in the third period (I, II, and III Five Year Plans), only the national form remained, the language, mainly—and even that was surreptitiously assuming a Russian form. In the fourth period, today, even the national form is openly being taken away and being replaced with a Russian form. Thus was the total enslavement of the peoples of the USSR brought about. Thus was the process of complete restoration and consolidation of the Russian Empire achieved.

Now let us turn to the question of how the Bolsheviks deprived the working masses, the workers and peasants, of their rights.

We have already noted how following the NEP a sea of

suffering engulfed the workers. What were the causes of this?

In the first years following the October Revolution, the Bolshevik leaders counted on revolution in other European countries as a development to enable them to extend their power far beyond the boundaries of old Russia. In 1924 it became clear that this was futile. Thereupon the Bolshevik leaders decided to build up the military forces of the USSR, to build up an army, so that in this way they might achieve world domination. But an army was not enough. To wage war under the conditions existing then, it was necessary to develop heavy industry (coal and petroleum, machine building, production of iron, steel and other metals, and the chemical and electrical industries). Heavy industry is indispensable for making rifles, machine guns, tanks, airplanes, artillery, etc. And the USSR had none of this, since Czarist Russia was an industrially backward country. But the USSR possessed enormous natural resources: coal, oil, iron, etc. In these circumstances, then, Stalin and his entourage planned to build up heavy industry in the shortest possible time, and with this as a foundation, to build up their war industry. Thus the origin of the Stalin Five Year Plans.

It is an extremely costly affair to build up heavy industry and a war industry. How did the Bolsheviks manage to pay for this?

The Bolshevik leaders placed the whole burden of developing heavy industry (industrialization) and a war industry squarely on the enslaved peoples and the working masses of the USSR. They paid for it through an unconscionable plundering of the natural resources of the "Union Republics," through levying enormous taxes and loans, by paying the workers low wages, and by getting free labor from millions of people it imprisoned in corrective labor camps. And especially industrialization was carried out at the expense of agriculture. To make industrialization possible, Stalin turned to a collectivization of agriculture, that is, an elimination of the individual farm and its replacement by the *kolkhoz*. He effected this collectivization very quickly and with great cruelty.

What part did Stalin's *kolkhozes* play in the industrialization?

1. The *kolkhoz* system allowed Stalin to get for a song all the grain that he could not otherwise get from the individual farmer, for it was impossible to maintain the sort of control over them that one could over the *kolkhozes*. The grain was also necessary for sale abroad in order to get the money to buy the machines which were nonexistent in the USSR. Further, the grain was necessary to feed the vast army and the entire party and police apparatus, to stock the military stores and by its sale to pay agents and propagandists abroad.

2. As a result of the introduction of large machines, the *kolkhoz* system permitted Stalin to transfer a great number of workers to industry. In the ten years from 1931-1940, for example, 28 million workers were shunted from the *kolkhozes* to industry.

3. The *kolkhoz* system permitted Stalin to make serfs of the peasants, that is, to place them in a position where they had no rights and where they became completely dependent on the Communist lords. *Kolkhoz* serfdom gave the Bolsheviks the advantage of practically cost-free peasant labor, enabled them, further, to get the greatest possible work out of the *kolkhozpiks*, and, above all, allowed them to keep an iron hand on a vast segment of the population.

These were the underlying reasons for collectivization. Stalin did not establish the *kolkhoz* system in order to give the peasants a better, more comfortable life, as Soviet propaganda claimed (everyone of us sees clearly that there is nothing of this better life). Stalin turned to collectivization solely to provide for the development of heavy and war industry. Much less being concerned with the interests of the peasants, he sacrificed them in advancing his plans for world domination. As a result of the forming of the *kolkhozes* the peasants lost their land, which the Bolsheviks had taken away from the landowners and given to them, and even their personal property, and the peasants themselves became rightless serfs. The peasants are now paying for the somewhat better life of days of the NEP by being in constant need and never having enough to eat—a condition which at any time threatens to culminate in a mass famine.

What Did Industrialization Give the Peasants?

Industrialization turned the worker into an extra part of a machine. The Bolsheviks made the worker a slave, whom, through laws based on terror, they chained to the factories and plants. They made the worker completely dependent on the state. They submitted him to an extreme of exploitation unheard of on this earth. The Bolshevik imperialists do not need free workers, workers to freely and creatively participate in running the state and industry; they need a slave whom they can force to work with his last ounce of strength and, for miserable wages, to labor where they order him.

Thus, industrialization and collectivization are in no way the building stones of socialism. They are the building stones of that order which will best ensure the realization of Stalin's imperialistic and colonial plans.

In discussing the history of the development of the USSR, the question of the inner party struggle and the great purges in the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks (VKP(B)) cannot be overlooked. We now turn to this question.

The Bolshevik Party came into power by deceiving the popular masses. From the moment the Bolsheviks took over, the popular masses did not have the least opportunity to express what they really wanted. The party based its power on the bayonets of the police organs and the army. But the policies of the Bolshevik Party not only did not convey the will of the people and realize their hopes; they did not even express the will of their own party cadres. From the very beginning up to the present time all power in the Bolshevik Party has been concentrated in the hands of one person, the dictator, who in turn surrounds himself with a handful of obedient "companions at arms" (his clique). In the first years of the Bolshevik domination the dictator was Lenin. Lenin took no one else's advice into consideration, and he could tolerate no opposition from other leading party members. At the Xth Party Congress, which took place on March 8, 1921, Lenin decided that those who opposed his policies be prohibited even from joining together in separate groups (factions). Thus, even if people were being fair or thought that they

were standing up for the interests of the people, they did not have the right to join together in separate groups, either within the party or without. People who did not agree with Lenin's policies were removed from the party by the so-called purges. The first large purge came in the beginning of 1922. The purges are a means of getting members out of the party who willfully oppose the policies of the party dictator.

During the time of Lenin's illness and immediately following his death (January 21, 1924), a fierce struggle for the secession to power broke out in the party. After Lenin, the principal contestants for the position of dictator were Trotsky, Stalin, and Zinoviev. None of them was concerned with the interests of the people, although they all claimed to be in refuting charges made against them. The ultimate victor in this struggle was Stalin. But this victory did not end the inner party struggle; it continued in various forms for some time (open discussions and demonstrations, people being expelled from the party and people who had been expelled being taken back in). Among Stalin's opponents, more and more important old Bolsheviks fall by the wayside. He eliminated his opposition for good in 1926 and 1927. Stalin charged his opponents with every conceivable and impossible crime and made a big show out of their trials, with all sorts of repentances and confessions; thus he disposed of Zinoviev and Kamenev and their group (Bakayev, Yevdokimov, Pikel, etc.). Trotsky was exiled from the USSR, and later assassinated abroad. In 1937, after another ostentatious trial, the following old Bolsheviks were shot: Pyatakov, Radek, Tukhachevsky, Yakir, Bukharin, Rykov, and Krestinsky.

Thus through purges did Stalin ensure himself of party members who would servilely support his policies and jump at his command. Stalin became a super-god and he exerted his power everywhere, restricted by nothing and no one.

Thus the people and the working masses of the Russian empire were only free from autocracy for a short time, from March to November, 1917 (not counting the non-Russian nations' more or less longer periods of independent statehood). Following the October Revolution there came new Bolshevik autocrats, even less constrained than the Czars. And along with them came unbridled lawlessness, coercion, terror,

exploitation, fear—those omnipresent companions of dictatorship.

But the inner party struggle and the purges did not stem solely from the struggle for power. Stalin destroyed not only his competitors; he also did away with many dedicated members of the party, those who wanted to serve the people, who were concerned with their welfare, who truly wanted to bring about a meaningful socialism, and who, for these good reasons, did not want to serve Stalin. They saw and understood what an outlaw he was and how his policies were directed against the people (Shumsky, etc.).

Of all the charges Stalin leveled at all those he destroyed while on his path to boundless power, there was not one that bespoke the truth. They were but a means of nullifying his opponents and of glossing over his own crimes. As a matter of fact, Stalin himself committed the same crimes of which he accused many of his victims. For example, Stalin charged that the Trotskyites proposed the building of industry at the expense of agriculture, and of making use of naked force rather than persuasion; he charged that Pyatakov was raising prices of industrial goods, and so on. But indeed, Stalin's collectivization clearly is building industry at the expense of agriculture, and that is being done through use of brazen force without any semblance of persuasion. And as for the high prices on industrial goods today, well, there is no sense even mentioning that.

Stalin's total triumph and his enthronement as supreme Kremlin autocrat was the signal for the adoption of a new constitution, the so-called Stalin constitution, at the end of 1936. This constitution consolidated Stalin's political, social and state structure. In March, 1939, the XVIIIth congress of the party took place. The congress showed there no longer was any opposition. *The party had become a docile instrument in the hands of Stalin*, a party that had become obsessed with the policy of Stalin, inasmuch as that policy gave it power over the people, safe and plush positions, even a luxurious life. *Already in being was a well-differentiated new class of exploiters—the class of Bolshevik lords.*

By signing a treaty with Hitler in 1939, the Russian

Bolshevik imperialists entered upon a road leading to new aggressions. Taking advantage of the fall of Poland, they seized Western Ukraine and Byelorussia in September, 1939. Thus, Western Ukraine and Byelorussia were forced to exchange the Polish occupiers for Russian Bolshevik ones. As a result of the war against tiny Finland, they managed to grab some Finnish territories, and in 1940 they occupied Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bessarabia. These new takeovers ("liberation" à la Moscow) spawned five new so-called Soviet socialist republics, namely: the Karelo-Finnish, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, and Moldavian. These brought the total of the so-called republics of the USSR to sixteen.

As a result of the defeat of Hitler's Germany, the Soviet Russian aggressors occupied ("liberated") Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, East Germany, and East Austria. These new victims were quickly transformed into colonies of Stalin in the same manner as Ukraine, Byelorussia, and the other non-Russian countries had been.

After the defeat of Japan the territory of the USSR was increased by the addition of the southern part of Sakhalin Island, by the Kurile Islands, and by North Korea. Stalin used the period of the occupation of Manchuria by the Red Army (this part of China had been occupied by the Japanese) to install his own espionage apparatus—the Communist Party of China. So when the Red Army left Manchuria, this territory was not returned to China, but was left in the hands of the Chinese Communist Party, a development which gave the party much-needed strength and helped it to wage a successful struggle against the Chinese government headed by Chiang Kai-shek.

The Soviet State System—The Most Anti-People System in the World

The Stalin constitution bombastically states that all the power in the USSR belongs to the people, represented by the councils (*soviets*) of workers' deputies. In Soviet terminology and propaganda, the councils are the highest achievement of

democracy (rule by the people). But what are these councils? In what lies their "highest democratism"?

As strange as it may sound, all this, in the USSR, has to be explained time and again. Those people who live under a democratic system and fully enjoy its benefits and freedoms do not have to be told what democracy is. But here the matter is quite different. Here it must be explained what democracy is and what it represents. Of course, we learn here of a Soviet brand of democracy, and Bolshevik propaganda spares no effort in providing all kinds of explanations; this is by no means an easy undertaking in circumstances where there is no democracy whatsoever.

The democracy of the councils allegedly lies in the fact that the councils assure the broadest participation of people in the management of the state. This alleged participation of the populace is effectuated as follows: the people elect representatives-deputies to appropriate councils that decide all the affairs of state. To make vital decisions the deputies are summoned from time to time to common meetings, the so-called sessions, and, once done, return to their daily chores in schools, hospitals, collective farms, etc. The decisions of the sessions of the councils then are handed up for implementation to the executive organs—the governments and executive committees. These organs are elected by the deputies and function on a permanent basis.

There are several types of *soviets*:

- 1) *The Supreme Soviet of the USSR*, which allegedly is the supreme body in the USSR. At their sessions the deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR pass all laws, make final decisions on the most important matters, and so forth. Between sessions (when deputies are back home), activities are carried on by the so-called *Presidium of the Supreme Soviet*, consisting of a president, a secretary, fifteen deputies (deputy secretaries) and fifteen members-at-large. The president of the Supreme Soviet today, in 1949, is Shvernik (previously Kalinin), while Gorkin is the secretary. All laws of the Supreme Soviet are implemented by the government of the USSR, that is, the Council of Ministers (formerly known as the Council of People's Commissars), which also handles all the current business of the state. The head or

chairman (premier) of the Council of Ministers is elected by the Supreme Soviet; the chairman, in turn, selects his ministers, who are subject to the approval of the Supreme Soviet. (This, of course, exists only on paper.) The chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR is Stalin himself.

2) *The Supreme Soviet of the so-called Union Republics* (the Ukrainian SSR is such a Union Republic). It is also, allegedly, the supreme authority of the Union Republic. The executive organ of the Union Republic is the Council of Ministers (Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR, for instance). If a union republic includes so-called autonomous republics, the latter, too, have their own councils.

3) *Oblast Councils of Deputies* (provincial), whose prerogatives cover the direction of affairs of a province or *oblast*; their executive organs are the *oblast* executive committees (*oblvyykonkom*).

4) *Raion Council of Deputies* (county), which are responsible for the governing of a county; they, too, have their executive committees (*raivyykonkom*).

5) *City and Village Councils of Deputies*, which are responsible for the city and village government. Their executive organs are an executive committee of the city council (*miskrada*), and a chairman and secretary of the village council (*silrada*).

Deputies to each council (soviet) are elected separately. Thus, it would seem that all problems—from the village and city council up to the Supreme Soviet—are dealt with by deputies elected by the people.

Moreover, deputies are elected by a general, equal, direct and secret ballot. This by itself looks very democratic, indeed. For the *general* elections embrace all segments of the population, that is, all citizens—nationality, race, religion, economic or educational status notwithstanding. We also know, however, that some elections are held that are not general, elections from which a certain number of citizens are excluded, for instance, national minorities, workers, landless peasants, or peasants with small parcels of land, women, and so forth. These segments of the populace are

sometimes excluded from the vote by the ruling caste in order to minimize the number of opposition votes.

Equal elections are those elections in which every citizen has but one vote. There also are *unequal* elections, those in which certain voters (for example, great landowners) have more than one vote. In such an unequal election of the first Russian *Duma* (the name of the Czarist parliament) in 1905, the great landowners, though constituting only an insignificant part of the population, enjoyed in the *Duma* an overwhelming influence as contrasted with the mass of peasants and workers.

Direct elections are what the term implies: the deputies are elected directly to given councils (supreme *soviet*, *oblast* council, and so forth). There also are elections of a multi-grade character in which the people elect so-called electors, who in turn elect from among themselves the deputies proper. This indirect type of election is an instrument for the ruling circles to eliminate unwanted people and to install those who can be counted on to support the regime.

Secret elections (voting by dropping ballots in a closed box) protect the voter against any outside pressure and enable him to vote for a candidate of his choice. For example, a director of a firm or institution may say to one of his employees: "If you don't vote for our candidate, you'll lose your employment." If the vote is not secret, then the employee in question has two options: one is to vote for the candidate of his choice and lose his employment, the other to vote for the candidate "recommended" by the director, a candidate who may not represent the employee's convictions.

In order to assess the Soviet councils (*soviets*), we must turn to the nature of the Soviet elections themselves.

Let us begin with the election of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, which consists of two chambers: the "Soviet of the Union" and the "Soviet of Nationalities." The former is made up of one deputy per 300,000 of population. The latter is composed of 25 deputies from each "union republic," 11 deputies from each autonomous republic, 5 deputies from each autonomous *oblast* and 1 deputy from each so-called national district. The "Soviet of Nationalities" is supposed to look after the interests of particular peoples or nations.

The first order of any election is the selection of candidates. How is a candidate chosen in the USSR?

Long before an election, the party organizations have drawn up a complete slate of candidates. As a rule, such a slate includes all the top-ranking leaders of the Communist Party (Stalin, Molotov, Kaganovich, Khrushchev, and so forth), lesser lights (Korotchenko, Hrechukha, Hrushevsky, etc.), and a number of names from industry, agriculture, science, literature, music, and the like, thereby creating the impression that the deputies-to-be represent all professions and groups, that along with party leaders there are professors, poets, labor leaders, heads of collective farms, foremen, and even milkmaids.

The overwhelming majority of candidates are party members. While the rest are not members, they nonetheless are wholly dedicated to the Party. Non-Party deputies, of course, are meant to show that the government is not confined to the Party (this admission of some non-Party people is euphemistically called a "bloc of Communists and non-Communists").

When the slate is ready, then individual candidates are assigned the election districts from which they may be elected (examples: Marshal Budenny in the Kamianets-Podilsky district, Hrechukha in the Berezhany district). The next step is that *the lower party echelons of a given electoral district are instructed to put up the candidate proposed by the party.* Then representatives of the raion (county) call a meeting of workers from industrial plants, collective farms, and other institutions. At the meeting a "hatchet man" proposes the name of the candidate, another such hastens to second the nomination, and shortly there ensues the "unanimous" selection of the candidate. No one dares to propose a counter-candidate, of course. This travesty is called a "free meeting of trade unions, collective farms, factories" that nominates their "own candidate." Such a candidate is then *officially put on the slate of candidates for a given elective office.* In government and party election campaigns, such candidates are "unanimously" endorsed at various meetings, in the press, and through other media.

Election day all citizens go to the polls, if it is a general

election; everyone casts one vote (equal election). Deputies are "elected" directly, for it is a "direct election." The voting ballots are cast in covered booths (secret elections). All this the Soviet government can allow inasmuch as there is *only one delegate designated by the party, and all the voters can vote only for him, for there is no other candidate for the office.* The Party tries to get out the whole vote in order to show the world that all the people "support" the Communist Party. An election in the USSR is a compulsory matter, not a right. Such elections always yield 99.99 percent voter turn-outs.

Even the most reactionary regimes in the world would not refuse to hold a Soviet-type election. If the czar in 1905 had conceived such a technique, his election would not have had to be unequal, ungeneral, and multigraded. Evidently, this art of "democracy" was not known in Russia in 1905.

We know that when the people of Western Ukraine unanimously and in an organized manner boycotted the so-called elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on November 11, 1946, and to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR on November 9, 1947, the Bolshevik criminals reacted savagely. NKVD detachments suddenly descended on every village and used bayonets to drive the people to the polls, beating them, breaking their arms, even shooting them at random. We also know that the "election committee" of a village casts the vote of the entire village.

Thus, the elections in the USSR do not give the slightest opportunity to people to express their true will. People have no possibility at all of proposing candidates of their own choice. On the contrary, every election in the USSR is a forcible abrogation of the will of the people. Thus, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR does not begin to be an all-national representation. If anything, it is a docile instrument in the hands of the Party. The broad masses in the USSR are wholly detached from a role in government; all powers belong to one party, exclusively.

Let us see now how the Supreme Soviet of the USSR functions.

The entire program of each session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR is prepared ahead of time by the Central Com-

mittee of the Communist Party. When everything is ready, along with the drafting of a series of laws, the session of the Supreme Soviet is called. Deputies are given their roles by special instructions: who has to propose which law, decision and recommendation, who is to second it and deliver laudatory orations. Those deputies picked to propose the laws already will have received the drafts in order to familiarize themselves with them. It goes without saying that in such stages sessions go smoothly, unmarred by any opposition or acrid debate, much less the voting down of any proposal. "We have no troubles or squabbles as have parliaments in the bourgeois countries, because our Supreme Soviet is the most 'democratic' in the whole world," a Soviet leader once said, accurately.

Clearly, *every law that is passed by the Supreme Soviet benefits not the people, but only the Party.* This is evidently the case with the Fourth Five Year Plan, which came into being through a special law of the Supreme Soviet. This law was dictated by the needs of the aggressive plans hatched by the Stalin clique, gearing the USSR for a new war. As all other Five Year Plans, this one brought about misery, suffering, hunger, and exploitation of the people.

As the Supreme Soviet of the USSR ignores the interests of the laboring class, so *the Soviet of Nationalities neglects the various peoples of the USSR.* Take the law on the Fourth Five Year Plan, which is openly pointed toward the detriment of the non-Russian nations of the USSR. Ironically, not a single deputy of the Soviet of Nationalities dared to raise his voice in opposition to the Plan. According to it, Ukraine, which possesses its own coal, steel, manganese, and other resources, was given the building of only one truck plant (the first in thirty years of Soviet power) that would turn out 25,000 trucks per year. At the same time, the Russian areas were assigned to meet over 30 percent (457,000 units) of the total Soviet automobile industry goal. In the Moscow *oblast* alone, 100,000 trucks and 70,000 passenger cars are being manufactured, which is discrimination of the highest degree. Much less protest, the deputies from the Ukrainian SSR seemed abjectly grateful for the one truck plant, as if Moscow had granted Ukraine a great boon.

Another example: in 1946 Ukraine was hit by a fearful drought, which, on the heels of the cataclysmic war, caused widespread famine in Ukraine. But not a single deputy of the Ukrainian SSR or the USSR breathed a word about the question of relief, either in the Soviet of Nationalities or anywhere else. Not a single soul was so intrepid as to suggest the central coffers be tapped or even that Ukraine's wheat quota be reduced for that year. On the contrary, all these lackeys devoted all their efforts to seeing that Ukraine came up with the quota. More, these "representatives of the people" extolled Stalin and thanked him for providing a "happy, joyful and abundant life" and for sending Kaganovich to Ukraine.

If the Supreme Soviet of the USSR is an instrument of the party, even more so is the government of the USSR. It must be added that the composition of the government is also dictated by the Central Committee of the party; the Supreme Soviet merely "approves" it. Also, all the changes of cabinet ministers are effectuated according to the desires and instructions of the Central Committee, or more precisely, of Stalin himself. The very fact that all "decisions" of the Soviet government (Council of Ministers) are countersigned by the Central Committee of the Party indicates that the Central Committee plays the key role. *All policy of the USSR government is the policy of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, an anti-people policy, aggressive abroad and exploitative at home.*

As are held the elections for the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, so are the elections for all other councils, or *soviets*, that is, the Supreme Soviets of the "union republics" and the *oblast*, *raion*, and even city councils. Here, too, reign no representatives of the people. What sort of deputies are these, at the level of the *oblast* and *raion* committees? Like the others: servile spokesmen of the oppressive regime, leeches on the people's body.

Thus, the people do not have any voice even in the management of local affairs. All the much-vaunted councils—from the Supreme Soviet down to the village councils—are in tight control of the Party. Their outward democratic form serves only to mask the pervasive party dictatorship.

Every citizen of the USSR clearly understands that when the Soviet leaders talk about the people they mean the Party. The omnipotence of the Party, after all, is confirmed in Article 123 of the Soviet constitution. This article states that the Party constitutes the "leading kernel" of all organizations existing in the USSR: the councils, trade unions, Comsomol cells, cultural, educational, and sports organizations, and so forth. "Leading Kernel" means that in practice all power is concentrated in the Party's hands, and that all other organizations are no more or less than outside trappings, mere tools of the Party in implementing its decisions.

The Party has not only usurped the people's most important democratic right—that of a secret ballot. It has also deprived the people of all other democratic liberties, such as *freedom of expression, press, assembly, religion, the right of inviolability of person and home*. The Soviet constitution asserts that these rights are limited only by the "interest of the working class," but we know that these rights and freedom are trodden upon daily by the interests of the Party.

Freedom of the press and of expression in the USSR reduces down to freedom to write and speak only that which the Party deems necessary or advisable (the Party then saying it is in the "interest of the people"). The slightest criticism of the basic decisions of the Party entails arrest, and perhaps trial and exile to a concentration camp as an "enemy of the people." No writer or poet can write or express his true feelings and thoughts: none can write about the truth even though it be glaringly obvious. A scholar is compelled to falsify the truth whenever it does not conform to the interests of the Party. Whenever someone dared depict the reality—as some indeed do—there is no medium to print it, for all printing houses, all paper supplies belong to the state; all is controlled by the Party. Freedom of the press and expression in the USSR is unlimited only for the Party for the purpose of deceiving the masses and concealing the crimes of the Party.

Freedom of assembly in the USSR also telescopes down to the Party's needs alone. To assemble when called is an important and onerous duty of every citizen. Workers, peasants, professional people of whatever level or persuasion,

cannot discuss any matter or problem freely. But they must attend meetings to hear new state burdens, new state requirements and duties. During elections the people "voluntarily" assume new obligations, as extra or overtime work or to buy up government-sponsored "bonds." When told to, they write flattering and obsequious letters to Stalin, laud the Party decisions, and the like.

Freedom of religion is wholly absent in the Soviet Union. All church organizations (with the exception of the Kremlin-backed Russian Orthodox Church) are outlawed. In Ukraine, for instance, the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church was ruthlessly destroyed in the 1930s; the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine and Carpatho-Ukraine was liquidated in 1945-1946 with the open connivance of the Russian Orthodox Church, which is wholly subordinated to the party and has long been a profane agency of the MVD.

The right of *inviolability of person and home* is a hollow phrase, crushed by the iron grip the MVD exerts on all citizens and their homes. The dread of this institution strikes the breast of every citizen of the USSR; no one knows whether he will be arrested today or on the morrow for some crime, real or imaginary, or for disloyalty to something that may be first defined at one's trial. The MVD man (*en-kevudyst*) is the master of life or death in the USSR.

The MVD (the Ministry of Internal Affairs) and MGB (the Ministry of State Security)* are the weapons on which the power of the Party rests. Without them the Bolshevik power would not last a single day. By imprisonment, torture, and exile, these terror instrumentalities keep the entire population of the USSR in absolute obedience and submission to the Kremlin chieftains. The Party leaders unceasingly state that the MVD and MGB forces act only to combat "foreign spies and saboteurs," which, of course, everyone knows is a cynical lie. Were this true, the Kremlin would not need hundreds of thousands to man the MVD and MGB forces, nor would it need additional hundreds of thousands of *sek-sots* (secret agents, informers), for there certainly aren't

*These agencies have subsequently been merged into the *KGB*—the Committee of State Security.

hundreds of thousands of "foreign spies and saboteurs." In reality, this vast network of secret police and special MVD troops are maintained to keep the people under control and thus insure the implementation of the Party's dictates. The *sek-sots* are omnipresent. They are to be found in every institution, factory, hospital, collective farm, university, and party cell. They watch every citizen, know what he thinks and what he does; and any potential opponent is whisked away to a concentration camp. Are all the 11 to 12 million arrested and deported citizens of the USSR spies or criminals? Obviously not. They are workers, farmers, intellectuals who have been incarcerated either because they wanted and fought for true freedom and democracy for the people, or because they failed to fulfill their work quotas, or because they were not obsequious enough.

The Soviet *courts* do not meet the classic definition of courts. The real court is on guard for the rights of the citizen. In its decisions, a true court is guided by the principles of justice, and its decisions are independent of all outside duress or pressure. Such a court is but a dream in the USSR. The validity of the Soviet court is undermined by the following elements:

1. The Supreme Court is elected by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, which does not reflect or represent the will of the people. Therefore, the Supreme Court cannot act as a people's court. It is a tool in the hands of the Party, much as is the Supreme Soviet itself. The same is true of the supreme courts in the union and autonomous republics, and the *oblast* courts as well.

2. The so-called "people's courts" for the *raion* are elected in the same way as are the deputies to councils. Therefore, the "people's judges" are in no way representatives of the people; they play the dummy to the Party's ventriloquist.

3. In their decisions the Soviet courts are guided by the laws of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the decisions of the USSR government, that is, laws and decisions which protect the interests of the Party and not those of the people.

Consequently, every verdict of the court is no verdict of justice, but an obeisance to the Communist Party.

The validity of the Soviet laws can best be assessed on the basis of actual examples and the ways these laws are implemented. Let us take, for example, the law "on efforts to protect the collective farmland from waste." On the strength of this law the courts can mete out punishment to any citizen who could glean some wheat-ears in the field, a bunch of hay, some straw or corn from the collective farms. This is immediately classified as a theft and punished accordingly. In reality, this is not a theft, but a humiliating way a farmer can ease his miserable lot into which he was cast by the Party. Here it is not a question of justice. It is but a violation of an instruction of the Party, a feeble flaunting, at best, of its awesome authority.

Or let us take the law dealing with the "arbitrary quitting of a job in enterprise (absenteeism), loafing, or arbitrary change of employment." This law is specifically directed against the working people. The worker is deprived of his right to struggle against intolerable conditions in his employment and of the right to change his employment. This law compels the worker to stay where he is ordered, and this for a wage which is not negotiable. Thus, any verdict based on this law is a crass violation of the most rudimentary justice—another example of the paramount nature of the interests of the Party.

Still another example: the law which resorts to the principle of collective guilt, whereby, for a real or spurious "crime" by an individual, the Soviet courts can punish also members of his family. This is especially flagrant in cases involving so-called "anti-state activities." Any criticism at all of the Soviet state is defined as "high treason." Yet millions of Soviet citizens believe that criticism of the Soviet system is no crime, but rather the duty of anyone who believes in the rights of the person and who cares about his society, his own nation. Millions of them now think and believe that *the struggle against the Soviet state is the most just and righteous struggle in the world.*

For a fuller understanding of the Soviet courts, we must add the following:

1. Before a citizen suspected of "anti-state activities" appears in court, he must undergo a gruelling inquiry by the MVD and MGB, including torture. The upshot is that he admits his "guilt" and signs a fabricated confession.

2. The accused has no right to engage an attorney, and while undergoing inquiry in the MVD cellars he cannot communicate with the defense attorney who will eventually represent him. When the latter appears in court, he differs little from the prosecuting attorney (*procurator*); his function often is limited to asking leniency for the defendant. The accused cannot call his own witnesses, could he find any who would dare to challenge MVD and MGB.

3. All political trials with the exception of those destined to become "show trials," are held *in camera*. The public knows only what it reads in the Soviet press.

4. Very often a defendant receives a harsh sentence although he is not there himself to hear it pronounced; this procedure is known as "trial by *troika*."

5. During their inquiry and investigation, the MVD and MGB can do with the defendant whatever they wish. If he consents to sign a declaration pledging "cooperation" with the MVD and MGB (if the secret police offer it in the first place), he is released without his case being tried in court, even though he be really guilty. This method is the principal way the police recruit *sek-sots*, or informers. The MVD or MGB can execute or torture a prisoner to death without fear of being brought to court for trial. We have a long list of such incidents, especially now, a time when Western Ukraine is undergoing the process of forcible collectivization.

6. Justice at the hands of the Soviet courts cannot be expected—not only in cases involving "anti-state activities." Citizens of the "most democratic country of the world" cannot look for justice in such mundane cases as petty theft, hooliganism, housing abuses, fraud, and even family discord. Personal and Party connections, bribes, and so forth, usually decide the outcome of the trial. No wonder that so many people appeal to us, members of the underground, to settle

their personal misunderstandings, since they shrink from going to a Soviet court.

Thus, justice in the USSR is scarcely justice, being an interpretation primarily of the interests of the Party. There is no justice as we understand the traditional sense of the word. Rather, lawlessness, terror, and violation of human rights are garbed in the mantle of legality and justice.

In summing up, we can state without reservation that the much-glorified Soviet democracy is, in fact, *an inhuman dictatorship of the Party. People have no participation in government, as they are deprived of the right to freely express their will through genuine elections of the all-national parliament. They also lack all other democratic rights and liberties. The Party courts close their doors to him who seeks justice and legality. All power in the USSR belongs exclusively to the Bolshevik Party, which sustains itself on the terror tactics of the MVD and MGB.*

Consequently, the Bolshevik or Soviet state is not a state of the people; it does not serve or defend their interests, nor does it strive to enhance their cultural and economic development.

For this reason, the Bolshevik state is an alien state, and one that is hated by the people. The vast popular masses strive to destroy both the Soviet state and the Communist Party as the twin sources of their inhuman misery, deprivation, and political and national enslavement.

The Bolshevik Party—A New Class of Exploiters

Bolshevik propaganda misses no opportunity to criticize capitalist countries, claiming that there is no real democracy in these lands where there is social inequality, where there exists the exploitation of man by man, where exist exploiters—poor and rich. At the same time it underscores stridently that in the USSR, social classes have been destroyed and, as a result, there is no social exploitation. There is only socialism, and the working people are steadily making headway toward Communism! This campaign goes on re-

lently, while the exploitation of the working people is the order of the day in the USSR, where the party leaders live luxuriously and all others lead a life under unbearable social and economic conditions.

How did such misery come about in the "land of workers and peasants," in the land where great landowners and capitalists were eliminated—literally?

Marx and Engels believed that the basic cause of the world's misery was private property. They contended that the destruction of private property, the taking away from the landowners of their land and transferring the land to society as communal property (socialization) would bring an end to the burgeoning class of exploiters, to the division of a country into rich and poor. When this happens, Marx and Engels contended, the state as such will also disappear. There would be no need for police and prisons, and furthermore the differences between nations would be erased, and well-being would gush forward in rushing streams. It would be the era of Communism.

But today, after a century of historical experience and after thirty years of our Soviet reality especially, we readily see that not private property alone can be a source of the rise of new classes. We see that in the USSR there is no private property as regards the means and methods of production (land, forests, mines, factories and plants, transport, and so forth). These have not only been taken by force from the landowners, capitalists, and wealthy peasants, but the former owners of these themselves have been destroyed. Yet the exploitation of many exists in the USSR: there exist the exploited masses and the exploiting party oligarchy.

There exists in the USSR an exploiting class that has been created not on the basis of private property but on that of the unlimited political power of one party. In Czarist Russia, landowners and capitalists exploited the working masses because most of the resources in the country were their private property. In the USSR the Bolshevik exploiters exploit the working masses because the party, having all power concentrated in its hands, *has gained the possibility of unbridled utilization of all the resources of the land.*

We recorded previously that, with the advent of the Bol-

sheviks to power, the land, factories, transport, banks, trade, and so forth became the property of the state. During the NEP period some branches of industry (above all light industry), trade, and some land still remained in private hands. Only in the period of industrialization and collectivization (1929-1930) did all the branches of industry, trade, and the land go over to the state. Had the state been of the people, had the Supreme Soviet and the government really been composed of people's representatives, then it would have been possible to say that the people, through their legally elected representatives, indeed direct their economic life. Then it would have been possible to state that the means and methods of production belong really to the people. But we know that the state in the USSR is a tool of the Party and that the people are wholly removed from the stewardship of the state. As a consequence, all means of production, belonging as they do to the state, belong in reality to the Bolshevik Party.

By usurping all state powers the Bolshevik Party has appropriated all the resources of the people. This development in turn has become the source of the rise of a new class of exploiters—the class of Bolshevik masters. In place of the former great landowners and capitalists have come new and worse exploiters. Exploitation remains, except under new forms.

In order to clearly understand how this has occurred, let us take a practical example. Let us take a village and assume that it is a small state. In this village-state we find landless peasants, some poor peasants, a few richer farmers, and a very rich man who possesses extensive lands and uses hired manpower; in addition, he owns a mill and a brick factory in which he employs hired workers. In the village there also is a school and some teachers. Thus, the village possesses all the social classes. The rich man is our landowner-capitalist who has a great power in the village, power that derives from his holdings. Workers who are employed in the mill and the brick factory are directly dependent on him, as are, indirectly, the landless and poorer peasants and the local intelligentsia (teachers, doctors, etc.) who rely on him for their daily bread.

But in the village also is the village council and the head of the village, the so-called *viyt* (village head). Let us assume also that the village council and village head represent the political power in the village-state; they govern the village, issue all sorts of directives and see to it that they are carried out.

What, then, might be the relation between the rich man (landowner-capitalist) and the council (government)?

1. The rich man, owing to the fact that the larger part of the villagers are economically dependent on him and that this part is unorganized and politically inarticulate, may easily be elected head of the village. Likewise, the village council may well be composed of the few richer peasants. Thus, the village population will find itself in a double dependence on the rich man: it will rely on him economically (he is the richest man in the village who dispenses employment), and it will depend on him politically. Such a state where landowners and capitalists were synonymous with government was known to exist in the beginning of the development of capitalism.

2. Let us now assume that the rich man may not be the village head, a post which may be occupied by a less prosperous or even a landless farmer. But the rich man, because of his economic power in the village, may exert overwhelming influence upon the village head, and thus may rule the village at his whim. This kind of dependence of the village head and the village council (government) on the rich man may be more or less significant in actuality. This state has prevailed in the further development of capitalism.

3. The village head and the village council, relying on the organized and politically conscious majority of the village's population, may become independent of the rich man, and even be successful in subordinating him in the economic affairs of the village. Such a process of the state's "emancipation" from capitalists and their control of state may be seen in a number of capitalist states.

4. Now let us assume that a bandit becomes the village head, basing his power over the village on the terror wielded

by his clique. He does not touch the assets of the rich man, but he compels him to share them. Such a process we have seen in Hitler's Germany. Hitler exercised his totalitarian rule based on the Nazi Party and the Gestapo, forcing industrialists and capitalists to share their wealth with him.

5. One more hypothesis: a bandit who has become the village head (through usurpation of power) wrests away the wealth from the rich man and the other more prosperous citizens in the village—their land, forests, meadows, mill, brick factory, and so forth—all of which he subordinates to his clique. He appoints his own officials and forces the village population to work for him. But in order to conceal this misrule, he sees to it that a council is elected of people of his choice. He can now claim that the power is in the hands of the people. The local intelligentsia is forced to follow and laud the bandit and his clique.

This is the state of affairs in the USSR. The working people have no means of production of their own, as there is no private property in the Soviet Union. They cannot, therefore, exercise any power in administering the output of the country, because they have no part in the government. The working people in the USSR have only their hands to work with, and nothing else. *In order not to die from hunger, they must work for the state. Thus, the state is the only employer; the entire economy belongs to it.* Consequently, from the economic viewpoint, the working people in the USSR are wholly dependent on the state, that is, on the party lords. This characteristic of the state as the only employer provides it with unlimited and arbitrary powers, especially to dictate such wages as it sees fit, and not as the work is really worth and not what the working people desire. This, in fact, makes the dependence of workers on the government in the USSR far stronger than the dependence of workers in a capitalist country.

But there is still one more essential difference between workers under the capitalist system and those in the USSR. A worker under the capitalist system working for a private industry, remains a free man. The workers in the USSR, while working for the state, lack any sort of freedom. In fact,

the working people in the USSR are chained to the place and type of work, having no choice either to change the place or type of employment. For all intents and purposes the working people in the USSR are considered cattle which can be easily disposed of by the Party. In fact, the Party can move a worker from industry into a collective farm without his having anything to say about it. He may be moved from Ukraine to the Urals, from Moscow to Lviv, regardless of whether such a transfer is desirable to him or not. A worker cannot change his place of employment; unauthorized moves are severely punished. Arbitrary desertion of one's employment meets with a term of seven years imprisonment. Absenteeism is punishable by a six-month term in the slave labor camps; at the least, a reduction of wages of 25 percent. All these measures not only make the worker more dependent on the state, they also deprive him of his essential dignity as a man. *Work in the USSR is slave work, and the workers are a new caste of slaves.*

It is well known that workers in the capitalist countries possess powerful means of defense, such as the right to strike and to form trade union organizations. In the USSR, where workers are punished for being late to work, even mention of striking is considered to be an anti-state act. As for trade unions in the USSR, they are merely instruments of the Party, and not protective organizations dedicated to the rights and interests of the working people. The Soviet trade union is an additional whip in the hands of the Party. Soviet trade unions do not care about any raise in wages, nor any defense of workers against abuses and exploitation by the administrations of plants and factories. On the contrary, they organize the so-called "socialist competition" (*stakhanovism*) merely in order to augment the production output. At trade union meetings the worker hears but one and the same slogan: give more, work harder. *All this happens because the trade unions are not directed by the workers, but by the party.*

In What Lies the Exploitation of the Worker?

The exploitation of the working class in the USSR is characterized by the following features:

1. High norms of production demanded of workers.
2. Exceedingly low wages.
3. Constant extension of working hours.
4. "Socialist competition" and *stakhsnovism* (*stakhanovshchina*).

The norms of production ("piece work") in the USSR, at the present state of technology and organization, are extremely demanding. The Soviet worker is required to produce as no other worker in the world, and the wages he receives are insufficient to feed and clothe his family. Of necessity the Soviet worker must engage in "speculation" ("moonlighting"), that is, additional work to secure supplementary income. In addition, a substantial share of his wages are taken away by the state under various guises, such as "voluntary loans" to the state, "patriotic contributions," and so forth. *The exploitation of the worker in the USSR has no match in any country of the world.*

The so-called socialist competition is by no means voluntary and never originated by the workers themselves. It is inspired and organized by the Party, as is the "piece work" system. Factory foremen and supervisors select the strongest and the most capable workers; these receive, as a rule, the best machines and tools of production and favorable conditions and favors. As a result, such a *stakhanovits* "piece worker" produces two or three times as much as the average worker. Other workers are then prodded to emulate the "hero of Socialist work," even to surpass him. The normal worker ends up redoubling his efforts just to earn what he has been making, not to mention the energy remaining to earn supplementary income.

To be stressed is that the difference between the wages received for overtime work and the value of work produced is extremely great, which is taken as profit for the state. For the work the government pays kopeks; the product it takes from the worker is worth hundreds of rubles. Thus, "socialist competition" and *stakhanovism increase the exploitation of the worker to a considerable degree*; they squeeze out every drop of energy, and, sooner than later, are detrimental to the worker's very health.

The Soviet worker is under constant control; he is watched in his handling of machines and in his attitude toward his co-worker. Any slow-up at work is met by severe punishment.

But the exploitation of the worker does not end with these measures. *The state is not only the sole employer from whom the worker may secure employment. The state also is the only retailer from whom the worker can buy necessary food and consumer products.* And here the state once again defrauds the worker by selling him its products at extremely high prices. For instance, the state pays 5.80 rubles for 100 kg. of rye, while 1 kg. of rye bread costs 2.80 rubles; for 1 kg. of meat the state pays 0.19 rubles, but sells it at a price of 9-11 rubles; 1 kg. of butter costs the state 4.50 rubles, but it sells it for 64 rubles. One hundred kg. of sugar costs 38-42 rubles at the sugar refinery, but the state sells this amount for 1,250 rubles.

How Is the Collective Farmer Exploited?

The basic technique of exploitation of the collective farmer is provided by high grain quotas—which the state takes from the farmer for *nothing*. The grain quotas are assigned not on the basis of the acreage used for the cultivation of the grain, but on the basis of the potential area of the collective farm. The state does not care how much wheat and other crops, per se, a given collective farm has grown; it sees only how much produce was possible. Most quotas are also assigned according to the general area of the collective farm, not according to the actual quantity of cattle.

The second channel through which the state squeezes out the grain is that of *payment in kind to the MTS* (Motor-Tractor Station) for its services to the collective farms. The MTS's and combines belong to the state, inasmuch as the state forbids collective farms to possess their own machinery, not only tractors and combines, but even reapers. This technique of depriving the collective farms of machines was clearly designed to make them wholly dependent on the state. For the use of MTS machinery the collective farms are obligated to pay rental fees which are dictated by the state as well. For these rental fees charged, a collective farm could

purchase its own machinery, but the state would lose by this, to be sure.

The third method of exploitation of the collective farmers are the exceedingly high production quotas expressed in terms of a *trudoden* ("working day"). The collective farmer delivers a great amount of labor, but his "working days" are computed always to his disadvantage. He must achieve at least 120 full "working days" a year lest he be punished by the government. In most cases, his personal "garden plot," given him for the purpose of growing garden vegetables, would be taken away from him.

In order to keep the collective farmer in thralldom, a series of control devices have been instituted. So-called labor brigades are assigned acreage to work on, along with equipment, draft animals, and so forth. Every collective farmer or a group of farmers is assigned a specific task (an individual or a group assignment, so-called), and the work is evaluated not only from the viewpoint of quantity, but from that of quality as well. When a "brigade" does not meet its assigned quota, as, for instance, its harvest quota according to plan, the members of the brigade may lose 25 percent of their working days. Brigade and "cell" leaders usually are awarded extra working days, sometimes 2-3 percent of the general run of the group's working days, so that they can oversee the collective farmers more effectively.

After the handing up of the wheat quotas, the distribution of grain for sowing and feeding purposes, and the allotment of fodder for farm cattle (during which process the administration of the collective farms indulges in widespread stealing), the collective farmers are left with very little bread indeed. Inasmuch as the high number of working days do not permit him to amass as many working days as he would like, the farmer is always on the short end of the stick. The meager allotment and money he receives in exchange for his labor does not allow him to feed his family adequately or buy clothing or other necessities of life. By selling the collective farmer all the consumer products he is able to purchase, the state again depletes his scanty living resources, for all government prices are pegged at an extremely high level. Therefore, despite severe penalties and

the close guard kept over the collective properties, people steal food and other products at every opportunity without compunction, for they believe that all is but the result of their own labor and their own land, wrested from them by the Communists.

But this official robbery of the collective farmers does not end here. They must also pay various taxes on their so-called garden plots and also have to give up their calves—if they are lucky enough to keep any—for the benefit of the collective farms.

The intelligentsia—teachers, doctors, scientific workers, and other professional men and women—are exploited by the state as harshly as are the workers and peasants. A professional man or woman cannot change the place of his or her employment, for everyone depends on the same, single employer—the state. The professional receives a very low salary, barely sufficient to sustain his family; he, too, must “speculate” in order to obtain essential extra food or money. Since the people in the professions are needed by the regime to maintain itself in power, the intelligentsia also are conscious of selling out their honor and dignity; they know perhaps better than most that they serve a totalitarian, antihuman, and deceitful regime. Teachers and educators know the true nature of the Soviet system, yet they must eulogize it in their writings and teachings lest they be dismissed from employment and deported to slave labor camps.

Those who have rebelled form still another class in the USSR that constitutes a substantial segment of the population. Over 10 million people have been living in the so-called correctional labor camps, also known as slave labor or concentration camps. These unfortunates live in deplorable conditions, under constant guard, and on a starvation ration. Their dignity as human beings is assaulted daily. They, too, must work.

The inhuman Soviet regime has been using these hapless prisoners as a cost-free manpower force for work in the *tundras* and *taigas* of Siberia and in the deserts of Central Asia, wherever climatic conditions are arduous in the extreme. Sanitation and health care are unheard of. Political prisoners also are being used for the construction of secret

military bases and installations. Once they are completed, many of the prisoners are executed in order to prevent them from disclosing their military "secrecy."

The Soviet government constantly declaims that every citizen of the USSR has "the right to work," but in practice it is the right of the regime *to force every citizen of the USSR to work!* There is no "unemployment" in the Soviet Union. Instead, there exists a well-institutionalized system of *forced labor*. If the capitalist governments could force their citizenry to work under circumstances similar to those to be found in the Soviet regime, there would be no strikes or unemployment in the capitalist countries, either. But slave labor is far more degrading than unemployment, and, all too soon, proves lethal.

Soviet propaganda shamelessly brags that there is no unemployment, no labor shortages, no strikes. This is true. It claims that Soviet production is increasing from year to year, in fact, that the USSR is surpassing all capitalist countries. And here what is only true is that production usually does increase.

But Soviet propaganda hides the other side of the coin: the misery and exploitation of the people, who suffer from chronic food shortages and a lack of the most rudimentary articles of daily life, and who are deprived of the most treasured possessions man can have; freedom and dignity.

Yet while the vast majority of the inmates of the USSR live in conditions that range from wretched to appalling, the ruling class of the Soviet Russian empire lives comfortably: by comparison, luxuriously. This class embraces the party leadership and the NKVD-KGB apparatus, along with a vast second echelon of the police system, which stringently implements all the policies of the party and government of the USSR.

They control all the national resources and the whole national income. They supposedly manage all this for the "interest of the people," e.g., cultural and educational institutions, social services, houses of rest, sanatoria, the further economic development of the USSR, etc. But in reality the lion's share of the output, wrung out of the people's sweat and fear, for the most part goes into these channels:

1. Support and maintenance of the party ruling strata, along with its supporting cohorts: the NEVD, EGB, and hundreds of thousands of secret agents who are charged with carrying out the policies of the party;

2. The military budget of the USSR, which fuels aggressive policies (expanding the heavy industries, the upkeep of the vast armed forces, etc.) and which euphemistically is summed up as the "defense" and "development of the national economy";

3. Propaganda activity outside the USSR and the maintenance of an army of secret agents abroad, who work for the "world revolution," meaning the establishment of the Soviet system around the globe.

In these channels disappears over 80 percent of the entire Soviet budget every year. As for the social and other benefits, they, too, are slated for the ruling class, and not for the average citizen. Health sanatoria and houses of rest are for the party leaders, high policy and military echelons, and Soviet writers, artists, and other members of the Soviet elite—the mainstay of the regime. Ordinary workers and collective farmers can only dream of getting into the health sanatoria and rest houses. As for free medical care, what is given is rather nominal, for major medical care is inconceivable without the money to pay for it. And as for social assistance and related services, one need only recall the pitiful existence of war invalids, army widows, and orphans.

One may think that much of the Soviet budget is earmarked for the development of education and science, if only because this is ballyhooed by the Soviet government. But here, too, we may point out that the entire educational system in the USSR is subjected to the party line and that the current development of technology in agriculture, industry, and other branches of the economy is attuned strictly to the needs and requirements of the Party. The USSR must have trained technicians and specialists in order to exploit the broad masses of the population. Hence, compulsory education in the USSR is limited to secondary and intermediate levels. In order to prevent the children of workers and peasants from entering the higher schools of education, the state has

introduced prohibitively high tuition rates. The state provides some scholarships for talented students, but these stipends are barely sufficient to sustain the fortunate few in school, forcing them to seek employment. Schools in the USSR are not the schools of the people but those of the Party, the means and tools of the Communist Party, whereby the Party molds the minds of the young people to mirror its political and ideological objectives. Such disciplines as history and literature are taught in a distorted and falsified light. The theaters, the cinemas, the so-called palaces of culture—none serve the interests of the people; they are but instruments of Communist propaganda. All these “cultural benefits” which the Soviet regime provides are almost inaccessible to the common people for the simple reason they do not have the time, much less the money, to enjoy them.

Despite the huge national income the Party reaps every year from the people, there is hardly anything of benefit for the people themselves. All and everything is grist for the mill of the Party. It is no exaggeration to state that the Bolshevik Party leaders make up the most reactionary class of exploiters ever known in the world. This is a principal reason for the fear and hatred entertained by the people.

These exploiters seek to alter their image by using such euphemistic catchwords as socialism and Communism. They incessantly repeat that socialism already has been attained in the USSR, and that it is now being transformed into Communism. These declarations are but hollow and mendacious phrases, of which every citizen of the USSR is cognizant. Socialism, as idealized in the writings of socialist ideologists the world over, conceives that order in which all means of production—land, forests, mines, factories, transport, and the like—belong to the people: they are communally owned. This is a social order which explicitly admits no exploitation of man by man. There can be no exploiting classes. But in the USSR all means of production are concentrated in the hands of one group—the Party—which exploits the working people to an unconscionable degree. The fact that there are no capitalists or landowners in the USSR does not necessarily mean that socialism prevails there, much less Communism.

Russian Bolshevik Imperialists— Implacable Enemies of the Ukrainian and Other Freedom-Loving Peoples

Before discussing the Bolshevik colonial system, we shall list the principal traits characterizing the colonial status of a given nation. Under the term "colony," we understand a country thusly:

1. It does not have political independence, that is, has no government of its own. The Rule of the colony derives not from its people, but from that of an aggressive state.

2. Its economic life is subordinated to the interests of the aggressor-state.

3. It furnishes the controlling state at the cheapest cost agricultural and industrial raw materials: wheat, wood, rubber, coal, iron, oil, and so forth. Often it constitutes the main source of these materials for the aggressor-state.

4. In it successively appear branches of industry which:
a) extract raw materials, that is, coal, oil, iron and other metals; b) help exploit the raw materials, such as manufacture of mining equipment, freight cars, agricultural machinery, and so forth; c) convert the raw materials into their final form (lumber, wool, casting of iron, even sugar, since it is too costly to transport the sugar beet from the colony to the aggressor-state).

In it there is little or no production of such products as machine-building equipment, or of textile, chemical, and electrical equipment, much less of complex mechanical gadgets and apparatus, despite the fact that the colony may have the raw materials for their production and especially despite the fact that it needs these products as well. Instead, such products are manufactured in distant metropolises, that is, in the aggressor-state itself. This is done, of course, to make the colonies dependent on the aggressor-state, so that the latter's citizens may enjoy a higher standard of life. In short, the economy of a colony is always developed one-sidedly, never integrally.

5. Sold in it are only those products which are produced by the metropolises and, more often than not, from the very raw materials acquired from the colony at low cost. Thus the colony becomes a *sales outlet or market* for the metropolis. The metropolis profits twice: by plundering the raw material and then by selling it, in final form, to its place of origin.

6. It gives up not only the raw materials; it also is the source of cheap labor.

7. It is a terrain of colonization for the aggressor-state. The latter's citizens settle in the most productive areas, work in industry as administrators, technicians, and engineers.

8. Its population is unremittingly subjected to physical destruction and assimilation; its cultural and industrial development wither.

In this light, we may readily see the situation of Ukraine. And everything that pertains to Ukraine may be applied equally to all the other enslaved peoples of the USSR.

We have already indicated at the outset that all the non-Russian peoples of the USSR have been forcibly incorporated into the new Russian prison house of nations, that the establishment of the USSR was in no way a voluntary union of independent peoples. We have also sought to show how the Russian aggressors progressively usurped the rights of the enslaved nations, reducing them to their present plight of political and national enslavement. The so-called "Union Republics"—the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Lithuanian, Georgian, and others—are today full-fledged Soviet Russian colonies. They do not have a semblance of independence.

The so-called Supreme Soviet of the USSR (and the Supreme Soviets of the "Union Republics") is not a representative body. Among its members is not a single genuine representative of the Ukrainian people. All deputies are picked *a priori* by the party, while the "election" campaign is a farce, aimed at the world at large more than it is at the Soviet citizenry. The last "election" to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, held on September 11, 1947, was boycotted by the greater part of the Ukrainian people.

Likewise, the "Council of Ministers" of the Ukrainian SSR is not a Ukrainian national government; it is but a lower branch of the government of the USSR.

Both the Supreme Soviet and the government of the Ukrainian SSR are directed by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, which in turn is subordinated to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Moscow. They but implement higher-up policies and decisions. It is up to the Central Committee of the CPSU whether Ukraine today is ruled by Khrushchev, tomorrow by Kaganovich, or by some Patolichev or Popov.

That the Ukrainian SSR has no independence is indicated by the Stalin constitution. Article 14 decrees that all important matters which really determine whether a country is independent or not are relegated not to the Supreme Soviets and governments of the "Union Republics," but to the Supreme Soviet and the government of the USSR. These matters are put this way:

Thus, the Union Republics have no right to enter into international relations; decide in matters of war and peace; change frontiers and create within their borders new autonomous republics, *krais* or *oblasts*; organize defense, conduct foreign trade. All these belong to the Union. Furthermore, to the Union belongs security; it has the sole authority to enunciate economic plans, approve budgets of the Union Republics; it maintains the management of banks, industrial and agricultural institutions, transport, communication, the credit and monetary system, state insurance, loans, legislation of basic laws on land utilization, education, health protection, general legislation and the courts. . . (Cf. *From Socialist Slogans to the Establishment of the Empire*).

The validity of the "government" of the USSR may be seen in the ministries it has, and in that their number varies from time to time. In 1947 the government of the USSR directed some 36 ministries, the so-called "Union Ministries," including some of the most important, such as the ministries of defense, foreign trade, of all the industries, transport, and so forth. These ministries are nonexistent in the government of the Ukrainian SSR. Other, less important, matters are di-

rected by 23 so-called Union-Republic ministries, that is, mixed ministries of the USSR and the "Union Republics." Any difference between the two ministries is hardly noticeable, except that the real ministers are those in Moscow, as we can see from the fact that the MVD and MGB are Union-Republic ministries. There are, to be sure, ministers of the MVD and MGB in both the USSR government and the Ukrainian SSR in Kiev, but the latter are ministers on paper, who take orders from Moscow and implement Moscow's orders in Ukraine.

Among the "Union-Republic ministries" are the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and of Defense. These two ministries were taken away from the "Union Republics" in 1923, but were given back on January 11, 1944. This undoubtedly was done by Moscow to *play on the national and patriotic feelings of the non-Russian peoples during World War II* for a dual purpose: to have more votes in the various international conferences after the war and to gain the backing of the non-Russian nations in the USSR, which had revealed deep-seated anti-Russian feelings during the Nazi-Soviet war. But Ukraine does not have even a paper minister of defense, nor were any attempts made toward the creation of "Republics" or national military formations in the Red Army. The Ukrainian SSR has neither ambassadors nor consuls in foreign countries, nor can it conclude international treaties. The only things that we see are the appearances of Dmitri Manuilsky at various international gatherings, where he castigates Greece, Indonesia, and other countries. But he utters not a single word in defense of the Ukrainian population that was brutally uprooted and deported by Communist Poland from such Ukrainian areas as the Lemko Land, the regions west of the Sian River, and the province of Hrubeshiv, Kholm, and Pidlasia.

Thus, the so-called Union-Republic ministries in the Union Republics have not even limited rights, and their influence, as that of the Union Republics *in toto*, on the course of Soviet policy is nil.

The only "independent" ministries in the Ukrainian SSR are: 1) the Ministry of Education; 2) the Ministry of Local Industry (production of peasant carts, sleds, brick, lighters,

and so forth); 3) the Ministry of the Furniture and Carpentry Industry; 4) the Ministry of Communal Economy (parks, city squares, water reservoirs); and 5) the Ministry of Social Security (pensions to widows, orphans and war invalids, etc.).

But even in these narrow areas of responsibility, the Ukrainian ministries are not truly independent. The Ministry of Education of the Ukrainian SSR in its operations must adhere strictly to the instructions of the Union Ministry of Education. For instance, a minister of Ukraine cannot introduce the teaching of Ukrainian history in the high schools by using undistorted textbooks. In fact, in the high schools of Ukraine the history of Ukraine is not taught at all as a separate subject.

Let us take, for instance, the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR and their prerogatives in the light of the Soviet constitution. Article 20 prohibits the passage of any legislation by a "Union Republic" which is not compatible with Union legislation. Article 69 gives the government of the USSR the right to cancel all the decisions of the government of a "Union Republic." For instance, should the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine enact legislation on the dissolution of the collective farms in Ukraine or adopt a decision lowering the wheat quota assigned for Ukraine—such legislation would not go into effect, inasmuch as it would be contrary to the Union laws as put down by the Communist Party.

Thus *the Ukrainian SSR is not an independent or sovereign state*, except in name only. It could easily and more accurately be called a *gubernia*, province or any other name indicating subordination.

Considering all this, the article of the constitution providing the right of each "Union Republic" to secede from the USSR constitutes the most cynical mockery. What in practice this right means, we, who are fighting for the emancipation and independence of Ukraine, know best.

From the register of ministries that belongs to the government of the Ukrainians SSR, we plainly see that the *entire economic life of Ukraine is directed by Moscow*. What has been left for the government of Ukraine is only local industry, which has but little role to play in the life of the coun-

try. All other branches of industry and the national economy of Ukraine are wholly in the hands of Moscow, specifically, the coal and oil industry, agriculture, trade, and finances. *The Ukrainian people, therefore, are not masters in their own country.*

The Soviet Russian occupants are looting Ukraine every year of millions of tons of coal, iron, oil, and manganese. They take away her wheat and other foodstuffs, leaving the Ukrainian people just enough food not to starve; they foster and organize famines in order to crush resistance (1933 and 1946-47). Prior to the war, Ukraine gave 101 million centners* of gross output of wheat, 70 million centners of rye, 44 million centners of barley, 35 million centners of corn, 102 million centners of sugar beet, 70 million tons* of coal (66 percent of the entire annual production of coal), 13 million tons of iron ore, one million tons of manganese, 6.7 million tons of cast iron and 5.4 million tons of steel. According to the new Five Year Plan, Ukraine is to deliver in 1950 almost 10 million (9.7) tons of cast iron, which constitutes half of the entire proposed Soviet cast iron production; about 9 million tons of coal, that is, one-third of the total Soviet coal production; 325,000 tons of oil, and 1,637,000 tons of sugar (over half of the total scheduled Soviet sugar output). Thus, *Ukraine constitutes a rich source of raw materials for the Soviet Russian aggressors.*

The problem of the source of raw materials opens up upon the larger view of the whole economic development of the Ukrainian SGR and of the other Union Republics. *First*, Ukraine is assigned the role of producer of *wheat and sugar beet* for the entire Soviet Russian empire. *Second*, Ukraine is permitted to develop only those branches of industry which have a direct bearing upon the production of the industrial raw materials, such as coal, iron ore, manganese, oil, and so forth. Consequently, those branches are well-developed in Ukraine. *Third*, Ukraine is allowed those branches of industry which have a direct bearing upon agriculture and the processing of raw materials. These branches exist only for a

*Centner ("sotnar") equal to 100 kilograms, or 220 American lbs. Ton ("tona") equal to 1,000 kilograms, or 2,200 lbs.

more systematic exploitation of Ukraine. They are: the production of mining and metallurgical equipment, agricultural machinery, freight cars and locomotives, electrical plants, etc. All these branches are essential for Ukraine for its mass production of coal, iron, manganese, and the like. This local production of tractors, locomotives, and mining and metallurgical and other equipment lowers considerably the cost of production and transport of raw materials. If all this machinery would have to be brought into Ukraine, it would cost a great amount of money. Hence the Kremlin has no other recourse but to have it manufactured in Ukraine.

But the production of locomotive and agricultural equipment, as well as mining and metallurgical equipment in Ukraine, is lower than that of the same branches in the Russian Republic. For example, according to the 1950 Five Year Plan, the target for tractors in Ukraine is three times smaller than that of the Russian SSR, and the production goal of metallurgical equipment is half that of Russia.

Special mention ought to be made of the relation between the production of cast iron and steel, for this also indicates the colonial status of Ukraine. Thus the production of cast iron, the first product derived from iron ore, for 1950 is 9.7 million tons, and at this figure is more or less equal to cast iron production set forth for Russia (9.5 million tons). But the production of all-important steel for 1950 in Ukraine is 8.8 million tons, while in Russia it is 16 million tons, or virtually twice as much.

All other branches of industry in Ukraine are *either totally undeveloped, or are developed insufficiently*. they are all concentrated in Russia proper, specifically, in the Leningrad and Nechernozemny centers (in six *oblasts*, all closest to Moscow). These industrial centers do not possess their own raw materials (coal, iron, oil, manganese, etc.), yet they are the most developed areas industrially. For instance, the Nechernozemny center which, territory- and population-wise, is half the size of Ukraine, produced industrially before the war twice as much as Ukraine. The same ratio exists today after the war. A single Moscow *oblast* in 1950 is scheduled to produce one-fourth of all-Union production of heavy trucks, the same one-fourth (25,000 trucks) earmarked for all

Ukraine. Russian *oblasts*, especially the Moscow and Ivanovo *oblasts*, are to produce in 1950 89 percent of the total production of woolen textiles, despite the fact that they themselves have no raw materials for these products. But the Uzbek SSR, which constitutes the main source of wool production, is earmarked to produce a bare 3.4 percent of the total Soviet textile production.

Thus the economy of Ukraine, as well as those of other Union Republics, is constrained in a totalitariat straitjacket, regardless of Ukraine's needs and the fact that Ukraine possesses all the necessary raw materials for the development of all of its industries. By this policy of deliberately limiting the industrial development of Ukraine the Russian master makes Ukraine economically dependent on Russia, and in turn develops the economy of Russia at the expense of Ukraine and the other enslaved non-Russian nations.

Russian industry, which is being developed on the base of alien raw materials, finds ready sales markets exactly in the place from where it loots the raw materials—the Union Republics. In 1950 the Uzbek SSR is slated to produce 2.4 million tons of wool, from which 6 billion square meters of textiles can be manufactured. A part of the wool will be exported abroad; another part will go to the Russian textile factories to turn out 4 billion square meters of finished goods. All the other Union Republics are scheduled to produce only 500 million square meters of textiles. The Uzbek SSR, the prime supplier of wool, will manufacture only 161 million square meters of textiles, or roughly a quarter of the Russian textile industry. It is clear that such a state of affairs does not satisfy the people of Uzbekistan or of any other Union Republic. Moreover, they are forced to buy at high prices the textiles manufactured in Russia. In this way the Union Republics are robbed doubly by their Russian aggressors-masters. This the Kremlin euphemistically calls the “friendly and selfless assistance of the great Russian people.”

Taxes and “loans” are the third major form of robbery of the enslaved peoples. Great sums are extorted in this way for the benefit of the Russian masters, while the needs of the people receive scant attention. Thus the peoples in the Union

Republics work for the Russian Bolshevik enslavers.

The Ukrainians and other non-Russian nationals are, as a rule, being reduced to manual labor. Increasing in number in each Union Republic yearly are the Russians serving as technicians, engineers and civil servants. This implantation of the Russian element is the worst form of colonization. For over thirty years Moscow has thus been "assisting" Ukraine and other Union Republics; it has brought in the Russian ethnic element to strengthen Moscow's hold on these countries.

Parallel with the colonization of Ukraine by Russian settlers, the Soviet government has resorted to the physical destruction, or genocide, of the Ukrainian people. In 1933 the Soviet government organized a deliberate famine in Ukraine that resulted in the death of at least seven million Ukrainians. In 1946-47 it instigated another famine which claimed hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian victims. And how many other Ukrainians have been executed, murdered in prisons, and obliterated in concentration camps? How many Ukrainians were killed at the war fronts, sent there untrained and poorly equipped? To understand the Soviet mentality, we need only recall the fate of the Crimean Tatars, who after World War II were deported *en masse* to Siberia and Central Asia. Russians took their places.

Another method of destroying the national identity of the Ukrainians is Moscow's Russification policy, which drums constant propaganda about the superiority of Russian culture and about the "Russian people being the most cultured people in the world." It even claims that Ukrainians could not have been sustained as a nation without the "help" of the Russian people. To bolster this claim, the Soviet Russian government outrageously falsifies history, castigates and denigrates Ukrainian national heroes and national traditions, and, most important, simply appropriates as Russian certain periods of Ukrainian history and many outstanding Ukrainian literary works (examples: the period of Kievan Rus has become a part of Russian history and the classic epic, *The Tale of Ihor's Armament*, is now an early example of Russian literature). The Russian language is glorified as the "most advanced and cultured language in the world."

Could the non-Russian peoples, upon whom it is being forced, possibly protest?

After the end of World War II, colonialism disappeared almost completely in Africa and Asia. In the USSR, however, it has attained its highest form. *The Union Republics of the non-Russian nations, which Soviet propaganda has acclaimed as independent states, are virtual colonies of Russia, the metropolis, while the non-Russian peoples are slaves of the Russians, the master-race nation!*

The Russians overwhelmingly constitute the basis of the Party, administration, army and the MVD and MGB. True, there are some Ukrainians in the leadership at the top—the Korniyets, Hrechokhas, Korotchenkos, and others—but these are wholly Russified, just as in Czarist times were such Ukrainians as the Kochubeys and Tereshchenkos.

Knowing full well that they enjoy no support among the non-Russian nations, the Bolshevik leaders are now relying more and more exclusively on the Russian people as their mainstay. Thus they are trying to bribe one part of the Russian people with better positions, sinecures, and so forth. They dupe most with propaganda to the effect that the Russian people are a “chosen people,” because they are the “most capable” people in the world. It is the Russians, after all, who have made almost all the important technical discoveries and inventions. If one doesn’t believe this, he need only read *Pravda*. Such tyrannical rulers of Russian history as Czars Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great are being extolled as great and “enlightened” leaders, despite the fact that they oppressed the masses of the Russian people and waged aggressive wars against their neighbors. This propaganda is succeeding in poisoning the minds of the Russian working people, who are also being oppressed and exploited.

* * *

Finally, we should like to point out certain traits of Bolshevik policy and those promises on which the Communist leaders have acted in the periods of seizure and strengthening of power in the Kremlin.

The basic ingredients of Bolshevik policy are *deceit and*

violence, both of which have been developed to perfection. Deceit and terror, in the opinion of the Kremlin leaders, can only succeed when they are massive and used constantly.

It is indeed pervasive. The official spokesmen of the Kremlin government lie to themselves, lie to their hapless subjects, and lie to the world at large. They repeatedly de-claim about "Soviet equality and democracy," "the self-determination of all peoples," and "the war against imperialism and colonialism" at the same time they themselves practice these unprecedented forms of imperialism in the USSR.

This duplicity of the Soviet government and its leaders is taken for granted by the peoples inside, who have become adept at reading government statements. When the Kremlin leaders talk about "liberation" they mean oppression and enslavement. By the term "peace," they usually mean the "peace" of the Soviet brand—the death of weaker and defenseless nations.

In order to protect itself from the winds of freedom outside the USSR, the Kremlin has imposed on the Empire a strict isolation, the "Iron Curtain." Shut out are Western ideas and influences. Since there are few visitors from abroad, the Kremlin may with impunity brag about "freedom and democracy" in the USSR. The new official visitations from abroad are treated to a "guided" tour, according to the well-known precept of the "Potemkin village." They are shown only those places and establishments which the Kremlin wants seen. Foreigners cannot travel wherever and whenever they wish, and no citizen of the USSR is eager to talk to foreigners, for this means that he might be arrested and sent to a concentration camp.

Terror is the most effective weapon the Soviet government has found to keep the citizenry in total obedience; people not only obey orders, but even glorify their masters, praising their wisdom and their foresight.

Another important tool of Soviet policy is the classical doctrine of "divide and conquer." Therefore, before the Kremlin tries to absorb its victim, it first tries to demoralize and divide it, as in the case of a nation. Soviet agents are sent in to instigate unrest, civil disorders, strikes and the "class

struggle." Wearing the mantle of "defenders of the working class," the Communists first direct their struggle against the exploiting classes—the landowners and capitalists—leaving the middle class undisturbed. Only after the destruction of the landowners and capitalists do they proceed to eradicate the middle class—the small industrialists, merchants and small farmholders, the *kurkuls* (*kulaks* in Russian). Simultaneously, the Bolsheviks are busy building up their own party and police apparatus, which takes over the government once demoralization is achieved.

If the country against which the Kremlin is waging a subversive war contains a national minority or other ethnic groups, then the Bolsheviks pose as "liberators" of the oppressed minorities. In such a case, the Communists do not attack landowners and capitalists but launch, instead, a frontal attack against the government and all those associated with it in its policy of oppression. If and when the oppressed nation or minority gains its freedom, then the Communists begin their own operations for a takeover.

We must also understand that in their tactics of subversion and infiltration the Bolsheviks are using various methods and approaches. For instance, they often classify as "exploiters" not only the capitalists and landowners but any other social group that they consider "unreliable" or potentially dangerous. These are usually pinned with complimentary labels—"traitors," "scum," "sell-outs," "anti-Semites," "fascists," "Hitler's lackeys," and so forth.

The rule of "divide and conquer" is also effectively applied in the struggle inside the Communist Party itself. This struggle is waged under various guises. In Ukraine the intraparty struggle is conducted, in most cases, against "nationalist deviations," "national communism," "bourgeois nationalism," and the like. In the 1920s, M. Skrypnyk attacked such well-known Communists as Shumsky, Yavorsky, and others, who were liquidated. A few years later, Skrypnyk and his associates in turn were assailed and dispensed with by Zatonsky and Khvyliia, who also in turn were liquidated by a new party orthodox clique, headed by Kyrlyuk. The latter was sped on his way into the unknown by Stebun-Ketzelson, Parkhomenko, and others. And so it goes, on and on.

Permanent terror as a feature of government lies in the very nature of Communism-Bolshevism. The Soviet leadership has to keep the masses in constant obedience and responsiveness. And if there should be no real enemies, then they must be invented in order to justify the party and secret police terror. Actually, all these Communist leaders who were liquidated for alleged "deviations" were in no way "nationalist deviationists." They were simply following the directives of the Party. It was the Party that changed the policies, and they, the "deviationists," were too slow to adapt themselves to the Party zigzagging. Kyryliuk and Co. were dubbed as "followers" of Prof. M. Hrushevsky and, therefore, the precepts of Ukrainian nationalism. In fact, they were neither.

After the war, the Kremlin labeled the Ukrainian resistance movement as "Ukrainian-German nationalist," "fascist," and so forth, in order to justify its brutal policies in Ukraine following the end of World War II.

Chapter 2

On the Bolshevik Ideological Front

The frantic noise that the Stalinist masters have made about ideology and ideological work in the Party, in the Comsomol, and among the masses merits the attention of each and every one of us, although this clamor is nothing new. In the course of the three decades of totalitarian rule of the Party, ideological matters inside the Party frequently came to the boiling point, threatening the very existence of the Party. But what is going on today on the Bolshevik ideological front is something which heretofore has never been seen—the voluntary agreement of all nations of the USSR. Previous ideological changes may be characterized as having flowed out of overstretching Marxism in order to fit practical Bolshevik policy. This was clearly and euphemistically called “the development of Marxism in the new historical circumstances.” Although the stretched-out Bolshevik ideology had nothing in common with the spirit of Marxism, it nonetheless preserved at least some Marxist appearances. Today, the Kremlin chieftains have not officially discarded Marxism, but they do bring new elements into their ideology that cannot be defined as Marxist. If anything, the present changes seem to be addressed toward revamping Bolshevik ideology itself. It is an undeniable fact that the reconstruc-

tion of Bolshevik ideology has been forced on the Party by life itself. The scissors of theory and practice could not be extended further, and something had to be done to prevent the complete collapse of this ideology. The war exposed completely the mendacious Bolshevik ideology and precipitated these changes. The total departure of the then Bolshevik ideology from practical politics and the realization by the masses of the utter mendacity of this ideology—these were the real reasons underlying the change. All was masked outwardly by a few slogans, such as the necessity of enhancing the ideology for the “strengthening of the position of socialism” and the “further construction of Communism.”

For additional light on these charges, let us discuss the deviations of practical politics from the Bolshevik ideology, starting with the nationality problem.

In theory, the Bolsheviks contend that the Soviet Union was established with the voluntary agreement of all nations of the USSR, implying that the nationality problem was practically “solved” on the basis of “equality and friendship” of all the peoples making up the USSR. But the practice of the Russian totalitarians, from the very beginning of their takeover, contradicts, wholly and unmistakably, this implication. After the victory of October Revolution, the Russian Communist imperialists, under the cover of revolutionary slogans and by exploiting the revolutionary fervor of the Russian masses, enslaved all the non-Russian nations of the former Russian empire, despite the fact that after the collapse of the empire in 1917, these nations had succeeded in establishing their own independent states. Thus, the imperialists took the all-important first step toward the restoration of the old Russian prison house of nations.

The second important step was the creation in 1922 of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Soviet Union for short, a development which further strengthened the Russian empire. It entailed the liquidation of almost all the autonomous prerogatives of the “Union Republics” and their submission (called “union”) to the Russian imperialist center.

Today, these Union Republics constitute no more and no less than ordinary Bolshevik administrative provinces—*gubernias*—with general secretaries of the Communist

Party as their governors. All the Supreme Soviets of the national republics are merely decorative outposts of the imperialist center in Moscow. They are neither elected nor approved by the people. Neither the Supreme Soviets nor the governments of the Union Republics have seen a jot of independence; they are, for all intents and purposes, branches of the Kremlin oligarchy.

From the economic viewpoint, the Union Republics, as we have already pointed out, are only colonies of the Russian metropolis, which is Russia, or the Russian SFSR. In support of our contention, we need only quote from the Fourth Five Year Plan.

Of the scheduled general production of automobiles in the USSR, only 5 percent has been allotted to Ukraine, contrasted with 91 percent for Russia, including 30 percent of the trucks for the Moscow *oblast* alone. Of total tractor production, Ukraine has been assigned 22 percent and Russia, 73 percent. Of the proposed textile output, the Russian Republic, which grows no wool, has been assigned 89 percent, while Uzbekistan, the principal wool-producing country, only 3 percent. With an almost equal production of cast iron (Ukraine—9.7 million tons, Russia, 9.5 million tons), Ukraine has been assigned only 8.8 million tons, Russia, 16 million tons.

The dominant nation in the USSR is the Russian nation, or more exactly, a Russian imperialist elite with millions of Russian cohorts who obediently implement all the policies of the Kremlin. The Russian people have been corrupted by their elite class, which has been tutoring them to be implementors of the policy of oppression and enslavement of the non-Russian peoples. Consequently, in the USSR there is no equality of nations, and certainly no friendship between the Russian and the non-Russian peoples. Instead, their community of interest and their common enslavement by Moscow make for close cooperation and true friendship between the Ukrainian and other non-Russian nations in the USSR.

After wresting the power in Russia, the Bolshevik Party secured through terror key positions in the government. Then, once it destroyed all the democratic rights of the

peoples, it ousted all these peoples from the management and rule of the state. In order to sustain itself in power, the party built up a powerful and unprecedented police apparatus of oppression—the NKVD and NKGB (today the MVD and KGB), with its blade of terror directed not against foreign enemies, but against the citizens of the USSR, despite the declarations of the Kremlin chieftains to the contrary.

With all political power in its hands, the Party stretched out its tentacles to economic life. Having nationalized all the means of production, the Party concentrated all economic power in its hands, depriving the people this time of any influence or direction of the economic development. All the trade union organizations, factory committees, collective farm meetings, and other forms of organization are being used by the party as the instruments of its policies, which, as a rule, are inimical to the interests of the people.

The Bolshevik Party also restored the exploitation of the working people. In industry, this exploitation, as in the capitalist system, is being effected through the illegal appropriation of the additional value produced by the worker. In agriculture this exploitation is accomplished through the Stalinist collective farm system, with its wheat quotas, payment in kind, and the so-called *trudoden*, or "piece work" system.

On the basis of its monopolistic political and economic position, the Party has been transformed into a class of Bolshevik masters. The basis of this new class is not private property, but a privilege to freely dispose of and utilize all the means of production and all manpower itself. As a result, Soviet society has been divided into two irreconcilable and mutually antagonistic classes: the class of exploiters and the class of exploited workers and peasants. As far as the intelligentsia is concerned, the Party, through deceit and terror, compels it to serve the government and the Party, even at the cost of prostituting its intellectual resources.

Under such conditions, with the existence of two such mutually exclusive classes, it is impossible to speak of a "moral-political unity of society," a "unity of conscience and ideals" in the process of "socialist construction." On the con-

trary, Soviet society is torn apart not only by economic and political antagonisms, but by moral and ideological-cultural factors as well.

These antagonisms and contradictions inside Soviet society, along with the contradictions emanating from the imperialistic and colonial policy of the Kremlin, will sooner or later lead to the collapse of the Stalinist empire. In this process of disintegration of the USSR, the enslaved non-Russian peoples, including the millions of oppressed workers and peasants and the intelligentsia, will be the gravediggers of the tyrannical system.

This is the real state of relations between nations and peoples in the USSR, although in theory this state is depicted quite differently. The national oppression and colonial status is called "equality and friendship of peoples"; the totalitarian type of state—"the highest form of democracy"; the antagonistic class society and exploitation—"socialist society"; and the aspirations of the working people toward the destruction of the Soviet system—"moral and political unity."

It is clear that these contradictions between real life and ideology put a special demand upon the latter to apply itself to practical politics and to fabricate some ideological justification for the reactionary policy of the government, a policy of fraud and deceit. Toward this end, it must be admitted, the party leadership is exerting a ceaseless effort. In order to falsify the reality, Moscow has even enlisted such branches of human learning as history, philosophy, political economy, law, literature, and the arts. Needless to say, all these have been made to prostitute themselves and have ceased to be fruitful branches of human knowledge.

On the other hand, there are no voices to point out the contradictions between the life and the ideology, voices which would dare to proclaim that all created by Stalin in the USSR is neither socialism nor Communism. Even those who have supported Stalin's policies despite some grave doubts and reservations as to the validity of his "theories" have not dared express their true feelings and thoughts. For the Bolshevik oligarchy Stalin has become a peerless philosopher, as economist, a historian, a critic, a literary

expert; he has become a prophet, capable on the basis of "scientific deduction" of uncovering "social conformities" and of governing them. Stalin's word has become the gospel.

On November 6, 1944, in his address on the occasion of the 27th anniversary of the October Revolution, Stalin, in order to justify his failures early in the war against Hitler, expounded a new theory on so-called aggressive and nonaggressive nations. Naturally, he included the USSR in the roster of "nonaggressive and peaceful nations." According to his theory, aggressive nations, as a rule, are those always planning aggressive wars because they believe in war as a policy of government.

Thus, the USSR, as a "nonaggressive and peaceful nation," was caught "unprepared" by Hitler. This piece of Soviet semantics may be given credence by some Peppers, Wallaces, and Zilliakuses, but not by any Soviet citizen. The Soviet citizenry knew that the Stalin oligarchy, Party, and Soviet General Staff had been preparing for war for five years before Hitler even started on his preparations. The First Five Year Plan had outlined a huge military budget. Moreover, when the Nazi-Soviet "nonaggression" pact was signed in August, 1939, Stalin himself embarked upon a series of aggressions. With the approval of Hitler, he occupied in the fall of 1939 Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia; he attacked Finland, and in 1940 he annexed Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and a part of Bessarabia. The USSR always maintained a huge army, and it used it not for defense but for aggression.

The original inability of the Red Army to cope with Hitler's thrust was not due to "unpreparedness," as Soviet propaganda would like the world to believe. The main reason for the collapse of the Soviet armies in the summer of 1941 is that millions of the non-Russian soldiers in the Red armies refused to fight in defense of Stalin and the USSR, as most of them believed that any war involving the USSR would bring about their own national liberation from Communism. There were as well other reasons for the rapid disintegration of the Soviet armed forces, such as the lack of an officer corps (Stalin decimated it in 1937-1938), inadequate military equipment, lack of modern transport, and so forth.

But to be stressed is the spaciousness of Stalin's theory on "aggressive and nonaggressive nations."

The Party has acclaimed Stalin's "genius"; his "clairvoyance" is legendary. Yet the fact that Nazi Germany was preparing for aggressive war was a secret to no one in the West. And everyone knew that France and England were less prepared for war than Nazi Germany. But all this only was in Stalin's mind, hence his "theory," as explained in one of the Soviet publications:

Comrade Stalin has uncovered and explained one of the most important legalities of the society's development in the last few decades. Comrade Stalin has demonstrated for the first time in the social sciences that aggressive nations, as the attacking nations, are, as a rule, more prepared for war than peaceful nations. . . . (*Bolshevyk*, No. 14, 1945).

Let us take another Stalin "scientific discovery," namely, his "theory about transient, provisional and permanently acting factors of war," according to which a war's outcome is decided not by transient factors, but by permanently acting factors, such as "the strength of the rear (*hinterland*), the morale of the army, the number and quality of divisions, the armament of the army and the organizational capabilities of the general staff. . ." In war, Stalin said, the victorious are "those states which are stronger than their adversary in development and organization of the economy, in their experience and mastery, in the fighting spirit of their armies, and in the endurance and unity of their people throughout the war. . ."

As we can see, Stalin has not, by any stretch of the imagination, discovered America; these elementary facts are to be found in every basic military manual.

Or let us take a look at Stalin the philosopher. The review *Kulture i zhyzn* (Culture and Life), in No. 1, in an article on the first volume of Lenin's works, comments on Stalin's brochure, *Anarchism or Socialism?*:

In the chapter on "Dialectical Method," Comrade Stalin *proves* [italics ours—Author] that life is a perpetual movement and change. . .

After this introduction one would not be unreasonable in expecting some profound thinking on the part of Stalin, but what he proceeds to say is that in life there is "*the new and the old, the growing and the dying*," adding to this "the revolutionary and counterrevolutionary." He was anticipated by Heraclitus over 2000 years ago, but he did add two words, "revolutionary and counterrevolutionary."

Stalin's philosophical depth also is evident from his "major work," the 30-page brochure which appears as a subchapter of *A Short Course in the History of the All-Union Communist Party (b)* and which is titled, "About Dialectical and Historical Materialism." It is a popularized repetition of what was said by Marx and Engels and, later on, by Lenin.

We have already mentioned that the "enlightenment" conducted in ideological matters changes so rapidly that even the closest advisers of Stalin cannot always guess how this or any other ideological matter should be interpreted.

In his article, "Marxism and Leninism on the Sources and Character of Wars," R. Fedoseev departs from the position of Lenin on war, especially World War I, and takes into consideration the fact that in the First World War the Bolsheviks were against the slogan of "Defense of the Fatherland," fighting instead to "Defeat the Czarist government." He writes that the first part of World War II (prior to the involvement of the USSR) "was an imperialist war for the division of the world. But in the course of its development the character of the war changed. The peculiarity of World War II is that its character was wholly transformed by the participation in the war of the socialist state, the Soviet state. . . This day [June 22, 1941] became a turning point of World War II. From this moment on danger hung over the freedom-loving peoples [surprisingly enough, the Kremlin "clairvoyants," including Stalin, could not see this danger before June 22, 1941—Author]. . . If we consider these changes which occurred in the character of World War II, it will become quite clear that the war of the freedom-loving peoples against Fascism was a just war. . ." (*Bolshevyk*, No. 16, 1945)

This is the characterization of World War II not by a scholar but by a deputy chief of the propaganda and agitation section of the Central Committee of the Communist Par-

ty, the agency which directs the entire ideological activity.

Stalin, in his address of February 9, 1946, before election time, touched on the same matter:

This does not mean, of course, that World War II is a replica of the First World War. On the contrary, World War II differs essentially from World War I. . . World War II against the Axis Powers, in contrast to the First World War, *assumed from the very beginning an anti-Fascist character, the character of a war of liberation*, one objective of many being the restitution of democratic liberties. *The entry of the USSR into the war against the Axis Powers could only strengthen and did actually strengthen the anti-Fascist character of World War II.* . . [italics added—Author]

Thus, according to Stalin, World War II from its very beginning was a liberation war; Fedoseev saw it start, at least, as an imperialistic war. In any event, after Stalin's pronouncement, Fedoseev's interpretation was discarded as "unscientific."

These jugglings and jostlings of ideological "theses" are not infrequent or atypical. For instance, a top Kremlin leader made the following statement in the fall of 1939:

If we speak about the great states in Europe, we can see that Germany is a state which aspires to a speedier termination of the war toward peace. England and France, which only yesterday tried to save themselves from aggression, today stand for the continuation of the war and are against its conclusion by peace. It is not only senseless, but also criminal to wage a war for the destruction of Hitlerism under the false banner of a struggle for democracy. . .

So spoke the closest adviser of Stalin, Vyacheslav Molotov, on October 31, 1939, during the period of the political honeymoon between the USSR and Nazi Germany. This ideological viewpoint changed, to be sure, when Hitler attacked the USSR. For the latter the war became a "liberation war," because it was "an anti-Fascist" war, with one of its objectives "the restoration of democratic liberties."

It is clear that in this atmosphere of ideological inconsistency and total subordination of science and scholarship,

there is hardly any possibility of a free scientific development. On the contrary, science, scholarship, and culture are put strictly into the service of the Party. This does not mean that in the USSR there are no historians, economists, or social scientists. They do exist, but only nominally, for they cannot pursue their professions objectively or in accordance with their conscience.

That the social sciences in the USSR are virtually meaningless testifies to the spuriousness of Bolshevik ideology. The lowly estate of the social sciences gives the Kremlin leaders much concern, not because they care about the development of science but because of the lack of "Party scientists" to continue Soviet Propagandistic use of research and scholarship.

Especially noticeable is the decline in such branches of science and scholarship as political economy, philosophy, and law. During the years of Soviet rule there have appeared no serious works on political economy to speak of. Those that saw print were quickly censored and proscribed. Moreover, most of these works treated the history of political economy rather than its theory. There still is no theoretical and scientific grounding of the Soviet economic system, a lack which especially disturbs the ruling class in the Kremlin. This lack not only compromises the Soviet economy in the eyes of the world, it also makes the presentation of the Soviet political economy excruciatingly difficult in the Soviet institutions of higher learning themselves. The Soviet scientist never can be sure of what to teach or write.

Such a theoretical grounding of the Soviet economic system is by no means an easy task. To write the truth about the existence of the exploiting classes, about the laws of values and to determine the real role of the state in Soviet economics is not possible. But to justify the Soviet system in the spirit of socialism and to preserve the appearance of scientific research and objectivity is an art of extreme effort, to say the least.

The much-propagandized view in Soviet economics to the effect that in the USSR one can create one's own laws of economic development, which is allegedly also a policy of the Party, has proved to be absurd and unrealistic in Soviet life.

It had to be officially rejected as a "subjective and voluntarist view, a theoretical justification of leftist machinations . . ." (*Bolshevyk*, Nos. 23-24, 1944).

The same fate befell the law of values. On the premise that in the USSR "socialism" had been attained and by use of the theoretical definition of socialism, as well as Party directives, the Soviet economists labored to prove that the law of values had been "overcome" in the USSR. But as soon as the speciousness of this "theory" became evident, a new "law of values" in Soviet economics was invented, in "a varied form," to be sure.

Is it not surprising that this new view on the law of values should have been invented and proved by none other than Stalin himself?:

Comrade Stalin, as a consequence of developing his knowledge of trade and finances, demonstrated that the law of values has not been overcome at this stage of socialism and that it continues to exist in the Soviet economy in an changed form. . . This law of values, which has been the basic law under capitalism, here has become a secondary law. . . (*Bolshevyk*, Nos. 23-24, 1944).

It is quite apparent that this "changed form" is nothing else than a very clumsy attempt to alibi the fact that the law of values in the Soviet economy operates with the same outcomes as under capitalism.

Such examples can be cited by the dozen. But we should like to limit ourselves to restating the official characterization of the deplorable state of the political economy in the USSR:

The most important condition for the successful solution of this problem [development of socialist economics] is the expansion of theoretical research in political economy, especially in the political economy of socialism. But, regrettably, it is in this area that the economists have made very little progress. The instructions, given by Comrade Stalin in January, 1941, on the expansion of economic theory, so far have not been implemented in practical research. Such exceedingly important theoretical problems of Socialist economics as

the economic role of the Soviet state, socialist planning, activity of the law of values in an altered form in the USSR, the socialist principle of division of work, the problem of socialist production, Soviet finances and credits, and so forth—all have yet to be taken care of. . . (*Bolshevyk*, No. 14, 1945).

Even worse is the situation with philosophy in the USSR, if one can talk about the subject in its true meaning.

At a republic meeting on matters of propaganda (June 24-25, 1946), the second secretary of the Central Committee of the Party of Ukraine, Lytvyn, declared with despair:

We can hardly see any influence of our philosophy on workers in the other branches of science. In this regard, we cannot name a single work of our philosophers that illuminates a methodological problem in any concrete science. This may be explained above all by the fact that the majority of our philosophy workers know very little about any concrete science and do not work to improve their knowledge in this respect. . .

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in its decision on "the shortcomings in the scientific work in the branch of philosophy," adjudged the work of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR thus:

The Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR does not illuminate the real and pertinent problems of Marxist-Leninist philosophy nor does it dwell on the philosophical heritage of V.I. Lenin. It has not produced works that would unmask the pirate-like fascist ideology, has not prepared textbooks on dialectical and historical materialism, logic or psychology. The Institute does not unite, prepare and advance young cadres of theoretical workers. It is wholly detached from the scientific community and scientific institutions; it does not organize conferences on philosophical works, nor does it hold discussions on theoretical problems. . .

Matters, of course, did not end with this theoretical pronouncement. A reorganization of the Institute of Philosophy followed, with new people being brought in, but the work of the Institute has hardly moved ahead.

Especially great difficulties are encountered by Soviet philosophers in connection with the progress of the natural sciences, which cannot be reconciled with the Soviet philosophical theories. G. Alexandrov, in his address on "Some Tasks of Social Sciences Under Present Conditions," stressed above all the necessity of the philosophical determination of the objectives of the natural sciences:

"We must create works out of Marxist philosophical materialism," he said, "which would encompass in depth the latest attainments of the natural sciences."

In addition, Alexandrov proposed some other tasks for the Soviet philosophers:

We need serious works from the discipline of logic. We must create a Marxist-Leninist history of sociological disciplines. We must produce research works in all the basic problems of historical materialism. This part of Marxist-philosophical science has been especially enriched in the last decade by our party and by the works of Comrade Stalin. But, on the other hand, we wholly lack researchers to analyze the problems of historical materialism. . . (*Bolshevyk*, No. 11, 1945).

On the basis of what has been said by the leading Soviet thinkers, we can readily see that in the field of Soviet pseudo-philosophy (one can hardly speak of true philosophy), nothing has been achieved in the USSR. The only "serious works" of this field are the "works" of Comrade Stalin.

No wonder that with this extremely low state of the philosophical sciences, the Soviet educational system should suffer a great deal from the lack of qualified personnel to this field. The same Alexandrov is incensed by the crass illiteracy of certain categories of Soviet educators.

The decline of Soviet ideology is also demonstrated by the profound crises in Soviet literature and the arts which, as in science, are forced to serve the decaying Soviet ideology. The cause of this decline lies in the subordination of literature and the arts to the official ideology.

The basic function of literature and the arts in the USSR, which is restricted to performing political and party tasks, has led to a considerable lowering of literary quality. Even works that are recipients of the highest Soviet literary

awards, such as Gorbатов's *The Unconquered*, or Fadeev's *The Young Guard*, or W. Wasilewska's *The Rainbow*, are very weak efforts from the viewpoint of literary value. Their intrinsic emptiness lies in the fact that the authors unfailingly depict the Soviet reality in rosy and idealized terms, according to Party dictates.

In this respect, logical were the demands of such Ukrainian writers as Panch and Horodsky to let them have "the right to make mistakes" (for which boldness they had to pay later on), as a prerequisite for leading Soviet literature out of its morass. What they were asking is for writers and poets to have a free hand in creativity rather than be tied down by party requirements.

Naturally, Soviet writers, deprived of normal conditions in which to create freely and without restraint, of necessity write little, turn out very poor and inadequate works and seek various ways to bypass the tasks imposed upon them by the Party. After the war, they enjoyed a measure of relaxation and less Party control, and proceeded to write some works which radically departed from the requirements of the Party. These were serious works; there were also manifestations in favor of Western literature.

All this alarmed the Central Committee, which acted swiftly to "liquidate ideological deviations" on the literary front, an operation entrusted to A. Zhdanov. We shall not dwell here on the decisions taken by the Central Committee in the case of such journals as *Zvezda* and *Leningrad* and the repertories of the theatres, or the dismissal of Tikhinov from his post as president of the Union of Soviet Writers. All these developments have been covered by the press. What we do wish to do is to call attention here to those demands and requirements which the Party imposes on literature.

First, the party demands unconditionally that literature and the arts be wholly subordinated to the party. On August 28, 1945, Zhdanov, Stalin's whip on the literary front, stated at a meeting of the Leningrad writers:

Our literature is not a private enterprise, conceived for the purpose of satisfying the various tastes of the literary market. We are not at all obligated to provide a place in our literature for various tastes and habits that

have nothing in common with the morals and qualities of a Soviet man [read: the politics of the Party]. . . Many writers, as well as those who work as responsible editors or occupy important posts in the Union of Writers, believe that politics is the prerogative of the government, the prerogative of the Central Committee. They believe that politics is not a concern of theirs. . . We demand that our comrades, as literary leaders, as well as those who write, be guided by what the Soviet system cannot live without, that is, politics. . .

Secondly, the Party demands that literature and the arts be preoccupied above all with Soviet subject matter. Here it would be a mistake to think that what is required from the Soviet writers is a true portrayal of Soviet life. If such were the case, there undoubtedly would be a great number of works of high literary merit. But the fact is that the Soviet writers are not allowed to write about what is in their hearts, for they would be writing about the NKVD terror, the famine, the party dictatorship, the exploitation of the working people, the enslavement of the conquered non-Russian peoples, and so forth—all themes which are proscribed in the USSR. The Party compels Soviet writers to stick to "Soviet themes" for one purpose only: to embellish the wretched Soviet reality, to alibi the party politicians and to help cover up the innumerable crimes committed by the Soviet government against the peoples of the USSR.

Third, the Party is endeavoring to suppress the general trend of enchantment with Western literature in the USSR, not because this literature is considered to be of "lower literary quality," but simply because the Party is deathly afraid of the ideological impact Western literature would have upon the Soviet writers and the peoples of the USSR as a whole. Western literature could tell a death knell for the Soviet ideology. Having no possibility of proving the "low quality" of Western literature, the Soviet chieftains resort to chauvinistic tricks and approaches in order to undermine the general admiration for Western literature.

"Does it behoove us," Zhdanov said at the aforementioned meeting in Leningrad, "as the representatives of the best Soviet literature and as Soviet patriots to assume a debasing posture before the bourgeois culture, one of pupils? As

it is, our literature, which reflects our system, a system superior to any bourgeois-democratic system and one which mirrors a culture much higher than any bourgeois culture—our literature has the right to impart to others new, universal morals [here we have the messianistic fever]. . . We are not the same Russians we were in 1917, and Russia is not the same, either, and our character has changed as well. We have changed and have grown along with those gigantic transformations which have changed the face of our country to the very roots. . .”

The same deplorable situation is also to be found in Soviet literary criticism, whose task is not to advance and favor the growth of literature and the arts, but to pursue the role of watchdog, to see to it that the directives of the Central Committee are carried out by the Soviet writers, poets, and other literati. Thus, Soviet literary criticism can never be scientific and objective. If from time to time a sane voice is heard in Soviet literary criticism, it is immediately silenced.

For instance, in No. 5 (1946) of the Soviet review *Oktiabr* (October), there appeared the article, “*O cherenkakh i cherenushkakh*” (Graft and Bird-Cherry Tree), by its editor, F. Panfiorov. In it he analyzes various problems of literature, life, and literary criticism. The author takes to task the generally accepted Soviet description of the “enemy”: “Fritz is a soulless, empty and cowardly individual who knows little about the war *metier*; he has no feelings, no compassion or love.” And then he poses a question for Soviet writers:

Why cannot we assess the strength of the enemy, his psychology, especially the fact that he by the millions, though temporarily, went along with the fascists. . . (*Pravda*, No. 149, 1946).

In the very same issue of *Pravda*, Panfiorov was assailed:

It is a distortion that millions went along with fascism. Soviet writer F. Panfiorov should not satirize the fact that the German fascists, these outcasts of humanity, “people with the morals of beasts,” are called soulless. . . F. Panfiorov is confusing literary matter with politics and philosophy. . .

Understandably, after this, Panfiorov no longer expressed his views on the matter.

Let us cite another example to characterize Soviet literary criticism. Prof. Mykhailo Rudnytsky of Lviv University, well known for his pro-Soviet sympathies in the past, today has considerable difficulty in pleasing and satisfying his Stalinist masters. Although he has publicly condemned his old "errors" and has written many denunciatory articles (one of them is "Let Us Break Away from the Past"), nothing helps him. He is constantly harassed in the press:

Not so long ago, at a meeting of the intelligentsia in Lviv, Prof. M. Rudnytsky declared that literature is a technical-artistic matter. This statement by Prof. Rudnytsky was an attempt to defend the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists in whose camp he actively struggles against the revolutionary democratic camp. Until 1939, he wrote slandering and hostile articles against the Soviet Union and against Soviet Ukraine. . . (*Vilna Ukraina/Free Ukraine*, organ of the Lviv oblast committee of the party, No. 173, 1946).

Such criticism can only drive Prof. Rudnytsky to even more servile articles, which he has been writing against the Ukrainian independence movement in order to save his neck.

The total departure of Bolshevik theory from practice, the ideological dictatorship of Stalin, the decline of the social sciences, literature, the arts, and literary criticism—these are the elements which characterize the value of Bolshevik ideology, an ideology based on fraud and deceit, upheld by the bayonets of the NKVD and NKGB.

It is only natural that such an ideology should not attract not only the masses, but not even the members of the ruling Bolshevik Party. These members long ago have ceased to believe in their own ideology. Moreover, members of the Communist Party are no longer the heroes who in the name of grandiose ideas manned the barricades. Today they are simply robot-like functionaries who defend the imperialistic interests of the empire, using the once great ideal of "world revolution" to protect their sinecures.

Constant changes of ideological "courses and positions" have led not only to the decline of ideological work among the Party members themselves. Such shifting has also taken

away any desire on the part of the Party members to raise their theoretical-ideological level. The only incentive for theoretical work is the prospect of a political career, since "ideology" is one of the principal prerequisites for a Party career.

Radianska Ukraina (No. 124, 1946) reported the following sample of an "ideological examination":

We tried to exchange a few ideas with Comrade Mykhailiv, head of the trade department of the Verkhno-Khorthytsia raion of the Zaporizhia oblast, on the subject of the plebiscite in Italy, as a manifestation of the democratic growth in postwar Europe.

"Italy? Of course, I know about it from the newspapers," said Comrade Mykhailiv convincingly. "It is the country which is partially occupied by our troops. . ."

When we expressed our doubts, he looked at us accusingly stating:

"Well, how about Port Arthur, whose armies is it that are there, in your opinion?"

Or still another example:

"Would you please tell us, Comrade Burkhan [second secretary of the raion committee of Dubliany, near Drohobych], how do you improve your ideological-political level, and on what are you working at the present time?"

"I am now earnestly studying the fourth chapter of *A Short Course on the History of the All-Union Communist Party (b)*. . ."

"And what are you studying from Chapter Four?"

"I study the philosophy. . ."

"Then, would you please tell us about the two basic trends of philosophy. . ."

"Two trends, two trends? It seems I have forgotten a bit."

"Then, we shall help you. The materialistic and idealistic trends."

"Yes, I recall now. You are right, of course."

"Well, can you give us some examples?"

"Materialists? They are selfish people, thieves, you know. . . And the idealists, they are. . . they are. . ."

Comrade Burkhan could not answer other questions as well.

Comrade Vorobiov, a Communist and a raion procurator,

could not explain what the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is, nor what the essence of Soviet power is. Another Communist, Comrade Petrusenko (editor of a *raion* newspaper), did not know when the Bolshevik party was founded (*Radyanske Slovo*/Soviet Word/, No. 149, 1946, organ of the Dubliany *raion* Party committee, Drohobych).

These examples are not isolated ones, but rather are typical of the entire Soviet Union. Party leaders are well aware of the situation. They know that this means a decomposition of the Communist cadres, a process which threatens the existence of the Party itself. Hence the drive for the "ideological elevation" of the Party cadres.

"During the war," said Comrade Lytvyn at a republic meeting of party activists, "our leading cadres acquired much experience in political and organizational work. But many of them neglected individual work to gain knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory. A good number of them have lost the knowledge they had acquired before the war, and have been left behind in their ideological-theoretical development. These comrades do not work to improve their knowledge; they continue to manifest their intolerable indifference to the problems of history and do not try to expand their viewpoints and their theoretical knowledge. Therefore, they are not on the level of present requirements. We can no longer tolerate such a state of affairs."

The Central Committee of the Communist Party, through its Kursk *oblast* committee, issued stern instructions to expel Communist *ignoramus*es from party work:

[We must] use all means to correct the shortcomings in the work of ideological-political education of Communists, and especially of the leadership cadres, and to create unbearable conditions for political know-nothings. We must weed them out of the ranks of the Soviet party and economic posts, and oust those who have no desire to raise their political level, including their removal from posts of leadership. . . (*Pravda*, No. 161, 1946).

The Soviet ideology is especially unacceptable to youth. The powerful Soviet literary whip, Zhdanov, addressing a congress of the Comsomol, said:

The young Soviet generation should strengthen the force and power of the Soviet socialist system and utilize fully the motive power of the Soviet society for a new and undreamt of flourishing of our well-being and culture. . . Toward this and we need to see to it that our literature and our journals do not stand aside from these objectives of the present time, but, instead, should help the party and the people to educate the young. . .

Another leader, Mikhailov, then secretary of the Central Committee of the Comsomol, speaking at the XIIIth Comsomol Congress (December 12-15, 1946), put it plainly:

We must admit that the present state of our political and educational activity lags seriously behind the tasks and objectives required by the present time. . . As a proof of the great neglect of the ideological work among our cadres we can cite that, regrettably, many a Comsomol leader did not pass the test and was unable to withstand the impact of an alien and hostile ideology, letting himself get into a situation that corrodes the party links, as iron corrodes with rust. . .

We have still another official admission that the Soviet ideology cannot enlist the youth:

The Central Committee of the Comsomol has taken cognizance of the fact that in the latest period numerous Comsomol organizations have neglected the Marxist-Leninist training of the cadres, have weakened the work of political education of Comsomol members and the youth in general. The majority of Comsomol cadres do not conduct any propaganda work at all. Moreover, among a good part of the Comsomol leadership one sees an ever-growing scornful attitude toward the study of revolutionary theory. . . (From the Decisions of the Comsomol Central Committee of June 22, 1946).

It is evident that the mendacious and corrupt Soviet ideology cannot attract the youth, which is always ready to be attracted by great and noble ideals. The youth cannot respect conjectural, makeshift "ideologies," which are con-

stantly being changed at the whim of the Party, or, rather, a few topnotch Party leaders.

What is truly ominous is the fact that the Bolshevik ideology is especially detested by and objectionable to the student youth, particularly the study of Marxism-Leninism, which has become integrated into the official curricula of Soviet schools.

As far as the great masses of the people in the USSR are concerned, the influence of the Bolshevik ideology on them is even less marked than on the other classes of Soviet society. In the course of World War II millions of Soviet citizens for the first time were exposed to the outside world. They saw the life of other peoples and found it far more attractive than their own. The common people not only ceased to believe in Soviet propaganda, but they also began to oppose actively the Bolshevik policy.

The ideological putridness of the Stalinist ideology, the indifference to this ideology on the part of the Party cadres, the scornful attitude toward it of the student youth and of youth in general, and the wholly hostile attitude of the popular masses—all this indicates that the Soviet "ideological front" is in very bad shape, indeed.

Therefore, the Soviet Party leadership is trying to "re-construct" their ideology without openly rejecting the Marxist theory. On the one hand, they reiterate endlessly that their ideology is the Marxist ideology, that it continues to be a further development of Marxism. On the other, however, they are compelled to admit—in order to bridge over the evident contradictions between their "theory" and Marxism—that certain theses, expounded once by Marx and Engels, have become now "old" and "inapplicable."

"Our country would appear defenseless in the face of the new developments, new facts and new experience, if the Bolshevik party did not dare to exchange old theories of Marxism for new ones that correspond to the changed historical conditions," they write (*Bolshevik*, No. 14, 1946).

Nonetheless, in the proclaimed overall opinion of the Stalinist leadership (and this with an eye for consumption by the naive), such changes are neither contradictions of Marxism, not even departures from it, because "all the basic

premises, discovered and proved by Marx, have preserved their full force" (*ibid.*). "The changes introduced by the Bolsheviks constitute an expansion of the Marxist theory, in which lay and lies now the creative spirit of Marxism" (*ibid.*).

In reality, the Stalinist masters do not take the Marxist theory seriously *per se*; they merely use and distort it to suit their propagandistic objectives. We hasten to add that any "contradictions" are theoretical. In practice they long ago broke away from it, as we have previously indicated in discussing the divergences between Bolshevik theory and practice.

We need not go into a theoretical analysis of the question whether "all the basic premises, uncovered and proved by Marx, have preserved their full strength." We categorically state here that if some Marxian premises on socialism have *not* been preserved, then this has taken place in the USSR, in the country of "victorious socialism," in the very country that allegedly is guided by Marxist theory.

For instance, one such premise of Marxism is the elimination of the exploitation of man by man. In the USSR, however, this practice has not only *not* been abolished, but it has flourished. The Soviet worker falls short of comparison with any worker in the capitalist countries; he is actually a slave of the state and the party, which the worker in a capital state is not.

If today the Stalinist masters continue to prate about Marxism, it is only to mask their reactionary views and their imperialism, especially in their propaganda among the free nations. For the domestic market in the USSR they are peddling new ideological merchandise of their own devising.

Typical of such new ideological "theory" is the slogan, "The Russian people are the most outstanding people of all peoples comprising the Soviet Union," thus entitling the Russian people to exercise the "leading role" among the peoples (Stalin).

What does this "theory" mean in practice?

This means above all that in openly espousing Russian chauvinism, the Stalinist chieftains are denying Marxism. For they are propagating the "superiority and the leading

role of the Russian people," which is a purely Russian theory, one which is contrary to any teachings of Marxism.

This racist view was advanced during the last war; officially, it was enunciated by Stalin on May 24, 1945. In actuality, it was only a theoretical formalization of what had existed and had been practiced long before. It is an undeniable fact that the Bolsheviks relied on the Russian people in their conquest of the non-Russian peoples. Although placed again under a strangling social yoke, the Russian people proved to be an instrument in the hands of the Bolsheviks, the essential tool in their policies of imperialist conquest and oppression of other nations. The Bolshevik masters have exploited and are still exploiting the Russian people, cruelly, while at the same time they are using a minority of this people for their aggressive policies.

It is also a known fact that the caste of Bolshevik masters—by national character and composition—is Russian. The fact that it may include a sprinkling of representatives of other nationalities does not alter the Russian character of the Bolshevik rule. The non-Russian representatives, who constitute an insignificant minority, even are thoroughly Russified. They not only speak Russian, but also think Russian. Their activities are nothing short of treasonous to their own peoples. Such Ukrainian Communist leaders as Korotchenko, Brechukha, and Timoshenko have as much Ukrainian interest at heart as had such Russified Ukrainians as landowner Rodzianko and capitalist Tereshchenko in Czarist times.

That the ruling Bolshevik class is Russian is attested to by all its policies. And so far as composition is concerned, the Red Army has long been a Russian army; equally Russian are such important instrumentalities of the Bolshevik regime as the NKVD and NKGB. The ethnic Russians occupy all key posts in the "Union Republics," plus many subsidiary positions. The Russians control the whole cultural life of the national republic; they also keep a heavy hand on their economic life, using their economic resources for the imperial benefit of the USSR—which is the Russian Republic itself. Or to put it more clearly: the USSR is the Russian empire.

While practicing the great-state Russian imperialism,

the Russian Communist leadership, solely for propaganda purposes, decries "Great Russian chauvinism," proclaiming it to be dangerous for the unity of the USSR, as dangerous as, it says, "local nationalism" is in the "Union Republics." But while the Kremlin has been waging and is still waging an implacable war against the "bourgeois" nationalism of the non-Russian peoples, it has been acting and continues to act as a Great Russian chauvinist and nationalist center.

World War II has shaken the ground under the Stalinist masters. It has compelled them to drop their mask of internationalism and to rely openly on Russian chauvinism as their only ideological basis of imperialism. Thus, in openly espousing Russian nationalism and chauvinism, they have made talk of divergences between "theory" and "practice" a mockery. We emphasize here that only a part of the Russian people is to be found in the pretorian clique in the Kremlin. The vast masses of the Russian people are fed chauvinistic slogans about the "greatness" of the Russian people and their messianistic mission in the world; this may make good reading for them, but they are not really involved.

But even in this policy the Kremlin chieftains are loath to provoke the growth of anti-Russian feelings and "local nationalism." Indeed, they are using all sorts of ideological and political subterfuges in order not to inflame anti-Russian feelings and opposition. Yet they tirelessly hammer into the ears of the peoples of the USSR the "cultural superiority" of the Russian people. Thus, the Russians have the "most glorious history," the "best literature," the "leading philosophy"; the Russian people have brought "happiness to all peoples of the USSR" in that they have "brought together all the Slavic people," and the Russians "saved Europe and world civilization," etc.

The theory of "superiority and the leading role of the Russian people" is a two-pronged weapon of the Kremlin. It fosters the notion that without the Russian people, all the other peoples of the USSR would be even more "inferior" and insignificant. On the one hand, the cultures and histories of the non-Russian nations are denigrated and are assigned a secondary and subservient role in Soviet life. But there is redemption. Thus, on the other hand, the non-Russian na-

tions are encouraged to study the Russian language and to read in the original language the "great treasures" of Russian history and literature. In essence, it is a Russification policy, which is designed to lead to the cultural genocide of the non-Russian peoples. This process, unlike the Russification policy of the Czars or the senseless and exterminatory policy of Hitler's Germany, is as disarming as it is insidious, steadily implanting the belief in the non-Russian nations that they have no other course but that of hitching their star to the Russian, not only in a political-economic sense, but culturally as well, indeed, in very identity.

Still another basic promise of Bolshevik ideology is the "theory of the great-state concept." Its essential tenet is the preservation of the Russian territorial empire not only for the benefit of the Russian people, but of the non-Russian nations as well. Neither this "theory" nor the "theory of superiority and the leading role of the Russian people" has anything in common with classical Marxism.

The Kremlin leadership is interested more in the preservation and expansion of the Russian empire than it is in the well-being of the peoples of the USSR. While the Bolshevik leaders always think of the territorial aggrandizement of the USSR—which they cover up with the ever-existing danger for the Party posed by the "capitalist countries"—the rank and file of the non-Russian peoples dream about the future destruction of this empire and the establishment of true freedom and a democratic system of government.

This feeling of the great part of the population of the USSR is well known to the rulers of the Kremlin, yet they ceaselessly propagate the concept of the "great-state theory" among the Russian people and foster among the non-Russian nations the notion that only in the present Soviet state would they be able to develop their national cultures and their political, social, and economic development. The Soviet state is constantly being depicted as the only center of historical development of all the peoples of the USSR.

This viewpoint is plainly seen in the Soviet interpretation of the centralist policies of such notorious Russian tyrants as Czar Ivan the Terrible and Czar Peter the Great. The

activities and policies of these two Russian despots, who built the Russian empire on the corpses of the Russian and non-Russian peoples, are being presented as the "greatest political achievements" of the Russian people. In these two men, the Kremlin says, are embodied the "highest political ideal"—the Russian state.

Consequently, the role of the Communist Party, as it is being explained today, lies not in the struggle against the Russian state and empire as such, but against the capitalist system, which was incapable of guiding the Russian state.

This is clearly underscored today by Fedoseev:

For the past half a century, from the time of the emergence of idealism, a basic turning point in the historic fate of our people has taken place. In the course of the first half of this period, Russia was lagging further and further behind the leading countries of the world, was falling progressively into dependence upon the great imperialist states. Within the span of a brief historical period, Czarist Russia suffered two great defeats, with the Russo-Japanese War and World War I. . . . The bourgeois-landowners' system of Czarist Russia was driving our country into stagnation and backwardness. Not a single one of the bourgeois and petit-bourgeois parties existing in Russia was able to point out to the country a new path of development, and none of them thought about how to seriously change its social-economic order. . . . Only the Bolshevik party through the narrow confines of this bourgeois horizon could outline a glorious pathway of development through which our country could join the ranks of the leading nations and set for itself the task of surpassing in its progressive movement the foremost countries of the world. . . . (*Bolshevyk*, No. 9, 1946).

In discussing the period of the Russian Provisional Government, Fedoseev added:

The Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries were leading the country to full catastrophe, to a subservient dependence on the imperialistic states. Russia was saved from a shameful fate by the Bolsheviks, who were able to inspire the working class and working peasantry into

struggling for the establishment of a powerful Soviet state. . .

There is small, if any, need to recite more facts to show that the Bolshevik Party is strengthening and propping up the Russian state today. In fact, we know this to be true: the Bolshevik Party has saved the Russian empire from its downfall, and it is strengthening this empire in fulfilling the legacy of the greatest Russian imperialists, "the gatherers of Russian lands." We know that the Bolsheviks not only have saved the Russian empire; they have taken the places of its former rulers as well. Nothing has changed in this Russia, except the character of the enslavers and exploiters and the forms of oppression and exploitation, forms that are more refined and efficient. The Russian state has embodied a system of oppression to this day.

In this process of saving the Russian empire, the Bolshevik imperialists were at first reluctant to admit their role. Instead, they repeated constantly their assertion that they had destroyed the Russian state and that the USSR is a state of a new, socialist type. Today, their reluctance has wholly disappeared. The Kremlin is playing up Russian imperialism and nationalism in order to attract Russians who are chauvinistically inclined. There is no question that only Russian chauvinists can be attracted to the Bolshevik Party, which now depicts itself as the heir of the Russian state, so detested by the enslaved non-Russian nations and by the laboring Russian masses as well. But, in order to enlist in their camp other Russian but non-chauvinistic categories, the Kremlin chieftains present the USSR also as a sort of "socialist commonwealth," a center of social justice and progress.

In 1924 Stalin wrote:

If Leninism were only an application of Marxism to the peculiar conditions of Russia, then Leninism would have been only a national phenomenon, a purely and solely Russian phenomenon. Yet we know that Leninism is an international phenomenon, which has its roots in the whole international development, and not only the Russian development. . . (*Problems of Leninism*, p. 1).

In this defining statement Stalin clearly enunciated that Leninism above all was an international phenomenon. In 1924 this statement was wholly appropriate, and Stalin did not claim that Leninism was the attainment of Russian culture.

Today, stress is put on it as the "higher attainment of Russian culture at the same time it is the highest attainment of world culture:

Lenin and Stalin provided the answers, scientifically proved and supported by the experience of social life, new answers to the political and theoretical problems, the proper solution of which Russian literature and philosophy sought throughout the XIXth century. Therefore, Leninism constitutes truly a higher achievement of Russian culture and science. . . (P.T. Yovchuk, *Leninism and the Leading Russian Culture of the XIXth Century*, p. 26).

Today Leninism is presented as a national treasure, the national pride of the Russian people, but at the same time Leninism is further described as "capable of bringing happiness" not only to all the peoples of the USSR, but to the peoples of the world as well:

Leninism is a higher achievement of world culture, because the revolutionary working class of the entire world has found in Leninism a theory that has uncovered profound laws of the development of the bourgeois society leading to its reconstruction into a socialist society on the basis of the Soviet system. . .

We know from experience how the "socialist society" operates, a society built on the Soviet system, because we live in a state in which Leninism is the state ideology. We know that this and other nonsense about Leninism is nothing but verbiage designed to conceal Stalinist imperialism from people who have not seen Stalinist socialism up close, who have not experienced the vaunted "happiness" directly under the Stalinist ideology. Leninism is a new form of Russian messianism, the function of which is to mask the unbridled Soviet Russian imperialism.

It is clear that in these conditions Russian patriotism

has found its fitting place, for it is not a socialist patriotism, but simply a chauvinistic one.

"The socialist ideology rebuffs the cosmopolitan view of the fatherland," is the slogan today of the heirs of Marx (*Uchytelska Hazeta/Teachers' Gazette*, No. 43, 1946). It was Marx who said that "the proletariat has no fatherland." The Stalinist masters, on the other hand, have a fatherland, indeed. In the process of inflaming this Russian patriotism, they also exhort all citizens to love the USSR, a Russian state, with all its imperialistic features. And no matter how hard the Kremlin leaders try to disclaim chauvinism, in reality they cannot convince anyone to the contrary, since all their policies are blatantly supported by chauvinism.

In this connection, we should like to explain one problem, namely, how the new theory of the great-state concept attempts to solve the relations of the Russian state with the non-Russian nations that are enslaved by this Russian state.

According to this "theory," the Russian state had played a "historical-progressive role" in the history of all the nations composing the USSR. The present version of the Russian state, it says, has not enslaved these nations; it has but "united" them around the great Russian people. Because of such union around the Russian people, they have had the opportunity, under the leadership of the Russian people, to destroy the capitalist system and to enter the Soviet Union. In this process, it points out, lies the progressive role of the Russian state; this role is so great that it overshadows any excesses of Czarist imperialists in the past (and of the Bolshevik imperialists as well), which were only of a secondary nature.

Thus the destruction of the independence of the non-Russian nations, their enslavement by the Russian state, and their historical oppression and economic exploitation—all this the "theory" relegates to "secondary" importance. The destruction of the Ukrainian Kozak state, the extinction of the Zaporozhian *Sich*, the imposition of servitude upon the free Ukrainian peasantry, the forcible conscription of Ukrainian men into the Russian armies to be used for imperialistic conquest and aggression, the economic pillage of Ukraine, the destruction and Russification of Ukrainian culture—all

that which is vital for the Ukrainian people is, Moscow tells us, a minor consideration.

What is important, then? The Soviet "progress?" The incorporation of Ukraine into the USSR cannot be called progress on any score. The Ukrainian SSR is an abject colony of Communist Russia.

We strongly doubt that this "progress" satisfies the non-Russian nations of the USSR. Their struggle against the new Czars in itself proves that these peoples balk at this new "theory." To bolster their theory, the Kremlin has been rewriting the histories of the non-Russian peoples in order to bind them to that of Russia:

The history of the peoples of the USSR is one organic process. The history of an individual people may be properly interpreted only in connection with the history of the other peoples and, above all, with the history of the Russian people. . . (*Bolshevyk*, No. 14, 1945).

The most important guiding principle in analyzing the history of the Communist Party of Bolsheviks of Ukraine is the premise that the development of Ukraine, especially after its union with Russia, constitutes an organic part of the general historical development of pre-Revolutionary Russia. After the victory of the great October Revolution Ukraine has been developing within the general common process of development of the Soviet Union. . . (K. Lytvyn's address at a republic meeting, June 24-26, 1946).

This interpretation of the history of the peoples of the USSR necessarily has the task of erasing the integrity of the historical development of these non-Russian peoples in the past and in the present and of precluding any possibility of their separate development in the future.

Also, the Soviet meaning of "patriotism" must be imparted to the non-Russian nations of the USSR. For instance, the above cited Ukrainian Communist leader, Lytvyn, stated at the meeting:

Some poets are trying to limit the feeling of patriotism of the Ukrainian soldier to the territory of Ukraine only. The rest of the Soviet Union is thought of as a foreign land, not a common fatherland. Such feelings

evolve from national narrow-mindedness... The new patriotism is characterized by a profound love toward the new socialist fatherland, to the Soviet order... A Ukrainian of our epoch is above all a Soviet man who feels himself to be a member of a great brotherly family of peoples...

So the Kremlin attempts to supplant the love of the non-Russian peoples for their own countries with love for the USSR, or the new Russian empire. The Ukrainians are admonished that Ukraine is not their fatherland and that love for Ukraine is "national narrow-mindedness." But love and admiration for the Soviet Russian prison house of nations—the USSR—is true "patriotism."

Both the "theory of superiority and the leading role of the Russian people" and the "theory of the great-state concept" constitute the new basic premises of the reconstructed Bolshevik ideology. These "theories," as we have pointed out, have little in common with Marxism. But the Stalinist chieftains, if only for their general lack of humor, waggishly call themselves Marxists, stretching out the writings of Marx and Engels to an outlandish degree in laughable support of their reactionary theories.

To illustrate the falsification and perversion that characterize Stalinist "theory," we should like to cite a fragment of the article F. Engels wrote in 1875 in rebuttal to the statement by a Russian writer, Tkachov, to the effect that the Russian people are "revolutionary by instinct" and that they were virtually "chosen" to lead the socialist movement. Engels wrote:

The Russian people, they who are "revolutionary by instinct," did stage a few peasant uprisings against the *nobility* and against individual officials, *but never against the Czar*, except for those cases in which at the head of the people was an *imposter* who claimed the throne. The last great peasant uprising, which took place during the reign of Catherine II, was possible only because Emelian Pugachov posed as her husband, Peter II, who allegedly was not slain by his wife but, instead, was dethroned and incarcerated in a prison from which he had escaped. On the contrary, the Czar is a god on earth for the peasant: "God is in Heaven, and the Czar

not far away," the peasants would say. That the peasantry in their masses, especially after the emancipation from serfdom, was thrust into a position which compelled them to wage a struggle against Czardom cannot be doubted, but let Mr. Tkachov relate his fable about their being "revolutionary by instinct" to someone else. . . (Karl Marx, *Izbranie proizvedenia/Collection of Works*, Vol. II, p. 548).

Today, the Stalinist chieftains tirelessly chant the refrain that the Russian people are "a chosen people of socialism," that they are "revolutionary by instinct" and that they are the "most important nation, possessing an unclouded wisdom, stable character and a gift of suffering." Above all, they chorus, the Russian people were the first to build socialism in their own country and they are now trying to help build socialism in other countries of the USSR, and some day in the other nations of the world. . .

It is true that it is becoming increasingly difficult to bend, stretch, and reinterpret Marx and Engels. In substituting for the premises of Marx their own, the Kremlin ideologists are extended to the limits of their command of semantics. They contend that the ideological tenets of Marx are somewhat stale for the new era, inasmuch as Marx and Engels, living in a different and earlier historical period, could not elaborate a set of permanent premises, one which would be in all times. Therefore, Marx's premise that socialism will first be victorious in the West has been changed to the *possibility* of its victory first in Russia.

The Kremlin leaders have tampered with another important promise of Marx: for a complete victory of socialism, the revolution must occur in a few countries. We now read of the possibility of establishing socialism in *one* country and, for yet another twist, even in an industrially backward country! Of course, the Kremlin chieftains then point to the Bolshevik policy, resulting in the establishment of "socialism" in the USSR.

To be seen are many other transformations of Marx's principles, a task even more arduous than the rewriting of history. Documents can be burned; but Marx's text, universally known, cannot be disposed of.

Take this prickly case. For reasons we have enumerated, the present rulers of the USSR are defending the imperialism of Czarist Russia. But Marx and Engels criticized it without end. Unmasking the imperialist policies of Czarist Russia, they castigated them resoundingly. But to attack Marx and Engels directly is unthinkable for just about anyone in the Bolshevik hierarchy. This literally dangerous task, then, fell to Stalin.

In his piece on "Engels' Article on the 'Foreign Policy of Russian, Czardom,'" which appeared in *Bolshevyk* (No. 9, 1941), Stalin sought to justify Czarist policy by contending that Engels had exaggerated and erroneously analyzed its role. In his ponderous way, Stalin belittled the well-known view of Marx and Engels that Czarist Russia constituted the last remaining citadel of European reaction, and sternly took to task Engels's argument that the "annexation of Alsace and Lorraine by Germany as a war factor was much less important than the plan of Czarist Russia to grab Constantinople. . ."

This acrobatic reappraisal of the role of Czarist Russia is part and parcel of the official glorification of Russian imperialism, which is redefined as the expression of the "superior qualities of the Russian people."

If we suppose for a minute that Marx and Engels were monumentally wrong in assessing such an important contemporary phenomenon as Russian imperialism, what should we think of their other prognostications? Were they all wrong? It may be fairly stated that no premise of Marx, basic or secondary, has preserved any validity in the USSR.

Marx's criticism of the capitalist system is today as timely as ever—if it is applied to the present-day Bolshevik system and policies. The assessment by Marx and Engels of the imperialist policies of Czarist Russia applies in full force today to the USSR. The premise about additional production as the source of the income for the capitalists, the exploitation of the worker in the USSR, equally preserves its full force in the USSR. And confirmed classically is the view about the class essence of the capitalist state, except that the exemplar is the state of Stalin.

Ironically, Marxism is the very theory that hits the

Stalinist leaders the hardest, for it is completely at odds with Bolshevik theory and experience. Marxism looms up equally as a danger for Bolshevism as once it was for Czarist Russia. The only solution for the dialectical dilemma of the Bolsheviks is to ban all the writings of Marx and Engels—a solution they may just exercise once they have spent sufficient time and energy in glorifying Czarist imperialism.

The "theory of superiority and the leading role of the Russian people" and the "theory of the great-state concept" are, as the new elements of Stalinist ideology, milestones along this ideological road. The first milestone of Stalinist ideology is the contention that the present Soviet social-political system is a socialist one, the system which presumably is the most viable of all. This premise holds least of all, for the Soviet social-economic and political order is the basis of the Soviet state, an order of the privileged class of Stalinist parasites. But to renounce this premise now on the part of the Kremlin ruling oligarchy would mean the collapse of the Bolshevik ideology.

The Kremlin formula is designed to forestall such collapse by its two component parts. One is to inflame chauvinism in the Russian people and at the same time to foster an inferiority complex in the non-Russian nations. Here the Stalinist chieftains are endeavoring to weld them all together by inculcating in all a love for the Stalinist state and an admiration for its power. The other is to convince the masses of the people that the Soviet social-economic and political order is the most viable, that it is "a better form of organization of society than any non-Soviet order" (Stalin).

At present, the victory of the USSR in World War II is being feverishly exploited by the party apparatus as proof of the validity of Bolshevik ideology.

"The war demonstrated," Stalin proclaimed in his pre-election address, "that the Soviet social system is truly a system that arose from the cadres of the people and that it enjoys their full support; that the Soviet system is fully viable, the powerful basis of society's organization."

War is a serious test for any given state. It involves survival. But in no way does it prove in itself the superiority of any social-economic and political system. Both the United

States and England also emerged victorious in World War II, but these states have social systems quite different from that of the USSR. Yet we hear *ad nauseum* from the Kremlin that the capitalist systems are "rotten and unviable." Czarist Russia also engaged in victorious wars, but this did not mean that its social system was viable. Instead, the whole world now knows how corrupt and unstable that system was.

What is worthwhile discussing is the statement by Stalin wherein he claims that the Soviet system is the "system of the people" and that it "enjoys their powerful support." His vindication of it by victory in war is sheer nonsense; but his claim that the system meets the needs of people merits our attention, for the validity of the Soviet system here is truly tested.

Let us, then, first take a look at whether the Soviet system is the "system of the people."

The nationalization of all industry and the collectivization of agriculture, etc., dramatically stamped the whole production of the USSR with the cachet of most advanced "social character" in the world. But at the same time, *private ownership was not replaced by communal ownership of production—that is, the people had not become the owners of the means of production. All means of production in the USSR are in the hands of a small class of Stalinist chieftains, who occupy an exclusive, monopoly-like position in the rule of the state.*

Thus, social-economic unity has not been realized. On the contrary, such nationalization has cleft society sharply into two classes: one of the exploiters, the other of the exploited. The first includes the Bolshevik Party with its cohorts of supervisors; the second embraces the incomparably larger grouping of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia. This cleavage is responsible for the unbelievable exploitation of the working people, not to mention the ever-increasing shortage of basic consumer articles. The pauperization of the working class in the USSR has reduced it to the lowest level ever known in the history of capitalist states. The working class in the USSR is constantly undernourished and is subjected, moreover, to periodical famine crises (1921-1922, 1932-1933, and 1946). Work for the Soviet worker has be-

come his supreme function. It is an oppressive burden, performed daily under extremely taxing conditions: the physical demands, the cruel discipline, and the enervating lack of freedom.

Thus, the Soviet economic system, this basic component of the Soviet order, is not *socialist*. Rather than a system of the people, it is a reactionary, backward one, a system of unbridled exploitation. Naturally enough, not only does it not enjoy general support, it also generates a profound resentment on the part of the working people.

The crushing position of the working masses in the USSR is exacerbated in that *the working masses have no voice whatsoever in governing the state*. The so-called basis of socialist society—the *soviets* (councils), allegedly the highest form of democracy—serve only as window-dressing, a cover-up for the Stalinist dictatorship. The masses of the USSR have no genuine representatives in any state organ. They have no possibility, much less right, to elect freely their own representatives. Elections in the USSR are not a free expression of the people's will, but a compulsory affair wherein the working people must cast their votes for preselected Stalinist candidates. For us, the citizens of the USSR, all this is known too well. Should someone entertain a different view of the USSR and "Stalinist democracy," it would behoove him to cast an eye at the last "elections" of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, especially in the western provinces of Ukraine. There these "elections" were conducted without any pretense of democratic form; the atmosphere was one of naked terror, fraud, and cynicism.

Consequently, the political basis of the Soviet system, as its economic system, is totally reactionary and anti-people, and as such, could not possibly enjoy the support of the people.

The *Soviet system*, thus, is not a socialist system; it is made up of a class of exploiters and one of the exploited. *The working masses of the USSR, we know, do not want capitalism, yet just as assuredly they do not want Stalinist pseudo-socialism, either*. What they want and crave is a true classless society, a true popular democracy, a free life in their own independent states, and, consequently, they strive

for the destruction of Stalinist tyranny and its imperialistic structure—the USSR.

Thus, the third premise of Stalinist ideology with regard to the socialist and popular character of the social-political system of the Soviet state: it is as reactionary as the other two.

An important place in present Bolshevik ideology is occupied by the "thesis on the progressive transition to Communism." Taking for granted that the first phase of Communism, socialism, already has been attained, the Kremlin ideologists contend that the second phase, a higher phase—that of the true Communist society—is now being built. Under this system, they claim, there will disappear "differences between city and village and between physical labor and intellectual endeavors," where "everyone will be recognized for his capabilities and needs."

We shall not dwell on nonsensical propaganda utterances on the subject of Communism, such as the statement that under Communism all collective farms will have "mechanized laundries." The contention about the "transition to Communism" is reactionary and groundless. There can be no "transition" to Communism in the USSR, inasmuch as *there is no socialism in the USSR. So long as there is no communal ownership of the means of production, so long as there exists the horrible exploitation of man and no realization of the principle of the division of labor, so long can there be no "transition" to Communism.*

The "progressive transition to Communism" is further defined by the statement that during the "transition from socialism to Communism there could be no social revolution, inasmuch as there is no conflict between productive forces and productive conditions, there are no classes which would have to be removed from the road of the progressive development of society" (*Molodyi Bolshevik*, Nos. 3-4, 1946).

It does not take much imagination to see that behind this propaganda talk lurks a fear on the part of the Stalinist clique of revolution. What is truly behind this statement is the fear of the Party of any revolution in the USSR, for it knows that the target of any revolution would be the Communist dictatorship. Today, the Soviet system is riper than ever for a social revolution for a number of reasons: a) the

contradiction between the social character of production and the form of control of means of production; b) the exploitation of the working people; c) the dictatorship of the Stalinist clique; d) the dissatisfaction on the part of the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the USSR; e) *a social revolution in the USSR is bolstered by the trend to national revolutions on the part of the subjugated peoples of the USSR*. Both the working people and that enslaved nations are ripe for any change in the USSR.

In general, by virtue of the "theory about the progressive transition to Communism," the Stalinist leaders are trying to justify their "socialism," fearful even to admit that a social revolution is possible in the USSR.

This "theory" also serves to cover up the manifestations of Russian imperialism and its aggressive conquests. This is especially evident in the Fourth Five Year Plan, which is clearly geared for war. The overwhelming part of the plan and its budget is earmarked for the construction and expansion of war industries in Siberia at the expense of consumer goods, which are never abundant nor even adequate in the Soviet Union.

Communism, in the thinking of the Stalinist chieftains, is not a system which would insure the well-being of the people but one which is to be equated with the Soviet government and the rule of the Communist Party.

The role of the party is defined as follows:

The world does not know of a political party other than the party of Lenin-Stalin able to play an exceptional role both in the solution of social problems inside the country and in the solution of general national objectives and the protection of state independence and its own people against foreign aggression.

The Soviet State and the party of Lenin-Stalin are inseparable. In the leading and directive activity of our party, in its dedicated struggle in the cause of the people—lies the gigantic source of strength of the Soviet state, its victoriousness over the enemy and its further strengthening of the military-economic power of our fatherland. . . (*Propagandist*, No. 10, 1945).

As we may readily see, the Bolshevik Party is depicted as a force without which the USSR could not exist. The

Party has demonstrated "great organizational capabilities," it has "solved all social problems" and it has protected the USSR against foreign aggression.

The purpose of preaching on the necessary existence of the Bolshevik Party is only too obvious. It is to strengthen the position of the Stalinist oligarchy and the Soviet state, which are presented as "inseparable." Anyone who opposes the Party dictatorship and its antihuman policies is by definition struggling against the Soviet state, and vice versa: who opposes the Communist Party is automatically "an enemy of the state."

The new Bolshevik ideology, whose basic elements have been discussed in this chapter, is the attempt of the Stalinist oligarchy to save and prop up its ideological and political positions. Toward that end, Stalin ordered the establishment of an Academy of Social Sciences, charged with the essential task of preparing a "scientific ideology" on the basis of the premises we have examined.

In addition, the Academy of Social Sciences has to train a great number of workers for the central institutions, the Central Committee, the "Union Republics" and the *oblast* and *raion* committees, and to prepare new cadres of teachers for various scientific and research institutes.

Moreover, the Academy is used also for general Party purposes: to bolster party education and to help elevate the theoretical knowledge of party cadres. Thus a centralized Party education has been established with the creation of a higher party school under the direct supervision of the Central Committee for the training of ideological party workers. Equally, under the Central Committees of the "Union Republics," as well as under the *oblast* and *raion* committees, party schools have been established with two-year training periods. Only members of the Communist Party, up to 40 years of age, are eligible for training in these schools. Great stress is placed on independent and group study of Leninism, above all, the history of the Communist Party, as well as on attendance at evening university courses on Marxism-Leninism.

The same system of Party education has been introduced in the Comsomol organization:

A special task of first secretaries is to insure the basic improvement of the political education of Comsomol members and the youth; to organize control of the political self-education of the leading Comsomol activists; to provide the greatest possible assistance to Comsomol members who independently study the history of the Bolshevik party. . . (Decision of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Youth Organization, August 22, 1946, *Molodyi Bolshevyk*, No. 7, 1946).

But all these radical changes in the Bolshevik ideology, the ideology which is propped up by Russian chauvinism and NKVD bayonets, will hardly increase the ideological strength, for there is none to speak of. This "ideology" is helpless to meet the challenges of progress. It is especially helpless to meet the demands of the Ukrainian liberation movement, principally the establishment of new relations among the nations on the principle of truly free and independent national states. Add to this the struggle against exploitation and for the establishment of a genuinely classless society. Needed is an ideology that depends on the participation of the people in the government of the state, on respect for man's dignity and his enjoyment of all democratic rights. What is needed, in summary, is an ideology attuned to "Freedom for Nations—Freedom for Individuals."

Chapter 3

On the Freedom of the Press in the USSR

A free press is one of the greatest achievements of mankind. But regrettably, in the century in which it would seem that democracy has won an ultimate triumph, in this very century, freedom of the press is far from being general. There still are many peoples, many millions of human beings, who have yet to benefit from this great achievement. Such a powerful weapon as a free press on the alert to defend their legitimate rights is denied them.

After the crushing of fascism in the last war, many peoples have been graced by a free press. Not so the peoples who found themselves under the *knout* of the Stalinist imperialists. On the great territory that stretches from Vladivostok in Eastern Asia to the Elbe River in the center of Europe, a free press is conspicuous by its utter absence. In the USSR itself the press has never had its own voice. But the press still possesses a measure of freedom in the countries which recently have been put under the "protection" of the Stalinist imperialists (Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania). And this only during a transitory and "preparatory period" before their "union" with the USSR. In these countries a press in opposition to the Communist propaganda organs is being momen-

tarily tolerated. Even more, depending on the particular situation of the individual country, the Bolshevik press itself has to follow a course less strident than that in the USSR. But, subjected to a thousand pressures, the voice of the free press in these countries weakens daily.

Communist declarations on the freedom of the press in the USSR are shamelessly mendacious. In the past thirty years all the Kremlin rulers have done nothing if they have not muzzled the press along with all other democratic rights. This has not prevented them from claiming *ad nauseum* that the press is serving the people. In the international arena they have endlessly repeated the lie that the press in the USSR is "free" and "unrestrained."

These claims of necessity again impose on us a duty, that of dwelling on the problem of the press in the USSR. The ultra-reactionary policy of the Stalinist chieftains in the matter of the press must be unmasked. Indeed, the very fact that this discussion has to be conducted in the *underground* press automatically proves that the press in the USSR is not free.

We do not believe that the press of the so-called Western democracies is ideal. We know that not all of the press—and most of it not all of the time—serves the people. We know how great an influence is exerted upon this press by capitalistic interests, how servilely dependent on these interests the press can become. Far from ideal, the Western press has great shortcomings. But it is a free press; the Soviet press cannot compare. Molotov, talking at the Paris Peace Conference with James' Byrnes, U.S. Secretary of State, admitted that in the West, in addition to the great newspaper chains, there also is an independent and objective press. But what have we in the USSR? Do we have any other beside the official press, which serves solely and exclusively the interests of the Party? Most assuredly not.

Even in Greece, which we hear daily is being ruled by an unrestrained reactionary regime, Communist newspapers are printed. Can we point to anything similar here, in the country of "victorious socialism" and "highest democracy?" Would non-Communist newspapers be allowed? The answer again: most assuredly not. Here the whole press, without a

single exception, belongs not to the people but to the Communist clique in the Kremlin.

Such central newspapers as *Pravda* and *Kultura i zhizn* (Culture and Life), and such journals as *Bolshevyk* (Bolshevik) and *Propagandyst* (Propagandist), which give the whole Communist press its tenor, are published by the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (b). *Izvestia* also is published by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, although its publication is fronted by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, which, as is known, has no real significance except that of serving as a facade for the Stalinist dictatorship.

On the republic level and in the lower echelons this faint distinction between the Party and the *soviets* disappears; they publish the newspapers jointly. For instance, *Radyanska Ukraina* and *Pravda Ukrainy*, as is plainly marked on their mastheads, are published by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR. The provincial newspapers, for example, *Vilna Ukraina* (Free Ukraine) and *Lvovska Pravda*, and the *raion* newspapers (e.g., *Chervoni Berezhany*, organ of the Berezhany *raion*), are at the same time organs of both the *oblast* Party committees and the *oblast soviets*, or the *raion* Party committees and the *raion soviets*.

Thus, the spine and sinews of the Soviet press is the Party press, published directly by the Party organs.

All the youth newspapers, central through republic to school, are in the hands of the Comsomol, which, in the final analysis, is the Communist Party.

Krasnaya Zvezda (The Red Star), organ of the Defense Ministry, is also a Party organ. All army newspapers are published by the political administration of the Soviet Army, or, in other words, by the Communist Party.

Likewise, the organs of the trade unions, cooperatives, cultural, scientific, and sports societies, and so forth, are controlled by the Party, as are the organizations which supposedly publish them (according to Article 126 of the Soviet constitution, the party is a "leading kernel" in these organizations). Clearly, none of these organs could write anything

which would be considered contrary to the interests of the Party.

As we can see, there is no independent press, neither political nor trade union nor scholarly. Equally, those "independent" voters, who are publicized as voting together with the Party machinery in one "bloc" during "elections," do not have their own press as well. All newspapers serve the Stalinist policies and ideology.

The subordination of the press in the USSR to the Party is attested by yet another factor: all editors-in-chief, as a rule, must be Party members. In any case, all copy is subject to censorship on the part of propaganda secretaries, on occasion even by first secretaries of the Party. More important articles are usually discussed by outstanding Party ideologists before their publication. Very important articles dealing with programs and overall policies are printed in the central organs, and then reprinted in the press of the "Union Republics" and in their *oblast* and *raion* organs. Party control over the press is so tight and total that the Czarist press censorship was, by comparison, a child playing with its toy.

Again, that the press in the USSR exclusively serves the party interests can be best judged from the character and contents of the Soviet newspapers. All of them, regardless in what language they appear, are identical. Every article, every piece from editorial to news item, reflects the interests of the Party. Even the very appearance of the Soviet newspaper is standardized as to form and make-up: the first pages cover the problems of Party politics and the USSR; the last is usually reserved for coverage of international news. Even in the literary and scientific journals, the first pages are reserved for the orders and speeches of Stalin, the decisions of the Central Committee, etc., followed only then by the regular material.

Let us look at one issue of *Radyanska Ukraina* (August 24, 1946). It is typical. On the front page: "To Improve Selection, Placement and Training of Cadres"—a full four columns; "Exceptional Success of the Film 'Oath' in Lviv"; "All-Union Socialist Competition"; "Bread—to the State," a report of the Ministry of Land on the performance of tractors (two columns). Page 2: "Meeting of the Activists of the

Leningrad Party Organization"; "Meeting of Writers of Leningrad" (in connection with the decisions of the Central Committee on the policies of the reviews of *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*—four columns); "Procrastination of Wheat-Threshing Delays Grain-Collection"; "Empty Bells of Bobrynsk and Dmytriv" (more on the grain collection), a report by the Ministry of Technical Cultures on the work of agriculture and tractors (two columns). Page 3: "On the Eve of the New School Year," "Monks of Petropavlovsk" (on the dismissal from her job of a woman Communist); "Give the Soviet School Good Textbooks" (three columns with a few news items); a brief report on the plenary session of the Paris Peace Conference on August 22, a summary of the speech by Tsaldares (one-half column altogether); the address of D. Manuisky (over two columns), and a report on the recall of the Yugoslav Minister from Athens (altogether, three columns). Page 4: "Nationalist Beating Around the Bush" (attack on M. Rudnytsky) and items on international developments (five columns in all), and one column on various items. The entire content of the issue: politics of the Party; politics in the economy and industry, politics in the grain-collection, politics in science, and politics in ideology.

Do these items reflect the interests of the working people? Do they mirror the true life of the USSR? Not at all. "Socialist competition," "grain-collection," and the like only remind the average citizen of the USSR of his subservience to the Party and the Communist state. The meetings of the Leningrad writers, at which they were forced to humiliate themselves and to denounce their friends, do not, in any way, reflect the views of these writers.

Actual Soviet life finds no place in the Soviet press. The Soviet press either ignores or distorts and falsifies the reality. It systematically hides the truth, deliberately ignoring even the most important events and developments should they not be in the interest of the party.

Not so long ago (1944) the Soviet government, using its police and security forces brutally "resettled" two ethnic peoples; the Crimean Tartars and the Chechens. Here was a happening of great importance, far more important than delayed and deficient grain-collections in one or two *raions*. It

was literally a matter of life and death for two historical peoples. In a matter of a few days 180,000 Crimean Tartars and over 300,000 Chechens were herded in freight cars like cattle and carted away to the interior of the USSR. This was a dreadful crime of the twentieth century, newsworthy anywhere. Yet the Soviet press did not print a single line on this "policy." Compare this coverage with the torrent of vitriolic editorials should one or two of Stalin's busy spies be arrested in one of the Western countries.

We should like to make this absolutely clear. We are not talking of any published criticism of this treatment of hapless peoples. This is unthinkable in the USSR. What we wish to emphasize is that the Soviet press failed to report it at all.

The overwhelming majority of Soviet citizens first heard about these inhuman deportations on June 26, 1946, through the publication of a law by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian SFSR on the liquidation of the Chechen-Ingush ASSR and the transformation of the Crimean ASSR into a Crimean *oblast*. At the same time the Soviet citizens first heard of the reason justifying the crime committed by Stalin (collaboration of the Crimean Tartars and the Chechens with the Germans). The Soviet press *en masse* not only failed to inform its readers about the deportation, it also failed to write up the long struggle of the Crimean Tartars and the Chechen-Ingushes against the evils of Stalinist tyranny and Russification.

Pravda (No. 164, 1946) did deem it important enough to stress the "difficulties encountered in the Crimean region by new settlers" (who were moving lock, stock, and barrel into the ancestral homes of the Tartars).

In 1944 the Stalinist imperialists concluded a treaty with their Warsaw satellites on the "exchange" of the Ukrainians living in Poland for the Poles in the USSR. This treaty was concluded over the heads of both peoples concerned. The terms of the "exchange" suited only the interests of the Kremlin.

Understandably enough, the Ukrainian population balked at leaving their ancestral areas—the towns and villages in Pidlasia, the Kholm and Hrubeshiv districts, the Sian area and the Lemko Land. When Soviet and Polish

troops resorted to force to deport the thousands of Ukrainians, the latter took up arms to defend themselves. In order to break this resistance, the Warsaw puppets of Stalin, upon instruction, initiated a policy of terror and genocide: burning of villages and outright murdering of a once-peaceful population, including the women and children. It was a crushing program: the Warsaw government dispatched into the Ukrainian areas numerous army and police units (amounting to a few divisions), which were joined by Soviet NKVD troops.

For an idea of this Polish-Soviet action:

In the village of Pyskorovych—two thousand Ukrainians were murdered; in Berezka—130 persons; in Pavlykova—300; in Bakhiv—150; Horayets—150 (mostly women). This scale of slaughter was applied to the whole Ukrainian countryside.

But the citizens of the USSR, with the exception of those who personally met with the Ukrainian "resettlers" or who read about these killings in the Ukrainian underground press, remained ignorant of these events. The press of the "independent" Ukrainian SSR did not find it worthwhile to protest against this inhuman treatment and persecution of kindred Ukrainians by the Polish Communist government. Yet the same press could often express the fierce indignation of the Ukrainian people over events in far-off Greece or Trieste. We stress: not a single line appeared in the Ukrainian press on what was going on behind the Curzon Line. Nor did any news of the inhuman resettlement of these Ukrainians appear in the press of other "brotherly" republics of the USSR. Although the lives of over one million Ukrainians were at stake, the matter merited no mention in the tons of verbiage spewed forth by the Soviet press.

For almost three full years the Ukrainian Insurgent Army waged armed warfare on the Ukrainian territories against the Stalinist occupiers. The UPA also defended the persecuted Ukrainian population west of the Curzon Line. Thus, in those years the UPA engaged in a series of large and small encounters, including large-scale battles, with both the Soviet and the Polish troops: near the village of Hurby (the Rivno *oblast*, April, 1944); at Uhniv (Peremyshliany *raion* of the Lviv *oblast*, April, 1945); at

Tysova (near Peremyshl, September, 1945); at Zhuravkiv (Drohobych *oblast*, November, 1945); a series of fierce battles in the winter of 1946 in the Black Forest (*oblast* of Stanyslaviv). The UPA destroyed many *raion* centers; Radekhiv (Lviv *oblast*), Otynia, Delatyn, Nadvirna (Stanyslaviv *oblast*); Bircha, Lubachiv, Hrubeshiv, Krystonopil (behind the Curzon Line); Probizhna (Ternopil *oblast*) and Strilyshcha Novi (Drohobych *oblast*); and it raided *oblast* centers in Stahyslaviv, Peremyshl, and other places. In these battles, regiments, sometimes entire divisions, took part, resulting in heavy casualties on both sides. For instance, in the battle at Hurby thirty thousand Soviet troops participated; and in the battle at Radvantsi—four thousand Soviet troops. In the battle at the village of Zabolky (Kulykiv *raion*, Lviv *oblast*) 470 NKVD troops were killed, the Ukrainian insurgents suffering 40 dead and 18 wounded.

But these battles of the UPA against the Soviet and Polish troops, as great and as spread over the calendar as they were, never received mention in the Soviet press in Ukraine or elsewhere in the USSR. Reports of this fighting did appear in the Polish press, in a distorted fashion, to be sure. For instance, the newspaper *Dziennik Rzeszowski* (The Rzeszow Daily) of September, 1946, published an interview with General Rotkiewicz, commander-in-chief of the Polish troops which operated against the UPA. He was quoted as saying:

As you may know, the problem of security continues to be a thorny question. Especially, the eastern and southern counties of the *Województwo* [Rzeszow] are subjected to constant attacks on the part of the UPA. . .

The Polish troops continue to wage the struggle to clear the eastern and southern counties of UPA bands. Recently, we succeeded in destroying the band of Hrin. In the battle between the UPA and Polish troops, 24 UPA-ites were slain, 2 wounded, and 5 captured. Our troops captured 1 mortar, 5 light machine guns, 5 automatic rifles, 8 rifles and 5 boxes with ammunition. In a battle with the Burlaka band 60 bandits were slain.

The intensity of the offensive mounted by the Polish troops is to be seen from the fact that in the period of August 1 to August 20 alone, 67 UPA-ites were killed, 13 wounded and 128 captured. A great

amount of all sorts of arms was seized as well. Killed at the same time was Bir, commander of the UPA band, and the deputy commander of the Hrin band as well. . .

We need not be concerned here with the veracity of these reports nor their exaggerated, one-sided presentations. For us it is important to point out that the Polish press acknowledged the existence of the UPA from time to time.

Space limitations prevent us from reproducing all the reports appearing in the Polish press. To cite some, however:

"When Will an End Come to the Bands?" (*Nowe Horyzonty* [New Horizons], August 4, 1946); "Destruction of the Banderaites in Sianok County" and "The End of 'Damian'" ([Poland in Arms], August 8, 1946); "Intensified Attacks of the Banderaites" (*Nowe Horyzonty*, August 25, 1946); "Gangrene of Banditism in Gorlice County" (*Dziennik Polski* [The Polish Daily], August 25, 1946); "Rzeszow Struggles against the Bandits" (*Glos Ludu* [The Voice of the People], August 28, 1946); "What the UPA Dreams About" (*Rzeczpospolita* [The Republic], September 3, 1946); "Destruction of the UPA Radio Station" (*Dziennik Rzeszowski* [The Rzeszow Daily], September 2, 1946); "How the Powerful Band of Semen was Destroyed" (in the same newspaper under the date of September 12, 1946); "On the Tracks of the Banderaites" (*Przakraj* [The Cross-Cut], a long reportage claiming that Polish troops had slain two hundred UPA members and wounded several hundred, September 15-21, 1946); "Action of the Military Units against the Banderaites" (*Trybuna Robotnicza* [The Workers' Tribune], No. 22, 1946); "Successes in the Struggle against the Banderaites" (*Nowe Horyzonty*, October 13, 1946).

Thus did the Polish press cover the "bandits." But it must be stressed that the activities of the UPA on the Ukrainian lands under Poland were only a small part of the guerrilla warfare operations of the Ukrainian underground. The main operations and thrusts of the UPA were conducted in Soviet Ukraine, that is, in the USSR.

But in the USSR the Soviet press has kept an absolute silence on the UPA activities, despite the fact that Ukraine's western areas have been the principal terrain of UPA operations as well as its extensive political activities. Soviet citi-

zens throughout Ukraine could have learned about the UPA only from three "appeals" to the UPA that have been issued by the so-called "government" of the Ukrainian SSR. These called on the UPA fighters to lay down their arms. (Also, there have been the feuilletons of Ostap Vyshnia, Ukrainian humorist, which have appeared in the Soviet Ukrainian press.)

In the fall of 1945 and the spring of 1946, strong UPA units made daring raids into Slovakia. The entire Slovak and Czech press, both Communist, reported extensively on these UPA raids.

For instance, the newspaper *Democrat*, organ of the Slovak Democratic Party, under the dateline of September 20, 1945, said:

In the northeastern part of Slovakia there have lately appeared armed groups. . . So far there have been no cases of these groups committing acts of violence against the lives or properties of our citizens. . .

The Communist newspaper *Vykhodoslovenska Pravda* of September 21, 1945, reported the presence of the UPA in Slovakia in a somewhat different light:

From the very beginning it was clear that these small groups of outcasts of humanity . . . were hiding from the severe hand of justice. . . They have come to us because in Poland their lives have become impossible what they have achieved here is to be brought to justice. A few of them have been captured, some of them have succeeded in escaping to the forests of Hungary. So looks the history of the so-called Banderaites in our country. . .

The newspaper assured its readers that this was the end of the UPA and that its appearance in Slovakia was as ephemeral as a soap bubble. But in April, 1946, UPA units again raided Slovakia, meeting everywhere, as was the case the first time, with the sympathetic and friendly support of the Slovak population. Then even the Communist press was compelled to take a more serious attitude toward the "history of the Banderaites."

To illustrate, let us cite a part of the article which appeared in the June 1, 1946 issue of *Bojownik* (The Fighter) in Bratislave:

Recently all the newspapers have reported that Eastern Slovakia has been cleared, that there are no Banderaite groups on our territory. A series of newspaper reports have appeared that give our community an opportunity to learn something about the objectives of these armed formations, which for more than a year after the war have been waging fierce battles against the state authorities of the Polish and Soviet states. Through coordinated operations our land army has cleared the territory of the Republic and today insures its integrity. We stand today beyond any danger. We have no reason to fear unsuccessful actions on the part of individuals or small groups. Order and security for the individual and his property have been assured, and the army is ready to nip in the bud any steps which lead to the negation of these achievements. . .

But the newspaper felt it could not afford to ignore the great enthusiasm the appearance of the UPA units had evoked among the Slovak people. It added:

With the appearance of the Banderaite formations, generally known under the name of UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army), a series of questions have been raised as to its present activities, objectives, political direction and the capability of its operations. . .

The Soviet press, needless to say, made no mention of the UPA presence in Slovakia. Moreover, the Soviet press has kept mum about the unprecedented manhunts of the NKVD which have been going on since 1944 in our villages and cities, about the mass arrests and deportations to Siberia, about the countless trials behind closed doors, about the harsh sentences and about the executions.

Today, the Stalinist chieftains, having robbed Ukraine of its grains and livestock, and disregarding the drought hitting the eastern areas of Ukraine, have encouraged the spread of a new famine in these areas. But the Soviet press coolly ignores all these happenings. If one peruses the numbers of *Radyanska Ukraina* for 1945, one will possibly find two or three hints about the drought. An article here, a speech of Khrushchev, and the address of Mikhailov at the thirteenth session of the Comsomol, in which he stated: "The

task of our propagandists and agitators is to carry to the wide masses the immortal ideas of Lenin and Stalin, to mobilize the people, to overcome the difficulties arising from the consequences of the war, a situation complicated by the drought and the poor harvest in some *oblasts* and *raions* of our country. . .” (*Radyanska Ukraina*, December 14, 1946). A reader between the lines would know that some area of Ukraine were suffering from actual hunger.

The word “drought” hides the terrible specter of famine, which daily decimates the population. Thousands of famished and bedraggled people from the eastern areas of Ukraine wend their way to the western to seek food—from their equally famished brothers. They are emaciated things, wandering through villages, flitting through markets. They crowd railroad stations, young and old, women and children, joined by crawling invalids of the Red Army. They carry little bundles in their hands, and they tremble incessantly, trembling from the cold, trembling from fear that any moment they may be arrested by the NKVD, trembling that their meager food, bought, begged, and stolen, may be taken away.

These depressing scenes are not to be found in either the press or any official statement of the Soviet government. On the contrary, the Soviet press constantly boasts about the “flourishing, happy, and prosperous life” in the USSR, about the “great enthusiasm” with which the people have welcomed the new Fourth Five Year Plan. The Soviet newspapers are replete with photographs of contented workers, well-fed children, and smiling collective farm women, and so forth, as if no famine had touched them.

The essential characteristic of the Soviet press is to misrepresent the truth, to make white out of black, and vice versa. Nowhere in the world is this device so well developed and so widely used as in the USSR. No untruth can be too base, no protest too specious—all culminating in double-talk—the lie which is indispensable to the functioning of the Soviet press.

On February 10, 1946, the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR were held throughout the Soviet Union. As in all other Soviet elections, these were held bereft of any

democratic forms. The people did not choose their candidates; they were imposed upon them from on high. Especially in Western Ukraine, scene of a violent anti-Soviet struggle these "elections" were held under terroristic conditions. Before the elections, strong NKVD detachments had descended upon most villages to monitor the proceedings. For instance, in the villages of the Zhydachiv *raion* (Drohobych *oblast*), a total of 600 NKVD troops "watched" the voting; in the Stryi *raion*—5,253 NKVD men, in the Peremyshliany and Pomoriany *raions* (Lviv *oblast*)—3,200 NKVD troops—troops over and above the permanent NKVD garrisons in the various cities of Western Ukraine. In many localities people were driven by the NKVD guards to the polling places, as for instance in the village of Dobrivliany (Stanyslaviv *oblast*), where NKVD guards prodded the "voters" along with their bayonets (a Ukrainian woman, Anastasia Wozna, actually was pulled by her hair to the polling booth by the NKVD).

But despite the ever-present terror of the secret police, hundreds upon thousands of persons boycotted the "elections." In the Kalush *raion* (Stanyslaviv *oblast*), 12,596 voters refused to vote; 10,108 in the *raion* center of Kozova (Ternopil *oblast*) abstained. Such cases of organized boycott ran into the thousands.

Were the Soviet press free and unhampered, such crass violations at the polls would be widely reported and criticized. But not in the USSR. On the contrary, the Soviet press reported that the elections were held in an "atmosphere of great elation and enthusiasm" and that the voters were so eager to cast their votes that the authorities "had to restrain them in their enthusiasm" and keep them "in orderly lines."

Is this the way the press should serve the people? Does this prove that the Soviet press serves and protects the interests of the peoples of the USSR?

Evidently and certainly not. The Soviet press is the docile instrument and tool of the Communist Party and its totalitarian regime. The Soviet press is in fact an enemy of the people, for it stops at no lie in order to whitewash and justify the policies of the Communist Party, to cover up its crimes and persecution. It is also guilty of misinforming the

free world, yet outside of the Soviet government it is the only link with the free world. In any event, much of what is supposed to be happening in the USSR is given the world at large by the Soviet press. It is regrettable that the outside world at large should not realize the magnitude of the lies and deception disseminated regularly and systematically by the Soviet press.

We who are forced to live under this tyrannical regime have long learned to distinguish the kernel from the chaff; we have even learned how to glean truth from the propaganda verbiage. We know when we read that the workers of one or another factory "have pledged themselves to overfill their production quotas" that this "pledge" has been imposed on them by the Party overseers; when we read that such or another collective farm or village fulfilled its grain-collection before the deadline, we know that terror or other means of coercion was used to "encourage" the peasants.

Let us take a concrete example. The district newspaper of Lviv, *Vilna Ukraina* (August 28, 1946), wrote:

In Bolshevik fashion the Collective farmers and laboring peasants of the Horodok *raion* are implementing the resolutions of the XIIth plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine with respect to the harvest . . . and collecting of other agricultural products for 1946. . .

In order to better the organization of harvesting, threshing, and surrendering of wheat and food product quotas, the *raion* Party committee has obligated itself to help the peasants in their harvesting and grain-collecting campaigns—as was the case in the village of Dolyniany (secretary Hlobin) and in the village of Bartaty (secretary Hrabenko).

But throughout the villages of the Horodok *raion* the situation was the reverse. The peasants simply refused to surrender their crops, so that the Party organizations quickly were ordered to "prod" and "encourage" the peasants to fulfill and meet their quotas. Actually, the "assistance" of Comrades Hlobin and Hrabenko did not lie in their actually helping with the harvesting or threshing of the wheat. What they did was to threaten the farmers with deportation to

Siberia; together with the NKVD guards they forcibly wrested the wheat away from the peasants and sent it to the collecting points.

Here is still another example; On October 11, 1945, thirty NKVD soldiers arrived in the village of Hrushka (Otynia *raion* of the Stanyslaviv *oblast*), and along with the local NKVD chief and the procurator (attorney general) of the district, they seized the wheat of individual peasants forcibly by rooting up their homes, grounds, and so forth.

On September 20, 1945, the procurator and NKVD guards swooped down on the village of Dzuriv (Horodenka *raion*, Stanyslaviv *oblast*) to collect the wheat contingent. A poor widow, Anne Harmash, was short 9 kg. of wheat to meet her quota. Without hesitation, the procurator imposed on her the fine of nine centners of wheat in addition to her quota. The widow, knowing the fine would be impossible to meet and fearing deportation to Siberia, drowned herself in despair.

Nonetheless, the *raion* newspapers in Otynia and Horodok boasted that the farmers of the villages of Dzuriv and Hrushka were fulfilling their quotas "enthusiastically and in the Bolshevik fashion" and that both the procurator and the *raion* NKVD chief "helped" them in their effort. There was no mention of the criminal act of the procurator that drove the widow to her self-destruction.

The Soviet press constantly spews forth a mass of all kinds of appeals, letters, notes of appreciation, telegrams, all of which allegedly are prepared and sent by the workers or peasants themselves. But we know only too well the technique underlying such appeals and letters. As a rule, the texts of such public documents are prepared in the Party headquarters and produced at the meeting, where all present are induced through threats of terrorization and deportation to sign them.

For example, on September 9, 1945, the NKVD herded the villagers of Teliache (Tovste *raion*, Ternopil *oblast*) to a meeting at the village headquarters and forced them to sign the following telegram to Stalin:

We, the peasants of the village of Teliache, have already completed our grain-gathering. We are now pre-

paring the fall sowing and we are grateful to you, O Father, for the liberation from German slavery. . .

Whoever refused to sign the telegram was mercilessly beaten. Maria Mykytiuk, a peasant woman, was especially savagely mauled, necessitating her hospitalization. But the Soviet press reports that such telegrams to Stalin are "enthusiastically endorsed to the general joy and thunderous applause of those present."

These telegrams and letters are dutifully printed by the Soviet press to create the false impression that the population of the USSR, especially the people of Ukraine, are wholly loyal and dedicated to the Soviet system and to Stalin, and that all in the USSR are fully content with the rule of the Communist Party.

To further reveal the mendacity and double-talk of the Soviet press, we shall review its dealing with the Ukrainian liberation movement.

As we all know, the Ukrainian national liberation movement waged a heroic and determined struggle against the German occupiers of Ukraine during World War II. In this struggle was born and steeled the UPA. But the Soviet press, ever following the general Party line, identifies the Ukrainian revolutionary movement with the Nazis, constantly referring to it as being composed of "German agents."

Here is a sample:

In the terrible days of the occupation of Western Ukraine by the German fascist aggressors, the miserable remnants of Ukrainian-German nationalists raised their heads. They openly and with dedication served the fascists, becoming their loyal helpers in the torturing and destroying of the local workers and peasants. . . (*Radyanska Ukraina*, No. 163, 1946).

Moreover, the newspaper has the audacity to act in the name of the Ukrainian people and to express "their" views:

This will never be forgotten by our people. The Ukrainian-German nationalists have long ago prepared their graves. The working people of the western areas never did and never will follow these despicable bandits. . . The working people of the western *oblasts* have

already recognized the power of the Soviet system, and no force on earth will ever be able to break the will and desire of our liberated people for the new life. . .

So writes the Soviet press mendaciously about the working peoples of the western areas of Ukraine, who, in compactly following the leadership of the Ukrainian revolutionary underground, boycotted the "elections" to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, thereby demonstrating their full and unqualified solidarity with the Ukrainian revolutionary underground movement. The fact is that this movement expresses the desire of the entire Ukrainian people, and hence it enjoys their total support. It is this popular support which has enabled the Ukrainian underground to wage a determined struggle for three years against the Nazis, and now another three years against the Stalinist imperialists. *Any objective observer must realize that such a struggle could not have been possible without the support of the people, especially since there has been no support of any kind from abroad.* The Kremlin, of course, knows this.

But the Soviet press does not record this truth. This brings us to the principal question: Whom does the Soviet press serve when it hides the truth about the struggle of the Ukrainian people, and, even more, when it nigrifies and lies about this struggle?

By way of proof that the Soviet press is "free," the Kremlin leaders very often piously point out that the press can criticize anything in the USSR. This is wholly untrue. There is, to be sure, an enormous amount of criticism in the Soviet press. But who is criticized? Some individuals, certain organizations and institutions, even some Party leaders and Party organizations, but never the Party itself nor the overall policy of the Party.

But we know that the roots of the evil lie not in certain individuals but in the reactionary Stalinist regime, in the criminal policies of the Party, in the very being of the Party itself. It is the Party that enslaves a number of foreign peoples besides oppressing millions of its own citizens simply because it has established a totalitarian system to insure its dominant position. The Party alone must dominate and rule. Would the removal of one or more leaders from the leader-

ship of the Party change its policies? No such changes have ever improved the lot of the working people. On the contrary, changes have hastened the deterioration of the general conditions of the citizens of the USSR.

These conditions can only be changed with a total destruction of the Bolshevik Party and with the establishment of a new and equitable order. If in the USSR there were a truly free press, its blade would be directed against the abuses of the Party administration. But inasmuch as the press is not free, it utters no word of criticism of the Party and its policies, it does not uncover and score its crimes and it does not defend the people. In a word, it does not struggle against the root of the evil.

As we have pointed out above, the Soviet press does indulge in criticism, but this criticism is directed solely against those who fail to follow the instructions of the Party; those who could not fulfill their assignment quotas in production: those who neglect the "education" of the youth. But it could never identify the system as the source of all difficulties.

In order to convey the impression that it is concerned about the welfare of the working masses, the Soviet press publishes from time to time reportages and articles purportedly in the defense of the people.

As a rule, Soviet criticism in the press is not proper criticism at all, but scurrilous personal attack. The Soviet lexicon is rich in the debasement of the individual.

In the No. 159, 1945 issue of *Radyanska Ukraina* one H. Stepovy assailed Eugene Kyrylyuk for his book, *Outline of the History of Ukrainian Literature*:

E. Kyrylyuk did not even use [in his speech at the party meeting of the Union of Writers] the term, 'nationalist error.' He simply, it would seem, erred. Perhaps the only mistake of E. Kyrylyuk was his hope that the old theses of Yefremov published under his editorship would not be uncovered. But in this respect he certainly made a mistake. The nationalist stench is too strong not to be unnoticed in the *Outline* edited by E. Kyrylyuk.

On the part of Kyrylyuk we have a very conscious attempt to publish this nationalist contraband as an achievement of Soviet literature. We have to expose

this contraband and another attempt to put into circulation the long unmasked nationalist theories and petty theories inimical to Soviet society. . .

These are no longer the errors of a Soviet literary critic. What was published in the *Outline* and advanced in justification of what was written proves that E. Kyrylyuk has sunk deeply into the nationalist mire and that he does not even make a serious attempt to extricate himself from the mire onto hard ground. . .

As we can see, this is a straightforward denunciation, and not a criticism of a literary work. The Soviet press often uses this method against persons who have "sinned" against the party. As a rule, such criticism heralds a "liquidation" of such persons, or serves as a justification, should "liquidation" already have taken place. In the latter case, the Soviet press never writes that such persons were against the Party only, but that they were also against the people and the state.

In the matter of description of the internal Soviet life, the Soviet press is guided by one criterion: to live in the best light possible; to depict the life of all peoples of the USSR and the working people in the most glowing colors; always to "prove" that the Party policies are directed in the interest of the people; and above all, to show the Party enjoys the unqualified support of the people. At the same time, the Soviet press describes conditions in the capitalist states in the darkest light possible. Thus what the Soviet press does not want to see in the USSR it perceives perfectly in the countries outside the USSR; national oppression and discrimination, unemployment, hunger, and exploitation.

Toward these ends, all information from abroad is very thoroughly screened by one official institution—which is TASS, the Soviet news agency. It is the policy of TASS to filter into the USSR only such information which redounds to the advantage of the Party and the Soviet government. All dispatches of TASS are printed throughout the USSR without any changes or editing. Only such august organs as *Pravda* can permit itself to have independent political articles, but these usually are written by important political party bigwigs.

Press dispatches by Soviet correspondents from abroad

observe the same rules governing the Soviet press at home. All straight reporting is interlaced with editorial comment, so that the reader has no chance to pass an independent judgment.

The year 1946 was full of international conferences of all kinds, at which delegates of various nations spoke. The Soviet press, of course, printed the speeches of Molotov, Vishynsky, and Manuilsky in their entirety. The addresses of other "friendly" leaders were given generous play: Kardejł, Moshe Piade, Rzymowski, Enver Hoxha, and others. The addresses of Byrnes, Bevin, Austin, Connally, Shawcross, and other Western leaders were reported in abbreviated form, overshadowed by commentary and explanations to the effect that their speeches were weak, ineffective, and inconsequential. It would appear that the Soviet reader is not interested in what the Western leaders have to say. In any event, he has to be guided, as a child, on what to read, how to read, and how to think.

When an event occurs which is not favorable to the Soviet side and the Soviet press has to take a stand, then the matter is greeted with a reportage full of irony and cynicism. The onus for anything bad is invariably put on the other side. This is the style of David Zaslavsky, whose articles often appear in *Pravda* under such titles as "Black Deeds of the American Intelligence" (No. 174, 1946) and "Pitiful End of a Shameful Comedy" (No. 183, 1946).

The latter article of Zaslavsky is worthwhile commenting on. In it the writer makes reference to classified materials that some Canadian citizens forwarded to the Soviet attaché, or more simply, about the espionage of the Soviet diplomatic personnel in Canada. The Soviet government made its first reference to the matter in a statement on February 20, 1946, but failed to report that the stealing and espionage were uncovered by Igor Gouzenko, a code clerk in the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa who defected to the Canadian side. Only on August 3, 1946, was the name of Gouzenko mentioned for the first time by Zaslavsky. What is clear is that Gouzenko, while working in the Soviet Embassy, has provided sensational evidence on the worldwide spying by Soviet diplomatic posts throughout the world, and specifically on the support

the Soviet Embassy has given the so-called Canadian Progressive Workers' Party. In two long columns, Zaslavsky tries to talk away the Soviet espionage activities, concentrating instead on the Canadian government for giving asylum to Gouzenko, "a deserter and traitor."

How one-sidedly the Soviet press informs Soviet citizens about life abroad may be seen from the fact that the main source of its information is the Communist press in foreign countries (*The Daily Worker*, *L'Humanite*, *Rude Pravo*, *Glos Ludu*, *Borba*, and so forth). If other newspapers are quoted, it is always in small measure and in any case only when they write something favorable about the USSR.

As a rule the Soviet press gives a big play to Communist leaders and sympathizers abroad, such as Dimitrov, Tito, Hroza, Bierut, Gomulka, Gottwald, Leon Krzycki, Senator Pepper, and the like.

The fourth page of the July 17, 1946 issue of *Pravda* carried an item on the address of U.S. Secretary of State Byrnes on the results of the Paris Peace Conference, but considerable space was given to the address of Bierut at the first congress of the "Democratic Union". And *Pravda* (No. 118, 1946) gave extensive coverage to a meeting of pro-Soviet groups at Madison Square Garden in New York on June 15, 1946, at which Senator Pepper assailed U.S. foreign policy almost totally in the Bolshevik spirit.

Through special presentations, interpretations, and selection of facts and events, the Soviet press endeavors to create in the reader's mind the impression that the non-Soviet world is on the verge of collapse, that it is ridden with hunger and strife, while the USSR, on the other hand, basks in universal admiration. All movements which are favorably disposed toward the USSR are called "democratic" and "national," while any adverse movements, organizations, and individuals are denounced as "fascists," "anti-people," and so forth.

In similar fashion, the Soviet press "enlightens" its readers about the Ukrainian emigration and the emigrations of other peoples. As a rule, all these organizations are labeled "tools of foreign intelligence services." Earlier they were referred to as "Hitler's hirelings." Now they are called

"lackeys of Anglo-Saxon reaction." Thus the activities of the Foreign Representation of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council (UHVR), which directs the struggle of the UPA and the entire Ukrainian people, is denounced and derided by the Soviet press. In its eyes, Stepan Bandera, who spent the whole time of the German-Soviet war in a Nazi concentration camp and whose two brothers were murdered in the Auschwitz concentration camp, is a Nazi agent. It sees the leaders of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee (UCC), headed by Very Rev. Dr. Basil Kushnir, as "fascists-reactionaries," because they oppose the Soviet domination of Ukraine and help the Ukrainian people in their effort to regain their freedom and independence.

How completely the Soviet press is subservient to the party may be seen from the attack of the central organ of the Comsomol, *Komsomolskaya Pravda* (September 15, 1946), on another review, *Soviet Sports*:

The review writes extremely dryly on our sports masters, our own adepts of physical culture; but once it treats of foreign sports, the review has no limits in its enthusiasm and admiration. . . . Almost 60 pages is devoted to the achievements of foreign sports. But not a line is to be found pointing out the commercial and mercantilist character of bourgeois sports. The editors pay little attention to the sports movement in our country and pay much too much attention to foreign sports. This is a great mistake on the part of the review and its editor, Comrade Kotelnikov. . . .

The discovery of penicillin in England in 1941 was long kept from the Soviet citizens simply because this would constitute a recognition of foreign science. This will not do in the USSR. Indeed, in 1946, a review, *Ukraina*, reported that penicillin had been discovered by a Russian scientist, Prof. Yermolin, in 1942. Likewise, the anti-typhoid vaccine was "discovered in 1939 by Prof. Yatsemirsky-Krontovsky. . ." But the anti-typhus vaccine was known in the West much earlier. In Lviv, for instance, this vaccine had been manufactured by the Weigl Institute. But for the Soviet press—the beginning of all discoveries and inventions in medical science is in the USSR.

This, in essence, is the performance of the Soviet press. Only fanatically dedicated and ideologically blind Communist chieftains may consider the Soviet press to be free.

It is evident that in Ukraine the mission of our underground press has a great significance, for it has become a powerful weapon and instrument in the struggle against the Stalinist enslavers and exploiters.

Therefore, it is our sacred duty to nail down the Communist lies and to carry the truth to our people by all means available to us.

Chapter 4

Chauvinistic Frenzy and Russification Fever of the Bolshevik Imperialists

The "struggle against deviation" that is represented by great Russian chauvinism, about which the Bolsheviks were talking loudly some time ago, has ended today with the complete victory of this "deviation." The Stalinist chieftains have embraced and advanced the ideological positions of Russian chauvinism quite openly. On May 24, 1945, in the Kremlin, Stalin proposed a toast to the Russian people, who, according to him, "are the most outstanding nation of all the nations comprising the Soviet Union" and who possess a "clear wisdom, a stable character and a gift for suffering." This was the official avowal of an open chauvinistic course, which, in fact, has existed for many years.

This frankly chauvinistic declaration, which finally confirmed the completion of the shift of the Bolsheviks to the position of Russian chauvinism, served as the beginning of a fiery campaign to inflame chauvinism in the Russian people. This campaign, into whose service the great Bolshevik propaganda resources have been placed, is being conducted according to a scheme outlined by Stalin in order to "prove" the following:

a) The Russian people, by their very nature, are the most outstanding nation;

b) They constitute the leading force of the nations of the USSR.

What immediately catches the eye of any knowledgeable person is the fact that this "theory" smacks of strong similarity if not direct imitation of Hitler's "racial theory" on the superiority of the German people over all other peoples of the world. This "theory" is wholly senseless and has no scientific basis whatsoever, just as the German racist "theory" had no scientific ground to justify its claim of "superiority."

Inasmuch as this "theory" is unscientific, lacking any rational and historical basis and argument, the Communist thinkers, theoreticians, and propagandists have been ordered to distend such sciences as history, philosophy, and political economy in order to justify the "racial theory" proposed by Stalin.

The first argument which seeks to prove the higher "qualities" of the Russian people points to their "historical attainments." "The Russian people throughout their history have demonstrated that they are hard-working, freedom-loving, a brave people who have been able to stand up in their own defense as well as to give a helpful hand to their friends. . ." (Cf. *A Collection*, published by *Radyanska Ukraina* in 1946).

In order to stretch out the "continuity" of Russian history, Stalinist chauvinists today have shamelessly stolen from the Ukrainian people the entire period of Kievan Rus, adding it to the history of the Russian people. For outside consumption they claim that Kievan Rus is a common heritage of the Russian, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian peoples (which, in fact, is a falsification of history *par excellence*!). But they never forget to add that the Russian people performed the "leading role" in the Kievan State, thus making Kievan Rus a Russian state. In this respect the Stalinist chauvinists do not differ from their Czarist predecessors. More often than not they contend simply and without a twinge of conscience that Kievan Rus was a Russian State:

In far-off antiquity the Russian people created a great state and protected with their breasts their native land and independence. . . Kievan Rus of the XIth and XIIth centuries was one of the greatest states of Europe [this is, of course, to the exclusive merit of the Russian people]. . . The valorous struggle of the Russian people against the Mongol-Tartars invaders saved Western Europe from the mortal threat of enslavement by the Mongol-Tartars, who, as a result, could not advance into Western Europe. . . (*A Collection*).

There is no mention whatsoever about the role of the Ukrainian people in this struggle against the Mongol-Tartars, as if the Ukrainians had not existed at the time and hotly fought these Asian invaders.

But what is known to every objective and scholarly historian is the fact that Kievan Rus was the exclusive creation of the Ukrainian people. It is also known that at that time there was no Russian people as such; at best they were only in the bud of their formation in the thirteenth century in the Volga-Oka basin. The Russian people created their state much later (the beginning of the Russian state took place with the birth of the Muscovite Principality, which successfully conquered all the neighboring principalities and which in the fifteenth century entered upon territorial expansions).

It is an equally known fact that it was the Ukrainian people who spearheaded the struggle against the Mongol-Tartar invasions (the battle on the Kalka River, 1223; Pereyaslav-Chernihiv, 1239; Kiev, 1240). For their part, the Russian (Muscovite) princes accepted vassalage in the Golden Horde, and it was only in the fifteenth century that they liberated themselves from the Golden Horde when the latter had become weakened by internal strife.

By this we do not mean to deny the fact that the Russian people did struggle against the Mongol-Tartar invasions. Note, for example, their victory at Kulikovo Field in 1380. What we want to underscore is the chauvinistic interpretation of this struggle, which ascribes this anti-Mongol struggle exclusively to the Russian people.

For the Stalinist chauvinists to tell the truth would be tantamount to denigration of the role of the Russian people.

Diminished would be their stellar capabilities as a state-building nation, their "superior qualities," and so forth. The current policies of the Kremlin directed toward elevating the Russian people to the pedestal of racial superiority would be seriously weakened. Thus they resorted to the theft of a vital and substantial part of Ukrainian history—Kievan Rus—in an attempt to aggrandize the Russian past. Thus, in Soviet histories the Russian state appears two centuries before it was actually formed.

For these reasons, in place of denunciation of Russian imperialism, there now is *open apology* and support for it. Moreover, this Russian imperialism is given a *historical-progressive role*; it is justified and idealized so that it can serve as a powerful propaganda argument. Therefore, for the Kremlin imperialists, the former Czarist chauvinist historian, Klyuchevsky, and the entire Czarist chauvinist historiosophical school, all providing "historical arguments," are far more useful than the Soviet historian Pokrovsky, who was praised by Lenin.

Lenin, in his article, "On the National Pride of Great Russians," wrote:

We are imbued with a feeling of national pride and, therefore, we especially detest our past, filled with slavery (when the landowners and *boyars* led the peasants in suppressing the freedom of Hungary, Poland, Persia, and China), and we hate our present slavery, when the same landowners, with the help of capitalists, led us into the war in order to suppress Poland and Ukraine, to suppress democratic movements in Persia and China, to strengthen the Romanov clique, as well as the cliques of the Dobrynskys and Purishevyches, all of which shame our great Russian pride. . . (Cf. *Collective Works*, V.I. Lenin p. 691).

Here is the official glorification of imperialistic conquest:

The army of our Fatherland very often marched outside its borders to fight in foreign lands. The Russian army appeared in Germany, in Berlin, showed up within the borders of Bavaria, in sultry Italy, in the snowy Alps, on the heights of Montmartre in Paris, behind the Balkans, at the walls of Constantinople, in the ice-covered Bay of Botnia, in Holland, Portugal; the Russian

marines made landings on the shores of friendly America. The Russian navy fought not only on the seas of our Fatherland, but also on the waters of the far-distant Mediterranean Sea. . . (Cf. A. Kryvitsky, *The Russian Officer Abroad*, p. 7, War Publishing House, Moscow, 1946).

No longer are cursed the Czarist imperialists who drove the peasants to war. Instead, we have a pure glorification of "Russian arms." No longer is there talk about the suppression of freedom in Hungary, Poland, and Persia, but an idealization of these military campaigns which aimed at the suppression of freedom of other nations. Why? Because these imperialistic campaigns and wars are cited today to prove the "superiority" of the Russian people. With this glorification of past imperialistic wars the chauvinism of the Russian people is inflamed; with it the present-day Russian-Bolshevik imperialism is justified and abetted.

For still greater idealization of the Russian imperialist past these aggressive wars are given such decorative and euphemistic appellations as the "liberation of brother-Slavs," "rescuing of Europe," and so forth. "The Russian people liberated the brotherly Slavic peoples from slavery and got back their independence for them" (*Collection of Articles*, published by *Radyanska Ukraina*, 1945). "Similarly, as in the times of the Tartar invasions, the Russian people saved Europe from falling under Asiatic domination; in 1812 they saved it from Napoleonic domination. . . This is again demonstrated, but with new force, the power of the Russian people and their progressive role in the history of mankind. . ." (*Bolshevyk*, No. 10, 1945).

Thus the imperialist wars against the Turkish empire are called a "liberation of brother-Slavs," and the "restitution of their independence, while the return in Europe of dark reaction, established by the Holy Alliance after the defeat of Napoleon, is called the "rescuing of Europe." Although these interpretations of Russian imperialistic policy in the past clearly contradict the historical truth, they nonetheless stoke the fires of Russian chauvinism and fully justify the Stalinist policy in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, which again is referred to as the "liberation of brother Slavs" by the Russian people. In this drive

to promote traditional Russian imperialistic interests, the Kremlin now is exploiting the Security Council of the United Nations, just as in previous times the Czars used the Holy Alliance to advance the Russian cause.

The well-known statement of Lenin—"in each national culture there exist two national cultures"—or, in other words, there exists a class structure—is no longer applied with the rigidity Pokrovsky exhibited, but only whenever it is convenient and practical. In order to build up Russian chauvinism and to propagate the "superiority" of the Russian people, it has not been enough to make recourse to such shining names among the working and exploited masses as Cherneshevsky and Plekhanov; it has also been necessary to borrow the "heroes" of the great Russian culture: the "Purishkeviches, Guchkovs, and Struves." The most inhuman Russian imperialists have been elevated to the status of the "most important Russian men," and their criminal activities are cited as proof that the Russian nation is the "most talented" of all nations. Therefore, such single-minded conquerors as Ivan the Terrible or Peter I are cited as "farsighted leaders," whose "prudent activities have strengthened the power of the Russian state."

Not so long ago V. Soloviev wrote a drama, *Ivan the Terrible*. It seeks to represent this Russian tyrant as a great Czar-builder, whose great wisdom and farsightedness overshadow all the bestial crimes he committed against his own people. Peter I was rehabilitated early, by A. Tolstoy in his historical novel, *Peter I*. Other blood-letting Czars await their rehabilitation. This may well include Catherine II, who would long have been rehabilitated were it not for her German origin; her "achievements" for the Russian state match those of Ivan and Peter.

As we can see, history is interpreted from great-power and racist viewpoints, all in order to hammer into the minds of the Russian people their "superiority," "state-building capabilities," "liberation messianism," and their "saving of Europe and its civilization."

The outstanding traits of the Russian people have been revealed with particular force not only in the matter of creating a powerful national state, but also in the crea-

tion of priceless spiritual values. The Russian people are talented and active, implacable and unbending in struggle, insistent and dedicated in work. . . (*Bolshevsk*, No. 10, 1945).

Following this chauvinistic bent, the Stalinist chieftains raise Russian culture and science far above the places they rightly deserve:

Russian literature, by its ideals and liberational tendencies, its artistic perfection, and so forth, occupies first place in the world (Cf. *Collection of Article*, published by *Radyanska Ukraina*, 1945). It sings of the virtuous traits of the Russian, his courage and heroism in struggle, his clear wisdom and stable character, his self-dedication and suffering, his readiness to sustain any kind of sacrifice in order to attain a higher ideal, his fervent patriotism, his undying faith in the great future of Russia and his readiness to undertake any sacrifice, including the giving of his life on the altar of the fatherland. Russian literature and arts are imbued with idealism, profound realism, humanism and love of people. . . The Russian theater, by universal recognition, is the best theater in the world. . . (*Bolshevsk*, No. 10, 1945).

In science, even the least significant discoveries are trumpeted as "great inventions" in order to "prove" the predominance of Russian science and its "superiority" over Western European science. A Russian review, *Novoye Vremya* (New Times), was enraged that a British journalist should not be able to find in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* the name of Popov, the "Russian inventor of radio." Incidentally, the names of many of these Russian inventors were not known before, never even having been mentioned in Russian publications prior to 1940 or 1943. Not only was one Popov the "inventor of radio." A self-made technician, I.I. Povsunov, "invented" the steam engine twenty years before it was invented by James Watt, while one I.P. Kublin designed a bridge arching over the Neva River. Andrei Nortov anticipated the English inventors as regards a machinery part, the so-called brace. Lomonosov "developed the ideas of current atomism" and "discovered and experimentally proved a law

on the preservation of energy"; Morkovnikov created a "theory about the mutual interaction of atoms in the molecule," and so forth. According to *Bolshevyk* (No. 10, 1945), the "contribution of Russian scientists to universal science has not only been a great one, but it also has played a benevolent role in the development of world science. . ." This "benevolent role" and its extent was not explicated by the Communist review.

Some "Russian firsts" are prominent in the field of technology:

Stepan Litvinov constructed a steam engine of double efficiency—utilizing a monocompound—in the years 1815-1820, thus leading the technical thought of Europe by some eighty years. To him also belongs the daring concept of a steam boiler. . .

The Englishman Humphrey Dewey is credited with the discovery of the volt arc in 1815. But actually a Russian physics professor, Vasily Petrov, in 1802 constructed at the time something unique—a galvanic battery—and not only discovered this phenomenon, but also proved that the volt arc could be used for illumination.

Electrical light is usually connected with the name of Edison. But a Russian inventor, Lodichin, as far back as 1873, constructed a lamp with a hot string. . . (*Komsomolkaya Pravda*, No. 195, 1946).

Russian political economy, as is known, has been extremely poor in original authors and theoreticians; the school has made no contribution whatsoever to the development of world economic thought, something which was frankly acknowledged in the press until 1940, or rather, 1943. Now, when the new chauvinistic course has gone into effect, there are virulent attacks on old economic texts. For instance, *Survey of Economic Thought of Russia in the First Half of the XIXth Century*, by I. Blumin (published in 1940), was assailed by *Bolshevyk* (No. 6, 1944) as "unscientific" and "contrary to fact." But, in actuality, the book was attacked because Blumin wrote that the science of "political economy in Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century was in great degree an alien science imported from the West." This is not true, wrote *Bolshevyk*, if only the "Russian nation is

the most outstanding nation"; therefore, it "had to have some outstanding economists as well."

In the same vein the same review, *Bolshevyk*, assailed D. Rosenberg, who in his *History of Political Economy* (published in 1940), out of 482 pages, devoted "only 17 pages" to Russia, and in which such Russian economists as Pososhkov, Mordvinov, and Turgeniev are depicted only as poor imitators and weak disciples of the Western European economists. Worse, Rosenberg did not mention at all such Russian economists as Krizanich, Lomonosov, and Radishchev. And even still worse, Rosenberg begins the history of Russian economic thought with Peter the Great (which is correct), while he should have begun with the *Ruska Pravda* (again, a crass theft from the Ukrainians).

In the Chauvinistic cast imprisoning *Bolshevyk*, the *Russian political economy* is a "great step in the development of world economic thought." Many Russian economists, it writes, were original thinkers who "had moved economic thought ahead," as, for instance, Mordvinov (about whom there is not a single line in the *Concize Soviet Encyclopedia*), "who several decades before the appearance of German economist Friedrich Lischt had developed the basic principles of the so-called national economy."

An "outstanding" Russian economist is Pososhkov, whose "great merit lies in that he foresaw a notion of the state theory of money" (Cf. *Bolshevyk*, No. 6, 1944). Actually, he made a reference to his "majesty the Czar," whose one word in support of the official currency would "make that currency strong and for centuries unchanged. . ." With these words Pososhkov apparently has won a place in the history of economic thought on a par with Montchretien, Willam Stafford, and James Stuart.

Whenever it becomes unduly difficult to prove that some of the "outstanding" Russian economic minds did not lead world economic thought and were not "first" among them then it is explained that he or they stalwartly did not "bow blindly before Western European scholars and scientists," but instead tried to utilize the Western European ideas for their best possible application to the specific conditions to be found in Russia.

The same situation prevails with the history of *Russian*

philosophy, which has never existed in Russia in the full meaning of the word, to say the least. But how could it be possible that the "most outstanding nation" should not have its "famous philosophers" and "leading philosophy?" Therefore, a number of authors have been unearthed who might have had the remotest relation to philosophy—Lomonosov, Radishchev, and others (for instance, Radishchev's *Journey from Petersburg to Moscow* is compared to Hobbs' *Leviathan*, Spinoza's *A Theological-Political Treatise* and Rousseau's *Social Contract*). Herzen, Belinsky, Dobrolubov, and Chernyshevsky, who heretofore were only "revolutionary democrats" and followers of the Western European philosophers (for instance, Chernyshevsky was a follower of Foyerbach), have been proclaimed to be the "ingenious classicists of Russian philosophy." Failing to demonstrate any original philosophical thought on their part, the Soviet hacks describe them as "creative," that is, they "generalized and critically refurbished the attainments of Western European thought," they "struggled for its realization" and, above all, they were "great patriots of their fatherland..." (Cf. M.T. Wowchuk: *Leninism and the Leading Russian Culture of the XIXth Century*).

In order to insure the "continuity" of Russian philosophy, Plekhanov was added, but, following Lenin, only with harsh criticism. At the top of Russian philosophical thought were placed Lenin and Stalin, with "Leninism" being proclaimed as the "highest achievement of Russian and world culture and science. . ." (Cf. M.T. Wowchuk, *op.cit.*).

But the most important and basic task has been to demonstrate that the "classicists" of Russian philosophy have "created their own basic and original materialistic systems, inseminated with the ideas of dialectical development" (*Bolshevyk*, No. 10, 1945), and that these "classicists" have understood the "limitations of Hegelian dialectics and the materialism of Foyerbach." The purpose is, of course, to tie up organically the "classical" Russian philosophy with Leninism, this "highest achievement of Russian and world culture and science," and thus, again, to "prove" that the Russian nation is the "most outstanding nation."

For these reasons German classical philosophy, hereto-

fore considered to be one of the component elements of Marxism and, *ipso facto*, of Leninism, is now under concentrated attack. True, Hegel and Foyerbach have been taken to task before, but never with such virulence. Suffice it to say that because of its old reverent approach to German classical philosophy, the third volume of the *History of Philosophy* (published in 1943 by the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR) was denied the Stalinist Prize. It may also be mentioned that the book was published under the editorship of the most outstanding Stalinist ideologist of our day, G. Alexandrov, chief of the Propaganda and Agitation Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Having postulated that the Russian nation is the "most outstanding nation of all nations," the Stalinist chieftains have deduced a "theory" about the *leading role of the Russian people* among other peoples, a role which is said to have "developed historically."

We are told time and again that this "leading role" was assumed by the Russian people at the very beginning of their history. It became manifest with the fact that "around the hard-working and warlike Russian people arose and developed our multi-national state" (*Collection of Articles*, published in 1945 by *Radyanska Ukraina*).

What we must understand by the term, "leading role," is the conquest and enslavement of numerous non-Russian peoples. It is, of course, incontestable that the USSR did not come about as a result of a process of "voluntary union," but directly as a result of bloody military conquests of Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Central Asia, Siberia, and so forth.

A pertinent question arises: How can the Kremlin totalitarianians, as they extol Russian imperialism (the "leading role" of the Russian people) and the "voluntary" establishment of the USSR—how can they contend that "the Russian people never took the role of enslaver, of oppressor of the freedom of the peoples. . ." (*Radyanska Ukraina*, No. 95, 1946)?

Were the Kremlin chieftains truthful and logical they would fairly and squarely ascribe the imperialistic crimes to at least a part of the Russian people—for indeed it was a

part, the Russian elite, which played the "leading role" and no one else.

The crimes of Russian imperialism are too great and enormous, too well known to the peoples of the USSR to be covered up or even minimized. There was a time when the Bolsheviks themselves spoke and wrote about these crimes, and even now they still refer to them, but for them they blame the Russian Czars, great landowners, and capitalists, and this only in those cases which the Bolsheviks believe serve their cause. As a rule, the blame is put on those Czars whom they consider to have been weak and bungling, such as Nicholas I and Nicholas II. But they idolize Czar Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great as "great builders" of the Russian state.

But the Bolshevik propagandists are not content merely to carp at weak Czars, capitalists, and landowners. They relegate their crimes to a secondary plane by emphasizing the idea of a powerful centralized Russian state. They counsel not to pay much attention to the past crimes of Czarist imperialism. To be studied, instead, is the growth, power, and greatness of the Russian state. By doing so, they artificially detach the crimes of Russian imperialism from the Russian state, and then such a "whitewashed" Russian state is ascribed to "some particular higher qualities of the Russian people."

With this neat dialectical "operation," it becomes clear to all that the Russian state was formed thanks to some benevolent "leading role" of the Russian people, and not to grasping imperialistic conquests involving the bloody subjugation and destruction of a number of non-Russian peoples.

In this respect, Hitler and his party were, at least, open. They announced, even boasted, that the German nation is a *Herrenvolk*, a "nation of masters," while other peoples are slave peoples, destined to serve the German masters. The Stalinist imperialists are cleverer. They do not claim Russian superiority; they merely accept it as a fact. "The Russian people were never a nation of masters, but they were the leading nation of all other peoples of our state. . ." The semantics differ; the essence is the same.

In order that the theory of "leading role" of the Russian

people be more palatable to the non-Russian peoples, they are told about the *progressive* role of the Russian state. The non-Russian peoples are given to understand that, in having been admitted to the same state, they have been graced by an opportunity, along with the Russian people and under their leadership, to wage a common struggle against absolutism and the capitalist-landowner system, especially at a time when this struggle is being conducted by the Russian proletariat and the Bolshevik party.

The Kremlin truth-jugglers, however, conveniently omit one intriguing fact. If the non-Russian peoples had not been conquered and brought to a "happy state" cohabiting with the Russian peoples under one roof, they could have continued their own national development in their own independent states—without having had to pay with the lives of millions of their peoples at the altar of the "leading nation." It is forbidden to talk, write, or even mention this fact in the USSR, for obvious reasons. It is always understood that whatever national oppression was suffered was due to the "capitalists and great landowners."

But for the non-Russian nations such spurious distinctions have never existed. For them to fight against the capitalists and landowners meant to fight against the Russian state, that is, for the destruction of the Russian state, which was an instrument in the hands of the very same capitalists. This, of course, the Bolsheviks know well. If the non-Russian peoples failed to destroy the oppressive Russian state, they have never stopped struggling for their national and social liberation. This can only come about with the destruction of the idea of the Russian *Herrenvolk*.

As far as the Russian people themselves are concerned, no one can deny that they struggled against the Czarist absolutism, against the capitalists and landowners (this was in their own interest), and that this struggle also helped the fight of the enslaved non-Russian peoples. But any claims about a "leading role" for the Russian people in this struggle is sheer chauvinistic nonsense. What "leading role" did the Russian people play in the struggle of the Ukrainian people against Czarist imperialists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries? Where was this "leading role" in the

"sacred war" (*hazavahat*), waged from 1840 to 1860 by the Caucasian peoples, or in the struggle of the insurgents of Central Asia (1898, 1916)? These peoples fought absolutely alone, with bravery and dedication—without any help on the part of the "older brother." On the contrary, the Russian people were pawns in the hands of their imperialist masters who, as Lenin wrote, thrust the peasants into wars to suppress the freedom of Hungary, Poland, Persia, and China. The Russian people struggled against absolutism but this same absolutism used them to subdue Ukraine, the Caucasus, Turkestan, to suppress the liberation struggle of the Poles and even the Hungarians, in order to "strengthen the cliques of the Romanovs, the Bobrynskys, the Purisheviches." The pawns made up the conquering "Russian army," in honor of which even today paeans of glory are sung, the forerunner of the Red Army today. All these deeds were committed by the Czar-builders, the genial military leaders and strategists, those who today are praised to high heaven. None other than Peter I ordered the slaying of the entire population of the City of Baturyn and its razing to the ground, none other than Peter, who later drove thousands of Ukrainian Kozaks to ignominious death in the marshes of the Neva River. It was much-glorified General Suvorov who slaughtered the Polish insurgents in Warsaw (the "Slaughter of Prague," a suburb of Warsaw).

Nor is it true that the Russian revolutionary parties, including the Bolshevik Party, exercised political leadership over the non-Russian peoples. In their activities, there was no hint of a "leading role" of the Russian people. But the activities of the Russian revolutionary parties were detrimental to the struggle of the non-Russian peoples, because all of them attempted to preserve in one form or another the integrity of the Russian empire. They were fighting only to change the form of government. This objective could not satisfy the enslaved nations, whose primary objective was the destruction of the Russian empire and the establishment of their own independent national states. Whatever group or individuals joined the Russian parties in these political activities were considered as lost to the cause of the enslaved peoples.

Such is the unadulterated truth about the "leading role" of the Russian people in the Czarist period. We are being accused of consciously ascribing the crimes of the Czars to the Russian people. This is not the case at all. We merely ascribe these crimes to those who committed them. In that today the Stalinist chieftains are casting these crimes into the form of a "leading role" of the Russian people only underscores the imperialistic, anti-people essence of this theory, and brands its authors as outright imperialists.

According to the Stalinist chauvinistic theory, the "leading role" of the Russian people also revealed itself in the pronouncements that they "were first to hoist the banner of the great October Revolution and that they attained freedom not only for themselves" but "also helped the other peoples of our country to liberate themselves from absolutism, from capitalist-landowner exploitation and national oppression." More: "the Russian people were the force which united the people of our country into one family, that is, the Soviet Union. . . The destruction of the capitalist system and the establishment of the Soviet Union is called the "culmination of the progressive role," a role played by the Russian state.

Undoubtedly, the October Revolution facilitated the liberation of the enslaved nations of Russia, but in this process there was no "help" from, nor any "leading role" played by, the Russian people. Moreover, the struggle of the non-Russian peoples in turn helped the Russians in the struggle for their social liberation. As far as the "union" of these people to form the Soviet Union is concerned, it was, in fact, the Russian people who were that "force," utilized by the new Bolshevik imperialists to enslave Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, and Turkestan, all of which had been able to establish their own independent states. And today every citizen in the USSR knows that the establishment and strengthening of the Soviet Union represents no progress. Rather, it is a process of the restoration of the Russian empire, a period of new national and colonial oppression, implemented by the Bolshevik imperialists; it is the establishment of a new class society, a new exploitation system. Having helped the new imperialistic clique to enslave the non-Russian peoples, the Russian people have lost, together with

the non-Russian peoples, the liberties and privileges they had won in the October Revolution. The Bolshevik chieftains imposed upon them a yoke just as oppressive and onerous as that of the former capitalists and landowners. Thus, nothing has changed in the situation of the non-Russian and the Russian peoples alike. How can there be talk of a "leading role" of the Russian people when this people did not play any role in the liberation of the non-Russian peoples by Russian Bolshevik imperialism—by such new imperialists as Stalin, Kaganovich, Molotov, Beria, Khrushchev, and others? It is only from Stalin and his ilk that we read and hear:

The Russian people raised high the banner of freedom and equality of all peoples, the banner of true democracy. Priceless are their leading role and their contribution to the economic and cultural renaissance and the development of the peoples of the USSR; they provided gigantic forces and made great expenditures in the construction of the national economy of the national republic. . . (*Bolshevyk*, No. 10, 1945).

Such ingenious declarations are intended to convince one and all of the "progressive role" of the Russian state. Above all, they are intended to convince the non-Russian peoples that they should be happy and content for having been incorporated into the Russian empire. Why? For therein they have found "freedom, equality, democracy, socialist industry and the leading agriculture."

The Soviet leaders repeat such spurious assertions from day to day, from week to week, from year to year, while at the same time freedom, equality and democracy are being trodden upon at every step, in every part of the USSR. The Kremlin chieftains talk about Soviet material contributions to the economies of the national republics, while at the same time these same national republics are being despoiled of their national resources for the benefit of the colonial center—Communist Russia. In return for the billions the national republics contribute to the central budget, they receive but a small share of the all-Union budget. In the Russian Republic, according to the Fourth Five Year Plan, is concentrated the automobile production (over 91 percent of the total), and this Republic provides 89 percent of the total wool

production, despite the fact that Russia proper does not possess raw wool materials. And this Russian Republic, which produces only as much cast iron as Ukraine, has double the production of steel. Only after thirty years of Communist domination in Ukraine is the first car factory being built there, the country in which, despite the "first rate development of agriculture," 7 million died of hunger in 1932-1933.

It would be profitless to dwell on the "leading role" of the Russian people in the period of World War II. The "leading role" of the Russian people was assigned them not by the non-Russian peoples, but by the Kremlin chieftains expressly in order to puff up Russian chauvinism and national pride.

The Bolshevik leaders are playing on Russian national pride and Russian *amour propre* for a sound reason. The Russians overwhelmingly constitute the basis of the Communist Party; all other non-Russian members of the Communist Party are "national" who have been wholly Russified, no longer having any organic connection or loyalty to the people from which they sprang. And the Russians constitute the kernel of the Red Army; it is, for all intents and purposes, a *Russian* army, although at least half of it is non-Russian. The Russians, too, occupy the key positions in the entire structure of the USSR. And out of the total of 6,134, "Heroes of the Soviet Union"—4,123 have been Russians, with the rest distributed among the non-Russians.

In the administrative apparatus, the Russians hold the key positions not only in the Russian Republic, but also in all the "Union Republics"; there they constitute a majority of the civil servants. This is especially true of such institutions as the organs of oppression and persecution, the NKVD and the NKGB.

In the economic sector of the "Union Republics," the highest echelon of officials are Russians. The Russians constitute also the overwhelming majority of qualified workers in the "Union Republics," with the replacement pool, naturally, being in the Russian Republic. Also, in the economic sphere the Russian Republic is accorded favored treatment.

Even in the cultural life of the national republics, the Russians play a preponderant part. Russians, sent from the Russian Republic, constitute a high percentage of teachers

and professors in all institutions of higher learning in the national republics. Russians also head the important cultural institutions of the non-Russian republics.

In this respect, the Kremlin prattle of the "leading role" of the Russian people indeed has some basis in fact. This role, however, does not flow out of some innate goodness or altruism of the Russian people. No, they are simply being used by the imperialist center of Moscow as instruments of colonial policy in the non-Russian countries. This role is by no means an honorable role, whether the Russians themselves realize this to be so or not, because they act as unpopular and hated executors of the policies of an oppressive regime.

But the inflaming of Russian chauvinism is only one side of the coin. The other is the Russification policy inflicted on the non-Russian peoples, a policy which is being conducted today with a fervor and totality undreamed-of by the most ardent Czarist Russifiers of the past.

The most effective method of Russification is, simply, the *systematic physical destruction of the non-Russian peoples*, coupled with the forcible settlement of the Russian ethnic element on the non-Russian territories. Destroyed not only are individuals, but entire ethnic entities.

We all remember the law of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Republic, announced on June 25, 1946, which confirmed the "resettlement" to other parts of the USSR of two peoples: the Crimean Tartars and the Chechens, and which abolished the Chechen-Ingush and Crimean Tartar autonomous republics. This "resettlement" was nothing but a physical destruction of the two peoples. The forms and methods of the "resettlement" defy imagination. Most of the leaders were executed, thousands were sent to jails and concentration camps, while hundreds of thousands of others—including the aged, women, and children—were simply herded up and carted away like cattle to the arid and empty areas of the USSR. They were resettled in a nowhere. Two historical peoples, known for their long struggles for freedom, have simply ceased to exist, while their ancestral homelands have been peopled by ethnic Russians. Thus two important strategical-economic points—the Crimea and

Grozny—overnight have become Russian. What Czarist colonizers could not accomplish at long length has been done at a stroke by Russian Bolshevik "democrats."

Here it would be worthwhile to consider some "arguments" that were invented by the Stalinist leadership to justify the "resettlement." They explain that at the time "when the peoples of the USSR defended their fatherland . . . many Chechens and Crimean Tartars, under the instigation of German agents, joined the voluntary detachments organized by the Germans and, along with the German troops, waged armed warfare against units of the Red Army, and also, by German direction, organized diversionary bands to undermine the Soviet authority in the *hinterland*, *all this with the overwhelming masses of the population of the Chechen-Ingush and the Crimean ASSR offering no resistance to these traitors of the fatherland. . .*" (Decree on the Dissolution of the Chechen-Ingush ASSR and the Transformation of the Crimean ASSR into the Crimean *oblast*).

This is the official explanation of the "resettlement." But what was it in reality?

The German-Soviet war and the oncoming war front generated hope for eventual liberation among all the enslaved non-Russian peoples of the USSR. Thus, the Crimean Tartars and Chechens, who had never abandoned their centuries-old aspirations to freedom and who ardently detested the Russian Bolshevik enslavers for having turned their lands into colonies and their peoples into slaves, took up arms to fight for their freedom. These peoples, we repeat, aspired to national liberation, and thus their leaders who led them in this struggle were no traitors by any stretch of anyone's imagination. They regarded the war as an opportunity that could crown their struggle with success. The very fact that the overwhelming majority of the population of the Chechen-Ingush and of the Crimean ASSR indeed did not resist the alleged traitors only attests that the anti-Russian struggle was profoundly popular and that it was, in fact, a national struggle for liberation. This struggle was a free expression of the will of these peoples. The Stalinist dictators had refused to allow them their national self-determination or even separation from the USSR, a right and privilege

guaranteed them by the "most democratic constitution in the world"—the Soviet Constitution. But for trying to implement this idea, these peoples were punished harshly and unconscionably.

Kremlin allegations to the effect that the struggle of the Chechens was waged upon the instigation of German agents were repetitious of the perennial lies used so often with respect to the Ukrainian people: the legitimate struggle of the Ukrainian people for their freedom and national statehood has been downgraded as a "German intrigue." As far as the "volunteer battalions" were concerned, the fact is that they included not only Chechens and Crimean Tartars, but also many other nationalities who hated Bolshevism. The Russians have themselves to thank for the creation of the Russian Liberation Army (ROA); and thousands of the soldiers of these "volunteer battalions" later joined the ranks of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army—among them many Ingushes, Chechens and Tartars, who fought against both the Hitlerite and Stalinist imperialists.

We emphasize that this destruction of entire ethnic entities was carried out indiscriminately by the Soviet government *and was officially admitted by the same government*. But this wholesale eradication of all the subjugated peoples has been going on for years. The only difference is that not all the subjugated peoples are as small in numbers as were the Chechen-Ingushes and the Crimean Tartars. Most cannot be "resettled" as easily.

We emphasize that this destruction of entire ethnic entities was carried out indiscriminately by the Soviet government and was officially admitted by the same government. But this wholesale eradication of all the subjugated peoples has been going on for years. The only difference is that not all the subjugated peoples are as small in numbers as were the Chechen-Ingushes and the Crimean Tartars. Most cannot be "resettled" as easily.

The Ukrainian people especially have been subjected to this inhuman process of destruction. It is estimated that by 1940 the Soviet government had destroyed about 12 million Ukrainians, including the 7 million and more who had lost their lives during the man-made famine in 1932-1933. Dur-

ing the Soviet retreat from Ukraine in 1941 in the face of the advancing German armies, the NKVD murdered thousands of Ukrainian political prisoners who had been thrust into Communist jails throughout Ukraine without trial or investigation. During the three years after the German-Soviet war, the Bolsheviks executed or sent to prison or Siberian camps over one million Ukrainians. In order to marshal manpower for industrial expansion in the Urals and Siberia, Moscow has always shunted there a great number of Ukrainian workers. Most are deported, the others are "encouraged" by the falsely painted prospect of better employment and easier living conditions.

At the same time the Russian ethnic element infiltrates in great numbers, especially into the cities and industrial centers. Suffice it to say that the cities of Western Ukraine, from which the Poles were "resettled" and "exchanged" for Ukrainians, are now filled with Russians; such cities as Lviv, Ternopil, and Rivne today have an almost totally Russian character. The cities of Eastern Ukraine, which had been Russified in Czarist times, for long have served as springboards of Russification and Russian influence in Ukraine.

Parallel with the physical destruction and forcible implantation of the Russian element, a powerful Russian attack has been launched on the cultural life of the non-Russian peoples. The overall purposes of the attack are to inculcate in the non-Russian peoples a feeling of inferiority, and imbue them with a feeling of slavish respect for the Russian people, as an "older brother" and a "leading nation."

All this, of course, is to facilitate the assimilation of these peoples by diminishing their moral and spiritual resistance.

Toward these ends *the Kremlin has ordered a radical revision of history, literature, the arts, language, the press, and thought itself*. Almost every month of 1946 saw appropriate decisions taken by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, such as "On Distortions and Errors in the Interpretation of Ukrainian Literature" in the *Outline of the History of Ukrainian Literature*, "On the Repertory of Drama and Opera Theaters in the Ukrainian SSR and Efforts To-

wards Its Improvement," "On the Journal *Vitchyzna*," and so forth. This attack is conducted under the slogan of "Against Nationalist Distortions," against the influence of the "concepts of Hrushevsky and Yefremov"* and "For a Scientific Marxist-Leninist Approach," "For a General Elevation of the Artistic and Ideological Level of Many Literary Works, Theatrical Pieces and Movie Scenarios," and the like.

This attack is especially directed against the *history* of Ukraine, for it is the history of a given people that formulates their national consciousness, recalling the greatness of the past and calling for the realization of new national purposes and objectives. It is the breeder of a new, patriotic generation. Attacks on the history of Ukraine have been made before; their virulence depends on the needs and aims of the party at a given moment.

In 1946 the sniping and assaults on Ukrainian history were coordinated into a systematic onslaught. It started with the attack against the textbook, *A Short Course on History of Ukraine*, published in 1940, and the four-volume *History of Ukraine*, published in 1943 for higher institutions of learning by the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. Demands were made to dissolve the Institute of History on the grounds that its activities were not broad enough, that is, that they were confined exclusively to the history of Ukraine.

Both textbooks, though very much Russified, were said to be not what was needed at the present time; they did not "properly" throw light on the origin of the Ukrainian people and on such questions as the Treaty of Pereyaslav which was being interpreted as a "lesser evil" for Ukraine, but an evil nonetheless. Such was not in line with the official theory of the "superiority," "leading role," and "assistance" of the Russian people. These "inadequacies" and "shortcomings" were declared to be "unscientific," "non-Marxist" and, most sharply, "nationalist distortions."

Pressured and terrorized, the editor-in-chief of both textbooks, Prof. Petrovsky, had to recant:

*M. Hrushevsky and S. Yefremov—Ukrainian historians; died in Soviet Russian concentration camps.

...The directive of *Kultura i zhezn* (Culture and Life), organ of the Administration of Propaganda and Agitation of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, deals with the fact that during the last few years many books have been published in Ukraine, and a number of articles as well, which contain several errors of a bourgeois-nationalist nature. Especially this pertains to the first volume of *The History of Ukraine*, prepared by the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR and published under the editorship of this writer [that is, Prof. Petrovsky]. . . Our duty is to submit these shortcomings and errors to a severe criticism. The historians of Ukraine should not leave a single stone unturned in examining the theory of Krushevsky. . . (*Radyanska Ukraina*, No. 147, 1946).

So looks "free scholarship and science" in the Ukrainian SSR. Likewise, the "Marxist viewpoint and interpretation" has been forced upon such known Ukrainian historians as professors Krypiakevych, Korduba, and Terletsky, who, as citizens of Western Ukraine, had not as yet become "familiar" with Marxism.

The latest "corrections" of Ukraine's history culminate in the following basic assertions:

Kievan Rus is not a creation of the Ukrainian people, but a joint creation of the Russian, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian peoples, in which creation the Russian people played the "leading role." The Treaty of Pereyaslav, or, as it is now being referred to, the "union of Ukraine with Russia"—was the greatest blessing for Ukraine, corresponding as it did with the "centuries-long" desire of the Ukrainian people to be united with the Russian. It was thanks to the Russian people that the Ukrainian nation has been freed from absolutism and oppression and has entered the Soviet Union, and that the Ukrainian people have succeeded in establishing their own socialist state. The history of Ukraine must be regarded and interpreted in an uninterrupted link with the history of the Russian people, "remembering always that in this process the Russian people—the older brother—has played the most important role. . ." (*Radyanska Ukraina*, No. 147,

1946), and that the desire of the Ukrainian people to be united with the Russian is "the most important rationale of Ukraine's history."

Now, let us examine these "corrections" in order to see clearly the overall goals of the Russian imperialists.

We have already pointed out that the attachment by the Russian people of the Kievan State, that exclusive creation of the Ukrainian people, was necessary in order to feed Russian chauvinist pride and augment the sparse history of the Russian people, and thus to provide "proof" to the effect that the Russian people are the "most important." This artificial attachment, which pretends to establish the "leadership" and "tutelage" of the Russian people as regards Ukraine in the oldest period of Ukrainian history (Kievan Rus), would show that the Russians have always been important specifically to Ukraine and Ukrainians. As to the assertion that the Ukrainian people have always desired a union with the Russian people, here is sheer propaganda seeking to justify Russian imperialism and its conquest of Ukraine, both by the Russian Czars and by the Russian commissars.

The Treaty of Pereyaslav, concluded by Bogdan Khmelnytsky with the Moscovite Czar, was an ordinary political alliance that was directed against Poland. But the Bolshevik imperialists call it the "joining in of Ukraine with Russia" (we note here that the term "joining in" was invented by Czarist historiography) in order to justify the takeover of Ukraine that took place after the signing of this treaty. The Russian Czars, by eliminating or limiting one provision after another of the treaty, eventually were able to occupy Ukraine. Having euphemistically renamed this takeover "joining in" and by maintaining that this act had been desired by the Ukrainian people over the centuries, that is, from the times of Kievan Rus, the Kremlin leaders today believe they are convincing in their justification of the Russian conquest of Ukraine.

But, in reality, what did this "joining in" entail for Ukraine? It brought about a gradual limitation of the political rights of the Ukrainian Kozak Republic; for the first time in Ukraine's history the Ukrainian peasantry knew slavery. It also brought about the destruction of the pride of the Ukrain-

ian people—the Zaporozhian *Sich* (1775). More, it started a progressive destruction of the flourishing Ukrainian culture and the well-developed network of Ukrainian schools. It saw the subordination of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church to the Russian Orthodox Patriarchate of Moscow (1687). It meant mass losses of Ukrainian lives through inhuman use of Ukrainian manpower in various constructions and in the aggressive wars conducted by the Czars. It ushered in the era of harsh economic exploitation of Ukrainian resources and the imposition on Ukraine of Russian colonizers. It finally brought about the liquidation of Ukrainian independence (1782), with the result that in the second half of the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries, the Ukrainian people were reduced to a mere ethnographic notion. It took the great literary spirit of Taras Shevchenko and the creative genius of the Ukrainian people to turn the tide and produce a powerful national and literary renaissance.

One may clearly see in the results of the Treaty of Pereyaslave the true nature of Russian "help" to the Ukrainian people. It is not we, the Ukrainian nationalists, who are responsible for the infamy of the Russian people. The culprits are the Stalinist ideologists, who are trying to whitewash the crimes of the Russian Czars by presenting the history of Ukraine in a wildly distorted and falsified light.

Treated equally wildly is the latest period of Ukrainian history, entailing the *Ukrainian national rebirth*, the rebirth of the Russian democratic movement had the alleged "help" of the Russian people in this Ukrainian national rebirth, especially the "help" of a number of Russian liberal writers and thinkers, such as Chernyshevsky, Belinsky, and Dobrolubov. But the shoe was on the other foot: the fact is that Shevchenko was a friend, that Ivan Franko, a great and objective writer, recognized some of the achievements of Russian thought. That Maxim Gorky had been well acquainted with the great Ukrainian novelist, Michael Kotsyubynsky, does not prove in any measure whatsoever that the Russians were favorably disposed toward the Ukrainian people. One of the above-mentioned Russian writers, Belinsky, who is now glorified as a great friend of the Ukrainians, was actually an implacable enemy of Ukrainian literature, bitterly assailing

three outstanding Ukrainian writers—Hrebinka, Kulish, and Shevchenko.

In May, 1841, Belinsky wrote an article on Hrebinka's *Swallow* and Osovnyanenko's *Matchmaking*, in which he sharply castigated the Ukrainian language and the attempt to introduce it into literature. On August 3, 1841, he wrote caustically to N.Kh. Ketcher, "After reading *Swallow* and *Sheaf* I understood the whole dignity of *borshch*, lard and *halushky* [Ukrainian dumplings]."

In 1842 Belinsky received Shevchenko's *Haydamaks* (a poem) with unconcealed hatred, and five years later (1847) he wrote to P. Annenkov in Paris with respect to Shevchenko's *Dream*:

Faith may yet make of Shevchenko an ass, an idiot and a worthless man, a drunkard and a lover of *horilka* [Ukrainian word for vodka] and of *Khokhol* patriotism [*khokhol*—a derogatory term for a Ukrainian used by the Russians]. . . This *khokhol* radical has written two pasquils, one against the Lord Emperor, the other against the Lady Empress. . . When the Czar read the pasquil against the Empress, he burned with great anger. . . I have not read these pasquils nor have any of my acquaintances (which does not mean that they are bad, except that they are trivial and stupid), but I am convinced that the pasquil against the Empress is infuriatingly base. Shevchenko was sent into the Caucasus as a soldier. I am not sorry a bit for him: had I been the judge I would not have done less. I feel an especial hostility to such liberals. They are the enemies of all success. . . Another pig from among the *khokhol liberals*, one Kulish (what a piggish name!) in the magazine *Zvezdochka* (The Little Star), which is published by Ishimova for children, has printed his history of "Malorossia," wherein he says that "Malorossia" must be separated from Russia or perish. . . Censor Kutorga, who passed the article without reading it, was sent to jail. You see what these cattle, these brainless liberals, are doing! I hate these *khokhols*! These mutations play on liberalism in the name of *halushky*, *varennyky* [a Ukrainian dish] and pig lard. . . (From "The Present and the Past, *Visnyk* of Ukrainian Studies, Shevchenko Scientific Society, Vols. III-IV, 1939, Lviv).

It is this Belinsky who is now being extolled as a great friend of the Ukrainian people.

As far as another Kremlin assertion is concerned, namely, that with the support of the Russian people the Ukrainians destroyed the capitalist system and established their own socialist state, this, too, is pure invention. On the contrary, the Bolshevik Party, which inherited the traditions of the Czarist imperialists and which has relied on the support of the Russian people, has brought about a new enslavement for the Ukrainian people as well as for the other non-Russian peoples of the USSR.

Another Kremlin directive, that which would view the history of Ukraine as being closely linked with the history of Russia, aims at the destruction of the independence of the historical development of the Ukrainian people by "proving" that aspirations for the independence of Ukraine are "reactionary and not proper to the Ukrainian people, who have always aspired to live together with the Russian people." Such an interpretation seeks to instill an "inferiority complex" in the Ukrainian people. It says that without the Kievan State, the Ukrainian people would not have had the Zaporozhian *Sich* nor the Ukrainian Kozak Republic, and that without the outstanding assistance of the Russian people the Ukrainian people would have been swallowed up by the Poles, Swedes, Germans, Turks, the *entente*, and so forth. If the Russians had not led the Ukrainians by the hand, the Ukrainians would not have produced such great literary minds as Kotliarevsky, Shevchenko, Franko, Lesya Ukrainka, and Kotsyubynsky. Thus, for those who do not know the true history, it would appear that the Ukrainians are incapable of ruling themselves, that they do not possess the qualities needed for statehood, etc. But there is one laudable quality conceded to the Ukrainians: their desire to be always together with the Russian people.

The same may be said as regards the other statements and pronouncements of the Kremlin leaders on the historical development of the Ukrainian people. This development is said to be gravitating toward a "joining in" of the Ukrainian people with the Russian. This "historical law" was unearthed by Stalinist ideologists around 1943-1944, the time of a great

political crisis that shook the USSR. In virtue of this "theory," the Soviet ideologists contend, the Ukrainian people must acknowledge that they were destined to live together with the Russian and that the conquest and takeover of Ukraine by Russian was thereby "legal"; it has always been the innermost desire of the Ukrainian people to "unite" with Russia. The fact that the Russian empire oppressed the Ukrainian nation is not "important," they add, because the Russian people were not responsible anyhow for the imperialistic aggressions of the Czars. But these ideologists ignore quite well-known facts of history—that the Russian people not only let themselves be used as a tool of aggression and colonialism but also let themselves become "educated" in the art of great power politics.

Now, what is meant by a *class approach* to these matters? Presumably, we should take into consideration only those leaders who in their struggle to attain socialism and Communism were guided by the interest and well-being of the worker and peasant classes. Inasmuch as the Russian Czars were the principal oppressors of these classes, it would follow that they should be regarded as their enemies. And indeed, some have been, but not all. For instance, Czar Ivan the Terrible, the founder of Russian absolutism, and Czar Peter I, the founder of the Russian empire, have been accorded veneration, for it is they who built the powerful Russian state. This means that the formula of "class approach" is used by the Kremlin ideologists only at their convenience, only for the benefit of Russian imperialism.

For instance, the Communist Russifiers of Ukraine contend that such great Ukrainian *hetmans* as Vyhovsky, Doroshenko, and Mazepa were "enemies" because "they safeguarded the interests of the Ukrainian officers-feudals, wishing to impose a foreign yoke upon Ukraine in order to strengthen their class position and to broaden the opportunity to exploit the Ukrainian peasantry..." (*Radyanska Ukraina*, No. 177, 1946).

The fact is that after the conclusion of the Treaty of Pereyaslav the Russian Czar sent into Ukraine a great number of his princes and *boyars*. Those were given extensive land estates along with Ukrainian peasant-slaves. Once

in Ukraine they engaged such Ukrainian traitors as Samoylovych and Kochubey to help impose slavery upon all the Ukrainian peasantry.

And deserving of comment is the "foreign yoke" that Vyhovsky, Doroshenko, and Mazepa allegedly wanted in order to secure their class. Vyhovksy, it is charged, tried to subordinate Ukraine to "Poland, ruled by a small nobility." "Doroshenko wanted Turkey, while Mazepa tried to sell out Ukraine to Poland and Sweden." But those who desired to "unite Ukraine with Russian" are not guilty of wishing to see Ukraine under an alien power. In other words, the yoke of Czarist Russia, imposed upon Ukraine after the signing of the Treaty of Pereyaslav, was not a yoke at all. Rather, it was a "blessing." And so it was, in Russian eyes, for it turned Ukraine into a subjugated colony of Russia. Vyhovsky, Doroshenko, and Mazepa are villains, for they strove to preserve Ukraine's independence through international treaties and alliances.

The upshot of this Soviet "philosophy" is plain enough. The "class approach" to the history of Ukraine is a means of obviating this part of Ukrainian history which treats of the struggle for freedom of the Ukrainian people. It seeks to whitewash all the Russian agents and oppressors and thus justify the enslavement of Ukraine, and at the same time it denigrates those Ukrainian national heroes who fought against Russia. Every Ukrainian leader who defended Ukrainian political independence against the encroachments of Russia protected class interests and wanted to impose a "foreign yoke" upon Ukraine. By the same token, whoever helped imperialist Russian to enslave Ukraine is a "hero."

This absurd argumentation is being used by Communist Russia against the Ukrainian liberation movement today. Early in the 1920s Simon Petlura was a prime target of Soviet Russian propaganda. He was (and still is) depicted as a "traitor" to the Ukrainian people. Today it is Stepan Bandera whom the Kremlin denounces not only as a "traitor" but also as an "agent of Nazism," one who "sold out" to sinister foreign powers. Thus the Soviet ideologists today malign Ukrainian patriots like Petlura and Bandera as their ancestors maligned Vyhovsky, Doroshenko, and Mazepa, except that

the Soviet ideologists have surpassed their forebears in cynicism and effrontery.

Some great Ukrainian historical leaders cannot thus be besmirched and denigrated owing to their great popularity with the Ukrainian people. In these cases another method is used. Through falsification of history such leaders are represented in such a light as to render them "friends" and "subservient tools" of Moscow.

A classic example of such machinations is Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, who signed the fatal Treaty of Pereyaslav for Ukraine. But there were other treaties in his case. In 1656 Muscovy concluded one with Poland in Vilnius. A year later Khmelnytsky entered into an alliance with King Charles-Gustav X of Sweden and with Prince G. Rakoczy of Transylvania. One need not be a historian to realize that with its Vilnius treaty with Poland, Muscovy morally and in fact betrayed and broke the Treaty of Pereyaslav, the treaty which Khmelnytsky regarded as an expedient political alliance and not as a "joining in" of Ukraine with Russia. Indeed, Khmelnytsky's reaction to Moscow's Polish treaty was to seek strength for Ukraine elsewhere; hence his alliances with Sweden and Transylvania. But, accepting these facts, Soviet historian Petrovsky, writing on the instructions of the Central Committee, treated these awkward developments thus:

The Vilnius accord created certain difficulties for the realization of the plans of Khmelnytsky, but the great *hetman* did not relent in his efforts to realize the "joining in." He decided, *while preserving his fidelity to Russia* [underscoring authors] to present the Russian government at the same time with the fact of the destruction of Poland. . . Simultaneously, he strove to bring about peace between Sweden and Russia. . . (N.P. Petrovsky, *Unity of the Ukrainian People in One Ukrainian Soviet State*, Ogyz, 1944).

What is at the bottom in this rationalization is an attempt to prove that Khmelnytsky, despite the fact that Muscovy had betrayed him, remained loyal and faithful. His alliance with Sweden and Transylvania, aimed directly at Russia, is defused: he is depicted as a peacemaker. All this

is to present Khmelnytsky as blindly loyal to Moscow.

Presented in the same imperialistic light are Taras Shevchenko and Ivan Franko, whose literary works throb with hatred for the Russian state and for all other enslavers of Ukraine, works which shine with a vision and faith in the rebirth of a free and independent Ukrainian state.

Such Soviet "corrections" to the history of Ukraine are also applied to the histories of *other non-Russian peoples of the USSR*, for the Bolshevik Russification policy is the same and unchanging for its very oppressiveness. In its No. 4 (1945) issue, *Bolshevyk reported*:

The basic shortcoming of those works dedicated to the history of individual peoples of the USSR is the artificial extraction of the history of one people from the general historical process of all the peoples of the USSR. This error is to be found in *History of the Kazakh SSS*, in *History of Yakutia*, in *Outline of History of Bashkiria*, in the book on the history of Tартary. . . The history of the peoples of Russia . . . is a history of their rallying round the Russian people. . .

The "leading role" of the Russian people is also being imposed on peoples whose history is far more ancient than that of the Russian people, which, as we know, began only in the thirteenth century. But they cannot annex the ancient history of these peoples, as they did with Kievan Rus in the case of Ukraine, for the Russian truth-jugglers and falsifiers would have to go back several more centuries, for instance, to the second century in the case of Georgia, whose ruler then was Emperor Farnavadze. Nonetheless, the Soviet ideologists persist in propagating the myth of centuries-old "friendship and unity" with the Russian people.

Here is a sample:

Throughout the centuries the Azerbaijani people observed and preserved the principle of friendship and amity of peoples. . . Especially underscored must be the historico-traditional friendship with the great Russian people. The brilliant Azerbaijani poet of the XIIth century, Khahani Shirvany, dedicated a few verses to a relative of Galician Prince Yaroslav Volodymyrovych.

The Great Prince Nizami Hiandzevi—in the XIIth century—knew more deeply about Russia than people in Western Europe did. Many pearl-like stanzas did Nizami dedicate to Russian heroes... (Geydar Guseynov, *On the History of the Friendship of the Russian and Azerbaijani Peoples*, Institute of Philosophy, Academy of Sciences, Azerbaijanian SSR, Baku, 1946, p. 1).

As we can see, no extraordinary documentation is necessary for the Stalinist chauvinists; it suffices that Shirvany wrote a few lines about a relative of a non-Russian prince (who was a Ukrainian Galician prince) to "prove" for Russian historians that Nizami knew more about Russia in the twelfth century than did people of Western Europe and, on the basis of this threadbare assumption, to knit legends about "Russian-Azerbaijani friendship."

The conquest of Azerbaijan, as well as the Caucasus, is explained by Guseynov in the same way as the "joining in" of Ukraine with Russia:

Strengthening with time was that Russian orientation which later was followed by leading individuals of Azerbaijan, who believed it was advantageous to tie the fate of their fatherland with that of leading Russia rather than with then backward Iran... History has shown that the leading individuals of the Transcaucasus have not erred and that Russia, regardless of the aggressive policy of Czarism, played a progressive role in the Transcaucasus and in Central Asia...

For the Kremlin imperialists, how the Caucasus was conquered, how this freedom-loving Caucasus was bled by the Russian imperialist armies, and how the peasants and mountaineers of the Caucasus were subjugated, how the Russian armies massacred entire villages and how the great Caucasian uprising against the Russians (1864) was suppressed and drenched with the blood of the Caucasian peoples, who resisted the Russian onslaughts and invasions for over 40 years—all this would seem secondary and unimportant to the Stalinist chauvinists. But the truth is that they cannot write about these savage and inhuman massacres committed by the Czarist Russians in the Caucasus, for this would clash

with the image of the "leading role" of the Russian people. Because these people had been conquered by Czarist Russia, they were "reclaimed" by the Bolsheviks, who brought them "socialist liberation."

As in the case of Ukraine, all those who fought against Russia and for the independence of their own countries are branded as "traitors" to their countries while those who helped in the enslavement of their own peoples are glorified as "better leading individuals":

The most outstanding representative of this progressive trend [union with Russia] was the noted statesman of Azerbaijan of the XVIIIth century, Fatali, Khan of Kuban, who in March, 1775, declared himself to be a partisan of Russia.

Then we have still another example:

In 1940 in the city of Kazan there appeared an epos by the Tartar write, N. Isanbet, entitled, *Idegey*, whose hero was the Emir of the Golden Horde, Idegey. Right now this epos is being severely criticized because in it the author "expressed nationalist ideas alien to the Tartar people" and because "a feudal figure of the Golden Horde, an enemy of the Russian people, is depicted as a national hero" (*Bolshevyk*, No. 4, 1945).

As we can see, "an enemy of the Russian people" by definition cannot be "a hero of the Tartar people."

It so happens that Idegey, in 1468, raided Moscow; for that he is not only "an enemy of the Russian people, but also an enemy of the Tartar people." But Czar Ivan the Terrible, who destroyed the Kazan and Astrakhan *khanates*, who literally slaughtered all the inhabitants of the city of Kazan, the Tartar capital, is represented as a great Czar-builder who pursued a "progressive role" and who therefore deserves the respect not only of the Russian people but of the Tartar people as well.

We have already mentioned that the basic Russification interpretation of history applies equally to the *history of literature* and of the arts in general.

The Kremlin chauvinists say that the Russian people, as the "most outstanding in the field of culture," have led by

the hand the Ukrainian and other peoples to their cultural development. But is this really so?

Let us take the Georgian or the Armenian people. We all know that both these peoples are very ancient and cultured peoples, their cultures reaching far back in time. How could the Russian people have possibly led them toward cultural development? And when these peoples were indeed confronted with Russian culture, the result was demoralization and Russification, because the Russian culture itself has been one of the methods of assault inflicted upon the national cultures of these non-Russian peoples.

Nor did the Russian people lead the Ukrainian people toward their cultural development if only because Ukrainian culture is much older than the Russian. In their Kievan State the Ukrainian people created their own powerful culture (*Slovo o polku Ihorevim*—The Tale of Ihor's Armament—is a masterpiece of world literature). Today the Bolshevik chauvinists will not admit this fact, but, being unable to deny the great achievements of our literature of the Kievan period, they, like their Russifying predecessors of Czarist times, simply appropriate our culture, artificially attaching the Russian people to it. We recall that up to fairly recent times, no one questioned this self-evident truth; the culture of Kievan Rus in all Soviet publications was referred to and qualified as the Ukrainian culture. But the policy has changed. For instance, *Outline of the History of Ukrainian Literature*, published by the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, was assailed because it contains the statement that the "culture and literature of Kievan Rus belong to the Ukrainian people," a statement which, in the opinion of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, is contrary to "scientific premises" (read requirements of Russification).

Nor did the Russian people lead the Ukrainian people later on in history, that is, in the seventeenth and in the first half of the eighteenth century, because even then the Russian people, in comparison with the Ukrainian, were backward culturally. In Ukraine at that time there were Ukrainian public schools in almost every village, accounting for the widespread literacy. To be found in Chernyhiw and

Pereyaslav, and later on in Kharkiv, were *collegiums*. The Peter Mohyla Academy in Kiev provided scholars not only for Ukraine, but also for Muscovy as well (Ephiphanius Slavynetsky, Semen Polotsky, and others). Czar Peter I, in carrying out his cultural reforms in Russia, relied on graduates of the Peter Mohyla Academy of Kiev (Dmytro Tuptalo, Stepan Yavorsky, Theophanys Prokopovych, and others), because in Russia at that time there were no people with a higher education. It is a very well known fact that Ukrainian scholars were lured or forcibly abducted to Russia; so also were poets, singers and composers (Bortniansky, Wedel, and others). The publications of the Pecherska Lavra Printing House in Kiev were disseminated far beyond the borders of Ukraine. Thus, if the Russian people could not lead the Ukrainian people in the cultural field in the seventeenth century, how could they have done so back in the twelfth century?

The Ukrainian people developed their great culture when they enjoyed an independent life or were allowed a certain degree of autonomy. With the Russian enslavement of Ukraine, the "leading" Russian people led the Ukrainian people in the second half of the eighteenth century to a cultural and literary decline. And it was solely through their own strength that the Ukrainians roused themselves at the beginning of the nineteenth century and entered upon a powerful cultural development and literary renaissance, and not because of the special merits or assistance of the Russian people. There can be no objective argument on this score. But, berating the *Outline*, the Central Committee administration persisted:

In the *Outline* there is not true reflection of the influence on the Ukrainian literature of the Dekabrist movement, of the activities of Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolubov, of the great proletarian writer Gorky. Ignored in the book is such a great factor in the formulation of the new socialist ideology as the development of Marxism in Russian and the role of the Bolshevik party. . . (From a Decision of the Communist Party of Bolsheviks of Ukraine, "On Distortions and Errors in the Enlightenment of the History of Ukrainian Litera-

ture in the *Outline of the History of Ukrainian Literature*," August 24, 1946).

In other words, the nonexistent "Russian assistance" is defined as a relationship between the Ukrainian literary movement and such Russian writers as Chernyshevsky, Belinsky, Dobrolubov, Gorky, and the Dekabrists.

As far as the *Outline's* interpretation of the relation of Russian literature to Ukrainian literature is concerned, the decision had this to say:

The authors of the *Outline* ignore the common origin and unity and the mutual relationship in the historical development of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples, in their languages and culture. Hence in the *Outline* the history of the Ukrainian literature is not shown in any interrelationship with other literatures, especially the Russian. . .

Missing in the *Outline* is the great and fruitful influence of the Russian culture and literature; their links are ignored, while at the same time the influence of Western European literature is overemphasized. . .

Here, then, we have the same line as followed by the directive on the interpretation of Ukrainian history and its links with Russian history: the "leading role" of the Russian people in all developments of the Ukrainian people must always be noted and underscored.

The theory of the "class approach" to the history of Ukraine serves the same purpose: to show that all progress in Ukrainian history and literature was made possible through the "benevolent assistance" of the Russian people. The authors of the *Outline* have been castigated also for having "ignored the class struggle as the basic law of the development of class society, and for having accentuated, instead, nationalist elements as decisive factors in the development of literature. . ."

In reality, the authors of the *Outline* did not ignore the "class struggle" at all. What they failed to do was to adapt themselves to the latest requirements of the Central Committee.

What they wrote was, to say the least, "Marxist":

The reactionary policy of Russian Czarism and of the Imperial-Royal government of Austria deprived our people of the possibility of acquiring an education in our own language. The Ukrainian nobility, acting in their own class interests, estranged themselves from the Ukrainian culture, so that many talented Ukrainians, such as Ruban, Bohdanovych, Kapnist, Pohorilsky and Hohol, became participants of the Russian cultural progress, although they did avail themselves of Ukrainian subject matter in some of their writings. . . (*Radyanska Ukraina*, No. 144, 1946).

It is plain that the authors of the *Outline* did not ignore the class struggle. But they are being criticized because they critically viewed the fact that many Ukrainian scholars and men of culture went over to the Russian camp, a phenomenon which today is being regarded as a "progressive step."

"Undoubtedly a progressive phenomenon has been the collaboration of many Ukrainian scholars with Russian literature and, in the case of some of them, of embracing Russian literature altogether," writes *Propagandist and Agitator*, organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (No. 6, 1946). It would seem that the ultimate in being "progressive" would have been attained had all Ukrainian scholars and writers gone over to the Russian camp and had there been no separate Ukrainian literature at all! This is, of course, the very stuff of the dreams of the Russian Bolshevik Russifiers.

The "class approach," both in Ukrainian history and the history of Ukrainian literature, is being used for the purpose of belittling and denegating their value and significance. We know that our literature, the reborn Ukrainian literature, is the result of the awakening of the Ukrainian people and the progressive growth of national consciousness. In ideology and temper, our literature is national and democratic; no other kind of literature could have been produced by a people struggling for their national and social liberation. Only an insignificant portion of the Ukrainian nobility took part in the process of the cultural and political rebirth of the Ukrainian people. By inventing the "class approach" the Stalinist ideologists endeavored to deny the independent development

of Ukrainian literature and its national-liberational character, for this development is inimical to their chauvinistic and Russification plans.

The Ukrainian Soviet literature of today is not a true literature. Rather, it is a propaganda and agitation literature whose aim is to pollute the minds of the Ukrainian people. The fact of the total decline of this "literature," as evidenced by the absence of any high quality, is freely admitted by the Bolsheviks themselves. This literature, by its very nature, is not a national literature but a servile one at the disposal of the Communist Party. And despite the fact that it has been "directed" by the Party, it is still deemed "unsatisfactory," for even now it does not meet the requirements of the Russification policy.

That even this "literature" does not satisfy the Kremlin chauvinists may be seen from an example. A Ukrainian Soviet woman writer, Valentyna Cherednychenko, wrote a novel, *I—Happy Valentyna*, in which the heroine is a Ukrainian woman, Valentyna. In the novel, a hospital director asks Valentyna: "Do they teach in Ukraine the history of my ancestor, Damian Hnatovych Mnohohrishny?"

Valentyna replies:

From 1669 to 1672 he was the *hetman* of Left-Bank Ukraine. Later, in Moscow, he was forced to place his head to the executioner's axe, but at the last minute Czar Fedor Alekseyevych sent a messenger with a commutation of sentence and ordered that he and his brothers and family be deported to Siberia... (*Radyanska Ukraina*, No. 163, 1946).

In citing this passage, the Communist critic expostulated, "What has all this to do with the interests of the Soviet people?" According to him, the "Soviet people" should keep their minds on the problems of the day; the building of the war industry and the work on the collective farms. They should not be involved in such history.

In reality, the official Communist propagandists fear that descriptions of historical figures and events—of which the book of Cherednychenko has a great number—spread and strengthen the national feelings of the Ukrainian people. They do not advance the "friendship with the great

Russian people," and this is exactly what the Kremlin is afraid of.

Bolshevik criticism also engulfed the Ukrainian poet Romanchenko, who, while on vacation in Vienna, wrote some poetry about Ukraine, its "Volhynian forests and ancient graves of the Kazaks, covered with moss," and about the *Sich*, "from which my glorious and intrepid ancestors fought for freedom and truth. . ."

These same Russian Bolshevik chauvinists also assailed another Ukrainian woman writer, Rzepetska, who in her novel, *The Besarab Family*, wrote that in 1914 the Ukrainian population of Galicia was afraid of the occupying Russian army (according to the Soviet ideologists she should have written that the population of Galicia "joyously" received the Russian army!). Similar attacks were leveled against other Ukrainian writers, such as Masenko, Kundzich, and Smiliansky.

In all instances, the Bolshevik imperialists exalt everything Russian, no matter whether these events be imperialistic or democratic. They glorify all Russian Czars and hangmen and all Russian aggressive wars, but at the same time they denounce all non-Russian writers who dare to write, even objectively, about the historical events of their own peoples.

Consequently, a number of Ukrainian literary reviews have been subjected to severe criticism for "ideological deviations," among them *Vitchyzna* (Fatherland), *Dnipro* (The Dnieper), *Radyansky Lviv* (Soviet Lviv), and *Perets* (Pepper). The editorial staffs of these have been reshuffled and "purged." Maxim Rylsky, the noted Ukrainian poet, was replaced by Alexander Korneichuk as head of the Union of Writers of Ukraine. Terrorized are such poets as Panch, Horodsky, Bazhan, and Smiliansky. Some of them have been forced to "recant their sins." For instance, one such "recantation" is a verse by Maxim Rylsky:

Amid the dark forest, in quiet woods,
There is a glorious city basking in beauty,
There are churches and churches beyond count,
And the city is called Moscow.

It grows, and it ages like a seasoned wine,
And it flourishes as a flower in the sun.
There live our brothers, with whom we must march
together;
Our faithful brother-defenders.
We shall never allow Moscow or
Kiev to fall under the yoke of the enemy!
We are one family, united by the community of blood
And by the ancient faith and courage!
We stand in the struggle for our freedom
In an indestructible array.
We shall find our illustrious pathway for centuries,
When our Kiev will be together with Moscow.

Commentary is superfluous.

Here we should like to mention the plight of *dramatic literature and the theater*; these, too, are at the mercy of the Russification policies of the Kremlin. The Decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, "On the Repertory of Dramatic and Opera Theaters in the Ukrainian SSR and Efforts for Their Improvement," points out a number of "errors and shortcomings" and recommends "elimination from the repertory of stage plays not dealing with contemporary life, especially the presentation of such works which paint the past in idyllic tones." Some of the works, it charges, have the faults of national limitation, errors and distortions denoting old prejudices, and contain distortions of a bourgeois-nationalist character (*Why the Stars Do Not Fade Away*, by Popylenko; *I am Living*, by Pinchevsky). In the works of some playwrights the representatives of the class of exploiters and the oppressiveness of the pre-revolutionary class society are idealized; the remnants of antiquity are praised, and, above all, the brotherhood and friendship of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples is treated with silence. . ."

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine presents a task to the playwrights of Ukraine—to create clear and artistic works on the victory of the Soviet system in our country, on the great fatherland's

war, on the heroic work of the Soviet people, on the Stalinist friendship of the Soviet peoples, on the centuries-old brotherhood of the Ukrainian people with the great Russian people and on the leading role of the party of Lenin and Stalin in the life of the Soviet people. . . Playwrights and theater critics should pay especial attention to the education of the working Ukrainian people in the spirit of the unshakeable friendship of the Soviet peoples, of the love for the great Russian people and of the hatred toward all the enemies of the Ukrainian working people, including the most senseless enemies of the Ukrainian people—the Ukrainian-German nationalists. . . (*Radyanska Ukraina*, No. 202, 1946).

These are exactly the same requirements which the Party demands from the historians and literary writers: to cultivate in the Ukrainian people an inferiority complex, to paralyze the national resistance, to mask Russian Bolshevik imperialism, and to facilitate the Russification of the Ukrainian people.

The problem of the *language* and the Russification policy carries paramount importance; let us distinguish three specific aspects of this problem.

First, the Russian language is being imposed upon the Ukrainian people by all possible means and methods as the privileged and dominant language of the regime. The Russian language reigns exclusively in the army; it is the language in administration, the courts, the Party and the trade union organizations. In the institutions of higher learning the most important disciplines are being taught in the Russian language. The Russian-language schools, which are very numerous in Ukraine, are provided with the best teaching personnel. Almost all textbooks, literature, journals, etc., are printed in Russian, for instance, *Vrachebnoye delo* (Dental Work), organ of the People's Commissariat of Health and Ukraine. In addition, in Ukraine there are a great number of Russian newspapers, which are served by extensive Russian staffs and which carry the latest news items, such as *Pravda Ukrainy* and *Lvovskaya Pravda*. It has become mandatory that each book published in the Ukrainian language carry its title in Russian, along with a Russian inscription, "in the

Ukrainian language." In the libraries many Russian literary works are found only in the original, not in a Ukrainian translation.

Second, along with creating artificial conditions favoring the Russian language and giving it the status of a privileged language, there proceeds a steady propagation of admiration for the Russian language, the "most beautiful and most cultured," the "language of the leading Russian people."

Great attention should be paid to the study of the Russian language, the language of Lenin and Stalin, Pushkin and Gogol (Hohol), Chernyshevsky and Dobrolubov, Turgenev and L. Tolstoy, Saldykov-Shchedrin and M. Gorky, the language in which are written the wonderful works of Sechenov, Pavlov, Mendeleev and Bach, Timiriazev and Lysenko, Lobachevsky and Krylov, Burden, Speransky and many other Russian scholars of world renown.

To put the study of it on an appropriate level and to engender the interest of students in it is a very important pedagogical and political task, as well as a scientific and a general cultural one. . . (From the address by Prof. Chavdarov at the inter-oblast conference of teachers, held on January 5-9, 1945, in Lviv).

In his address to the non-Russian soldiers of the Red Army, Kalinin declared:

It [the study of the Russian language] is absolutely necessary. Not to have knowledge of the Russian language in the army is unthinkable. All our military laws and statutes are written in the Russian language; all battle orders are written in it, all commands use it. The Russian language is the language of Stalin. In it speaks to the Soviet peoples and to the Red army our *vozhd*, Comrade Stalin. . . (*Soputnik Agitatora* [The Guide of the Agitator], No. 15-16).

First, the Russian language is used in all army administration. Then it is explained that because all manuals of army training are in Russian, the Russian language must be studied!

Third, constant efforts are being made to erase gradually certain characteristics of the Ukrainian language and

thereby make the Ukrainian language closer to the Russian. In a preface to a new *Ukrainian Syntax*, published in 1946, it is clearly written that its editors were guided by one of the decisions to "Insure a unity with the syntaxes of other peoples of the Soviet Union, especially the Russian following the latest proposal of the state commission." In reality, this *Syntax* is a far cry from the *Ukrainian Syntax* that was published in 1927 by the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences; the latter reflected correct and traditional linguistic rules.

The *Party* is the principal implementer of the Russification policy. It provides the ideology and programs and carries them out with all the means at its disposal. The Party also directs the destruction of the cultural values of the Ukrainian people. The Communist Party in Ukraine became wholly Russified after liquidating such known Ukrainian Communists as Shumsky, Skrypyk, and Khvylovy.

The Party, in its Russification policy is supported by all organs of government, all "Councils of Ministers" and, above all, by the security organs of oppression, the NKVD and NKGB, which in their personnel composition are virtually entirely Russian.

The schools in Ukraine, especially the high schools and the institutions of higher learning, are the most effective media of the Russification policy. Here the Ukrainian youth are being taught a distorted and falsified version of the history of Ukraine and of its national and cultural traditions and customs.

The *Red Army* is also a powerful medium for the Russification of the non-Russian peoples. It is trained and educated in Russian imperialist traditions; it is imbued with the spirit of conquest of foreign territories and the subjugation of alien nations.

Russification is also evident in the entire economic life of the non-Russian countries. All the main branches of Ukrainian economic life are directly subordinated to Moscow; in all economic, fiscal, and industrial enterprises in Ukraine the Russian language is dominant. Most management personnel are Russian. The industrial centers of Ukraine have a wholly Russian cast, with young Ukrainian workers being subjected to the Russification techniques.

Also, one of the most outstanding features of Russification in Ukraine is the systematic influx of Russians into Ukrainian towns and cities. They are industrial specialists, economists, high administrative officials, police officers, teachers, army officers and noncommissioned officers, all of whom bring along their dependents to swell the growth and increase the penetration of the Russian ethnic element in Ukraine. The same policy of "resettlement" of Russians is being followed in all other non-Russian republics of the USSR, notably the Baltic states, Byelorussia, and Moldavia—that is, at the western periphery of the USSR. The Kremlin seeks to make these countries "security safe" by increasing as much as possible the number of Russians among their largely hostile non-Russian populations.

Understandably, the Russification policies of Moscow are bitterly opposed by the non-Russian republics. The Kremlin retaliates with perennial "purges," arrests, and deportations under various pretexts and guises.

Chapter 5

The Scourge of the Twentieth Century

The Ukrainian people, who had the misfortune to be conquered and to be made to live in the USSR, know better than any other people in the world the *reactionary and anti-human essence* of Bolshevism. For the past 27 years, every day and every hour spent within the Bolshevik empire is both a cruel reminder and confirmation of the undeniable truth that the *Soviet Union is today the largest prison house of nations*, in which the Russian Bolshevik clique cruelly oppresses scores of nations that are not Russian; and that the USSR is the largest exploiting system in the world today, in which the newly created class of Party chieftains ruthlessly exploits millions of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia. Every day and every hour brings further proof that the USSR, this "most democratic state in the world"—constitutes *an absolute dictatorship of the Central Committee of the Communist Party*, based on the *unbridled terror of the NKVD*—a system without precedent in mankind's history. Here democracy is trodden upon while the dignity of man is cynically derided and violated.

For the Ukrainian people, Bolshevism from its very inception has been a more dangerous phenomenon for man than fascism, a fact which the Ukrainian people have ex-

perienced in their daily lives and one which cannot be denied or disputed.

But because the Ukrainian people are now at a critical moment in their history, it is incumbent upon us to know what Bolshevism is in practical life, not as a philosophical doctrine. The policy of the Bolsheviks in the last few years with respect to the Ukrainian people, especially their bloody persecutions of the Ukrainian national movement, does not allow us to keep quiet. This policy has brought about the worst kind of enslavement and misery for the Ukrainian people.

As a result of the dissolution of the Russian empire in 1917 and the fall of the Austro-Hungarian empire in 1918, the Ukrainian people, who in the nineteenth century experienced a great national, cultural, and political revival, rose up to achieve freedom and established their own independent state, first on the territory formerly under the Russian occupation, then over the entire Ukrainian ethnic territory: the Ukrainian National Republic became a fact of life.

But this reborn Ukrainian independent state had to wage a defensive war against its aggressive neighbors, especially the Russian Bolshevik and Polish imperialists. As a result, the Ukrainian people again lost their independence and again their territory was occupied by alien forces: the largest part of Ukraine was taken over by Communist Russia; Western Ukraine went to Poland; Bukovina and a part of Bessarabia to Rumania; and Carpatho-Ukraine became a part of Czechoslovakia. But although they lost their political independence, the Ukrainian people have never stopped waging a struggle for restoration of the independent state by all means accessible to them, ranging from the parliamentary-democratic process to revolutionary underground forms. Thus between the two world wars a series of revolutionary organizations were established: active in Ukraine under the Soviet Russian regime were such organizations as the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (SVU), the Union of Ukrainian Youth (SUM), the Brotherhood of Ukrainian Patriots (BUD), and the Ukrainian Military Organization (UVO). In Western Ukraine under the Polish domination were the Ukrainian Military Organization (UVO) and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), which expanded their scope of

operations to include the Ukrainian lands under Rumania and Czechoslovakia. Moreover, in Western Ukraine (Galicia and Volhynia), there also existed strong legal Ukrainian political parties, which had their deputies in the Polish Parliament, and a great number of economic, social, and financial organizations, especially the well-developed Ukrainian cooperative movement.

When World War II broke out, all nationally conscious Ukrainians believed that an opportunity had come for them to realize their national-political objectives through reestablishment of a free and independent Ukrainian state. But this hope soon proved to be illusory; Ukraine passed from the hands of one totalitarian tyrant into those of another inhuman despot. The Ukrainian people took to arms again in order to protect themselves against the totalitarian regimes, which waged war on the Ukrainian land, and for the restoration of a sovereign and independent Ukrainian state. Thus, during the German occupation of Ukraine, there was born the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which attracted the finest and most patriotic element of the Ukrainian people—tens of thousands of the Ukrainian youth, thousands of Ukrainian men and women.

The Ukrainian Insurgent Army, directed by the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council, conducted a liberation struggle against the Nazi enslavers and for the total liberation, both national and social, of the Ukrainian people. It could not but fight against the Nazis, who were set upon imposing their domination over Ukraine, as their predecessors had in 1918. The UPA, along with other Ukrainian political and patriotic organizations, met them with an implacable armed and political struggle, when these Germans, now in Nazi uniforms, appeared again in Ukraine.

Understandably, the Russian Bolsheviks, the greatest enemies of the liberation of peoples today, decided to suppress by all means at their disposal the liberation movement of the Ukrainian people. *From 1944 until today (1946) Ukraine has been a field of unseen orgies and bloody excesses of NKVD terror. The NKVD hangmen have been murdering indiscriminately the flower of the Ukrainian nation—its young men and women.*

The fact is that today, in the twentieth century, a cen-

tury in which the principles of democracy, humanism, and equality of all nations, regardless of number or size, have allegedly become victorious, hundreds of thousands of the best sons of the Ukrainian nation must die because they are fighting for freedom, a freedom to which they are entitled as much as any other nation in the world. They are being killed by a government which has signed the charter of the United Nations. This is the shame and outrage of our century.

Basely criminal are the methods which the Russian Bolsheviks are using to destroy the Ukrainian liberation movement and the Ukrainian nation as a whole. These methods bespeak the denial of any progress, the dearth of cultural achievement, and the negation of human behavior.

It is, therefore, the purpose of this chapter to reveal and illuminate the barbaric methods used by the Kremlin against the Ukrainian struggle for freedom and national independence.

Fully realizing that the ideological-political and moral positions of the Ukrainian independence movement are an important factor in the general struggle of the Ukrainian people, the Bolsheviks *have been devoting much effort and attention to the ideological aspect of the struggle against the Ukrainian movement.*

The basic methods of the Bolsheviks herein are: a) *twisting and distortion of historical facts and a tendentious interpretation of the history of Ukraine in general; b) liquidation of all centers of free Ukrainian scholarship and science; c) destruction of all Ukrainian historical works; d) dissemination of slander directed against the leaders of the Ukrainian independence movement.*

In the process of national rebirth of the Ukrainian people Ukrainian historical scholarship and science played an important part. We can assert that Ukrainian historical science was the essential factor in formulating the national consciousness, in the formulation of independence ideology and desires. It is performing this role very successfully today, which is a normal phenomenon. In teaching the past history of the people, with all its illustrious and tragic developments, historical science helps induce in the people a sense of national pride, patriotism and national identity and

devotion to the fatherland. All these political and moral elements have an especially important meaning for the Ukrainian people, who are struggling for their national liberation. Therefore, it is understandable why the Kremlin imperialists, in their planned assault on the ideological positions of the Ukrainian independence movement, should have decided to *destroy above all free Ukrainian historical science*, decided to destroy all the values which Ukrainian historical science has succeeded in developing for the Ukrainian people.

The broadest tactic used by the Bolsheviks in their struggle against free Ukrainian historical science is the *mendacious and tendentious interpretation of the historical facts of Ukrainian history*. Using a pseudo-Marxist approach in the interpretation of political development, but in reality falling back on the old chauvinist Russian "theories," elaborated in Czarist Russia, Soviet historiography analyzes every fact of Ukraine's history according to one criterion: does a given fact or development help the "theory of unity between the great Russian and Ukrainian peoples"? Thus, true patriotic events from Ukrainian history are either eliminated outright or rendered in distorted fashion (example: the struggle of the Ukrainian people against the Soviet Russian aggression in 1918-1923, and the establishment of the Ukrainian Central Rada in 1917 and its policies). At best, important events are given a "character of treason," of a sell-out to "foreign interventionists."

Thus, according to Bolshevik historiography, the greatest and most significant act of Bohdan Khmelnytsky was the Treaty of Pereyaslav, which in the Soviet Russian interpretation is the "joining in" of Ukraine with Russia. But, in reality, the Treaty of Pereyaslav was only a *political alliance of the independent Ukrainian Kozak state with the Muscovite state*, a treaty concluded between two independent governments, which was so viewed by Khmelnytsky and his Kozak government, according to historical documents; and so was the treaty understood and so it is understood today by all the Ukrainian people. The sole purpose of the treaty was to effect a common struggle of two independent states, Ukraine and Russia (Muscovy), against Poland. The theory

about a union or "joining in" was invented by the Russian chauvinist historiography to "prove" that the Ukrainian people during the entire period of their existence desired nothing more than a "union" of Ukraine and Russia. Underlying this theory is a two-fold purpose: to demonstrate that the Ukrainian people never craved their national independence and to justify the present colonial status of Ukraine in the USSR. Mazepa, who concluded a treaty with King of Sweden Charles XII and endeavored to separate Ukraine from Russia and form a free Ukrainian state, has been maligned and belittled as a "traitor" by both Czarist and Soviet Russian historiography. He is depicted as a "traitor of the Ukrainian people and an agent of Sweden"; he also is portrayed not as a representative of the Ukrainian nation as a whole, but as a mere spokesman of the Kozak officer class. The Ukrainian Central *Rada*, the revolutionary government of Ukraine, created by the Ukrainian people during the Russian revolution and composed of representatives of all the social and political strata of Ukraine, was, in the eyes of Soviet Russian critics, "only an agency of German imperialists" and only "representative of the Ukrainian bourgeoisie."

Thus, in ascribing such to "foreign intrigues," or "special interests of the Ukrainian bourgeoisie," or in simply hiding the true facts of history, *the Bolsheviks are endeavoring to compromise in the eyes of the Ukrainian people all which is truly patriotic in Ukrainian history; they are trying to denigrate and besmirch the ideal of an independent Ukraine, to undermine the feeling of national pride and the desire for independence and to turn the Ukrainian people into a mass of apolitical slaves.*

It must be added that the Bolshevik historians apply the same criterion to Ukrainian literature and Ukrainian culture in general.

The sole "reappraisal" of the history of literature of the Ukrainian people was thoroughly conducted immediately after the Soviet Russian takeover of Ukraine in 1920. It did not manage to eliminate the influence of Ukrainian historical science upon the Ukrainian people. Extant were hundreds upon thousands of books and manuscripts dealing with the undistorted history of Ukraine. Alive were hundreds of

Ukrainian writers, among them original creators of the free Ukrainian science who had exerted a great impact and still enjoyed a powerful influence upon the formation of Ukrainian national consciousness and national character.

This the Kremlin could not tolerate. Therefore, the Ukrainian people were wholly isolated from the creative influence of free Ukrainian science and scholarship. In Eastern Ukraine they put out a list of prohibited literature and subsequently destroyed all books dealing with the history and literature of Ukraine which would not embrace the Soviet Russian view. *They eliminated the teaching of Ukrainian history from all the schools of Ukraine* and introduced instead a course in the history of the peoples of the USSR. Ukrainian literature had to be taught according to the Soviet line. The so-called Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR was turned into a propaganda agency of the Soviet government. Hundreds of Ukrainian writers were bodily removed in countless "purges"; they were deported, jailed, or executed out of hand. Among them was Ukraine's foremost historian, Prof. Michael Hrushevsky.

Destroyed were hundreds of poets, writers, literary critics, and other cultural leaders who refused to repudiate or denigrate their own history and national traditions. Woefully long is the list of Ukrainian writers and poets alone who were done away with by the Bolsheviks in the period between 1920 and 1940. It includes over sixty of the most outstanding literary figures, ten prominent Ukrainian historians, and almost all the Ukrainian philologists, ethnographers, and economists, plus all those whose works were considered to be "detrimental" to Soviet Russian ideology. *From 1930 on there was no meaningful Ukrainian science or scholarship in Ukraine.*

With the Soviet occupation in 1939, and then again in 1944, of Western Ukraine, the Kremlin unleashed an overall assault on Ukrainian science and scholarship in this Ukrainian land which heretofore had not known Soviet Russian occupation. The Shevchenko Scientific Society, the only remaining center of free Ukrainian science on Ukrainian soil, was reduced to a branch of the so-called Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, and as such was wholly subordinated

to the propaganda department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. By use of threats of deportation to Siberia, imprisonment and worse, the Bolsheviks forced three prominent Ukrainian professor-historians of the University of Lviv—Krypiakevych, Terletsky, and Korduba—to renounce their former "erroneous bourgeois-nationalist views" on the history of Ukraine. They were compelled to reject publicly all that in which they had believed all their lives. The purpose of this scurrilous action was two-fold: to disseminate Soviet "scientific theories" and thereby confuse and disorient the people as regards truth and reality, and, second, to break spiritually those outstanding historians and writers who for many years were the voices of the authority in the fields of history and literature. In Western Ukraine, as they had done earlier in Eastern Ukraine, the Bolsheviks diligently searched for Ukrainian books, manuscripts, and other historical documents to burn or otherwise destroy. Such bookburning has been known in modern times to exist only in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and the Soviet Union.

This Soviet ideological assault has been especially virulent when directed against the Ukrainian independence movement and those organizations which directed it: the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, led by Stepan Bandera.

Having no solid argument to level against the Ukrainian liberation movement, the Bolsheviks are disseminating barefaced lies to the effect that this movement is supported by Nazi Germany and that it is serving the interests of that country.

They are waging an especially strenuous and mendacious campaign against the OUN and the UPA. But the fact is that both these organizations were and are being guided solely by the interests of the Ukrainian people, principally their undying desire to attain their freedom and national statehood. In the ranks of these organizations is concentrated the most ardent element of the Ukrainian people. Both organizations are subordinated to the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council, the highest authority of the Ukrainian people during the liberation struggle; it was formed during the period

of the anti-Nazi struggle of the Ukrainian people by representatives of various Ukrainian political parties and groups.

To speak about the alleged venality of the Ukrainian independence movement and its collaboration with the Nazis would mean to deny and contradict the four years of fierce struggle waged by the OUN against the Nazi invaders. It would mean to ignore the history of the years 1941-1944, a period during which the whole Ukrainian nation witnessed the implacable struggle waged against the Nazis occupiers. During this epic and desperate struggle thousands of Ukrainians were killed or sent to Nazi concentration camps, including the highest leaders of the Ukrainian underground movement. To know, as they did, that the UPA and the OUN, backed by the entire nation, fiercely fought the Nazis, and yet still contend that both the UPA and the OUN "collaborated" with the Nazis, is something only the Soviet Russian truth-jugglers can do.

We might well ask ourselves: Why have the Bolsheviks resorted to such low and unabashed lying about the "collaboration" of the UPA and the OUN with the Nazis?

The answer is simple enough. They know only too well the great masses of the Ukrainian people aspire to freedom and national independence, a right which the Bolsheviks cannot overtly deny, as they assert time and again that Soviet Ukraine is a "sovereign and independent state." But, again, knowing as they do that the overwhelming majority of the Ukrainian people are supporting the patriotic Ukrainian anti-Soviet underground movement, they had to attach some stigma to this movement. Hence their resorting to the whopping lie that the Ukrainian underground movement was upheld by the Nazis and that, in effect, this movement was directed against the Ukrainian people.

Although not denying formally the right of the Ukrainian people to their independent Ukrainian state, the Bolsheviks are striving to convince them that the Ukrainian SSR is, in fact, an independent and sovereign state of the Ukrainian people:

"What other Ukrainian independent state do you want? The fact is that the slogans of the UHVR, UPA and OUN

are merely shields behind which the Ukrainian nationalist leaders hide their despicable and servile collaboration with the Nazis," harp the Soviet official propagandists.

The purposes underlying this official lie about the Ukrainian underground movement and its alleged collaboration with the Nazis are:

1) To create the myth that leaders of the anti-Soviet underground movement are hired agents paid in German marks or American dollars;

2) To sow distrust and dissension between the leadership and the rank and file membership of the Ukrainian underground movement;

3) To compromise the ideal of Ukrainian independence by besmirching it with the stigma of foreign intrigue and espionage;

4) To convince the rank and file membership of the Ukrainian underground movement that the Ukrainian SSR is an "independent and sovereign state" of the Ukrainian people, and that consequently there is no need to fight for a "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist" state;

5) To break all resistance on the part of the Ukrainian people to the present Soviet regime in Ukraine.

The Bolsheviks also persist in another lie. This one is that the Ukrainian underground movement aspires toward the restoration of the old capitalist and landowner system in Ukraine.

But in reality the Ukrainian national independence movement had always underscored and is continuing to underscore that it opposes the restoration of the old, feudal-capitalistic social order in any future Ukrainian state. The Ukrainian national liberation movement has always contended that it stands for the liquidation of great private holdings, the nationalization of industry, trade, and banks, and the establishment of such a social order in which the exploitation of man by man would disappear forever. This is most clearly stated in *The Platform of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council*, adopted in July, 1944, and in *The*

Program Decisions, adopted by the Great Extraordinary Congress of the OUN in July, 1943. These basic policies of the Ukrainian national independence movement are attested to daily by the fact of its political activities, which are seen not only by the Ukrainian people, but by the Soviet Russian invaders of Ukraine as well.

In order to further compromise the Ukrainian liberation movement, the NKVD and Soviet propagandists disseminate wildly fanciful lies about the outstanding leader of this movement, Stepan Bandera.

As is well known, Bandera was arrested by the Gestapo in 1941 in the first days of the German invasion of Ukraine. His crime: taking part in the proclamation of the restoration of the Ukrainian independent state. He was kept in the Nazi concentration camp in Oranienburg until 1945. This fact alone should demonstrate that the OUN did not and could not collaborate with, still less support, the Germans. But this did not stop the Kremlin, despite the wide authority and respect Bandera commanded among the Ukrainian people.

Dimitri Manuilsky, the so-called foreign minister of the Ukrainian SSR, addressing a teachers' convention on January 5, 1945, in Lviv, asserted that "the Germans arrested Bandera with his own consent," that is, his arrest was not real. This fooled no one, except possibly the Kremlin itself.

The policy of mendacity has been the basic element in the so-called "mass political work" conducted among the Ukrainian population:

The basic direction of the mass political activity in the village at this time is to be extensive explanation to the population of the fact that the sovereignty of our state was achieved by the Ukrainian people only by virtue of the leadership of the Bolshevik party, only through the active help of the great brotherly Russian people. . . It is necessary to explain constantly that a true, free and independent Ukrainian state exists now and that it can continue to exist only in the brotherly family of peoples of the powerful Soviet Union.

It must be constantly hammered in that . . . all these Simon Petluras, these Konovaletses, had called into Ukraine the German imperialists towards the end of

enslaving the Ukrainian people, to give them up to the whips of German lords and capitalists. We must repeat time and again that all these Banderas, Melnyks and OUN-tes supported and continue to support the German Fascists, they assisted and continue to assist the Germans, the cursed enemies of the Ukrainian people, to strangle and destroy the Ukrainian people. . .

In mass political work it is necessary to unmask the provocative and lying slogan of the Ukrainian-German nationalists—"For a Free and Independent Ukraine." It is imperative to explain to the population the Constitution of Soviet Ukraine, to explain that the Ukrainian people under the guidance of the Bolshevik party have already attained their freedom and sovereign rights; that they have united all their lands into one, great and sovereign state, while the Ukrainian-German nationalists—the Banderas, Melnyks and OUN-tes—are waging a struggle against the Ukrainian people not for a "free and independent Ukraine" but for a Ukraine of *kurkuls* and capitalists, for an enslavement of Ukraine by German Fascists, and for a transformation of the Ukrainian people into German slaves. . .

In explaining the history of Ukraine it is absolutely necessary to unmask the nationalist falsification of history, and to popularize widely such true Ukrainian heroes as Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Bohun, Kryvonis, Semen Paliy, Ustym Karmeliuk, Parkhomenko, Shchors, Kovpak, Oleh Koshovy and other heroes of our people; and at the same time to condemn the treasonable and anti-national activities of men like Mazepa, Doroshenko and other sell-outs. . .

14. The Plenum of the District Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine calls the attention of the party organizations to the fact that the mass political work among the population must be directed at the decomposition of the nationalist bands, at the education of the population in the spirit of hatred toward the German-Ukrainian bandits; at the inclusion of the entire population in the active and decisive struggle against the bandits. . . (From a *Secret Instruction of the Plenum of the Volhynian District Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine*, of October 3, 1944.)

As is evident from the above official document, the Party

orders outright falsity as concerns Ukrainian history; it calls also for efforts to demoralize the Ukrainian people by feeding them distortions and propaganda trifles—all for the purpose of undermining the genuine Ukrainian liberation movement.

Another propaganda theme in this “mass political work” is that of the “invincibility of the powerful Soviet Union,” especially its “invincible Red Army, armed and equipped with the latest technical armament,” and hence the uselessness of the Ukrainian liberation struggle.

“Against whom are you fighting? Against the Soviet Union?” asks a political agitator at a meeting of peasants.

“The Soviet Union today has conquered half of Europe, and the Red Army has defeated the Nazi army, the most powerful army in the world; we have thousands of tanks, planes, millions of soldiers. Molotov dictates today to the whole world. What do you have? A few automatic rifles and rifles? We will destroy you as vermin. A day or two, and no trace will be left of you. . .”

Thus, on the one hand, the Kremlin has mobilized all its resources toward the physical and moral destruction of the Ukrainian people; on the other, in order to destroy the national truth of the Ukrainian people, Moscow has proceeded to eradicate a great number of the Ukrainian cultural and intellectual elite, free Ukrainian scholarship and the national tradition and culture of the Ukrainian people.

* * *

Parallel with this political propaganda struggle against the ideological positions of the Ukrainian liberation movement, Moscow has unleashed a *well-organized armed-terroristic attack on the existing Ukrainian liberation organizations—the UHVR, the UPA and the OUN*—and on the whole Ukrainian nation, which has given full support to these patriot organizations.

It soon became evident that the Kremlin could not suppress the Ukrainian liberation movement merely by its security organs, the NKGB and NKVD (now MVD and MGB). It has had to use a number of combat troops of the Red Army with all its armaments: tanks, planes, artillery, armored cars, heavy and light machine guns, mortars, and so forth.

Thus the struggle against the UPA has very often assumed large-scale front operations, in which entire Soviet army divisions have taken part.

In the great spring offensive against the UPA which took place in the Hutsul land (begun on April 15, 1945), a Soviet combat division took part, along with special NKVD troops, local garrisons and special *istrebitel* (extermination) battalions. For several days Soviet planes bombarded Ukrainian villages and strafed the civilian population, killing indiscriminately over 150 people.

During battles against German troops on the Kovel-Strypa line in March-July, 1944, the Soviet command threw several divisions against the UPA positions. The culmination of the operations was the Battle at Hurby (June 24, 1944), in which the Soviet side used a great number of tanks and planes.

In another large-scale operation against the UPA in June, 1945, in the villages and forest of the triangle Yaniv-Zhovkva-Yavoriv (Lviv *oblast*), the Soviet command threw against the UPA insurgents several combat units, tanks, heavy artillery, and combat planes.

On September 17-18, 1945, in the Zavadiv Forest (Volhynia), the Soviet command called in an infantry regiment from Volodymyr Volynsky, as well as several batteries of heavy artillery and mortars.

(These cases are mentioned here only for the purpose of illustration, and not as an account of the military operations of the UPA.)

Thus in this epic struggle of the Ukrainian people for freedom and independence we may see the following relation:

On the Soviet Russian side there were thousands of NKVD troops, special security troops trained to combat guerrilla warfare, and entire army divisions, equipped with the latest armament and led by veteran military commanders; this great array of military might had the entire USSR behind it.

On the Ukrainian side there were tens of thousands of Ukrainian freedom fighters, consisting of highly patriotic youth, and thousands of older veterans who had fought in the war for Ukrainian independence in 1917-1920. Their ar-

mament consisted of rifles, submachine guns, mortars, hand grenades—all of various manufacture, usually taken from either German or Soviet troops. Thus, the *inequality* here was enormous. The only counterpoise to the technical and manpower superiority of the enemy was the unbounded faith of the Ukrainian insurgents in the rightness of their cause.

Hence the strength of the Kremlin lay in its physical and technical superiority, and it used it mercilessly in combatting the Ukrainian liberation movement. Yet, although it inflicted heavy casualties on the Ukrainian underground and the UPA, the Soviet government has failed to attain its overall objective—the complete destruction of the Ukrainian underground.

Failing in conventional warfare, the Russian Bolsheviks have resorted to other methods. In the spring of 1946 they began *burning the forests in those areas where they suspected the presence of large contingents of the UPA*. The ruthless tactic was obvious: by destroying the forests they sought to flush the Ukrainian insurgents out into the open fields, where they could be destroyed at will by the waiting Soviet army and security forces.

The methods of the burning itself varied. Very often they set fire only to certain sectors of a forest, while encircling the forest with heavy roadblocks, ambushes, and so forth. The woods were ignited either by NKVD troops, specialists (usually undercover agents), or incendiary bombs dropped by planes.

In the spring of 1946 almost all of the forest land in the Kovel area (especially Tsuman Forest) was consumed, as was the forest in the northeastern part of the Lviv *oblast* (Sokal, Rava Ruska, Radekhiv, Brody). The forests in the Stanislaviv area (the Black Forest) and a series of forest complexes were similarly destroyed.

Mention also should be made of the fact that as early as 1944 many woods were burned down in the areas of the UPA operations in order to obviate UPA ambushes, especially tree growth on either side of railroad tracks.

Material losses as a result of this action were enormous. In the forest complex of Lopatyn-Hrycevolia (Lviv *oblast*) some 3,600 *morgs* of forest were burnt down, and 9,000

morgs of forest in the Toporiv-Triytsia area went up in smoke.

It must be added that since Ukraine does not have many forests, the action of the Soviet government was tantamount to the deforestation of Ukraine.

The Bolsheviks did not stop at burning forests. Often have they burned, along with the woods, adjacent villages and individual farm holdings: Volytsia Radvanetska, Kuty near Triytsian Lisovi near Toporiv and Dobrolivka near Shchurovychi (Lviv *oblast*).

In order to cut off the UPA and revolutionary underground contact with the Ukrainian population, the Bolsheviks resorted to resettlement of the peasantry from the villages and farm holdings close to the woods.

Another form of warfare employed against the UPA has been the implantation of bacteria by the NKVD.

In July, 1946, the NKVD stationed in Volhynia distributed doses of poison to its *sek-sots* for them to place in the water and food supplies of UPA members. In the spring of 1946 in the Stanislaviv *oblast*, when the NKVD learned that the UPA was buying anti-typhoid serum on the black market, it flooded the market with poisonous serums that brought instant death upon consumption. Fortunately, UPA medical personnel were able to quickly uncover the criminal attempt, but not before over a dozen Ukrainian insurgents died from supposedly anti-typhoid serum.

Also, in the spring of 1946 many prisoners suffering from typhus in the Stanislaviv *oblast* were deliberately released. The NKVD hoped they would set off an epidemic among the Ukrainian population and, consequently, the UPA itself. In addition, the NKVD dispatched into the Ukrainian villages special agents who were disguised as refugees, beggars and fortune-tellers—all carrying *typhoid lice*. Again, the plan was to infect the villagers, who in turn would pass the disease along to the UPA freedom fighters.

It is a known fact that the use of bacteriological warfare has been outlawed by international conventions. No modern army, not even the Nazi army, has used bacteriological weapons, except the Soviet government, which has employed this dastardly weapon against the UPA.

Knowing that the best terrain for partisan warfare in Western Ukraine were the mountainous areas of the Carpathians, so long as food was obtainable, the Bolsheviks decided to forestall any partisan activities by organizing a famine. First of all, they confiscated all foodstuffs from the local population on the premise that if the population did not have enough to eat, it would not give any to the insurgents. Then they imposed excessively heavy levies on food. In addition, the district centers handed down decisions forbidding importing or exporting any food in the area.

Thus, for the last two years the Bolsheviks have systematically maintained a hunger blockade of the Carpathian Mountains, hoping that this tactic will force the UPA fighters to give up the favorable terrain.

The Bolsheviks have applied the same tactic in another terrain that was suitable for partisan activities—Polisia.

It must be stressed here that UPA fighters and OUN members have been under active orders never to surrender alive. Thus they have invariably committed suicide at the last, usually by shooting themselves or blowing themselves up with a hand grenade.

This kind of resolve, motivated by a sense of high patriotism, has applied to all members of the Ukrainian liberation movement. But it has also been encouraged by the knowledge of the barbaric torture they otherwise would undergo at the hands of the NKVD. There have been, of course, cases of UPA fighters being captured in the heat of battle. What we have learned of their treatment defies the imagination of man.

All captured insurgents must undergo a series of basic interrogations by the NKVD which last long weeks and months. In order to extract information, physical torture is applied as a rule. This includes burning of prisoners with hot irons, tearing off of skin, tearing out hair and nails, mutilation of sexual organs, or, in the case of women, cutting off breasts, crucifixion, and hanging.

For instance, on May 9, 1945, in the village of Nadorozhna, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD killed one insurgent, but captured another alive. He was brought to the village and tortured to death.

On August 11, 1945, in the village of Kobryn, Chernivtsi *oblast*, the NKVD captured two insurgents. They were taken the same day to the village of Drazhnytsia, where they were tortured for several hours. There the NKVD sadists publicly cut off the genitals of both insurgents and left them to die from excruciating pain.

On October 8, 1945, in the village of Saryi Hvizdets, Stanyslaviv *oblast*, the NKVD captured Vasyl Medvedyk and his son, who were suspected of helping the UPA. During the "investigation" the torturers carved a cross on the naked back of the father.

On November 16, 1945, in the village of Stetseva, Kolomeya area, the NKVD captured two insurgents. On one's chest, this time they carved a trident.

During the great manhunt in the Hutzul Land in April of 1945, the NKVD treated captured insurgents with exceptionally savage sadism: during "interrogation" the NKVD agents ripped skin off hands, pulled out nails, broke teeth and bones, mutilated faces, and so forth—all this before the eyes of the villagers, who were forced to witness the "punitive hand of Soviet justice."

On March 15, 1946, in the village of Pidpechary, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the Bolsheviks captured two insurgents: Yaroslav Stefaniv, 20, and Vasyl Lohaza, 19. When they refused to reveal whatever military information they knew, they were tortured viciously. Their sex organs were cut off and they were jabbed with hot irons. Finally, unconscious and near death, the two young men were thrown into the nearby river to drown.

Very often, captured insurgents were executed by the Bolsheviks on the spot, without trial.

On October 6, 1946, in the village of Kolodiyivka, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD shot a captured UPA soldier who hailed from Eastern Ukraine.

On December 27, 1946, in the village of Pidpechary, the NKVD put to death UPA fighter Pavlo Slobodian immediately after capturing him.

On December 15, 1946, UPA fighter Dmytro Oliynyk was shot to death by the NKVD in the village of Dobrivliany, Stanislaviv *oblast*.

In the period 1944-1945 the Bolsheviks also resorted to mass hanging of insurgents and captured Ukrainian underground members as a means of terrorizing the population.

In the months of March to July, 1944, in those areas of Western Ukraine which found themselves behind the Soviet front, hanging was so widespread that no village or town missed a daily hanging; frequently, Ukrainian insurgents were hanged from telephone poles (insurgents from the village of Myshkovychi, Ternopil *oblast*).

In the spring of 1945, in order to terrorize the Ukrainian population and stop its collaboration with the Ukrainian underground, the Bolsheviks instituted mass public hanging of Ukrainian insurgents in *raion* centers and other large towns. Such public executions took place in Berezhany and Chortkiv (Ternopil *oblast*), Strilyska Novi (Drohobych *oblast*), Bibrka (Lviv *oblast*), Korets (Rivne *oblast*) and a series of other towns in Western Ukraine.

All Ukrainian prisoners, either UPA soldiers or members of the OUN, if they were not murdered outright, were condemned to long years of imprisonment: twenty years on the average, most often in slave labor camps in Siberia. From there few returned alive. The Czarist deportation of political prisoners to Siberia was child's play in comparison with that instituted by the "democratic" Soviet government.

Through barbaric torture the Bolshevik inquisitors have tried to extort from prisoners any information they may have on the military situation or the operations of the UPA, its command in the area or any plans for future operations. Also, the NKVD tries to secure information on the local supporters of the UPA, those who provide food, clothing, and medical supplies for the Ukrainian underground. Some of the insurgents, unable to withstand physical torture, are broken and forced to appear at Communist meetings at which they denounce the UPA and the entire Ukrainian underground resistance struggle as "detrimental" to the well-being of the Ukrainian people. Many such insurgents, after recovering their health, cannot continue as informers—a role which they might have accepted under duress—and commit suicide.

Soviet propaganda has been proficient in utilizing such broken men for the purpose of demoralizing the Ukrainian

population; these hapless men are pointed to as "weaklings" and "traitors," and it is then announced that the entire Ukrainian underground has no heroes or true patriots.

In 1945, many of these victims were forced to join special units, commanded by NKVD officers, that combatted the Ukrainian underground resisters. Here, many of them turned their weapons against their Russian oppressors.

Against all rules of civilized warfare, the Soviet command and the NKVD have executed on the spot wounded UPA fighters. For instance, in the village of Yamnytsia, Stanislaviv *raion*, the Russians captured a wounded insurgent and, after a few questions, motioned him to leave. But he had hardly taken a few steps when they shot him in the back. In the same village, on May 25, 1945, the Bolsheviks smashed to death a captured insurgent with the butts of their rifles.

On April 25, 1945, during the great encounter between UPA units and Bolsheviks at Hurby (Rivne *oblast*), the Bolsheviks murdered 100 wounded insurgents and 200 young recruits, who had not even been given arms.

On March 5, 1946, in the forest near the village of Ispas, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the Bolsheviks slew a wounded insurgent, Fedir Leoniak.

On January 31, 1946, in the village of Ispas, the Bolsheviks captured three UPA nurses and two wounded insurgents. One of them, by the name of Khmil, and nurse Varka declared that they would not reveal anything about the UPA; they were executed immediately. The others were taken to the NKVD headquarters for "interrogation." There they were beaten with heavy iron bars and tortured under the supervision of NKVD Lieutenant Leshchov. He then brought the two UPA nurses in front of their parents' houses, and asked the girls whether they knew for what they would be shot.

"Yes," they replied. "We will die for a free and independent Ukraine." They were executed before the horrified eyes of their parents. For two weeks, their bodies, guarded by the NKVD, were left unburied on the snow. Eventually their remains were eaten by stray dogs.

The torture of wounded insurgents was an especially

favorite method of the NKVD, for they knew a wounded man had less endurance and less resistance to pain.

On October 19, 1945, near the village of Svydnyk, Drohobych *oblast*, the NKVD hangmen fell upon a secret UPA field dispensary and found three wounded insurgents, two UPA nurses, and three civilians. During the "interrogation" all the captured were placed on a hot oven.

On July 1, 1945, in the village of Polonychna. Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD murdered a wounded UPA soldier.

On March 3, 1945, during major Soviet operations launched against the UPA near the village of Isakiv, Stanislaviv *oblast*, on the Dniester River, NKVD men bayoneted to death UPA insurgent Werbovy when he declared that he was fighting for a free and independent Ukraine.

On June 9, 1945, in the village of Narayiv, near Berezhany, Ternopil *oblast*, the Bolsheviks tortured to death a wounded UPA insurgent when he refused to reveal military data on the UPA.

On March 24, 1946, in the village of Pidzvirnytsia, Drohobych *oblast*, the NKVD tortured a wounded insurgent and then threw him to die into a burning building.

To be added is that in their struggle against the UPA, the Soviet troops have been using dum-dum ammunition, which, as we know, has been outlawed by international conventions on warfare.

Only in some exceptional cases have the NKVD manhunters attended to the needs of wounded UPA insurgents. This has been especially true when the captured wounded fighter enjoys great prestige and respect in the UPA. The ulterior motive is to use such persons, after they are broken, for propaganda purposes, primarily for the demoralization of the people and the fighters themselves.

By and large, captured Ukrainian insurgents resist and refuse to reveal any information about the Ukrainian underground. But, in blatant disregard of fact, the NKVD extensively publicizes their "atonement" in the press and in special leaflets.

Such was the case with UPA Commander Rudy. Stricken with typhus, he fell into a trap as his unit changed bivouac. After a few days the Soviet police distributed leaf-

lets that were allegedly signed by Commander Rudy. The "declaration" stated that Rudy, in joining the ranks of the UPA in the anti-Soviet struggle, had "erred" in his judgment and had come to the conclusion that the struggle is "futile." As proof of his "atonement," the statement said, Rudy helped the NKVD to destroy Col. Klym Savur, commander of UPA-North. As it transpired, Commander Rudy never made such a statement.

Very often the names of prominent Ukrainian insurgents, who have not been executed, are extensively used in the Bolshevik propaganda by way of "proof" that the Soviet government is "generous and forgiving," even in the cases of the leaders of the Ukrainian underground.

Thus are the Bolsheviks using the name of a leading member of the OUN, Dorosh, who fell into their hands when the NKVD threw a gas bomb into a bunker, capturing him and other insurgents who were overcome.

Likewise, the Soviet propaganda machinery is using the name of Lt. Zmiuka, outstanding UPA Commander and son of the late Col. Dmytro Vitovsky, prominent Ukrainian military and political leader during the struggle for Ukrainian independence in 1917-1920. The Bolsheviks are using his name in leaflets to claim that he is alive and is now endeavoring to convince the Ukrainian people that the Soviet government will "pardon" all members of the Ukrainian underground resistance, both its leaders and its rank and file membership, if only they "atone" publicly for their past anti-Soviet activities.

But the fate of these wounded insurgents has been a harsh one. As soon as they have recovered from their wounds, they are put on trial and condemned to long terms in slave labor camps or jails.

In their hatred of the Ukrainian underground the Bolsheviks will not leave unmolested even the corpses of slain insurgents. They tie them to horses' tails and drag them through the villages; they also stab the corpses with bayonets and fling them into open fires. Above all, they forbid a Christian burial for the dead insurgents; if the latter are buried secretly, the NKVD is quick to exhume them.

On May 27, 1946, in the village of Yavche, Stanislaviv

oblast, an insurgent by the name of Boyan was mortally wounded in an ambush. His body was thrown into a well near Korolivka, in the village of Kolokolyn.

On July 18, 1945, in the village of Polivka, Ternopil *oblast*, the NKVD destroyed a cross on an insurgent's grave and posted guards to apprehend those who would place another cross.

On December 2, 1945, in the village of Khornokivka, Ternopil *oblast*, an insurgent from UPA-East was killed; the NKVD set a trap at the body (guards watched the corpse for five days!).

On August 20, 1945, in the village of Hrad, Volhynian *oblast*, the NKVD killed UPA Captain Zalizniak and a soldier, Kolia. The two corpses were taken to the village of Kolky, where they were hanged in the public square.

On January 15, 1946, in the village of Pidpechary, Stanislav *oblast*, the NKVD strung up the body of insurgent Yura on a fence near the city council. Into his chest was nailed a board with an inscription: "Bandit Yura." Eventually, the NKVD took down the body and buried it at the outskirts of the village, taking care at the same time to conceal a personnel mine to kill anyone who would take the body away for reburial.

On the same day in the village of Pidluzha, Stanislaviv *oblast*, two UPA insurgents were killed. The NKVD ordered a villager, Mykhailo Dolishny, to drag the bodies, tied together with barbed wire, to the building of the village council. When he refused to comply, they beat him into unconsciousness. Subsequently, they tied the bodies of the insurgents to the tails of two horses and dragged them to the village council building. The bodies were tied there to a post, where they remained for four days.

On February 20, 1946, in the village of Tiaziv, Halych *raion*, the NKVD killed Maria Kovalchuk during an "interrogation." She was the mother of UPA Commander Borodaty, who operated in the area. They then took her body to the NKVD headquarters in Halych, where it was thrown onto a garbage heap.

On July 4, 1945, in the village of Horokholyna, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD killed Stepan Lidchyn, an UPA in-

surgent. Subsequently, they gouged out his eyes with bayonets.

On October 10, 1945, in the village of Richka, Stanislaviv *oblast*, a UPA captain, D. Svyatoslav, trapped by an NKVD unit, shot himself to death with his own pistol. The Bolsheviks booby-trapped his body. When the villagers tried to put him into a coffin, the bomb went off, killing a 70-year-old woman, Maria Stefuranchyn, and two small boys, and wounding many others.

In the village of Mechyshchiv, near Berezhan, Ternopil *oblast*, the NKVD ghouls opened several fresh graves, looking for bodies of insurgents.

* * *

Unable to overcome the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement both on the ideological front and on that of actual warfare, the Bolsheviks have resorted to all sorts of provocations. A favorite one is the charge that the *Ukrainian liberation movement was inspired and supported by a foreign power, or by a combination of foreign powers, and, as such, is "anti-Ukrainian" and "treasonable."* They have tried to denigrate the Ukrainian liberation movement and, at the same time, they have pictured it as an imminent threat to the unity and security of the Soviet state.

As early as 1941, after the outbreak of the German-Soviet war, the Bolsheviks were viewing as a threat to their domination not only the Nazis, but the Ukrainian liberation movement as well. Retreating from the Ukrainian lands, the Bolsheviks left behind thousands of their experienced agents, often members of the Communist Party, for the purpose of infiltrating the Ukrainian independence movement.

In such a mass movement as is the Ukrainian liberation movement, it has been almost impossible to screen every candidate, especially during such a war as the German-Soviet war. Secret Soviet agents inevitably succeeded in being admitted into the ranks of the Ukrainian underground resistance and instituted subversive activities. Also, it must be stressed, during the Nazi occupation of Ukraine many of these agents joined the Gestapo and other Nazi police and security organs for the purpose of destroying and undermin-

ing the Ukrainian liberation movement by using German hands. (Some documents pertaining to this matter have already been published in the Ukrainian underground press, notably, *Idea and Deed*, No. 8.) These Communist agents not only wholeheartedly collaborated with the Gestapo, but also tried to check certain actions of the UPA as, for instance, their combating Soviet partisans who had succeeded in penetrating Ukraine under the Nazi occupation and were pillaging the Ukrainian villages and terrorizing the inhabitants. Also, these Soviet partisans frequently occupied entire forest complexes, thereby constituting a serious obstacle to UPA operations.

But the most important task of the internal Soviet espionage-subversion agents infiltrating the Ukrainian liberation movement has been to gain its confidence and to obtain key positions in it, so as to be able to inflict a deadly blow on it with the restoration of Soviet power in Ukraine.

These Soviet agents have operated thus: a) assassinating UPA commanders and leaders of the underground network (some of these assignments were completed during combat); b) supplying the NKVD with UPA instructions, documents and all information, including secret and confidential orders of the Ukrainian underground (this also included information about the whereabouts and hideouts of UPA and OUN leaders); c) sabotaging tasks, including non-execution of UPA orders by these undercover agents; d) misdirecting assignments in certain areas where Soviet agents had wormed their way into prominent positions in the underground movement; e) conducting unnecessary and wasteful combat operations, or misdirecting them, so as to sap and waste the strength of the UPA, or provoking unnecessary reprisals against the Ukrainian population; f) initiating political actions for the purpose of compromising the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement; g) engendering misunderstanding and conflicts in the underground movement; h) creating a network of Soviet spies in the organizations of the Ukrainian underground; i) inculcating defeatist views in the members of the underground organizations, particularly in the UPA ranks.

But these Moscow-sent worms have failed to discharge

their assignment; they have failed to destroy the Ukrainian underground, or even to inflict on it a crippling blow anywhere. The security organs of the Ukrainian underground have succeeded in uncovering the Bolshevik spy network in time and are destroying it completely. It cannot be denied, however, that some UPA commanders have been assassinated and that some UPA operations have been provoked which were unnecessary and which caused UPA losses in certain areas, thus weakening the overall strength of the UPA.

Most of these Soviet *agent-provocateurs* sent by the Soviet command into the ranks of the Ukrainian underground organizations were recruited from the ranks of "deserters" from the Red army. Taking its cue from the constant appeals of the UPA command directed at the Red army, calling on its soldiers to desert *en masse*, the Soviet general staff decided to send well-trained spies in the guise of "deserters." But this stratagem was quickly uncovered and counteracted.

...I, the undersigned, Stepan Polikarovych, a member of the Red army, Field Post Office No. 93355, was recently assigned to a snipers' unit (platoon) in the city of Kovel. From here NKVD Lieutenant Mishchenko sent me out to reconnoiter the terrain where the "Banderaites" operate. I was to perform this scouting mission in the area of the Kamin-Koshyrsk and Kovel *raions*. I was given ten days to accomplish my mission. If captured, I was to pose as a deserter from the Red army and to ask to be allowed to join the insurgents, and gain their trust; furthermore, I was to learn about the locations of the insurgent groups, make contact with "pseudo-commanders" and at an opportune moment steal the field case of the commander, then flee and re-join the closest NKVD unit, from where I would be sent back to Kovel.

As he sent me out, Lt. Mishchenko told me that if I let myself to be captured and did not return, he would deport and destroy my family and execute me eventually. On the other hand, if I accomplished my assignment and returned to my unit, I would be rewarded. . . (From a deposition by an NKVD agent-deserter captured by the UPA on December 9, 1945.)

Thus, the principal methods applied by the Bolsheviks in recruiting internal agents consisted of moral and physical pressure and terror, blackmail, persecution of families, financial bribes, promise of lucrative jobs in legal life, and so forth.

Dependent on whether the contact of the NKVD with a potential spy candidate is direct (for instance, when an insurgent is captured), or indirect (through blackmail of family, and so forth), the recruitment of spies varies. When an insurgent is captured, he is told the Ukrainian liberation movement is futile because of the great power and influence of the USSR. Then they try to intimidate him, saying that the Ukrainian underground resistance movement will be destroyed anyhow, and that there will be no pardon for anyone. It is then that they suggest "collaboration." If the captive refuses to agree to such "collaboration," he is threatened with torture, death and the destruction of his family; but they also hold out all sorts of promises and "rewards" in the future. If he still refuses to submit, he is subjected to physical torture until he finally agrees to "collaborate." He is then released, with the NKVD furnishing him with a plausible reason for his release. The indirect recruitment of a spy is made through his family, usually under the threat of arrest and deportation.

But these efforts to morally dislodge the Ukrainian underground movement have resulted in insignificant results because of the great moral stamina and endurance of the rank and file of the Ukrainian resistance.

The Soviet government, through its security organs, such as the NKVD and NKGB, has since resorted to *external spying*, employing so-called *sek-sots* (the origin of the word: *sekretniy sotrudnik*—or "secret collaborator"). This breed has come to infest the whole of the USSR. The *sek-sots* are everywhere: in village and city, in schools, public institutions, Party organs, army and police, collective farms and mines, and in the family as well.

The task of the *sek-sots* is to be the eyes and ears of the NKVD and NKGB. They must collect all information about the Ukrainian underground: where it bivouacs, its liaisons, modes of communication, names and characters of its lead-

ers, including *noms de guerre* and their social origin; armaments, planned actions, hideouts, magazines and supply depots—and above all, its contacts with the civilian population. These agents are duty-bound to collect all information concerning all persons in their environment: what people do, say and think; when and why they cry and when and why they laugh, etc. All this must be reported to the NKVD for filing. They also must disseminate rumors, negative reports and information which would cast an unfavorable light upon the Ukrainian liberation movement. They must spread untruthful reports tending to compromise the UPA and its leaders in order to undermine the confidence of the Ukrainian people in the rightness of the national struggle for freedom and independence.

The better to attain these tasks, the *sek-sots* must conduct themselves as respectable people, for instance, act as “enemies of the Soviet state”; they must also seem congenial people in order to be accepted and liked in society. The Soviet methods used in recruiting these *sek-sots* are, again, mass terror, blackmail, and bribery.

There is not a single village or city in Ukraine today that did not undergo mass arrests during 1944-1946. These arrests swept up 15-year-old boys and girls over the age range up to octogenarians. All who were arrested experienced one or another form of NKVD “interrogation.” Under the threat of physical torture, deportation, confiscation of property, loss of employment and so forth, all were propositioned to become secret collaborators of the NKVD. For instance, in the village of Nemiach, Lviv *oblast*, in January, 1946, there were only five persons who were not “interrogated” by the NKVD.

Some who weakened could not bear the impact of their commitment to the secret police, and ended by suicide, as was the case with Ivan Kovalyk, who killed himself on October 15, 1945, in the village of Koziv, Drohobych *oblast*.

To illustrate the method of recruitment of *sek-sots* by the NKVD, we reproduce a report by an invalid of the Red army, who hailed from the village of Polonka, Volhynian *oblast*:

I was arrested along with five other villagers. At the beginning I didn't know what all this was about, but

when I was brought to NKVD headquarters, I saw others from my village. When my turn came, the NKVD chief told me bluntly what I "have to inform the NKVD about the movement of the Banderaites," for which I would be rewarded by the Soviet government. I was to tell them whom the Banderaites visit in the village, and who supplies them with food. I was told not to be afraid that the people might find out about my collaboration with the NKVD, for the NKVD has ways to camouflage well such secret contacts. Information was to be channeled through some members of the family; alternatively, the NKVD would send a representative to talk to several people, including myself, and so divert suspicion from me. . . I began to balk at the proposal, pointing out I am an invalid, have to walk with crutches, and so cannot move freely in the village. But he refused even to listen to what I had to say. He became enraged and said that he needed such unsuspected persons as I. . . But I continued to refuse, saying that he might as well kill me on the spot. . . He then took me then to a wood shack and locked me up for several hours. It was winter, and I thought that he had left me there to die. But after several hours he let me out and brought me again into his office to repeat the same procedure as before. He warned that he would destroy me and my family, and that I would be sent to the same place where my parents had been sent (in fact, my parents were deported to Siberia in 1940). I kept silent. He then shoved some papers under my nose and told me to sign them. But I refused again. Then he wrote another statement to the effect that I do not recognize the Soviet government and refuse to cooperate with it. But this statement, too, I refused to sign, saying that I do recognize the Soviet government, that I had fought for it against the Nazis and had become a cripple. Finally, the NKVD chief gave up: he said that I would get ten years at hard labor if I disclosed to anyone this interview with him. . .

As we have said, the recruitment of "secret collaborators" by the NKVD extends to every stratum of Ukrainian society. Even the clergy are not left alone in this drive by the Soviet government to make every citizen a government and police spy. It is also known that many teachers in Western

Ukraine who had been brought from the eastern parts of the Ukrainian SSR, had undergone special spy training and had signed statements to the effect that they would "collaborate" with the NKVD.

Young Ukrainian girls are special targets of these mass arrests. As a rule, they are beaten during "interrogation" to force them to sign statements committing them to "collaboration" with the secret police. The victims are kept in school buildings, cellars, or garages, where frequently they are raped by drunken NKVD soldiers. Many of the latter are carriers of venereal disease. One Ukrainian girl from the town of Lopatyn, Lviv *oblast*, after her release, said that she had been raped by fifty NKVD soldiers.

Blackmail is used by the NKVD in the following cases: a) when one is deemed "disloyal" or is "guilty" of some crime with respect to the Soviet government (some members of one's family may be in the underground or have gone abroad, there may be a damaging deposition of conscience or compromising materials provocatively planted by the NKVD or denunciations by *sek-sots*, and so forth); b) when one is vulnerably economically dependent on the government (a job with the administration, in a state office or enterprise or in a school, etc.); and c) when one's socio-economic origin is suspect (merchant, wealthier peasant or *kurkul*, etc.).

If a person is branded as "disloyal," he or she is threatened with arrest and deportation to Siberia unless he or she agrees to become a "secret collaborator." A person in state employment is warned that he may be ousted immediately if he turns down the role of *sek-sot*. Richer people are threatened with deportation to Siberia.

We do not overstate the case when we say that in the USSR nine out of ten citizens are forced, at least formally, to become spies for the government. To be sure, not all "secret collaborators" who sign statements of collaboration with the NKVD attempt to live up to their commitment; indeed, most report nothing or inconsequential matters.

The NKVD also is trying to enlist school children into the ranks of its informing *sek-sots*, using such devices as candy blandishments, money gifts, and the threat of scold-

ings and beatings. School children are told to report whatever they hear in school and, above all, what they hear at home (many such cases have been reported in the city of Ternopil).

There also have been many cases (city of Chortkiv) of Bolshevik medical doctors receiving orders from the NKVD to provide medical ministrations only to those Ukrainian citizens who agree to become *sek-sots* for the secret police. In some hospitals doctors in the service of the NKVD agree to perform operations on patients only if these, too, promise to become informers for the secret police.

Under the threat of terror the Bolsheviks are trying to engender treason and denunciation as laudable virtues and as a sacred duty of the citizenry. The overall purpose of these police methods is more than one of keeping the people in the iron grip of the totalitarian state; above all, it is a matter of demoralizing the people, especially the Ukrainian people, by upsetting established values with blackmail, lies and terror in order to instigate corrosive fratricide among them.

Another method frequently used to combat the Ukrainian underground resistance is the method of provocation, which varies in technique and purpose from place to place. The NKVD is endeavoring to infiltrate the Ukrainian underground and to assassinate important military and political leaders. Under the guise of the UPA, they are trying to cultivate banditry in order to compromise the Ukrainian liberation movement, to generate estrangement between the Ukrainian population and the UPA, and the Ukrainian liberation movement in general. They are spreading deliberate and invented lies regarding outstanding leaders, so as to destroy the trust enjoyed and long-earned by the leaders of the Ukrainian resistance movement.

In 1945-1946, on the territories of the UPA operations, a daily matter was the masquerading of the NKVD as UPA soldiers. Their hats bore the Ukrainian *trident* (Ukrainian state emblem) and they spoke among themselves only in the Ukrainian language, making use of popular Ukrainian patriotic slogans ("Glory to Ukraine," and so forth). Once in a village, they would go to houses known to be visited by

Ukrainian insurgents; they would seek contact with the UPA leaders, and they would try to gain the confidence of the villagers.

Once unmasked, however, they reverted to their code of terror.

On April 29, 1945, in the village of Soluktyv, Stanislaviv *oblast*, NKVD men, disguised as UPA soldiers, brutally beat Anna Marchuk, after she spotted them as the NKVD and informed the local UPA commander.

On March 16, 1946, in the village of Pidlyptsi, Lviv *oblast*, UPA-disguised NKVD men were turned in by a villager and two girls after providing food for the would-be Ukrainian insurgents. They were arrested immediately and mauled severely.

The extent to which the NKVD has gone in its provocations is indicated by the following: In the spring of 1946, in the Stanislaviv area, NKVD men attired as UPA fighters set up two ambushes against their own column, "captured" several NKVD officers, and hauled them to the village, demanding "contact" with the UPA area commander in order to "pass the prisoners on to him." But the trick was uncovered in time; the bait was not taken.

Acting thus in their role of "Ukrainian insurgents," the NKVD men behaved ruthlessly with the Ukrainian population in order to engender in it hatred for the UPA.

On March 31, 1946, in the village of Oplitski, Lviv *oblast*, a Bolshevik band disguised as an UPA SB (security service) unit, set upon the house of a villager and beat up the farmer and his wife under the pretext that they were *sek-sots* collaborating with the NKVD.

On November 19, 1945, in the village of Kiydaniv, Ternopil *oblast*, disguised NKVD men pillaged the village and maltreated several villagers. Among those arrested was a demobilized soldier of the Red Army who recognized some of the NKVD faces; he went to NKVD headquarters to claim restitution for his property. There he was threatened with execution should he reveal their true identity.

On January 1, 1946, in the village of Berezovytsia Velyka, Ternopil *oblast*, Bolsheviks passing themselves off as Ukrainian insurgents arrested Anna Rohata, tied and

blindfolded her, and then cast her into the cellar of her house. During the ensuing "interrogation" she was badly hurt and then thrown into a stone quarry.

During the entire month of December, 1945, an NKVD unit disguised as an UPA group raided and pillaged the countryside of the Rivne *oblast* (the villages of Rokitno, Mezhyricha, Hoshcha and Korets).

During the night of February 1, 1946, in the village of Myshkovychi, Ternopil *oblast*, UPA-disguised NKVD arrested Ksenia Werbova. Unable to extract any information from her, they set upon her and then flung her into a river.

. . . In addition to my principal task (intelligence), I was told to pillage the Ukrainian countryside and take food, clothing and money, and to disseminate rumors that such pillage was being committed by Ukrainian insurgents. The loot I took was to be shared with Lts. Trachenko and Leniuk, the NKVD representatives in the village of Zhadova Stara (Chernivtsi *oblast*) . . . (From a deposition by Ivan Warbir, known as "Olaks" by the security service of the UPA).

In order to demoralize the Ukrainian population and to compromise the Ukrainian liberation movement, the Bolsheviks unleashed a powerful propaganda campaign, replete with lies and distortions regarding the UPA: about "heavy battles" in which the UPA suffered devastating losses, about deaths of outstanding UPA commanders, and about "murders" by the UPA of innocent people.

Utilizing ruse and deception, the Bolsheviks have also organized special provocative combat groups, consisting of NKVD agents and a number of captured UPA insurgents terrorized into serving in these ranks. The groups are commanded by NKVD officers, but their tactics are wholly patterned after those of the underground resistance movement. Their behavior is abnormally conspiratorial; they seldom visit villages, they avoid people, but in every other respect they imitate the UPA: they dress like the insurgents and they speak Ukrainian exclusively. Their tasks—to set up ambushes at wooded intersections and lanes, to control certain sections of the forest and to maintain contact with smaller UPA units and their commanders and to ensnare them

into ambush. When they must enter a village they try to pass for a "UPA unit" known in the area, demanding food, clothing and money—all of which they finally take by force.

In the spring of 1946 in the Rivne *oblast* in Volhynia there operated such an NKVD provocative band. Known as "OZONA." It was created by the NKVD center in Demydiv. Despite the fact that almost all members of the band became known for what they were, the band continued to operate under the flag of the UPA. They molested and maltreated the civilians. Example: they severely tortured Vasylyna Boychuk and her daughter, Olena, for no reason at all but to incite hatred for the UPA.

As mentioned before, the Bolsheviks have also been engaged in fabricating all sorts of "legends" concerning UPA commanders, mostly, that they are secret agents of the NKVD. Very often captured insurgents have been paraded by the NKVD in populous places, so as to give the impression that they willingly have gone over to the enemy side. And very often the NKVD, through its *sek-sots*, plants "evidence" on the premises of suspected persons so that they might have the semblance of a legal basis for arrest.

On February 18, 1946, in the village of Trostyanets, Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD arrested the local priest, the head of the village council, and a few village councilmen on the pretext that automatic rifles had been found secreted near their homes. As it turned out, the automatic rifles had been planted by the NKVD.

In the village of Kluchiv Velyky, Stanislaviv *oblast*, a badly mutilated corpse was planted at night near the house of Vasyl Vasylchuk. He was arrested on suspicion of murder and his property confiscated. Moreover, thirty other farmers lost their property because of "collective responsibility."

Such cases can be counted by the hundreds, all of which only confirm the desperation of the NKVD to undermine the strength of the UPA and the Ukrainian liberation movement as a whole, a movement which it known to be a mortal threat to the stability and the very existence of the USSR.

* * *

The most basic strength of the Ukrainian revolutionary

resistance movement has been its all-sided support by the entire Ukrainian populace. This has been recognized by the Bolsheviks, and so they have been trying to bring about at all costs a cleavage between the underground and the overt part of the Ukrainian society.

In order to attain this objective the Soviet government has been using every conceivable form of terror: mass man-hunts by special security troops that are armed with the most modern technical equipment; mass arrest, torture, murder, and deportation to Siberia, confiscation of property, burning of entire villages and the execution of hundreds upon thousands of innocent people. All this characterized the Soviet rule in Ukraine in 1944-1946. Not since the times of the Mongol-Tartar invasions in Ukraine in the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries had Ukraine experienced such barbarities and horrors as under Russian Bolshevik rule.

Here is a realistic picture in support of this:

The village N. at dawn. The village is encircled by hundreds of special NKVD troops, who have built huge fires at which to warm themselves. Every exit from the village is barred by strong roadblocks, every elevated bit of terrain has machine gun emplacements. The village is encircled by a tight chain of NKVD troops. Further on, in the forest, is another chain of troops. Hidden in the bushes are several tanks and armored cars. All forest lanes and paths are patrolled by sentinels and police dogs. All is set. The fate of the tranquil Ukrainian village is cast. Then the orders are given. The NKVD troops rise, check their weapons, take up long iron rods for prodding into underground tunnels and hideouts. The air is rent by shrill dog barking and whining rifle shots. Here and there windows are broken, and one hears vulgar Russian cursing. And now one hears the crying of children, the lamenting of women.

In a matter of incredibly short minutes the entire village is occupied. Each farmhouse is invaded by twenty to thirty security men, bristling with automatic rifles, hand grenades, and long iron rods. Inside the houses they break everything, rip up the floor boards, smash the oven. In the barns and other buildings they dig for arms and insurgents. But nothing is found. Returning to the house, now a shambles, they

order breakfast: eggs, roasted duck, vodka, *varenyky*. When the housewife wailingly says that she does not have the food they want, they beat her with rifle butts, kick her. Some of the NKVD men eye a young daughter, and the mother quails at what may be in store. Nevertheless, the daughter this time is unmolested; but she is arrested.

Still eating, in a neighboring house they find a hideout. Hand grenades are thrown, they pull a man out who has shot himself in the hideout. Two other insurgents spring out from the hideout, one with a light machine gun, the other with a sub-machine gun. They fire upon the NKVD men, but they are two against thirty. They cry, "Long live a free and independent Ukraine" as one is cut down. The other, cornered, shoots himself with his own automatic.

Near the burning house the NKVD "interrogates" the woman-owner. Who are these men? Names? Where do they come from? She refuses to say a word. They beat her, throw her to the ground, and then kill her with the iron rods and with rifle butts. The corpse joins the corpses of the two insurgents in the blazing fire. (But before these two were thrown into the fire, their heads had been cut off to be taken to the *raion* center of the NKVD for identification. So is the head of the third insurgent, thought to be the leader.)

From another house the NKVD men bring roasted duck, vodka, and resume eating "breakfast," the air filled with the stench of burning bodies. . . The NKVD drink a toast to the "Soviet power" and then try on the boots taken off the dead Ukrainian insurgents.

In the school building—classes will not be held—the investigating NKVD organs interrogate a crowd of people: women, men, children, hitting them incessantly. All are forced to sign statements promising "collaboration" with the NKVD. Many of them are put into trucks and driven to the *raion* center of the NKVD.

The siege lasts exactly four days. The village looks as if it were hit by a hurricane. At least 80 percent of the villagers are arrested, "interrogated" and beaten. Many of those taken to the center of the NKVD never return to the village. . .

This picture of the Ukrainian village of 1944-1946 is not a figment of the imagination: it is true. Through such man-

hunts and sieges the Soviet government not only tried to crush the Ukrainian underground resistance. They also were useful for collecting taxes, exacting "voluntary loans" and recruiting "volunteer workers" for slave labor in the Urals, the Donbas and the Kuzbas, and other places of the USSR.

Sometimes these manhunts and sieges are conducted in one *raion* or in several *raions*, so that the embattled territory looks like a veritable battle front. The NKVD troops dig trenches, prepare roadblocks, build machine gun emplacements, and string up field telephones as the countryside fills with troops. Then come the chattering bursts of machine guns, the sharp coughs of rifle fire, the raucous pows of hand grenades. One now sees wisps of smoke, then flames shooting up from villages and farm holdings. Tens of thousands of people are arrested and "interrogated," all to the accompaniment of crazed thrashing and physical tortures. Hundreds of families are deported to Siberia, most disappearing forever.

NKVD Colonel Shcherbyna, commanding officer of the great Soviet offensive in the spring of 1945 in the Hutzul Land, issued the following order to his troops:

- 1) To place military garrisons in all populated centers of the *raion*;

- 2) To increase recruiting of sek-sots;

- 3) Beginning on April 15 of the year and until further notice, to forbid all citizens, without exception, to move within the boundaries of the *raion* from one populated point to another without special permission from the military commanders, located in the populated points;

- 4) To arrest immediately all citizens who are circulating about the *raions* without special permission and imprison them;

- 5) To make all citizens, who provide shelter for the bandits and those who refuse to be mobilized into the Red Army, report to the military command. If it be ascertained that they have been sheltering those hiding from the authorities, they are to be arrested immediately and their families deported for resettlement;

6) All military commanders to make a thorough search of all buildings, towns, and localities in order to flush out and arrest bandits who are hiding, as well as their abettors, and those who refuse to report for mobilization into the Red Army; persons who put up resistance are to be destroyed;

7) To take members of families who are hiding from the Soviet authorities to the collecting point in the *raion* for deportation to Siberia.

Also, beginning in the fall of 1945, on all Ukrainian territories embraced by the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement, the Soviet government introduced military garrisons, mustering twenty to two hundred men in all major villages and towns, in order to more effectively combat the Ukrainian resistance movement. In January, 1946, almost every Ukrainian village had such a garrison; by April, 1946, some 60 percent of them still remained. The entire territory was turned into a huge military camp, with terror and persecution unbridled, bereft of any law.

The Soviet government has been applying the principle of family responsibility as regards the Ukrainian people. The NKVD arrested not only those whom they knew to be close relatives of the insurgents, but their distant relations as well. They persecuted also those whose relatives, close or distant, are abroad.

But the most cruel persecution and reprisals have been the lot of *parents, wives, husbands and children of UPA members and the Ukrainian underground resistance as a whole.*

These relatives live in permanent fear of the NKVD. The arrests usually are made at night. Then the long "interrogations" follow, with beatings and physical torture; they are threatened with execution and deportation to Siberia unless they reveal the whereabouts of the relatives fighting in the Ukrainian underground. When such information is not forthcoming, deportation is the punishment, with wife being separated from husband and from her children as well.

In the spring of 1945 a transient camp in Truskavets, Drohobych *oblast*, held 420 persons, members of families of the Ukrainian insurgents; 70 percent were females, 30

percent males; 60 percent were children, 30 percent old people.

On April 5, 1946, in the village of Kolodruby, Drohobych *oblast*, the NKVD deported six Ukrainian families whose members were in the Ukrainian underground; another six Ukrainian families with members in the Ukrainian resistance movement were deported from the village of Poverhiv of the same *oblast*.

From the village of Ridkiv, Rivne *oblast*, all families whose sons, fathers, brothers or husbands were serving in the UPA were summarily deported for slave labor work in the Donbas.

In April, 1946, in the Lubeshiv *raion*, Volhynia *oblast*, the NKVD arrested all the families of the insurgents, while their properties and all personal effects were looted by the NKVD and former Soviet partisans living in the area.

On February 14, 1946, in the village of Uhryniv Horishny, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD slew Dmytro Leniuk at the corpse of his insurgent son.

On September 7, 1945, in the village of Olesha, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD set fire to the house of the insurgent known by his alias, "Luty," and tried twice to throw his wife and child into the flaming house. Managing to escape both times, she was eventually arrested and jailed.

In the winter of 1946, in the Stepan *raion*, Rivne *oblast*, the NKVD deported fourteen families of the insurgents; eight more families from the same village were deported on May 8, 1946.

A 16-year-old, brother of a Ukrainian girl who was a member of the Ukrainian underground, told the following story:

... They came to our house at night. I was alone, because mother, afraid of being arrested, was staying at the house of some friends. There were thirty NKVD men. I began to cry, but they scolded me and called me a bandit. They pulled me out of bed in my shirt and ordered me to be ready in three minutes. When I started to look for my shoes I found they had already disappeared; one of the men had put them in his bag. They took me barefoot (it was at the beginning of March, and the ground was covered with snow). I was thrown into a

truck and taken to a neighboring village, to the military garrison, where I was thrown into the jail, which was a primitive shack with a dirt floor. In the morning I was visited by an NKVD lieutenant who questioned me about my sister. I refused to say anything. Then another NKVD man entered. He told me to lie on the floor face down. He then took a heavy wooden cudgel and began beating me on my back and head until I lost consciousness. When I came to he started "interrogating" me about my sister again, and again I refused to tell him anything. He then grabbed me by the hair and began slamming my head to the ground until blood began running from my nose. I lost consciousness again. I was kept in this primitive jail for three days; during that time I was given only one liter of hot soup. Every day they "interrogated," threatened to execute me, and so forth, but I refused to incriminate my sister.

On the fourth day they took me to another garrison, where they again began questioning me day and night. Then I was forced to do heavy manual work, and I was made to sleep on bricks. After a week I was transferred to the *raion* prison, where I was questioned by the prison chief himself. They let me go after three weeks.

The second day after my return home, an NKVD agent came, took me to another room, stuffed a handkerchief into my mouth, and began hitting me on the head and face with his revolver until I lost consciousness. . .

It is estimated that by the end of 1946 the NKVD arrested and deported to Siberia at least 80 percent of those Ukrainian families whose members were in one way or another connected with the Ukrainian underground.

The principle of collective responsibility was applied to far more than the family unit. Indeed, it was applied to the Ukrainian nation itself. For every anti-Soviet action taken by the UPA, the Soviet government responded with a sweeping, revengeful reaction. Not being able to apprehend the Ukrainian insurgents, the NKVD burned down entire villages, executed the innocent, and tortured summarily anyone who could be arrested.

On April 23, 1946, in the village of Dychky near Rohatyn, an YPA unit had a brief armed encounter with the

NKCD. By way of avenging their losses the NKVD burned 28 houses in the village belonging to people none of whom were involved in the encounter.

In the village of Staratyn, also near Rohatyn, to avenge the slaying of an NKVD sergeant, the Bolsheviks burned down eight houses. In the Burstyn *raion*, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the Bolsheviks put to the torch 50 homesteads between January 10 and April 30, 1946.

On April 25, 1946, near the village of Rozhniv, Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD, angry because they had battled with the UPA and lost, shot to death two Ukrainian girls, Emilia Yaremko and Halia Lesiuk, who were picking berries.

In the village of Pohoriltsi, Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD executed a man, his wife, and a 7-year-old child because insurgents once had been sheltered under their roof.

On February 13, 1945, Ternopil *oblast*, the NKVD burned alive a housewife because UPA men had ambushed an NKVD patrol in her garden. On December 21, 1945, in the village of Matiyivka, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD fired the homestead of Paraska Voloshyniuk for sheltering an insurgent. A young girl, Maria Rybak, who by chance was at the house, was thrown into the fire and burned alive.

On February 18, 1946, in the village of Kozivka, Ternopil, the NKVD executed Mykhailo Sahan and his wife and daughter for giving asylum to an UPA insurgent.

Following the example of the Nazis, the Bolsheviks have also practiced the holding of hostages, who are apprehended and held ready for execution in the event the UPA initiate anti-NKVD activities.

We have enumerated several methods used to terrorize the Ukrainian population. Yet another is mass arrests of great numbers of people; such arrests are frequent and are carried out at night, accompanied by NKVD brutalities that defy the imagination. All the prisons in Ukraine, including those built by the various foreign occupiers of Ukraine, have been overflowing with political prisoners arrested by the NKVD. Consequently, all available public buildings, schools, hospitals, cellars, storage places—all such have been transferred into provisional prisons.

Today in the Soviet jails in Ukraine are hundreds upon

thousands of Ukrainian political prisoners; by the end of 1946 the NKVD had arrested over one million Ukrainians, not counting those deported or "resettled" in Siberia and other parts of the USSR.

The Soviet prisons represent the worst possible conditions that ever existed or at present exist in any part of the world. They are so overcrowded that prisoners are packed like sardines; they are forced to sleep on dirty floors, without bedding; many prisoners die from suffocation. There is no proper sanitation and rampant are contagious diseases, like typhus and venereal diseases (often spread by syphilitic NKVD agents by violating Ukrainian women). The common diet consists of two hundred grams of black, sticky bread and one liter of soup over twenty-four hours. A great percentage of the Ukrainian political prisoners unfailingly is made up of women and the youth.

In the city of Kovel, Volhynia *oblast*, by the end of January, 1946, the NKVD arrested 80 persons, 70 percent of whom were youths. Such arrests were then carried out in other *raion* centers: Turivsk, Holoby, Kamin-Koshyrsk, Manyvychi, Matsiyiv, Kolky, Kivertsi, Stepan and Derzhavne.

In May, 1945, mass arrests of high school youth were conducted in the city of Ternopil. In November, 1945, mass arrests terrorized the cities of Berezhany and Buchach, Ternopil *oblast*.

As mentioned previously, all who are *arrested are subjected to physical torture and beatings in order to extract information on the Ukrainian underground.*

In the village of Hayi, Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD murdered a girl, but not before they cut off her breasts, broke her arms, and tore the hair from her head.

On June 15, 1945, in the village of Pnivie, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD, during its "interrogation," tried to hang a woman in order to extort a confession.

On June 14, 1945, in the village of Deveslavtsi, near Kolomeya, the NKVD rounded up 80 Ukrainian women and thrashed and tortured them in order to obtain information on the UPA. Two of them, Paraska Solovych and Anna Kovaletska, were released with their arms broken. On Feb-

ruary 22, 1946, in the village of Trostianets, Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD tortured several young Ukrainian girls for the same reason.

On May 29, 1946, in the village of Rayi Ditkovetski, Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD arrested two young girls; one of them died during the course of the "interrogation."

On May 7, 1946, at a homestead in Oseredok, Rivne *oblast*, the NKVD arrested a young boy, Oleksa Shablii. Their torturing damaged his nerve system; also, his whole body was stabbed with a bayonet. He killed himself a few days later.

The NKVD also tortured teenagers and children in order to secure information on the Ukrainian resistance movement.

In the village of Nemiach, Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD arrested three young boys. One was Hryhory Dubyna (15), who was questioned about his older brother, an insurgent; he was belabored until he lost consciousness. The same harsh treatment was accorded Luke Ciupan (13) and Volodymyr Boyarsky (15).

On November 22, 1945, in the village of Luka Mala, Ternopil *oblast*, the NKVD captured Ivan Hupchak (18). Because he refused to divulge any information on the UPA, he was beaten, tortured, taken to the woods and murdered there.

In the forest near the village of Dobrovody, Rivne *oblast*, the NKVD seized a boy who was tending horses in the pasture. He was 15 years of age. On the pretext that he collaborated with the insurgents, he was severely beaten and then lashed to a tree in the forest and left to die.

In the village of Polytsia, Volhynia *oblast*, in the winter of 1946, the NKVD arrested several 14-year-old girls and tried to extract information from them about the Ukrainian underground by striking them and by repeatedly dousing their naked bodies with cold water.

On August 1, 1945, in the village of Stebnyk, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD picked up 12-year-old Vasyl Drahan-chuk and beat him severely, but the boy did not say anything they wanted him to.

On March 27, 1946, in the village of Poduvilna, Lviv *oblast*, the Bolsheviks slew two little girls who were playing on

the road; one was an infant, one and a half years old, the other was twelve.

In the village of Belzets, also in Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD seized a pupil of the ninth grade by the name of Lozovy and during the "interrogation" systematically broke his arms and ribs, and finally killed him, throwing his body into a wheat-field outside the village. The next day the boy's mother found his body and made preparations for the funeral. His schoolmates gathered flowers for a wreath and were dressing the coffin when the NKVD returned. They dispersed the children and other mourners, took the corpse out of the coffin, and carried it to police headquarters, where they took off the suit, and then dumped the corpse in a ravine outside the village.

On May 1, 1946, in the forest near the village of Snovychi, Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD shot to death a 70-year-old man who was gathering twigs.

In the village of Pidzvirynets, Drohobych *oblast*, the NKVD shot down a farmer on July 19, 1946, for no discernible reason whatsoever.

On June 26, 1945, near the town of Bohorodchany, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD opened fire on people going to work in the fields, killing a woman, Justina Yaremko, 40, and Mykhailo Romaniuk, 24.

On June 6, 1945, in the village of Hutsulivka, Stanislaviv *oblast*, two drunken NKVD men broke into a school classroom in session and began firing their pistols over the heads of the children.

On October 6, 1945, the NKVD troops were conducting a manhunt for UPA insurgents in the mountain valley of Stanymir, near Nadvirna, Stanislaviv *oblast*. In their search they came across a girl-shepherdess, Anna Yaremchuk, whom they raped many times before finally killing her.

On March 26, 1946, in the village of Ispas, Stanislaviv *oblast*, a regional NKVD chief shot to death 17-year-old Maria Komashko, for resisting his advances.

There are many, many more examples of barbarities perpetrated by the Bolsheviks upon the peaceful Ukrainian population.

On December 2, 1945, a farmer, Petro Tarhonsky, who

had been wounded at the front four different times, was gathering wood with his son, Ivan, in a forest where an armed encounter was taking place between the NKVD and the UPA. In order not to have any witnesses to the NKVD defeat at the hands of the UPA insurgents, the NKVD shot both father and son. Their corpses were found the next day with bullet holes in the back of their heads.

On May 15, 1946, in Tsuman, Rivne *oblast*, the NKVD arrested many men and women and used them as a human shield in an attack on the UPA positions.

On February 19, 1946, the NKVD released from Stanislaviv prison two villagers from Uzin, Vasyl Wowk (born in 1905) and Oleksa Wowk (born in 1902). But in the evening of the same day *istribetels* came with orders to arrest them again. On the fourth day, their wives were carrying food to the prison when, on the outskirts of the forest, they found the corpses of their husbands, with their eyes gouged out.

On December 5, 1945, in the village of Berezivka, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD murdered the entire family of Vasyl Slavych. When the family was asleep, the NKVD men threw in four hand grenades through the windows. The first to escape outside was the married daughter, Maria, with a baby in her arms; she was cut down by the automatic fire of the NKVD. Then the NKVD finished off the farmer, Vasyl Slavych. Altogether, the NKVD murdered seven persons: Vasyl Slavych, 58, his wife Fenia, 49; three daughters, including the married daughter Maria, 22, and her baby son Ivan, 4. Only Dmytro Stelmakh, the son-in-law, succeeded in escaping alive. Wounded, he had hidden behind the body of the mother-in-law. After the massacre, the NKVD men pilaged the place, taking clothing and foodstuffs.

Another facet of the provocative policies of the Soviet government with respect to the Ukrainian people has been the attempt to demoralize the Ukrainian people and their aspirations to freedom and independence. One device that was used is the so-called *istreibitel* battalion organization, or the "self-defense detachment," or, simply, the "village militia." The Kremlin enlisted hereby the assistance of the legal segment of the Ukrainian people for active struggle against the Ukrainian revolutionary independence movement, mean-

ing, in practice, fomenting a fratricidal struggle among the Ukrainian people.

At the beginning, the NKVD tried to organize these *istrebitel* units out of volunteers. These were not forthcoming despite ardent appeals, promises, privileges, and dire threats. Despite the fact that the rank and file of the Ukrainian people fully supported the Ukrainian underground resistance movement, the Soviet government went ahead in organizing these subversive units, but now using force. The principal elements they relied on were the demobilized veterans of the Red Army and young men of draft age. These were called to the NKVD headquarters and "briefed" and "oriented" as to the purpose of the new para-military organization. Subsequently, they were issued rifles and ammunition and eventually organized into units commanded by NKVD commissioned and non-commissioned officers. If they balked at joining, they were threatened with deportation to Siberia.

Understandably, the Ukrainian people resisted this action with all means at their disposal. They boycotted the village meetings so soon as they learned they were being called for the purpose of organizing the *istrebitel* organization; parents told sons to give back the weapons, and so forth.

Since this was a general reaction on the part of the Ukrainian people, the NKVD resorted again to wholesale terror and intimidation.

On February 19, 1946, in the village of Poltava, Lviv *oblast*, the Bolsheviks arrested nine young boys for refusing to join the *istrebitel* organization.

In the village of Ridkiv, Rivne *oblast*, the NKVD summoned twenty men and "proposed" that they join the new group. When they refused, they were arrested and tortured; after that was over, they "voluntarily" joined the organization. One of them, Fedir Wiwysyk, a veteran of the Red Army, was beaten severely for holding out.

In September and October, 1945, in the villages of Slovie, Netsi and Pidsynovka in Volhynia, the NKVD arrested all males because they refused to join the *istrebitel* group. At the same time, in the village of Putsen, in Volhynia, twenty-two demobilized Red army members were called upon to join the militia (*istrebitel* organization).

In the village of Dovzhnytsia, Volhynia *oblast*, the NKVD took a young boy, tied his hands and feet, hurled him to the ground, and beat him until he consented to join the *istrebitel* organization. In the same area the NKVD arrested many other young men and kept them locked up for days without food until they agreed to sign up.

This went on for many weeks and months. Many Ukrainian men came home bruised, crippled, even mutilated after spending two to three weeks in the NKVD jails. All of them were forced to sign the following statement:

I, the undersigned (name), born on. . . , obligate myself to the NKVD to wage the struggle with arms in my hands against the UPA bands and their supporters up to their total destruction, without sparing my strength. If need be, I will give my life for our Soviet Fatherland. The arms which I receive, I will guard as my life itself, never giving them away. . .

Furthermore, the NKVD encourages debauchery, drinking, wild orgies, and so forth among the Ukrainian youth forcibly mobilized into the *istrebitel* and militia groups.

There is no doubt that one of the purposes in creating these organizations was to kill all sense of morality, patriotism, and national pride in the Ukrainian youth.

Despite the awesome pressures and duress which the NKVD utilized with respect to Ukrainian men and boys, the *istrebitel* action, on the whole, failed. The overwhelming part of the Ukrainian recruits, forced into these groups to fight against their own brothers, refused to honor the commitment extracted from them under duress. They went over in whole groups to the UPA, bringing their arms along with them. Alarmed by the increasing desertions of those Ukrainians to the UPA, the Soviet command soon came to the realization that such "conscripts" could not serve its purposes, and the *istrebitels* were disbanded.

Another Bolshevik method extensively utilized as a weapon against the Ukrainian independence movement has been a mass removal of the Ukrainian youth from Ukraine. The greatest percentage of the male youth between the ages of 17 and 23 were drafted into the Red Army. As a

rule, these Ukrainian draftees have been sent outside the borders of Ukraine, usually the Far East.

An almost equally large percentage of the Ukrainian youth, both male and female, has been "mobilized" by the Soviet government for work in coal mines, factories, industrial plants and forest works. Many of these youth have been forcibly put in the schools of so-called "Factory-Plant Education" (FZN).

This general demoralization of the Ukrainian youth is also abetted by the organization of so-called "clubs" in the village and by the impressment of the youth into the Comsomol organization.

The "club" ostensibly is a center of cultural and educational life, that is, the disseminator of Soviet propaganda. But, in reality, the "club" is a center of debauchery, drinking orgies, and so forth, where the village youth is enticed or, if need be, forced to attend. In most Ukrainian villages, these cultural "clubs" exist "in name only."

The task of the Comsomol organization is to educate the youth in the spirit of Communism-Bolshevism and, above all, in the spirit of anti-Ukrainianism, especially in opposition to and hatred for the Ukrainian liberation movement.

This basic task was spelled out in a secret instruction issued by the Volhynian *oblast* (District) committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine:

To obligate the city and *raion* committees of the Communist Party of Ukraine to provide systematic assistance to the Comsomol organizations in their mass political work among the youth, entering basic attention on the problem of elevating the ideological influence of the Comsomol organizations on the youth, especially in *explaining the anti-national essence of Ukrainian-German banditism and the necessity of involving the youth in the struggle against it...* [Italics author's].

Thus, realizing fully the basic task of the Comsomol, the Ukrainian youth, imbued with the spirit of the liberation struggle waged by their parents, have stood in decisive opposition to the Comsomol. Every young man or young woman, who has been enticed into joining the Comsomol, is

boycotted by his peers, who compose a majority of the Ukrainian youth.

In this sector, too, the Bolsheviks are using all sorts of devices, including physical beatings, as in the town of Burshtyn, Stanislaviv *oblast*, where they forcibly got many a Ukrainian youth into the Comsomol by beating him mercilessly.

In addition, in several cases, the NKVD also have organized *secret* Comsomol organizations for the following reasons:

a) to hide them from the Ukrainian underground resistance movement and the Ukrainian community at large, both hostilely disposed toward the Comsomol; b) to encourage to join the organization some weak elements from the youth who would not dare do so openly; c) to make working and collaborating with the NKVD more effective for the Comsomol. Needless to say, such a Comsomol organization is a center of spies and *sek-sots*. Such secret Comsomol organizations have been established in the *raions* of Kalush, Halych and Tovmach of the Stanislaviv *oblast*.

The Bolsheviks also *oppress and harass Ukrainian religious worshipers*. We do not mean here the official persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in connection with the movement to "convert" the Ukrainian Catholics to Orthodoxy. In this official persecution hundreds of Ukrainian Catholic priests and virtually the entire hierarchy—have been thrown into jail, while hundreds of churches and chapels have been closed down. This matter has already been widely described in various Ukrainian underground publications. Briefly, this operation, undertaken in crass violation of the Soviet constitution, has had the following objectives:

a) To destroy the Ukrainian Catholic Church as a religious and national institution, which has sought to protect the Ukrainian people from the blight of Russification;

b) To break by terror a segment of the Ukrainian Catholic clergy in order to compel them to work with the NKVD and thus to compromise them—to undermine their prestige and authority among the Ukrainian people.

But besides the official persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, the Soviet security organs *pillage the*

churches, disperse worshipers during the liturgy, destroy holy pictures, and publicly deride the religious sentiments of the Ukrainian people.

In the village of Morkva, in Byelorussia, the NKVD entered a church during the liturgy and routed the worshipers.

On May 13, 1946, a religious procession from Eastern Ukraine made a pilgrimage to the famous Ukrainian monastery in Pochaiv (Ternopil *oblast*). But before the procession could enter the monastery, they were set upon by NKVD troops, who cast away the church banners and assaulted the priests and worshipers. Eventually, all the pilgrims were arrested.

On June 19, 1946, in the village of Werbizh, Lviv *oblast*, the Bolsheviks broke into a church and threw out the vestments, religious books, and other church objects.

On May 29, 1946, the NKVD duplicated their depredations in the church in Nahuyiv; the next day the NKVD men tried to barter the stolen church objects for vodka.

On Easter Sunday, in 1946, NKVD commander Rudakov rode his horse into church of the village of Korchyn, near Skole, Drohobych *oblast*, in the course of a liturgy.

In September, 1945, the NKVD broke into the church of the village of Zdyshiv, near Lviv. After pillaging, the NKVD forced several young girls into the church, donned vestments and parodied the divine service drinking the ecclesiastic wine as they gave forth with vulgar and blasphemous words and actions. Subsequently, they set the church afire and tried to burn alive the people whom they had forced into the church to watch their "liturgy." But they desisted when confronted by the violent opposition of the entire village.

We have already mentioned that the Bolsheviks not only did not try to check the spread of such diseases as typhus or the venereal ones, but they deliberately sought to spread them among the Ukrainian people. In this the Bolsheviks had much success through helpless Ukrainian girls and women in prisons. Moreover, for more than three years, Red Army soldiers and other Soviet troops raped Ukrainian women on the orders to spread V.D.

The economic pillage of Ukrainian resources has also been one of the most telling methods of the Bolshevik strug-

gle against the Ukrainian liberation movement and the Ukrainian people as a whole. The Soviet government imposes upon the Ukrainian populace exceedingly heavy levies on such staples as wheat, milk, meat, and vegetables.

At the same time Ukraine is overrun by countless marauding groups that raid the countryside to denude it of everything portable: wheat, grain, clothing, shoes, home furnishings, clocks, musical instruments, all as if Ukraine is a vanquished country like Germany or Austria.

In 1946 the crop in Ukraine was ruined by a great drought. But this has not moved the Kremlin to reduce the agricultural quotas assigned for Ukraine. Failure to come up with the assigned quotas of wheat and other agricultural produce has incurred severe punishment.

Both the harsh economic exploitation and the drought which hit Ukraine in 1946 were devastating to Ukraine, especially in the eastern provinces of the country. One pitiable result was the sight of hundreds upon thousands of persons jamming the roads to Western Ukraine in desperate search of food.

There is no doubt that effects of the famine in Ukraine in 1946 were severely aggravated by the deliberate policy of the Kremlin.

In order to wrest away all the food produce of Western Ukraine, the Soviet government, by a special decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, forbade the sale and delivery of all foodstuffs from Western Ukraine. This food was appropriated by the Kremlin for its own purposes despite the known fact that a great part of the Ukrainian population was acutely suffering from hunger and malnutrition.

Thus, the overall Soviet Russian policy in Ukraine may be broken down into the following elements: physical destruction of all members of the Ukrainian underground resistance movement; tricking the Ukrainian people into fratricidal war; deliberate spread of typhus and venereal diseases; death-inducing conditions in Soviet prisons and concentration camps; harsh economic exploitation of Ukrainian resources. All combine into the single goal: the physical extirpation of the Ukrainian people.

The Kremlin could manage the disposal of such numerically small non-Russian peoples as the Crimean Tartars, the Chechen-Ingushes, and the Volga Germans. But it could not do so with the 40 million Ukrainian nation. Yet the formidable Ukrainian threat to the Soviet Russian empire could be dissipated in good measure by eliminating a goodly part of its dynamic element: the Ukrainian youth and the active participants in the revolutionary movement. This policy the Kremlin chieftains have been carrying out with both doggedness and ferocity.

We may say it has not been easy for the Kremlin chieftains. The attitude of the Ukrainian people toward the Soviet regime may best be exemplified by the *"elections" to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR that were held on February 2, 1946.*

In order to prevent a total boycott of these "elections" by the Ukrainian people, the Soviet government took "precautions." Already in January, 1946, hundreds upon thousands of Soviet troops were in Ukraine, with 20 to 200 men in every village. These troops imposed mass terror upon the defenseless population. Countless meetings after meetings were held, usually under the coercive blades of Soviet bayonets.

M. Hrechukha, head of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR who was "running for office" in the Berezhany district of Western Ukraine, was guarded by no less than eight thousand special security troops.

On the day of the "elections," the overwhelming majority of the people on the territory embraced by the activities of the UPA refused to go to the polls. Then the troops were ordered in. They drove the people to the polling place by force of bayonets, army tanks and armored cars. They pulled women by the hair; some they dragged in with the aid of barbed wire. The scene was bloody. Hundreds or people were executed, tens of thousands arrested, hundreds of thousands beaten and tortured. But the end result was a great defeat for the Soviet regime. Only a scant 3 percent, of the Ukrainian population went to the polls; 30 to 40 percent voted under duress and terror, while the remainder did not vote at all. Yet the subsequent official Soviet pronouncement blared

out that 98.8 percent of all registered voters had voted for the Communist slate.

On January 17, 1946, in the village of Volya Zhovtanetska, Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD executed Mykhailo Derkach for his "negative attitude toward the elections."

On February 2, 1946, in the village of Zheldets, Lviv *oblast*, the NKVD shot Hryhory Burko, 40; Nykhailo Senkiv, 42; Vasyl Stronnytsky, 32, and Petro Huzvira, 42, for their "derogatory stance toward the elections."

In the village of Kosmach, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD surprised three farmers who were hiding on election day and shot them dead without asking any questions. For good measure, they decapitated them and threw their bodies into a bonfire.

During the preparations for the election, the NKVD burned down 51 homesteads, in the Halych *raion*: in Stanislaviv, 41 and in Bohorodchany, 6. They arrested 590 persons in the Halych *raion*, 214 in the Stanislaviv *raion*, and 160 in the Bohorodchany *raion*. Moreover, they deported to Siberia six families from the Halych *raion*, including six children; three families from the Stanislaviv *raion* and twelve families from the Bohorodchany *raion*, including seven children. The NKVD murdered 33 persons in the Halych *raion*, 58 in the Stanislaviv *raion*, and 14 persons in the Lysets *raion*.

In the village of Bludnyky, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD captured Ivan Shaturna, a member of the "elections committee" who had refused to vote. He was beaten with rifle butts. Then they put a noose around his neck and, prodding him with bayonets, brought him to the polling place. There he again refused to cast his vote. For that they tied his hands behind his back and threw him into a well. (Ivan Shaturna was a veteran of the Red Army and had taken part in the German-Soviet war in 1941-1945.)

In the same village all those who had refused to vote were dumped in the cellar of the local dairy cooperative. The cellar was filled with water, in which the voters were immersed for five hours. But at the end these people still refused to vote.

In the village of Kolodiyivka, Stanislaviv *oblast*, NKVD

agents dragged Mari Yakubiv by her hair to the polling place.

In the village of Pipdechary, Stanislaviv *oblast*, the NKVD killed Anna Ovrach outrightly because she refused to go to the polling place.

In the village of Komariv, Volodymyr Borysovykh was beaten and tortured so severely that upon his release he hanged himself.

All those villagers of Selyshcha who had refused to vote were herded into the house of the head of the village council. The house was then set on fire. Those who tried to escape were cut down by rifle fire.

In recapitulating the methods of the Bolshevik struggle against the Ukrainian independence movement we must mention the so-called "Appeal of the Government of the Ukrainian SSR" directed to the Ukrainian underground organizations. In this, and in subsequent "appeals," the Ukrainian Soviet government called on the members of the Ukrainian underground to come out into the open with their arms and "with all their leaders" and to report to the organs of the Soviet government. Promised was a "full pardon" to all those who surrendered voluntarily; more, employment was dangled before them as well.

Some naive persons may think that these "appeals" were a genuine tender of "amnesty" on the part of the government of the Ukrainian SSR to the members of the Ukrainian underground. But this was not so. In the USSR there is simply no amnesty. In the USSR political opponents are destroyed, not forgiven, as is amply attested to by the horrendous 28-year-record of the Bolshevik regime.

These "appeals" were directed to the detested "participants of bands," the "lost ones." They peremptorily stated that the "lost" have to surrender by a certain date, along with their arms, but, most significantly of all, they had to disclose their political collaborators and all military and underground secrets. In addition, they would have to "collaborate with the NKVD. . ." (Cf. *The Year 1945 in the Ukrainian Lands*). The quoted Ukrainian underground publication adds: "As we plainly see, the conditions of pardon were cynically posed as to be unacceptable by anyone in the world,

much less by members of a dedicated political organization or revolutionary liberation army. . ."

In any event the Soviet government broke its word almost immediately. Those who surrendered were exploited by the Soviet propaganda machinery. More, a series of articles soon appeared in the Soviet press which would have it that among those who surrendered were still "secret sympathizers of the independence movement." Eventually, the NKVD arrested the majority of "pardoned" Ukrainian insurgents.

Example: on May 27, 1946, in the Stepan raion, Rivne oblast, the NKVD arrested all those who had accepted the "pardon."

Example: on December 10, 1945, in the village of Ozeriany, Volhynia oblast, the NKVD arrested former UPA member Loloda, who had been "pardoned."

Most of the "pardonees" were compelled to collaborate with the NKVD, forced in one way or another to combat the Ukrainian independence movement. "They are forced to travel together with the NKVD patrols and to reveal what they know of hideouts, village houses, their former war comrades, friends and sympathizers; they are forced to terrorize the Ukrainian people. . . This 'pardon' has caused more than one former insurgent to become demented and end up a suicide, while the rest have sunk to the bottom of human degradation. . ." (*The Year 1945 in the Ukrainian Lands*).

Significantly, and what was typical of the Soviet "democratic society," all these momentous events, especially the struggle of the Ukrainian people, were never mentioned in the Soviet press or over the Soviet radio. Especially was nothing said about the unbridled terror unleashed upon the Ukrainian people by the government of the USSR. For the past three years not a single article has appeared in the Soviet press which has treated objectively and impartially the situation in Ukraine. Yet the Soviet press has been very vociferous about the smallest strike in the United States or about a humdrum demonstration in Egypt. It has much to say about the Dutch oppression in Indonesia, but astoundingly fails to notice the daily oppression and persecution in Ukraine, not even the large-scale battles between the UPA and the NKVD and other Soviet troops.

Reading this, any foreign reader may well be excused for being incredulous. He asks: "Where are the Soviet 'people's courts?'"

But to understand the "mission" and "functioning of the Soviet "people's courts," let us take a case in point:

On April 24, 1946, Manoil Karalash was wending his way between the village of Chorny Potik and the village of Bridky, Chernivtsi *oblast*. Down the road came a Soviet truck, carrying the commander of the *istrebitel* group in the area, Obe Khrystenکو, and a political commissar from the village of Zastava, Alexandrov. Karalash knew both of them personally. In addition, there were a few NKVD men whom Karalash had never seen before. Khrystenکو ordered Karalash to hop on the truck and go with them to Chorny Potik to point out the house of priest Kostyniuk. He consented, not knowing what they were planning to do to the priest. The hapless priest was murdered, nor was his family spared. Subsequently, the NKVD spread the rumor that this heinous crime had been committed by the "Banderaites." Karalash publicly denied these rumors and named the true culprits. On June 26, 1946, he was arrested and sentenced by a "people's court" in Zastava to two years at hard labor.

At the trial, Judge Bondarenکو asked the accused:

"Do you really think it was Khrystenکو? One man resembles another man, and Khrystenکو was in Chernivtsi on that day. You are an honest man, and lest you suffer in jail, retract your testimony damaging Khrystenکو. . ."

But Karalash stoutly answered: "I was not drunk, I know Khrystenکو personally, and I saw them commit the crime. . ."

This, in essence, is the Soviet "people's court."

For the third consecutive year the Ukrainian people, alone and unaided, have been waging an unequal struggle against the Russian totalitarians for their freedom and independence. Nevertheless, today the Ukrainian independence movement is far stronger, despite the inhuman persecution and punishment meted out to them by Communist Russia. Today the Ukrainian independence movement enjoys much more understanding and sympathy both at home, among the other non-Russian peoples in the USSR, and abroad.

The quest of Ukrainian liberation and the establishment of a Ukrainian independent state is moving ahead, and no force on earth, not even the "powerful" Soviet Union, will be able to halt this process of rebirth of the great, vigorous and law-abiding Ukrainian people.

The inevitable result of this process will be an independent Ukrainian State. This is a law of nature; no people can be kept in political slavery forever. This is well known to the tyrants of the Kremlin and their allies, wherever they are to be found.

.

Chapter 6

Attitude of the Ukrainian Resistance Toward the Russian People

In considering the Ukrainian Resistance as regards the Russians, the Russian populace is to be distinguished from the Russian imperialists. The attitude of the Ukrainian Resistance differentiates sharply between the two.

The attitude toward the Russian people is the same as the attitude entertained toward all other nations. It is summed up in the slogan: "Freedom for Nations—Freedom for Individuals!"

The Ukrainian revolutionary movement of liberation, which sprang up because of the national enslavement and colonial oppression of the Ukrainian people, excludes all conceptions of chauvinism and still more of imperialism, its own or foreign. In struggling for the liberation of our own people, we are fighting for the liberation and independence of all nations, for we condemn all imperialism. We are convinced that the Ukrainian people, like every other people in the world, can develop fully and completely only as a member of the family of free and independent nations. We want to build our lives in our own independent country in close cooperation with all other nations. We believe that a just peace can be

maintained only by a system of free independent governments of all peoples within their ethnographic boundaries.

The destruction of the colonial exploitation of the USSR, which means the destruction of the imperialistic class of Stalinist overlords, is dictated by the deepest interests of all peoples of the USSR. The reconstruction of the USSR into independent states is the most just and progressive solution of the national problem, for it strikes at the root of Russian imperialism on the one hand, and on the other provides the possibility of the well-rounded development of each and every people. It leads not to national narrowness and eccentricity but to the broadest cooperation and friendship between nations, for only reconstruction would allow building on the principles of lasting independence, equality, and good will. The liberation of the peoples from the colonial yoke of the Russian Bolshevik imperialists would offer to every nation the essential prerequisites for the solution of the social problem in the interests of the laboring masses. The rebuilding of the USSR as independent states of all its peoples is not a return to the old and the antiquated. It is the only road to true progress.

The freeing of Ukraine from Russia is not a hostile act against the Russian people, as Russian propaganda paints it.

First, the struggle for the liberation of Ukraine is a struggle for the universal and long-recognized right of every people to live their own independent life on their own territory. Can any right-thinking person consider such a struggle as a hostile one against any other people? Besides, this struggle is perfectly legal even from the point of view of Bolshevik law. The constitution of the USSR assures to each so-called allied republic the right to secede from the structure of the USSR.

Second, the Russian people do not need Ukraine. Only the Russian imperialists need it. The assertion that Russia cannot exist without Ukraine—and both Lenin and Stalin have made it—is plainly an imperialistic slogan, employed by all imperialists to the end of misleading the populace. (The German imperialists performed the same way when they ranted that the German people were hemmed in, that they were threatened with starvation, that they needed “liv-

ing space.”) More than this, such statements form no argument; they cannot give any people the right to enslave others. They are only the exhortations of imperialists to try to justify imperialistic wars and the seizing of foreign territory.

The Russian lands are so rich and the Russian people so industrious that the country can provide for itself. But the land, the wealth of the Russian land, its industry—all must be in the hands of the Russian people and not in the hands of a class of Bolshevik overlords, which would enable the Russian people to work for themselves and not for the benefit of Bolshevik exploiters and their imperialistic plans. If the Russian people need Ukrainian coal, iron, and grain, they can secure these by exchanging with Ukraine its own economic products (wood or industrial products), not by seizing Ukraine and exploiting its wealth as if it were a colony.

The Czarist and now the Bolshevik imperialists have concentrated the basic branches of industry not where the raw material is abundant but in the poorer districts (the non-black earth regions and Leningrad) to which they transport raw material from the so-called Union Republics. So it is obvious that the detachment of Ukraine and the other “Union Republics” will cause changes in the present Russian economic system. But this primarily will be a blow not to the Russian economy but to its imperialistic structure, to all those branches of industry which are working for the imperialistic military needs of the Bolshevik conquerors. It will create at worst only temporary difficulties in the Russian economy. When rebuilt on a purely national basis, the Russian economy will have sound foundations for its fruitful development, that is, a strengthening of itself and serving the Russian people and not the Bolshevik exploiters. To what advantage do the Russian people (the people as a whole, and not their governing class) serve the profit by the fact that they have developed industry (built and rebuilt with such enormous waste of human life, labor and property), when that industry works not for the people but for war and armaments, when the profits from this industry go to the class of Bolshevik overlords and their antinational aims, when the overwhelming majority of the workers (with the exception of

the Party-Stakhanov-official layer) find in it not pleasant work but a hard prison-like servitude, insufficient return, unendurable exploitation, when the workers do not have the slightest influence on industrial administration itself? It is most assuredly in the interest of the Russian masses to do away with the imperialistic industrial structure of the USSR.

Its disposal is dictated also by the true interests of the enslaved nations in the USSR, who do not wish to be reconciled with their colonial status. We cannot agree that the treasures of the Ukrainian land should be carried away by the Russian Bolshevik occupants entirely and without payment only because they are needed by Russian industry, deliberately set up in regions without raw material. We cannot be satisfied with the fact that the economic system of Ukraine is lopsided (only village production and unfinished products), that Ukraine, having in abundance all necessary raw materials, should not be allowed to develop all branches of industry. We cannot gloss over the fact that millions of Ukrainians die of hunger only because the plunderers of the Kremlin steal their grain. We cannot allow Ukraine to remain a source of raw materials, a mere feeder for Russian industry, a fountain of wealth for the Bolshevik overlords. That is why we are fighting to liberate Ukraine from Russia: not in hostility against the Russian people but exclusively against the Russian Bolshevik imperialists, the destruction of whose regime is also in the interests of the Russian people.

We are working for the liberation of Ukraine and the transformation of the USSR into independent states of all peoples of the USSR. But at the same time we are striving also for the closest cooperation in the political, economic, and cultural fields with the Russian people, as well as with all other peoples. The Russian people are our immediate neighbor; with many interests in common we can develop a fertile cooperation if it is founded not on imperialistic subordination but on lasting friendship and equality.

Today the Russian imperialists are haranguing far and wide on the so-called assistance the Russian people render the Ukrainian people. There is not a particle of truth in this. It is a lie, a cynical lie, on two counts.

First, the policy of the Czarist regime, like that of the policy of the Russian Bolshevik imperialists toward the Ukrainian people, never was and is not now any policy of "assistance" to Ukraine but, unabashedly, a policy of national oppression and exploitation of Ukraine, a policy of annihilation of the Ukrainian people, of harsh and cruel dealing with Ukrainian efforts for liberation. Unfortunately, this and nothing else is the essence of Russian-Ukrainian relations, past and present. For this policy we blame the Czarist and Bolshevik imperialists, never the Russian people as a whole.

We must here state with sorrow that the Russian people have allowed (and are still allowing) themselves to be used as a massive tool for the Bolshevik policy of oppression of Ukraine. What did the Russian people do to check the Czarist imperialists in the betrayal of the Pereyaslav Treaty, the Vilnius agreement with Poland in 1665 and of Andrusiv in 1667? In the destruction of the Kozak Republic, the ruination of the Zeporozhian *Sich*, the introduction of serfdom into Ukraine, the prohibition of the Ukrainian language? What did the Russian people do to prevent the Bolshevik imperialists from conquering Ukraine in 1917-20? What have they done to prevent the oppression of the Ukrainian people from 1920 to the present? What are they doing today to prevent the Moscow-Bolshevik oppressors from throttling our revolutionary campaign of liberation? Of what "help" from the Russian people can we speak?

The favorable attitude of some enlightened individuals among the Russian people toward the Ukrainian cannot be generalized in any way as one of "assistance." These few afford us only some glimpses of a promising cooperation between two free and totally independent peoples, the Russian and the Ukrainian.

In working for cooperation with the Russian people, we take a decisive stance against ascription to the Russian people of any "leading role," any obligations toward an "older brother," any sense of inferiority induced by the nobler, higher qualities of that people ("the Russian people is the most talented nation," one that has a "clear mind, a fixed character and endurance"), for behind all these grandiloquent statements lurk Russian imperialism, racism, and chauvinism.

We believe that in the world there are neither superior nor inferior peoples, no people more talented than any other. There can only be advanced and less advanced peoples. A people lagging behind, as measured in industrial time, not only inherently are not inferior to so-called developed nations, but may soon surpass them. How often has the "inferiority" of the Slavs been pointed out, yet how intellectually paltry do all such assertions appear today? How pathetic the assertion of Hitler that the German nation was incomparably capable, the one empire-building nation of the world, thereby deserving the illusory right of being the lord of peoples. Each people has its national advantages and bents, but differences between nations do not confer upon any nation the rank of "most capable" nation in the world. The naming of any one nation thus is sheer racism, and as such this practice deserves only condemnation.

Thus we do not grant to the Russian people any "higher qualities" which would give them any right to view themselves as superior to other non-Russian peoples ("the older brother," the "great," the "most capable people," etc.). We will never consent to the notion of a "leading role" for the Russians, thanks to their "high" qualities.

For yet another reason we Ukrainians cannot agree with such notions. They also derive from the Bolshevik policy of absorbing the brightest pages of our history—the entire period of Kievan Rus and the Halych-Volhynian principality—and of our culture—especially the "Ruska Pravda" and the "Slovo." The Bolsheviks also deliberately have minimized our own achievements, including those we have accomplished with the "assistance" of the Russian people, by the nauseating falsification of historical truth (e.g., the Treaty of Pereyaslav, Mazepa, the attempts at liberation in 1917-1920, etc.). The overlords have as their goal the Russifying of the Ukrainians; their means, the implantation in them of a sense of inferiority.

We take our stand against the racist propaganda proclaiming the superiority of the Russian people, for such leads to the inflaming of Russian chauvinism in the masses, thereby creating difficulties for genuine cooperation between the Ukrainian and Russian peoples.

To repeat, the Ukrainian Resistance is struggling not

against the Russian people but against the Russian imperialists, against all those who are responsible for Ukraine's enslavement.

The moving spirit of Russian imperialism today is the Bolshevik party, the VKP (b), the exploiting class of the Bolshevik overlords. This new exploiting class is headed by the Stalinist clique. Naturally, some of the members of the VKP (b) do not wholeheartedly subscribe to the imperialist position, but this does not affect the imperialist character of the class as a whole. The old nobility also had produced a long series of fighters against Czarist autocracy (the Decembrists, Herzen, etc.), but those individuals did not substantially alter the exploitative nature of their class. The Bolshevik overlords form a purely imperialistic class that is enslaving millions of non-Russian peoples, and, as a result of its triumph over its arch totalitarian rival, Hitler Germany, has conquered the lands of Central and Southeastern Europe and is now preparing to seize the entire world.

It has nothing in common with socialism and Communism. It uses these systems as cover for its plundering imperialism and as a means of implanting its agents in all the countries of the world. The Bolshevik imperialists are the direct heirs of the bloody work of the Czarist imperialists. Therefore, we are struggling not only against the supremacy of the Kremlin, against the Stalinist clique, but also against the class of Bolshevik overlords as a whole, as an imperialistic and exploiting class.

That there are Ukrainian, White Ruthenian, Georgian, and other individuals in this class of Bolshevik overlords does not change by a whit its Russian imperialistic character. One part of these "foreign" members of the Stalinist lords are the Voroshilovs, Korotchenkos, and others.

As regards the Russian people, the Bolshevik class is exploiting them socially, as had the landowners and capitalists. The Bolshevik overlords have made the Russian laboring masses modern slaves; they are oppressed by the heavy yoke of Stalinist despotism and exploitation. The Russian people play no part in the supreme administration, much less can they dream of democracy.

But it would be a grievous mistake to think that all this

places the Russian people in a camp hostile to the class of Bolshevik exploiters or of Russian imperialism as such. It would be nice to think so, perhaps, but it is not true. The class of Bolshevik overlords has fastened firmly to itself a significant portion of the Russian people. It has done so by assigning to them the functions of imperialistic officials and *hayduks* (in the army, the MVD and MGB, the administration, economy, cultural-educational work and professional associations). In return, such Russians have shared in the imperialistic plunder. This corruption of some portion of the Russians is made all the easier because those with the courage to open the eyes of the masses have been systematically annihilated.

The case of the German people clearly shows the frightful and ruinous devastation of the masses that was wreaked by such imperialistic propaganda. The German masses—ensnared by racism, seduced by the alluring imperialistic plan to rule other nations, and encouraged by the initial military successes—docilely followed Hitler and his bandit gang. And thus an analogy for the Russian people. If the Russian people should acquiesce to the present chauvinistic course, they will meet the same fate as the German people did in their blind support of Hitler.

Therefore, although we do not equate the Russian people with Russian imperialism, we do not dare to overlook the fact that the class of Bolshevik overlords is attacking in depth. For joining the Bolshevik overlords are hundreds of thousands of Bolshevik *hayduks* and imperialistic officials (the majority of whom are Russians), deceived by the Bolshevik chauvinist propaganda. Not to reckon with this fact is to underestimate the power of the enemy against whom we have to fight. Add to this that Russian imperialism is deep-rooted, going back to Czarist times and earlier. For centuries the Russian people have been conditioned to oppress other peoples, and this process of corruption has been proceeding on an ever greater scale. This process has had its results. There is a most favorable soil for the sowing of imperialism among the Russian masses.

It is impossible to underestimate this: the Russian people have never lived a free life during their entire his-

tory; they have never thrived on the elixir of individual and political rights; Russia, as Herzen wrote, "*has equally no passion for equality or room for freedom*" (italics of Herzen). This is true from the empire of Arakcheyev to that of Pugachov (A.I. Herzen, *Izbrannye filosofskye sochineniya*, Ogiz, sotsekiz, 1940).

We may add that this almost naturally led to Stalin's empire. The struggle the Russian people as a whole put up against autocracy and the landowners and capitalists for their social liberation, even their revolutionary surge in 1917, did not end with the unshackling of the chains of despotism. The winds of freedom had never blown hard enough. From the exploitation of landowner and capitalist it was all too easy a transition to that of the Bolshevik exploiters. The Czar has been replaced by the generalissimo emperor.

Had the Russian people not lived for centuries under despotism and had they experienced any democratic traditions of government, they would not have succumbed so easily into dependence upon another imperialistic class. We cannot forget this, for even today their background permits the Bolshevik imperialists to harness at will the Russian masses to their imperialistic cart.

The influences of imperialism and of chauvinism are so strong that even the most progressive individuals cannot free themselves of them. For example, V. Belinsky, a Russian literary critic who scorned Czarism with his whole soul, to the end of his life never softened his hostile attitude toward the Ukrainian language and literature. To his discredit, he attacked Hrebinks and Shevchenko for writing in the Ukrainian language. What, then, can we say about unlearned people who are demoralized by imperialism? How much harder is it for them to overcome the pernicious influence of imperialism? An influence that appears in the most varied forms, that penetrates all sectors of the life of nations and individuals?

What Russian is either an imperialist or its lackey, opposing as he does the transformation of the USSR into independent states of all peoples. At bottom it is he who refuses the Ukrainian people the right to an independent national government, who is against the detachment of Ukraine from Russia, who helps deny the colonial character of the present

Ukrainian SSR, who takes his stand against the revolutionary struggle of liberation of the Ukrainian people, calls the rebelling Ukrainian bandits, fires on them, tyrannizes and terrorizes them, and eventually murders them for their part in the struggle for liberation.

Every Russian is an imperialist or its lackey, who directly or indirectly supports the Bolshevik colonial exploitation in Ukraine which steals the wealth of Ukraine, profits by the work of the Ukraine laboring masses and sends Russians into Ukraine to colonize it.

That Russian is an imperialist or its lackey who stands or suffers for the Russification policy of Ukraine, who flaunts his pleasure or hides his grief in the present racist-chauvinist course of Bolshevik policy, who more or less shares the imperialist views on the inferiority of the Ukrainian people. Against such people we obviously have the right to fight, since they are Russian imperialists or, much the same thing, are in their service.

To be candid: we have to remember this deep-rooted character of imperialism not only today, when we are fighting to destroy it, but later as well, after it has been vanquished. The prospect of resuscitation of imperialism among the Russian people will be with us for a long time.

Not only must the Ukrainian and the other oppressed nations of the USSR remember this. The Russian people must also. They must keep in mind that imperialism has been the cause of their difficult position throughout the whole course of their history. Russian imperialism has been and is the cause of the great poverty and retarded development of the Russian laboring masses, for it has turned and is turning all the national energy, work, and material wealth over to wars of conquest, plus a luxurious life for the exploiting classes. Least important is the full development of the material and spiritual life of the people.

One hundred years ago (1851), when Russia existed under the same despotism as today (save for another name and another form), the great patriot of the Russian people, Herzen, wrote:

So long as Russia can reconcile itself to its existing order, it will not have the future for which we hope. So long as it creeps along the Petersburg path or returns

to the Moscow traditions, it will have no other purpose than to fall upon Europe as a half-barbarian, half-degenerate horde, ruining the civilized countries, and finally perishing amid the general devastation (A.I. Herzen, *Izbrannyya filosofskyye sochineniya* (*Selected Philosophical Works*, Ogiz, sotsekiz, 1949).

How deeply strike these words of Herzen today! His fears are now near to realization. The Bolshevik imperialists are leading the Russian people further along the imperialistic Petersburg path as they invoke at the same time the Moscow traditions. So will they most certainly lead the Russian people to the end foreseen by Herzen. Stalin is preparing for the Russian people a fate that is worse than that prepared for the Germans by Hitler. This, all Russian patriots, the whole Russian people, must come to realize.

Chapter 7

The UPA— The Standard-Bearer of Liberation and Friendship of Peoples

The Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which is carrying on the heroic fighting traditions of the Ukrainian nation, came into being during World War II. It was during that struggle, waged at first against the Nazi invaders and then against the Soviet occupants, that the number of its soldiers increased and its fighting quality improved. Its leading cadres were formed and trained during the underground revolutionary struggle of the Ukrainian nation between the two World Wars. They were followed by the best sons and daughters of Ukraine, who saw the only purpose of their lives to be that of serving their nation and the cause of its liberation.

The UPA is a revolutionary and truly national army. Being the army of a subjugated nation, it sympathizes with the liberation struggle of other peoples, who are either enslaved or threatened by Soviet imperialism. Moreover, the UPA consistently and emphatically stresses the necessity of the closest cooperation between them and of a coordination of their efforts, insisting that the hateful Stalinist empire can

be overthrown only by the joint action of all subjugated nations. Therefore, the UPA is against all petty dissensions and disagreements affecting these nations, since they tend to dissipate their energy instead of directing it against their mortal enemy—Soviet imperialism. The lack of cooperation among the subjugated nations and, what is even worse, their mutual conflicts and misunderstandings strengthen the Soviet regime and facilitate its rule over them. On the other hand, a joint action on their part would offer the strongest hope of the ultimate dissolution of the Russian empire and the liberation of all enslaved peoples.

While fighting for a free and independent Ukrainian state, the UPA struggles at the same time for the right of each nation to a free and independent life within its own national state. The UPA believes that only a system of free national states ensures their unlimited development; that only this system can ensure a nation against aggression and enslavement by a more powerful neighbor and prevent the subjugation of small and middle nations by a coalition of world powers; that only this system creates a basis for true international cooperation in political, economic, and cultural fields; that it alone can eliminate the threat of war and create the basis for a lasting peace and true friendship among all nations. This system would enable the Ukrainian people also to achieve maximum advancement and development. The UPA believes that the acknowledgment of the principle of self-determination for each nation is not only the basis of common struggle and common victory of the peoples enslaved or menaced by Soviet imperialism, but also the foundation for their broadest cooperation in the future.

The Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (UHVR) is the supreme authority of the struggle for Ukraine's liberation, and its political directives inspire the activities of the UPA. In June, 1944, it made the following statement (in one of its proclamations):

We welcome the struggle of other enslaved nations for their liberation. We desire to maintain good neighborly relations and to cooperate with all of them, particularly with our neighbors, on condition that they acknowledge and respect the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people.

The UPA is fighting for the destruction of the totalitarian Soviet regime, for the overthrow of the dictatorship of the clique of Stalin's henchmen and for a progressive order in the Ukrainian state. In its opinion, all other nations should establish a just political and economic order which would correspond with the wishes and interests of the broadest masses of their citizens. Historical experiences of our times show that an unstable political order or economic system is not only harmful to the population of any country where it had been established, but also endangers its peaceful relations with other nations. The result of this development is the predominance of imperialistic cliques, who victimize their own citizens and are a perpetual menace for other countries.

The UPA fights for a Ukrainian state without the exploiters and the exploited, where all citizens will enjoy full civil rights and liberties, where nothing will be done to build up a machinery of oppression, and where all efforts will be directed towards social and economic advancement. Human dignity will be restored and individuals will enjoy all human rights and a high standard of living. The cultural achievements of their own people, as well as those of all civilized mankind, will be accessible to them.

The great slogan—"Freedom for Nations and Individuals"—has become the embodiment of the objectives for which the UPA is fighting.

The tendency toward cooperation with other nations and the attempts to create an active common front of the enslaved nations have been strongly manifested from the very beginnings of the UPA. The UPA represents an uncompromising, revolutionary policy. It observes strictly revolutionary principles and will never stoop to opportunism and profiteering. Carrying on its fight against the Nazi invaders, the UPA bore always in mind the unremitting menace of Soviet imperialism. The UPA had appraised this danger realistically and soundly. It made careful preparations to meet it, but this did not, however, impair the intensity of its struggle against the German occupants. Having the support of the masses, the UPA was able to wage a simultaneous struggle on two fronts. The UPA knew that the real and complete liberation of the people could be achieved

only by the overthrow of both the Nazi and Soviet regimes. This truth was accepted by the Ukrainian people as well as by other nations. At the same time, the UPA advocated the necessity of a common struggle of all nations against the German and Russian imperialists.

The war created conditions that were favorable for the spreading of these ideas. Above all, it opened greater possibilities for direct contact with various nations. Ukraine became a theater of merciless military operations where various national contingents were concentrated. They were pressed into service in the German Army through the madness of Hitler, who made these people die for his maniacal plans of world domination. It was among these troops that the UPA launched its educational-political activity.

A particularly intense campaign was started by the UPA among German allies—Italians, Hungarians, and Rumanians—as well as among the French, Belgian, Yugoslav, and Czech citizens, who were pressed into the German army or labor detachments. These people gladly read insurgent leaflets, from which they could learn the truth about the reactionary policy of Hitler and their own Quisling governments and acquaint themselves with military and political situations all over the world. These bold and inspiring messages were also convincing. They strengthened their morale and confirmed their belief that Hitler's tyranny would be ultimately overthrown.

This informational campaign culminated in an appeal to all these peoples to engage in an active struggle against the Nazis, disobey the orders of their military authorities, turn their arms against the Germans, join the UPA and assist it by every means. The responses to these appeals were numerous; there were cases of these soldiers' refusing to fight the UPA or surrendering when forced to fight. Some delivered up their weapons, uniforms, equipment and material. Many patriots—Italians, Serbs, Czechs, and others—deserted the German army or labor formations, joined the UPA and put at its disposal not only their abilities, skills and knowledge, but also their lives. This friendly attitude toward the UPA on the part of the German allies was a general phenomenon. Thus, for example, the German Command was forced in 1943

to withdraw all Hungarian units assigned to fight the UPA in Volhynia because of their friendly attitude toward the insurgents.

In addition, the UPA informed these soldiers about the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people. This fight strengthened their morale and incited them to oppose actively the forces of German imperialism.

The Italians, Rumanians, Hungarians, French, Belgians, Serbs, Croats, Czechs, and members of other national contingents were constantly confronted during their sojourn in Ukraine with the evidence of the deeds of the Soviet regime. The UPA exploited this fact to show them the true facts of Soviet imperialism. It realized that Nazi Germany would be superseded after her inevitable defeat by the imperialistic USSR and that this development would bring forth a direct danger to the independence of the Rumanians, Hungarians and other peoples. It was obvious that they would only change their oppressors and that all nations would face the problem of Communist fifth-columnists in their midst. The UPA realized that these nations would once more have to fight Soviet imperialism in the ranks of their own armies of national liberation, and not as Nazi mercenaries. Consequently, the UPA helped the Italian, Rumanian, Hungarian, French, Dutch, and Yugoslav workers and farmers in uniforms and overalls to realize that the USSR is an empire where all nations are ruthlessly enslaved, where democracy is suppressed and all basic human rights violated, where workers and farmers are ruthlessly exploited by a new class of Communist overlords, where terror, violence and lawlessness rule. The UPA made them realize that Soviet imperialism constitutes a mortal danger for all freedom-loving nations of the world.

Thus, at the very beginning of its existence, the UPA laid the foundations for a common struggle of all European nations against the Bolshevik imperialism, i.e., for a policy which is more imperative today than ever before. The UPA mainly paid attention to the so-called "national battalions" of the German army that were composed of Byelorussians, Georgians, Tartars, Uzbeks, Azerbaijania, Armenians, Tadzhiks, Turks, Kazakhs, and other peoples. They were former

Red army soldiers who were taken prisoner by the Germans and joined the "national battalions," either driven to despair by hunger and the unbearable conditions in the POW camps, or because of their ignorance. These peoples who had heroically opposed their first oppressor, Czarist imperialism, have never ceased to fight against its successor—Bolshevik imperialism. It was the Soviet aggressors who had destroyed their independent states, built upon the ruins of the Czarist empire, suppressed their national liberation movements, enslaved their peoples, and turned their countries into mercilessly exploited colonies. Some of them believed it possible to liberate their countries by fighting in the ranks of the German army. This reasoning was, of course, completely wrong and the UPA launched an intensive informational action to show these peoples that these ideas were misleading and deceptive. The UPA made them realize that the Nazis did not intend to liberate them, but, on the contrary, were attempting to subject them to their arbitrary domination in the same way as were the Soviet imperialists. Therefore, the UPA appealed to them to stop fighting for Hitler's empire and serving as Nazi tools in the fight against the European nations enslaved by Germany. It is true that in the "national battalions" there were also some outspoken Nazi hirelings, bandits and secret Soviet agents; however, a great number of those soldiers were honest people and to these the UPA appealed—to desert the German service, join the UPA, and engage in the struggle against Nazi and Soviet imperialists, the enemies of democracy and progress and the worst foes of freedom-loving peoples.

We shall quote some examples of the numerous leaflets distributed by the UPA in large quantities among the soldiers of the "national battalions."

Georgians:

.....When the war between Germany and Russia broke out, you did not desire to protect the Soviet Union, that new prison of nations. Some of you joined the national units within the German army. Thus you strove to help defeat your worst foe—Russian imperialism.

However, your hopes were not fulfilled. The Germans, as everybody knows, have launched in the territories occupied by them a policy of enslavement, plun-

der and physical extermination.

Georgians! Cease dying for the German plunderers and Russian imperialists! The Ukrainian nation appeals to you to engage in a common struggle against our common enemies. Join the Ukrainian insurgents, from your national units. (From the leaflet in Russian, "Georgians," September, 1943.)

Sons of Turkmenistan:

.....The Germans needed you as cannon fodder for their imperialistic conquests. The Germans, like the Soviets, bring our nations slavery and physical extermination. As proof of this are the German doings in Ukraine.

Turkmen! Desert the German conquerors. Join with arms in your hands the Ukrainian insurgent units who are fighting both German and Russian imperialists. (From the leaflet in Russian, "Sons of Turkmenistan," September, 1943.)

The appeals of the UPA met with a favorable response among the soldiers of the "national battalions." They understood the significance of the struggle being waged by the Ukrainian people, who were also enslaved by the Soviet regime. Soon, they became convinced that their proper place was in the ranks of the UPA, in the common fight against German and Russian imperialists.

Soldiers of "national battalions" responded to the appeals of the UPA and began to come over, first individually, later in the mass. Within the UPA were formed national units of the Georgians, Armenians, Uzbeks, Azerbaijanis, Tartars, and other nationalities of the USSR.

This was a great achievement in the common struggle against the most terrible enemies of mankind—the German and Soviet imperialists. Thus, the foundations for a true international friendship were laid and the common front of the enslaved nations came into being. It was based not only on the necessity to fight a common foe, but also on mutual respect, confidence and the acknowledgment of the principle of self-determination.

The national units within the UPA grew quickly. This was at least partly due to the frequent appeals of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army.

Circassians, Kabardines, Ossets, Chechens, Adighs, Lezghians, Ingushes!

Sons of the mountains! Stop being blind tools in the hands of German imperialism! Remember the legacy of your proud ancestors, who fell for the freedom of the Caucasus! The Ukrainian nation appeals to you to engage in the common struggle against your unremitting oppressors. Let us build a powerful front against the enslavement of mankind!

With arms in your hands, join the national units with the Ukrainian Insurgent Army... Prepare your forces for an all-out revolution against the Russian Bolshevik tyranny! We are united in our common struggle under the slogans "Freedom for Nations—Freedom for Individuals." (From the leaflet in Russian bearing the above title, November, 1943.)

Azerbaijanis: Only the united efforts of all subjugated nations can overthrow the imperialistic plunderers of Moscow and Berlin and establish independent states in the Caucasus and Asia.

We appeal to you to strengthen the ranks of your national units within the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. (From the leaflet in Russian, "Azerbaijanis," November, 1943.)

When the Nazis were rolled back from Ukraine and when it became obvious that Germany would lose the war, the UPA warned the soldiers of "national battalions" not to retreat with German imperialists and not to throw in their lot with them. Instead, it appealed to them to join the insurgents and prepare for the common struggle against Kremlin imperialists. Here is one example:

Uzbeks! The forces of German imperialism facing their doom try to entice you within the old German borders.

All enslaved European nations are engaged in a struggle against the Nazi monster. The Germans deserted by their allies are retreating to Europe. Bloody Bolshevism is taking over the Ukrainian territories. Do not retreat with the German forces! National units of eastern peoples are being formed within the Ukrainian Insurgent Army.

Uzbeks! Join the Ukrainian insurgent forces with arms in your hands! Let us unite our strength to deal a

mortal blow at Russian imperialists!

(From the leaflet in Russian, "Uzbek Askars," December, 1943.)

In fact, many soldiers of the national battalions, being true patriots of their countries, responded to this insurgent call of warning and joined their national units attached to the UPA to fight in their ranks against the Soviet imperialists.

It must be also pointed out that the UPA accomplished a great deal toward the enlightenment of Red partisans, especially those who were opposed to every kind of oppression and slavery and who sincerely desired the liberation of all nations and the well-being of the working masses. The Red guerrilla movement was organized by Soviet emissaries, who exploited the hardships suffered by the population of German-occupied territories and pressed many of the disappointed into their own partisan units, often by fraud and violence. These units consisted largely of paratroopers dropped behind the battle line and operating in some parts of Ukraine, especially in forest areas adjoining the Byelorussian territory. Time and again they undertook both large-scale operations and minor attacks against the Germans. The UPA exposed to them the objectives of Stalin's policy and convinced them that his criminal designs aimed at extermination of the revolutionary liberating movement of the Ukrainian nation in order to pave his way for ultimate world domination. The UPA pointed out to them that their political leaders and military commanders, instead of fighting the Germans, incited Red partisans against the insurgents and terrorized the Ukrainian population, knowing that it was the mainstay of the UPA. The UPA also informed Red partisans what their reward would be should Stalin prevail over Hitler and warned them not to be lulled by the hope of internal changes in the USSR, which were promised liberally by Soviet political commissars. The UPA made them realize that the destruction of German and Russian imperialism was a necessary condition for a free and happy life of the enslaved peoples.

In October, 1943, the Supreme Headquarters of the UPA directed this appeal to the Red partisans (quoted in part):

Red Partisans:

You were right to enter the fight against the German invaders. Nobody can sit idly by contemplating the picture of what is going on in Ukraine and other German-occupied countries. To fight actively against the Nazi barbarians is the sacred duty of every honest person.

But, while destroying the existing evil, we have to think about a better order for the future. What kind of order do you think should replace the German slavery? Should Hitler's "New Europe" be replaced by the Bolshevik USSR?

No! We are not fighting for such a change, we do not desire this order in Ukraine and in the world since both the German and Soviet imperialists are mortal enemies of our peoples.

Red Partisans! Extend your battle front and, after exterminating the German usurpers, direct your arms against the Kremlin henchmen and their agents! Drive away the political commissars and commanders delegated by Moscow! Take the road of progress to a great future! Unite with the enslaved nations against the oppressors for a happy future and for a new order established by free nations in their independent states!

Thus the UPA clearly showed the enslaved nations of the USSR, the soldiers of the "national battalions" and Red partisans, whom they had to follow and how they were to fight for their liberation. The heroic struggle of the UPA and its great achievements have drawn to its ranks members of all nations oppressed by Soviet imperialism. The fight of the national units of the peoples of the USSR along with the UPA is a separate, vast chapter and does not come within the scope of this chapter. We shall limit ourselves to mention of a few facts.

On June 25, 1943, after a three-day battle, a UPA detachment routed Soviet partisan marauders in the neighborhood of Teremno (Volhynia). In this engagement a Georgian unit distinguished itself. (From a UPA battle report, August 1, 1943.)

In August, 1943, an UPA detachment, consisting of Uzbeks, Georgians and Russians, killed 60 Germans in an engagement in the Mlynivka region (province of Rivne). (From

a press release of the UPA newspaper "To Arms," August, 1943.)

On April 29, 1944, national units under Comm. Yastrub participated and distinguished themselves in a big battle of UPA forces with an NKVD battalion near the village of Zaliznycia (district of Kremianets). The enemy's losses were 240 killed. (From a battle report by Comm. Yasen.)

The informational work among the USSR nations and their common struggle in the ranks of the UPA soon brought important results. The First Conference of Subjugated Nations of Eastern Europe and Asia was summoned on the UPA's initiative and took place on November 23-26, 1943, on the territory which the insurgent forces had wiped clean of German troops. In this conference, which had historical importance, there participated besides the Ukrainian delegation, representatives of eleven other peoples, the Azerbaijanis, Bashkirs, Byelorussians, Georgians, Kabardines, Kazakhs, Ossets, Tartars, Circassians, Chuwasches, and Uzbeks. They represented the true desire of their nations to fight against the German and Soviet oppressors for their national and social liberation, for the right to lead a free life in their own independent states in close friendship with all other peoples. The conference worked out a series of political resolutions and solved some questions of organization aimed at strengthening and extending the common struggle of the subjugated nations of the USSR. The conference also issued a proclamation to all enslaved nations of Eastern Europe and Asia, in which the political situation of the subjugated peoples was explained and the prospects and tasks that loomed ahead were discussed.

An extract from this proclamation follows:

The end of this war will not solve the present difficult situation by itself. To achieve this purpose it is necessary to overthrow the whole existing political system, to destroy the imperialistic clique and to build up a new order in Eastern Europe and Asia. This new order will exclude the possibility of enslavement of one nation by another. It will exclude every kind of imperialism and will guarantee the free development of all peoples. This order must be based on a system wherein each nation will establish its own independent state on its ethnic

territory. This order can be realized only by a national revolution, by a merciless struggle against the imperialistic ruling cliques.

In a fight against the common foe—the Soviet and Nazi imperialists—a united front of all eastern peoples is indispensable. The victory of national revolution cannot be won without mass enthusiasm. The subjugated nations of the East have taken the road of this sacred struggle. They have achieved important results. . . . Our fight against the imperialists is being waged in full solidarity with the nations of Western Europe. . . . Thus, the struggle is spreading all over Europe and the whole territory of the Soviet empire, attracting all subjugated nations as well as Russian and German peoples, oppressed by their own imperialistic cliques. Millions of Red army soldiers scattered throughout Europe and Asia, in trenches, in the rear and in German captivity, millions of workers in war plants and collective farms, slave laborers in Germany and Siberia—they all form the great revolutionary army of the East. They will be the instrument of our final victory.

No wonder that the existence of the national units in the UPA and the achievements of the conference of the subjugated nations caused concern to both Nazi and Soviet imperialists. They raged at the very thought that the subjugated peoples would no longer die for their schemes of conquest, that these nations had found the right road—the road of the common struggle against slavery, tyranny, and totalitarianism of both Fascist and Bolshevik varieties. The common fight of the Ukrainian people and other USSR nationalities caused special concern to the Soviet oligarchy, who had claimed to represent the enslaved nations and had declared to the rest of the world that the nationality problem was solved most fully and in the best way by their regime; that all USSR nations were living freely and enjoying equal rights. However, the fight of the UPA and the national units attached to it, as well as the Conference of the Subjugated Nations, constituted a forceful denial of these lies. The wily schemes of the Soviet imperialists were now unmasked. The Kremlin resorted to new tricks; it started a campaign of defamation against the UPA and intensified the activity of its secret agents to undermine from within the common struggle

of the subjugated nations. However, these NKVD schemes were detected and completely defeated. The attempts to destroy or at least weaken the UPA with the assistance of Red guerrilla warfare failed. The Red partisans in the territory under UPA control were completely exterminated. And the national units of subjugated nations attached to the UPA played an active part in these operations.

The rule of the Nazi invaders in Ukraine was supplanted by that of the Soviets. However, the UPA was used to their tactics and met the old oppressors in an open fight. At the same time the UPA came into contact with Red Army men, millions of whom were simple workers, farmers, or intellectuals of many national origins who had been pressed into the Red Army and terrorized by harsh discipline.

While they fought the German invaders, their hatred of the Soviet regime remained unabated. On their westward march, they saw with their own eyes what the Nazi "new order" had brought to the occupied territories; they also knew from their own experience the "blessings" of the Soviet system; therefore, the ideals of the UPA, its struggle against German and Soviet imperialists and its objectives—the complete overthrow of both totalitarian systems and liberation of all enslaved nations—became extremely popular with them. These ideas expressed their own conscious or subconscious desires.

It goes without saying that the war enabled the Red Army soldiers to see and learn much and helped them to understand better the criminal nature of the Soviet system. These men, accustomed to the hardships of front-line warfare, have also learned to be bolder and less submissive.

It was to these Red Army men of various national origins that the UPA directed its main attention. (This chapter does not deal with the work of the UPA among Ukrainians in the Red Army.)

The Kremlin slave masters fully realized that the ideas of the UPA were extremely dangerous to them. Taking advantage of their monopoly of propaganda services, in different ways they misled and deceived the Red army masses. Thus, for example, Kalinin taught his agitators how to deal with Red army men of non-Russian nationalities, as follows:

To a soldier—either Georgian, or Kazekh, or Uzbek—who does not fight well or shows negligence, the agitator should talk like this:

“Do you really want us not to take part in this war while all other peoples are fighting like lions? How is it possible to keep out of this war?”

If soldiers tell you: “Why are you talking to us like this and scolding us?”, then you can reply: “I, too, am an Uzbek (or a Kazakh), and I love our people no less than you do, and, therefore, I am talking like this.” (From the “Handbook of the Agitator,” 1943.)

When these agitators arrived in Ukraine, they launched a campaign of lies and slander directed against the UPA and the Ukrainian liberation movement. Those bloodsuckers and hangmen of millions of human beings cynically maintained that the UPA was against the people, that it murdered Red Army men and that it did not fight the Germans. These shameless lies were spread by Soviet propagandists to thwart the fraternization between the Red army soldiers and the insurgents and to prevent the revolutionary UPA ideas from reaching the Red Army men.

However, even this mendacious propaganda and the seemingly insurmountable barriers that separated the Red Army men from the population were unable to hide the truth about the UPA from them. The truth infiltrated by countless different channels into Red army ranks. It roused the hatred of the Red soldiers toward the Soviet regime, opened their eyes and converted them.

The Party (and NKVD watchdogs in the army) could not prevent the Red Army men from talking to the people. No regulations could prevent it. The people talked about the German crimes, described the atrocities of the Gestapo, and could not help mentioning the men who stayed all the time at their posts, who defended them from terroristic attacks and from deportations to Germany; they told about their insurgent army, about their partisan heroes. The Red Army men were informed that the UPA fought against both Nazi and Soviet occupants. The Red Army soldiers, who had seen and experienced all Soviet crimes, came to the conclusion that the UPA's fight against German and Soviet imperialism

was right and that it offered the only way out for the enslaved nations of the USSR.

From the "newly liberated" territories there came men who were forcibly drafted for military service. They, too, ignored the threats of Soviet secret agents and told the soldiers the truth about the Ukrainian revolutionary-liberating movement and about the fight of the UPA. The belief in the justice of this struggle grew among the Red Army men.

In addition, all along the routes to the front on which Red Army soldiers were advancing, they were greeted by thousands of insurgent leaflets and appeals, attached to roadside trees, telephone poles, bridge railings, and walls of buildings. At night, unknown hands scattered them around. Here are extracts from some of them:

Red Army Men:

Only by an all-out national revolution shall we destroy the prisons of nations created by Hitler and Stalin. Only by revolutions shall we terminate the bloody imperialistic war and establish a new order and a lasting peace.

Red army men! Do not act against the people! Do not fight the UPA that is waging a struggle against our common enslavers—the Nazi and Soviet occupants. Join the insurgent units! Long live peace and friendship among nations!

Red army men! Protect the lives and property of your families and yourselves! Fight against the foes of mankind—the Nazi and Soviet warmongers! Death to Hitler and Stalin! Freedom for nations and individuals! (From UPA leaflets to Red Army men.)

Special NKVD units, assigned to collect and destroy these leaflets and posters, were unable to carry out their task. The threats of the NKVD (and summary executions of persons on whose premises leaflets were found) were of no avail. People did not destroy the leaflets and posters. Singly or in groups they persistently read them, and each word remained imprinted in their hearts. The Red Army men were careful to hide the leaflets and pass them on among their friends, despite NKVD persecution.

Here are some extracts from the UPA leaflets distrib-

uted among the Red army units during their westward march:

Red Army Men:

Hitler and Stalin desire to dominate the globe, they want to enslave all nations. Nazi and Soviet imperialists have long prepared for war. For many years they have expanded their war industry and produced mass destruction weapons at the cost of the destitution and suffering of the civilian population. By the Russo-German Treaty, the Kremlin imperialists supplied the German army with bread and coal and other raw materials. Thus the Nazis were able to subdue the nations of Western and Central Europe. . .

Red army men! The war has entered a critical stage. The subjugated nations have united to destroy the German prison of nations—the so-called “New Europe”—as well as the Bolshevik USSR. The Ukrainian people also belong to this great revolutionary front. This fight is organized and directed by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. National units of subjugated peoples of Europe and Asia are fighting in the ranks of the UPA for the annihilation of German and Soviet slavery, for a just peace, for independence of free nations. . .

Unite with the people, choose the path of revolution! A general uprising of all enslaved nations shall overthrow this prison of peoples and destroy all hangmen and warmongers. (From the leaflet in Russian, “Red Army Men,” December, 1943.)

Red Army Men and Officers:

Ukrainian insurgents do not fight against the sons of the working people or against the forcibly mobilized Red army men and officers. They destroy only the Soviet terroristic apparatus—the NKVD, party bosses, Red governors, town mayors and other Soviet henchmen.

(From the leaflet in Russian, “Red Army Men and Officers,” January, 1944.)

Never before had anyone used such language to Red Army men. No one had ever put before them with such clarity the truth which some of them had surmised and others felt. They had been blindfolded for many years by Stalin's

propaganda masters and no one had ever opened their eyes to the truth. No one had ever appealed to their feelings and convictions with such forceful effect.

The UPA spoke to them in the language they understood and proved its statements by facts familiar to everybody. It convinced them by its foresight, inspired them by the spirit of its revolutionary struggle and the progressiveness of its principles. It gained their confidence and strengthened their faith. The Red Army men, who were drawn from almost all the national groups of the USSR, began to understand clearly that there was a striking resemblance between the Nazi and the Soviet imperialists, that both of them strove to dominate other nations and to exploit them. They learned that the UPA was fighting against both German and Soviet imperialism, that it was protecting popular interests and struggling for the liberation of all subjugated nations of the USSR. The Red Army men embraced wholeheartedly this realistic and sound program. As a matter of fact, these oppressed and misled people saw the just solution of the nationality problem in the ideals proclaimed by the UPA, in the complete liberation of all peoples and the establishment of free and independent national states. Having experienced the terror of social exploitation and suppression of man's liberties, they were enthusiastic about the progressive program of the UPA. In short, the UPA's great slogan, "Freedom for Nations—Freedom for Individuals," was accepted by Red Army men of all national origins with deep understanding and emotion.

During the war, bankrupt Soviet overlords, looking for a new foothold for their imperialism, resorted to encouraging Russian chauvinism. These tactics were particularly evident in the army. Taking this into consideration, the UPA addressed, in November, 1943, the Red Army men of Russian origin in a leaflet. It contained a concise statement of the UPA's objectives and analyzed the relations between the Ukrainians and the Russians. Here are some extracts:

The Ukrainian people do not consider the Soviets as their liberators. They regard them as their enemies, covering their designs by phrases such as "friendship," "Liberty," "Happiness"... That is why the Ukrainian

people fight for a complete separation from the Soviet Union. They appeal to all peoples of the USSR to accept the principle of independent national states and to inaugurate a policy of mutual friendship and cooperation. They also wish to be on friendly terms with the Russian people, provided that they destroy the Soviet yoke and establish their own state on their own ethnic territory. However, we will never consent to the Soviet Russian occupation of our country or to its political and national enslavement under the disguise of "liberation."

Comrades, Red army men and officers! We appeal to you to support us in our fight for an independent Ukraine. Do not fight us! Disobey your commissars when they incite you against Ukrainian insurgents! (From the leaflet in Russian, "Comrades, Russians, Red Army Men and Officers.")

After the end of the war, the Soviet overlords celebrated their victory over their Nazi competitors. However, this victory, won at the cost of immeasurable suffering, losses and human sacrifices of all nations of the USSR, did not bring any benefits, changes, or improvements for the peoples of the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the regime of national suppression and social exploitation was even intensified. An uneasy question presented itself to all Red Army men: What did they fight for, did any change come with the overthrow of Hitler? The UPA tried to answer these questions for them. An example of such attempts is a UPA proclamation to Red Army men in 1945:

In spite of the overthrow of Hitler, oppression, exploitation of the working masses and terror are continuing. Your fight for the victory of justice has not yet ended. You shall terminate it only when you overthrow the dictatorial and terroristic exploitation system established by the worst foes of our peoples—the government of Stalin and his clique.

Let us undermine the Soviet system from within. . . Annihilate the people's enemies—the loyal hirelings of Soviet imperialism! Organize underground political resistance and armed revolutionary struggle under the slogan "Freedom for Nations—Freedom for Individuals!"

Do not help Stalin's henchmen to fight the existing national resistance movements of subjugated nations!

Do not assist Soviet hirelings in their struggle against the revolutionary organizations of the Ukrainian nation!

(From the leaflet "Soldiers and Officers of Red Army, Conquerors of Hitlerite Germany.")

The UPA was the force that aroused not only its own people, but also all other enslaved nations of the USSR to a sustained struggle, paying no heed to the fact that the Soviet imperialists were victorious. Continuing with unabated energy its fight against the Soviets, the UPA has proven that such a struggle is possible, just and purposeful, since it aimed at the destruction of the Bolshevik dictatorial system of enslavement and social exploitation and promises full national and social liberation to all peoples of the USSR.

To popularize its idea about the necessity of a continued struggle for the overthrow of the Soviet regime, the UPA took advantage of large-scale movements of Red troops in July-August, 1945. Revolutionary appeals and leaflets were distributed in large quantities in towns and villages and read by great numbers of Red Army men.

First of all, it informed the Red Army men about the true objectives of the fighting Ukrainian nation and influenced them to take a decidedly sympathetic attitude toward the insurgents. There were numerous instances of Red Army men passing on insurgent propaganda, disobeying the orders of their authorities, and refusing to fight the UPA. We mention here only one particularly striking case illustrating the effects of insurgent informational action.

On July 28, 1946, the NKVD carried out a big roundup action in the wooded area of "Yablinka" and the villages of Nanchivka, Tykha, and Voloshynova (district, Strilky, province Drohobych). The insurgents, dispersed by the superior enemy, were retreating through the village of Nanchivka in the direction of the forest Steletz Maly. Here, they were stopped by a medium tank. It opened fire with a machine gun that soon jammed. The insurgents availed themselves of this opportunity and headed for the forest. However, a Red cavalry detachment approached from the same direction. The NKVD troopers expected the horsemen to attack the insurgents, but nothing of the kind happened. The Red cavalry-

men passed the insurgents in a friendly way, without firing a shot. When the NKVD asked the horsemen for an explanation of their behavior, their answer was, "We won't shoot at the insurgents."

Secondly, the political work of the UPA contributed to the fact that Red Army men had made the liberation struggle popular all over the USSR. This news reached even the remotest parts of the country. It is no wonder that our struggle and our ideas have met with sympathy and understanding on the part of all enslaved nations. Today, they are well known in every nook and cranny of the Soviet Union.

Thirdly, the UPA propaganda created a substantial revolutionary consciousness among Red Army men. It also brought about a deeper understanding of the necessity to carry on the revolutionary struggle against Soviet imperialism. Red Army men openly began to voice their dissatisfaction with the Soviet system. This attitude was manifested not by single individuals, but by the mass of the soldiers. They came to realize that the only possible solution to their troubles was the complete overthrow of the Soviet regime. Now active manifestations of this feeling began to occur. Red Army men attacked and killed party members, NKVD agents, or hated officers and took up a protective attitude toward the population. Thus, for example, as a result of an armed clash between NKVD troopers and Red Army men in the town of Burshtyn (province of Stanyslaviv) on May 9, 1946, both sides lost ten men each. On November 26, 1945, Red soldiers stationed at Zboiska (near Lviv) killed their much disliked officer. On November 29, 1945, Red Army men killed three NKVD lieutenants on the 1st of May Street in Lviv. On November 21, 1945, two Red soldiers got out of a car near a distillery on Zhovkivska Street in Lviv, killed a party member, and departed. Such incidents occurred daily.

It was not by accident that Major General Novikov, a member of the Military Council of the Sub-Carpathian Military District, stressed in one of his speeches that the "revolutionary vigilance" in the army was still unsatisfactory. "We must always remember," he declared, "that our district lies on the border and that our military units are

stationed in Western Ukraine, where German-Ukrainian imperialists (i.e. Ukrainian insurgements) still are active.” (Quoted from *Stalinskoe Plemia*, the organ of the Sub-Carpathian district, August 21, 1945.)

The above facts help us to understand the uncontrollable rage of the Soviet imperialists. The growing brutality and barbarity of their fighting methods and the flow of mendacious propaganda aiming at disgracing and defaming our struggle prove that they are attempting to destroy and annihilate the insurgent army at any price. Nevertheless, we can say confidently that Soviet imperialism is unable to suppress or discredit our movement. The truth is spreading all over the USSR. All peoples of the Soviet Union realize the significance of our struggle and admire its greatness.

The Ukrainian insurgents have also accomplished important political work among some of the neighboring nations, notably among the Poles, who have been in contact with the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement since the beginnings of the UPA. This contact has become particularly close recently, after both peoples had lost their freedom.

We emphasize that we do not intend to deal with the Ukrainian-Polish problem as a whole. We would like to state, however, that Ukrainian-Polish relations were far from cordial and did not correspond with the vital interests of both nations. We are stressing this fact to illustrate the present changes in these relations and to show the part the UPA played in bringing them about.

The tragic memories of the past, the memories of hatred and continued enmity, prevented the two peoples from seeing eye to eye. Even during the difficult period of German occupation, when both nations were oppressed, no attempts were made to improve relations between them. Polish imperialistic circles have poisoned the soul of their people with chauvinism. The people could not get rid of it, or shake off its evil influences and change their ways of thinking and acting. The UPA, however, persisted in its attempts to convince the Polish population that it was essential to establish mutual friendly relations and bring about an active cooperation between the two nations. At first these approaches found little response. It was only the impending danger of

Soviet imperialism that prompted at least some Polish circles to think more realistically and soundly. Unfortunately, this attitude was not shared by many of their compatriots.

Following their shortsighted leaders, many Poles at first looked upon the Soviets as their liberators and not as imperialists and enemies of both the Ukrainians and Polish peoples. Some Poles cooperated with the Soviets in their fight against the Ukrainian national liberating movement and played an active part in the deportation of Ukrainians from the territories west of the Curzon Line. This infamous action served only the imperialist purposes of Stalin and his clique. Stalin's agents in Poland shrewdly fanned the passions of the Polish masses and incited them against the Ukrainians. Some Polish leaders adhered to this catastrophic policy and were followed by a part of their compatriots. They did not realize that they were merely tools in the hands of their Soviet masters.

However, even under these unfavorable circumstances, the UPA continued to follow the directives and principles of the UHVR and persisted in its efforts to show the Polish people how they could profit from the experience gained by the Ukrainians throughout the years of their sufferings under the Bolshevik yoke. It made them realize that:

- 1) The Soviet imperialists were preparing for the Polish people the same type of enslavement they had imposed on the Ukrainian people;

- 2) To ensure the success of their struggle against their oppressors, the Polish people must abandon the imperialistic and chauvinistic schemes of their leaders and cooperate with other nations, especially their neighbors—the Ukrainian people;

- 3) The Polish nation must discard all half-hearted "parliamentary" methods of fighting as unfit for the anti-Bolshevik struggle and choose the path of revolution.

In order to popularize these ideas, UPA units conducted many meetings with the Poles and distributed a vast amount of proclamations, leaflets, pamphlets, etc. It also sent personal letters dealing with these problems to some leading Polish citizens.

In one of the pamphlets printed in Polish we read:

Russia's deep penetration into Europe is without historical precedent. The Russian imperialists prepare for further conquests and will stop at nothing. The people, who are in their grasp, have but two alternatives, either to kill the Bolshevik monster or to perish in its embrace. No stratagems, no compromises can avert this deadly peril.

For each people (subjugated by the Soviets) there is only one road that leads toward freedom and life—that of anti-Bolshevik struggle. . . The Poles, too, will soon realize this self-evident truth.

(Zenon Savchenko, "Polish-Ukrainian Relations," p. 26.)

Every Pole should realize that the fate of Poland and of future Polish generations will be decided in the struggle against the Bolshevik oppressors. Every Polish man and woman should remember this fact and act accordingly.

The hopes that conferences, elections or pressures of Western powers might reestablish Polish sovereignty without Poles fighting for it will bring bitter disappointment. As long as Stalin's might remains unimpaired, he will not leave the Polish territory and will always find an excuse to keep the Polish people under his yoke.

(*Ibid.*, p. 34.)

Thus, the independence of Poland can be reestablished and preserved only through close cooperation between the Polish people and its Ukrainian and other neighbors. . . We do not want to live in a state of continuous enmity with the Polish nation; on the contrary, we desire to wage a common struggle against our mutual oppressors and establish good-neighborly relations after our final victory.

(*Ibid.*, p. 36.)

Warning the Polish people that their nonrevolutionary tactics were harmful and frustrating, the Ukrainian insurgents wrote in one of their innumerable leaflets as follows:

Poles, Underground Army, Fighters, Leaders of Anti-Bolshevik Parties, Intellectuals:

In your hands lies the future of your people. Do not tell your compatriots half-truths, because thus you are merely adding to the prevalent chaos and disorienta-

tion. Do not apply opportunist tactics since thus you are helping the enemy to demoralize your ranks and make it easy for the NKVD and UBP to destroy you. Speak up! Remember that your silence enables Moscow to delude your people and yourselves. Do not rely upon some magic outside forces or formulas, such as the conflict between West and East. It probably will not come in the near future—so your people have to work and fight. Tell them that they are enslaved, tell them what is in store for them if they refuse to fight. Unmask all base and sly schemes of Moscow and its agents. Tell the people why and against whom they should fight. Tell them that freedom and life can be won only through the complete destruction of the Soviet Russian empire, that their fate will be decided by the common fight of all enslaved nations. Frustrate all designs of the agents of the Kremlin! The struggle to come will separate all honest and loyal citizens from Bolsheviks and their fellow travellers. Don't be afraid of sacrifices; if you refuse to fight, your sacrifices will be even greater—and yet they will not avail you.

(From the leaflet, "Poles," October, 1946.)

The above quotations show how convincing and sagacious were the appeals of the UPA. They were supported by the whole activity of the Ukrainian insurgents, who have shown in word and deed that they strive for a cordial cooperation with the Polish people. Besides, life itself convinced the Polish population that it was necessary to wage an active struggle against the Soviets and to cooperate closely with the Ukrainian people and other enslaved nations.

These facts contributed to a marked improvement in Ukrainian-Polish relations in 1945 and 1946. Some Polish leaders and certain political factions expressed in their letters to the UPA their desire for cooperation with the Ukrainian people, congratulated the insurgents on their achievements, and condemned the crimes committed by some irresponsible elements of the Polish population. These views were also manifested in the talks of Polish representatives with the insurgents, at meetings and special conferences, and in various other ways. Polish peasants adopted a friendly attitude toward the insurgents. They were received as welcome guests and given all possible assistance.

In December, 1945, the UPA recorded in its appeals directed to the Polish population the positive fact that an improvement in Ukrainian-Polish relations had taken place. One leaflet read in part:

In the course of the summer, autumn and the beginning of the winter of 1945, there occurred many events which proved that the majority of the Polish people have changed their attitude toward the Ukrainian people. There were also some outward signs of an extensive cooperation between the two peoples in their struggle against their common foe—the imperialistic Soviet Union.

Wide circles of Polish population have also denounced the forcible deportation of Ukrainians from the territories west of the Curzon Line, recognizing it as a purely Bolshevik design. In several cases the representation of different Polish political factions condemned this anti-Ukrainian terroristic displacement action and assisted the Ukrainian population in escaping its tragic results. In some regions, Polish political organizations issued leaflets in which they appealed to the Polish army, militia and civilian population to stop this action and disobey the orders of Soviet officers who, dressed in Polish uniforms, directed the anti-Ukrainian policy of the puppet government in Warsaw. Polish civilians frequently opposed this terrorist action.

Having mentioned some specific facts, the leaflet went on to state that "the right way has been chosen and that the most important initial steps have been taken which must be continued until our political objectives are achieved." (From the leaflet, "Poles," December, 1945.)

Much could be written about the friendly attitude of the Polish population toward the UPA. However, we shall quote only an extract from the Polish Communist newspaper *Nowe Horyzonty* (New Horizons). It cannot be expected to feel or show sympathy toward the UPA; consequently, its statements are even more significant. We quote from the article "When Will the Gangs Be Destroyed?" by a certain Major E.H.:

A military unit under Col. Popka arrived at Peremyshl towards the end of 1945. . . . It has many tasks, but the

most important of all is the fighting against the "gangs" (thus do official Soviet circles usually refer to the UPA).

Unfortunately, it encountered here a great obstacle, which, I am sorry to say, is the lack of cooperation between the local population and the army.

Having mentioned the UPA raid against Orchivtsi (near Peremyshl) in which, in the author's opinion, some 500 insurgents participated, he exclaims:

Here is the rub! These people had weapons, a competent command directed their operations, they used secret meeting places and secret routes. One actually could not help meeting or seeing them. However, did anybody warn us? No! It is a pity that when our military unit arrived after encountering great difficulties . . . nobody gave us material assistance, nobody was able or willing to give us any information. . .

How is it possible to account for the fact that, in spite of the deportation of so many Ukrainians, the "bandits" still get help in many villages—get guides, scouts, spies, liaison men and couriers?

Why is this assistance denied to the soldiers protecting their countrymen? Why do many honest Poles acquiesce when some of the worst Ukrainian nationalists conceal their identity and pretend to be Polish citizens? Why do they not inform against the Banderaites known to them? The terror of the Ukrainian fascists (which, of course, is an invention of author E.H.) is a poor excuse and cannot justify this passive attitude.

These facts prompted the author to reach the pessimistic conclusion that the UPA units would not be destroyed "without a whole-hearted cooperation between the population and the army, if the Poles continue to work for the gangs, serve them as guides, supply them with food, execute their orders without opposition. . . If they spread rumors and false alarms and conceal information concerning the movements of the gangs, their stores, their underground shelters, etc." (*Nowe Horyzonty*, a weekly for the town and county of Peremyshl, August 4, 1946.)

Such were the complaints of Polish Soviet agents who

had expected that the expulsion of the Ukrainian population would deprive the UPA of its mainstay. Now they had to acknowledge that the Polish people denied them their assistance while giving active support to the insurgents. Evidently, the Polish population knew whom it ought to assist and did not pay attention to Stalin's hirelings.

Special consideration should be given to the work of the UPA among the soldiers of the Polish army, whom the puppet government in Warsaw employed for the execution of its deportation scheme and for the fight against the UPA. The UPA explained to the satisfaction of these soldiers, who were commanded by NKVD officers, that there was no purpose in their dying for Soviet imperialists and the Polish hirelings of Stalin. The Ukrainian insurgents wrote in one of their leaflets (issued in June, 1945) as follows:

Your present rulers order the deportation and expulsion of the Ukrainian population from its homes, and also instruct you to round up your own brothers and Polish patriots.

Polish soldiers! Remember that this way of serving foreign imperialists is dishonest and contemptible and will bring your own doom. Anyone who assists the Russian imperialists is a traitor to his people and a tool of its enslavers.

Soldiers of the Polish Army! Decide whether to side with those who are serving Moscow's interests or with those who are fighting its imperialistic designs in the same way as they opposed Hitler and the German imperialists. . .

Many Poles and Ukrainians, the best patriots of their countries, are united in a common struggle for freedom against Soviet Russian tyranny. You, too, must follow them and abandon the path of shame and treachery.

(From the leaflet in Polish, "To the Polish Army.")

The convincing appeals of the UPA found a sympathetic ear among the Polish soldiers and prompted them to spontaneous riots. Soldiers started to disobey the orders of their officers and frequently laid down their arms when forced to fight the insurgents. Those who surrendered, as a rule, were set free. No countermeasures of the puppet government had

any effect. Soldiers of the Polish army not only took a sympathetic attitude toward the UPA, but also spread its popularity among their compatriots.

The political work of the UPA among the Polish population was conducted with great efforts and persistency. It finally not only brought about a complete change of mood among a great part of Polish civilians and soldiers and popularized the liberation struggle of Ukrainian insurgents all over Poland, but also led to political and military cooperation between the UPA and Polish underground nationalist organizations and their armed units. Thus, the idea of cooperation between enslaved nations and their common struggle against Soviet imperialists promulgated by the UPA attracted the attention of broad masses of the Polish population.

This cooperation was demonstrated by joint Polish-Ukrainian action against mass deportations, by elimination of NKVD bandits and their Polish agents, by liberation of political prisoners and protection of the peaceful Ukrainian and Polish citizenry, by political propaganda campaigns, etc. A striking example of this cooperation was a successful attack of Ukrainian and Polish armed units against the stronghold of Polish-Bolshevik forces in the town of Hrubeshiv on May 27, 1946.

It is understandable that this development should have caused a violent outburst of rage among Soviet agents. All official newspapers showed signs of uneasiness and consternation. Thus, for example, *Echo Krakowa* (The Cracow Echo) published in its September 18, 1946 issue extracts from a report about cooperation between Polish insurgents and UPA, which appeared in Polish newspapers published in London. The article, clamorously entitled, "London Boasts of Cooperation with the UPA," ended with such a conclusion: "This whole report, eagerly seized upon by *Dziennik Zolnierza* [The Daily of the Soldier], not only reveals the existence of underground Polish-Ukrainian cooperation, but also shows that this cooperation is useful for certain circles in London and has their full approval."

This outcry of Soviet imperialist agents revealed that they realized how dangerous the cooperation of the subju-

gated nations might prove for their designs. They were aware of the fact that an understanding between the Ukrainian and Polish peoples and their cooperation with all other nations would put an end to their nefarious schemes and deal a deadly blow at their imperialist policy. This should serve as the best proof of the need of such cooperation to all those who, until now, have failed to recognize it.

In order to strengthen the friendly relations between the Ukrainians and other enslaved peoples, the UPA organized its famous raids into the territories of Ukraine's neighbors. In this way, the UPA spread information about the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian nation and life in the USSR, especially among those people who had not yet experienced the whole measure of Bolshevik terror. These raids stimulated the revolutionary anti-Bolshevik forces of these nations and roused an anti-Soviet attitude among the masses. They also created preliminary conditions for practical cooperation between these nations and helped to build a united anti-Bolshevik front.

These raids took place at periodic intervals. The population of the territories where the UPA units had previously been active received them, as a rule, as welcome guests. Even those who met them for the first time, having heard little or nothing about the UPA except slanderous propaganda, very soon realized who the insurgents really were and respected them as the fighters for a great cause—the destruction of Soviet imperialism.

The population reached this conclusion very quickly. For example, a Byelorussian collective farmer who had suffered grievously during the German occupation from Soviet robber partisans and for whom "partisans" meant "plunderers," on meeting Ukrainian insurgents declared, "You are my men, for you don't loot." The Polish peasants of Pidlasia, the victims of Soviet guerrillas, also told the insurgents, "You are men who do not assault or pilfer the population" (village of Lubin).

The Bolshevik press also distorted reports about the first raid of Ukrainian insurgents into Slovakia in the autumn of 1945. However, the Slovak population received them as welcome guests, realizing that the insurgents were national

liberators and the heralds of a great revolutionary uprising which would destroy the Soviet prison of nations and liberate the enslaved peoples.

This attitude was understandable, if one considers that the struggle of the UPA and its progressive ideas were close to the hearts of all nations enslaved or menaced by Soviet imperialism. On the other hand, this attitude toward the UPA on the part of all subjugated peoples emphasized the vitality of its ideas of international friendship and cooperation, based on a common struggle of all enslaved peoples against the Soviet imperialists.

The NKVD realized the great importance of the UPA raids. It understood that they were an important factor in strengthening the revolutionary consciousness of the subjugated peoples and attempted to stop them at any price. Thus, for example, to keep the UPA units out of Byelorussia, the NKVD stationed strong army units along the Dnieper-Bug Canal. However, the Byelorussian territory was raided constantly, beginning with the autumn of 1944. The Byelorussian population willingly received and housed the Ukrainian insurgents. The news of their exploits traveled like lightning all over Byelorussia.

In January, 1946, the following treaty was signed by NKVD and Czechoslovak representatives:

Strictly Confidential!

Treaty concerning reciprocal border crossings of the international boundaries by USSR and Czechoslovak frontier guards with the purpose of pursuing and liquidating gangs crossing the border.

On January 1, 1946, the undersigned representative of the NKVD frontier units of the Trans-Carpathian Area, Lt. Col. Kontorov for the first party, and the representative of the UBD, Lt. Col. Jan Stanek of the Czechoslovak Army, for the second party, have endorsed the proposition of Lt. Col. Stanek concerning the crossing of international boundaries by frontier army units into the territory of the USSR for the purpose of pursuing and liquidating gangs who are crossing the border.

Both parties have come to the following agreement:

1) The Command of the Soviet frontier forces con-

sents to the proposition of Lt. Col. Stanek as to reciprocal crossing of international boundaries by Soviet and Czechoslovak frontier units for the purpose of pursuing and liquidating gangs. . . .

Further points dealt with various details, such as exchange of signals, passwords, etc. The agreement was signed by Lt. Col. Kontorov and Lt. Col. Stanek.

However, all these measures aiming at forestalling new UPA raids into Slovakia were of no avail. In the spring of 1946, the UPA units made another large-scale raid into Slovakia. They advanced through the districts of Mezylabortsi, Stropkiv, Giraltovtsi, Bardiiv, Prisshiv, Barnov, Sabinov, Humanne, and Mykhaylovtsi, and reached Koshyci. In the leaflets, which were printed in Ukrainian, Slovakian, and Czech and were distributed in large quantities among the local population, the insurgents addressed the Czechs and Slovaks as follows:

Czechs and Slovaks:

Brutal violence, mass persecution of the peaceful population, arrests, executions, deportations to the concentration camps in Siberia and the Arctic, plunder and terror—all are now prevalent all over Ukraine.

Let this be a warning to all nations, who have not yet experienced Bolshevism in action.

Remember that this terrible fate is in store for your nations. The Soviet Russian imperialists are preparing this fate for the rest of Europe. Therefore the foremost duty of all freedom-loving peoples is to set up a common defense and to fight against this new Fascist totalitarian tyranny which is being imposed on the whole world by Russian imperialism.

The Ukrainian people have been the first victims of Russian Fascism. They were also the first to fight against it. . . .

We appeal to you, our brothers and neighbors, to join the struggle for our great and sacred cause.
Soldiers of the Czechoslovak Army!

Remember that we are fighting for the highest and noblest ideals; for liberty, brotherhood and equality among all nations, for national and social liberation and justice for every nation and individual. It was for these ideals that we shed our blood during the years of

struggle against the German occupation. Today, we are continuing our struggle for the same ideals against the Bolshevik invaders:

Therefore, do not take action against the Ukrainian insurgents, do not shoot at us, but rather join and assist us.

(From the leaflet, "Czechs, Slovaks, Soldiers!," April, 1946.)

The raid showed that these insurgent appeals were properly understood and interpreted by the Slovak people. The Slovak soldiers did not fight against the Ukrainian insurgents and even tried to establish friendly contact with them. Thus, for example, a soldier of the Czechoslovak army arrived in Slovakia from Prague in order to join the UPA and fight against the Soviet imperialists, who attempted to enslave his country. In the elections which took place after the raid, the Slovak Communist Party was thoroughly defeated. These facts, as well as the proclamation of martial law in Slovakia and the mass arrests which started after the raid and the elections, testify that the anti-Bolshevik struggle in that country had been intensified. It would contribute to the consolidation of the common front of all nations enslaved or threatened by Russian imperialism.

The relations between the Ukrainian insurgents and the national minorities in Ukraine indicated that the ideas of the UPA enjoyed widespread popularity among all enslaved peoples. One has to remember that these minorities living in different parts of our country had belonged, until recently, to the ruling nations and were used by their imperialistic cliques as a tool of their anti-Ukrainian policy. Intoxicated by chauvinism, they denied the Ukrainian people lawful claims to one or another part of the Ukrainian ethnic territory and very often disputed the Ukrainian right to an independent state. Now this state of affairs changed. The work of the UPA completely altered the attitude of the national minorities toward the Ukrainian people and its liberation struggle. Hatred and strife, artificially fostered by our enemies, disappeared. The national minorities followed the proclamation of the UHVR:

All national minorities living on Ukrainian soil are

hereby called upon to join the Ukrainian liberation struggle. Their civil rights in the Ukrainian state are guaranteed.

(From the proclamation of the UHVR, June, 1944.)

They will enjoy the same rights as the citizens of Ukrainian origin, especially that their national peculiarities and distinctiveness will be respected. They knew that the Ukrainian insurgents were fighting for the elimination of national oppression and, accordingly, treated the UPA with the same amity and confidence as the Ukrainian people. Besides, having experienced directly the terror of the Bolshevik regime, they were aware that the struggle of the UPA facilitates the fight of other nations against their Soviet oppressors. They were aware that the existence of an independent Ukrainian state and the establishment of a just order in the East were also safeguards of the independence of their own people.

The Czechs, many of whom lived in Volhynia, took (during both the German and the Soviet occupations) a sympathetic attitude toward the UPA. They assisted it in numerous ways and suffered the same kind of persecution as the Ukrainians. It is sufficient to mention as an example that on April 22, 1946, Soviet thugs burned down sixteen Czech farms in the village of Sofiyivka (district of Verba, province of Rivne). Evidently, these Czechs differed in their political attitude from some of their compatriots (Gottwald and Co.), who continued to cooperate with Soviet imperialists and helped the Bolshevik agents to enslave their people and prepare the eventual incorporation of Czechoslovakia into the USSR.

Another example will illustrate the attitude of the Hungarian population toward the UPA. In the village of Kobylanska Polana (Carpatho-Ukraine), the insurgents called a meeting of the local Hungarians. The Hungarian audience interrupted the insurgent spokesmen with a storm of applause and expressed their complete approval of the fight of the UPA. The youth became so enthusiastic that, on their own initiative, they destroyed the pictures of Stalin and other Politburo members as well as the Communist catchwords that were displayed in the meeting hall. The relations with the Rumanians were also similar. The Rumanian popu-

lation in Bukovina in the regions adjacent to Carpatho-Ukraine always treated the UPA with great sympathy. The Rumanians assisted the Ukrainian insurgents in many ways. They harbored the wounded, supplied needed information, and furnished expert guides.

We have already mentioned the Poles. Their position as a national minority in Ukraine completely changed since their transplantation to Poland by the Soviet authorities. Those few who remained took a thoroughly positive attitude toward the Ukrainian liberation movement.

These were the political achievements of the UPA in its struggle to unite the revolutionary forces of all nations enslaved or menaced by Soviet imperialism. They were achieved in the course of five years through the many-sided activity and heroic fight of the Ukrainian insurgents. These results are especially imposing if evaluated against the background of conditions against which they were achieved. They were gained in a merciless battle against both Nazi and Soviet imperialists; and the latter, who had come out of the war victorious, threw against the UPA the whole might of their gigantic apparatus of terrorism and oppression. No revolutionary army in the world, no revolutionary nationalist organization, had to fight against such odds as the UPA. The achievements of the UPA constitute the best proof of its strength and vitality which proceeded from its great and progressive ideas. The fact that all nations enslaved or menaced by Soviet imperialism treated the UPA with sympathy and enthusiasm can be explained only by its ideological and political strength, by the power of its political ideas. The fight of the UPA and its slogans were generally understood because they were just and progressive. They symbolized the struggle of progressive ideas against everything that is base and corrupt.

The achievements of the UPA were also a result of its great political experience which ensued from the long liberation struggle of the Ukrainian nation. The UPA had always elucidated the most complicated political problems and situations with an unparalleled accuracy and sagacity. It was with the UPA that the idea of the struggle against both German and Soviet imperialists originated. The UPA showed

that both imperialisms were of the same totalitarian nature and that they were equally dangerous for all freedom-loving nations, for democracy and progress. It was the UPA which first put forward the idea of a common front of all nations enslaved and menaced by Soviet imperialism. It was the first to propagate this idea and made the first attempts to realize it. It also contributed largely to the creation of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), an active member of which is the UPA's commanding authority, the UHVR. There is no doubt that the UPA was distinguished from other anti-Bolshevik forces by its superior and extraordinary qualities—its organization, its thorough knowledge of the internal situation of the USSR and Soviet policies in general, and also by its distinct program for the overthrow of the most atrocious regime in the history of mankind—the Bolshevik prison of nations.

These practical achievements on the road toward the unification of the anti-Bolshevik front of all nations, the intensified anti-Soviet struggle inside the USSR, as well as the growth of anti-Bolshevik sentiments and the realization of the true aims of Russian imperialists outside the boundaries of the Soviet Union are, indeed, very heartening signs. They confirm our belief that the enslaved nations will gain the final victory, that the Soviet "prison of peoples" will be overthrown by their united efforts, and that true liberty, lasting peace, and international friendship will eventually triumph.

Chapter 8

Contribution of the OUN in the Formation and Expansion of the UPA

This year of 1947 the Ukrainian Insurgent Army is observing the fifth anniversary of its founding (October 14). The Ukrainian people are marking this great anniversary with merited pride. Our organization also looks with pride and satisfaction on the path blazed by the UPA, because it was the OUN which contributed substantially toward the creation and expansion of the UPA.

From its very inception, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists concentrated its attention on cultivating in the Ukrainian people the ideal of armed struggle and the glorious traditions of Ukrainian arms, traditions which had been marred by the long enslavement, yet which were reborn and revived during the period of the Ukrainian National Revolution of 1917-1918. For its part, the OUN is cultivating the ideal of armed struggle by waging warfare against individual representatives of the foreign regimes in Ukraine to remind them that Ukrainian arms are not dead and silenced. Both its members as well as the masses of the Ukrainian people are reminded time and again that the ultimate liberation will come as a result of an all-national struggle and through their own arms.

The organization has attained in this field some outstanding successes, as is attested by the memorable events in Carpatho-Ukraine in 1938-1939, the time thousands of young Ukrainians attempted to enter Carpatho-Ukraine to join the autochthonous Ukrainian patriotic youth to defend the young Ukrainian republic which had been established in Carpathe-Ukraine. Despite the strongly-policed political borders hundreds of youth from other parts of Ukraine succeeded in entering Carpatho-Ukraine and joining the budding military formation therein, established at the initiative and with the basic support of the OUN. These formations gave an excellent account of themselves in battles against the Hungarian invaders in March, 1939. In these battles fell two outstanding leaders of the OUN, Zenon Kossak and Col. M. Huzar-Kolodzinsky. At a time when the army equipped with the most modern armaments failed to fire a single shot in defense of its independence, Ukrainian combat formations resisted the invaders and died gallantly in defense of their newly born independence.

Another indication and evidence of the moral preparation of the Ukrainian people for armed warfare is provided by the German-Polish war of 1939. In many localities of Galicia at that time, armed Ukrainian partisan units were organized which engaged in several armed encounters with the Polish occupation troops (actually, these Ukrainian units were formed above all to establish a nucleus of the Ukrainian armed forces which eventually would expand into the large force necessary for the restoration of Ukrainian independence).

Similar Ukrainian partisan groups were established during the Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine in 1939-1941, and at the outbreak of the German-Soviet war in 1941.

When the matter of the creation of the UPA came up for practical realization, the Ukrainian people already were morally prepared for the event. Seeing their only salvation in an armed struggle, they quickly responded to the call of the OUN, which was preparing a fertile psychological ground for the UPA.

From the very beginning of its existence, the OUN stressed the absolute necessity of the military training of its

members. It also tried to collect arms and ammunition and stow them away for future need. This task, under the totalitarian and semi-totalitarian regimes under which the Ukrainian people were forced to live, was an extremely difficult one.

The outbreak of World War II seemed to have changed the situation for the better as far as the Ukrainians were concerned. The OUN secured a great mass of arms and ammunition during the retreat of the Polish army in the German-Polish hostilities in the fall of 1939. In many areas of Western Ukraine—Berezhany, Sokal, Striy, and Polissia—Ukrainian insurgent groups, newly formed by the OUN, disarmed Polish army units and cached away their arms and ammunition, thereby swelling the OUN arsenals considerably.

An even more favorable occasion arose in 1941 during the German-Soviet war. The defeated and hastily retreating Soviet armies left behind in Ukraine huge quantities of arms, ammunition, and other military equipment, most of which fell into the hands of the OUN.

It was these arms of the Polish and Soviet armies which equipped the first units of the UPA. In turn, these arms were used by the UPA to secure still more arms from the German and Soviet troops. When the Germans began their retreat from Ukraine, the OUN launched a slogan: "Every Ukrainian man and woman must obtain arms and military equipment for the UPA." This campaign was very successful. The UPA insurgents secured great quantities of arms and other material from the retreating German troops as well as from their allies—the Hungarians, Rumanians, and Slovaks. These arms have made it possible for the UPA and the OUN to wage armed warfare to this very day, without any help from outside.

Thus the OUN created also the material base for the struggle of the UPA. Without OUN leadership and direction, the huge quantities of arms and ammunition left in Ukraine by the retreating Germans without question would have fallen in the hands of the Russians.

The OUN also concerned itself with the military training of its members. These cadres were composed of those who

had served, by virtue of the compulsory military service, in the armies of the occupation forces. The OUN also organized military schools and courses; in this respect especially intensive work was carried on under the Polish occupation until 1939 and under the first occupation of Western Ukraine by the Soviet regime in 1939-1941. In this period the OUN also organized an extensive system of underground military training courses among Ukrainians in Germany.

In the first days of the German-Soviet war the OUN established an underground officers' training school near the town of Mosty Velyki (Lviv *oblast*), commanded by Gen. Dmytro Hrytsai-Perebyinis, later Chief of the General Staff of the UPA; a training school for noncommissioned officers in the town of Pomoriany (Lviv *oblast*), commanded by Ivakhiv-Ros, first Chief of Staff of the UPA; another non-commissioned officers' school near the city of Rivne, Volhynia, and a series of military training courses. These people, trained militarily by the OUN, formed the nucleus of the command of the UPA. Thus, Hrytsai-Perebyinis, Ivakhiv-Ros, Kovalsky, Ostap, Yasen, Hrehit, Shabliuk, Halaida, Kruk, and many other UPA commanders were all seasoned members of the OUN who acquired their military lore under the leadership of the organization. *Only the OUN could solve the problem of providing the UPA with trained command cadres.* Only the OUN dared to tackle this problem, although our adversaries predicted that without truly professional military men the UPA could not long survive.

The UPA was born in the midst of the struggle against the Nazi invaders of Ukraine, and it was established for the purpose of this struggle. It is clear that the political direction of the UPA struggle was given by this political force which unswervingly stood on a platform of open struggle against the Germans. It is also known to everyone that this force has been the OUN, under the leadership of Stepan Bandera.

In expressing the will of the Ukrainian people toward national independence, the OUN, led by Bandera, proclaimed in Lviv on June 30, 1941, the Act of Independence. The Germans immediately reacted against it, thereby disclosing their imperialist-colonial designs upon Ukraine.

Under the leadership of Bandera the OUN declared war

against the new invaders, calling on the Ukrainian people to resist the Nazi aggressors. The arrests of Bandera and Premier Yaroslav Stetzko, and subsequently the mass arrests of OUN members in August-September, 1941, once again demonstrated what Nazi Germany had in store for the Ukrainian people. But these arrests did not break the OUN, which remained at the head of the determined struggle against the German aggressors. Beginning in the second half of 1942, the UPA struggle developed into full-scale warfare. Thus the OUN, through its revolutionary struggle against the Nazi aggressors, created the political foundations for the existence and *raison d'être* of the UPA.

In recapitulating, we must underscore that only the OUN could have initiated and created the UPA. The OUN had at its disposal all the hidden arms and ammunition; the OUN had the qualified personnel to provide the leadership for the UPA; and, above all, the OUN already was well into the anti-Nazi war.

Thus, in the second half of 1942, the OUN began to organize the first units of the UPA. In September-October, 1942, Commander Ostap, an outstanding member of the OUN, organized the first armed units which became known as the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), its purpose that of fighting the Nazi aggressors.

But at the same time a new problem arose which the nascent UPA had to face. Thus was posed by the Soviet partisans who were organized in the forests of Byelorussia and were beginning to infiltrate behind the German lines in Ukraine. In the areas they penetrated, these Soviet partisans terrorized and murdered Ukrainian independence movement fighters. In the village of Yelne (Rivne *oblast*) the Soviet partisans murdered at random 53 peasants, so the UPA now had to combat not only the Nazi security and police troops but the Soviet partisans as well.

The OUN, then, was unquestionably the initiator and creator of the UPA. On October 14, 1947, the Order of the UPA Supreme Command, read:

Five years have elapsed since OUN member Ostap began organizing in Polissia the first armed groups for the struggle against the occupiers of Ukraine. These

small groups, fighting against the German and the Bolshevik partisans simultaneously, gave rise to the new form of the revolutionary liberation movement—the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. In the period of a few months this movement spread rapidly over all of Polissia, Volhynia and Galicia and a major part of Right-Bank Ukraine. . .

The establishment of the UPA evoked a number of attacks on us on the part of adversaries within. Many of them said we were responsible for "childish pranks"; some called this struggle a "crime" or "Bolshevik-planted work," and so forth. These critics were negative for a variety of reasons: some because they were wholly detached from the people; others because of their shortsightedness, and still others because of narrow-minded party considerations. All warned the people that the operations of the UPA would provoke savage reprisals by the Germans and would unnecessarily cost victims. But how far these people were away from the real people, how little they knew about the inner desires and the patriotic zeal of the Ukrainian people! It was precisely the *reprisals of the Nazis that drew the Ukrainian youth into the ranks of the UPA.*

The OUN under Bandera's leadership was fiercely opposed to the organization of the so-called "S.S. Division Galicia," which was organized at the initiative of the Germans out of Ukrainian opportunists. The OUN called on Ukrainian youth not to join this formation, but to join instead the ranks of the UPA. And the overwhelming majority of the people supported the UPA. New insurgent units sprouted in Galicia, and Galicia soon became a powerful operational base of the UPA.

The UPA as a whole grew and expanded rapidly. Its ranks were swollen by young men of all political convictions, as well as by people of no particular political loyalty, being simply Ukrainian patriots who wished to serve the cause of Ukrainian liberation.

The OUN contributed a great number of its own cadres to the ranks of the UPA. These cadres strengthened the UPA with their moral zeal, becoming, in fact, its moral-ideological spine. They helped the UPA to adopt a highly heroic style,

which characterizes the UPA to this very day.

The OUN took care of the further training of the command cadres, necessitated by the growth of the UPA. It supplied candidates to the officers' and noncommissioned officers' training school for the UPA. For instance, two classes of the officers' training school "Oleni" (conducted in the Carpathian forests near Bolekhiv, Stanislaviv *oblast*) consisted exclusively of members of OUN and the OUN Youth Organization, comprised predominantly of high school and student youth. This school produced such outstanding UPA commanders as Lt. Seredny and Lt. Krutizh.

The political experience and political achievements of the OUN under the spirited leadership of Bandera helped the UPA considerably in espousing the correct political platform. Such progressive mottoes as "Freedom to the Nations" and "Freedom to the Individual," accepted by the second Great Assembly of the OUN, have become the fundamental tenets of the UPA. Also, the basic Program Decisions of the Third Extraordinary Assembly of the OUN have entered the ideological-political treasure house of the UPA.

Only on the basis of its ideological-political program could the UPA develop a movement uniting the other enslaved nations in a common struggle against Nazi and Russian Bolshevik imperialists. These enslaved nations agreed to hold a joint conference of the enslaved nations of Europe and Asia [it was held on November 21-23, 1943, giving rise to the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN)].

In all these political activities the OUN took an active, often the leading role. Among the non-Russian nationalities of the USSR which lived in Ukraine, the OUN conducted extensive informational activities on the necessity of forming a common front against the German and Russian imperialisms, issued thousands of appeals and statements, took part in the First Conference of the Enslaved Nations of Europe and Asia, and so forth.

The growth and expansion of the UPA to ever-increasing areas of Ukraine generated a need for a special political body, established on a wider basis which would encompass all other political groups recognizing the struggle of the UPA as an essential and inevitable one. Both the OUN and the

UPA agreed upon this broad concept and developed activities for its realization. Thus, in July, 1944, there convened a secret underground congress of representatives of all Ukrainian political parties and groups recognizing the struggle of the UPA, which resulted in the establishment of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (UHVR), to which the UPA was wholly subordinated. The OUN also has become a part of the UHVR, fact which disperses all unfounded rumors that the OUN has sought to monopolize the UPA.

Having become a member of the UHVR, the OUN continues to work for the UPA with full dedication, carrying the burden of responsibility for further activities of the UPA, especially in 1944 when the UPA had to ready its combat front against the Soviet troops, which were re-invading Ukraine.

The OUN also was the initiator of the UPA armed incursions into foreign lands for the purpose of popularizing the struggle of the Ukrainian people against Moscow and toward the establishment of a free and independent Ukrainian state. These raids carried the important freedom message of the Ukrainian people to other peoples who were being invaded by Soviet troops.

The OUN, following the directives of the UHVR, coordinated all its political activities with the UPA, thus assuring maximal effort for success. Thus, the OUN and the UPA jointly implemented the boycott of the "elections" to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (on February 10, 1946) and to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR (on February 9, 1947); they waged extensive informational campaigns on the true causes of hunger in the eastern areas of Ukraine; they combated the barbarous and inhuman deportation of the Ukrainian population from the Curzon Line territory; they waged a well-coordinated campaign against the collectivization of Western Ukraine.

The economic basis of the UPA rests on the voluntary contributions on the part of the population of money, food, meat, clothing, shoes, and so forth. All this is possible because the OUN has its well-organized networks, because, at bottom, it lives together with the Ukrainian people.

Such is the indispensable contribution of the OUN to the

organization and continued existence of the UPA, a fact of which we all are exceedingly proud. We bring forth this summation so that everyone may know what the OUN has done for the UPA for the past five years. We make all these statements strictly in the name of historical truth, the truth that is known by every soldier of the UPA and by the masses of the Ukrainian people.

Today, at the end of 1947, the UPA continues its heroic struggle for the freedom and independence of Ukraine.

Parallel with it, shoulder-to-shoulder, stands the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, led by Stepan Bandera. Our ultimate objective—a sovereign and independent Ukrainian State. We share the same views on the method of struggle for our liberation—a basic conviction of the necessity and purposefulness of the revolutionary struggle. Behind us are five years of fierce and unremitting struggle against the Nazis and the Bolshevik occupiers of Ukraine.

In the fire of direct struggle, amid our successes and our failures, with the great sacrifices paid by both organizations, we have cemented a combat friendship that can never be pulled apart by anyone.

Chapter 9

Why We Shall Be Victorious

We firmly believe that we shall win our great victory above all because we are fighting for *truth and justice, for the most basic desires of the Ukrainian people and, finally, because our ideas are the most progressive and the most humane.*

The Ukrainian independent and sovereign state for which we struggle shall be a state ruled by a free people, a state without great landowners, capitalists, and party leeches, a state which will insure all the rights of man and democratic liberties, a state which shall be free among the free states of other peoples. This is the objective toward which the Ukrainian people have been aspiring and toward which they are aspiring now, because they believe that such is their due. Therefore, they are for the obviation of the enslavement of one people by another (imperialism) in the belief that every nation should enjoy freedom in its own independent state and that only then would there be genuine friendship and amity among the peoples of the world. These are the basic ideas that provide the only equitable solution to all the pressing problems confronting the peoples of the world. These ideas are perhaps the most progressive that mankind can ever come up with.

Strength of the Liberation Idea

Our ideas are just, the most progressive, they flow out from the innermost desires of the people—and in this lies their formidable strength. These ideas energize the masses for the struggle, they elevate the spirit of the people to the highest degree, spurring national consciousness and heroism; they weld unity around the ideals of the national liberation movement. On the other hand, they enable the national liberation movement to penetrate deeply into the masses, whence it sprang up and bourgeoned. The Ukrainian people, 40 million strong, are fully aware of their tasks; they are prepared to make the highest sacrifice possible in the name of their liberation and the establishment of a free Ukrainian state.

Against this strength—the strength of freedom—carrying ideas—no prisons, no amount of deportation, and no amount of terror and execution—even though such techniques were and are being pursued on a genocidal scale—can effectively continue indefinitely. Terror, violence, and lies will not avail the Russian Bolshevik totalitarians. History has known a number of great empires based on terror and violence; it has known many inhuman tyrannies, but none could survive the final wrath of the people when they became conscious, intellectually and emotionally, of their in-born rights and their own strength. In the final analysis, the people have always been victorious. Truth and justice may suffer temporary setbacks before violence and lies, but at the end they always emerge triumphant. This is an ironclad law of nature; history knows of no case to the contrary. This will also hold true in the case of the Soviet Russian empire, a veritable prison house of nations. Under the assault of the people the French monarchy once fell; the Russian Czarist empire also had its downfall under the irresistible impact of people craving freedom and justice. Again, the once powerful Ottoman empire could not withstand the forces of freedom, and collapsed in due time. The same fate awaits the present Soviet Russian empire, an empire which is maintained solely by terror and enslavement.

Contradictions Between the People and the Bolshevik Leadership

The Bolshevik leaders never had and will never satisfy the popular masses, because they do not care about the interests of the people, if only their interests are diametrically opposite to the interests of the people. Their policy is an anti-people policy. What the Bolsheviks brought to the Ukrainian people, as well as to the other peoples of the USSR, is a chilling catalogue of oppression, enslavement, terror, pillage, exploitation, hunger, and other miseries. There will be no improvement or relaxation of the Soviet rule, now or ever. The much-talked about, but still awaited, dissolution of the collective farm system after the war is the best of proof that one cannot rely on the promises of the leaders of the Communist Party.

It is quite natural that the general despair and discontent brought about by the Soviet system should have evoked great mistrust of and hatred for the Bolshevik rulers. This discontent and hatred is growing and will continue to grow. The only answer that the Bolsheviks can muster is terror and more terror, which in turn stokes the seething hatred of the masses. True, the Communist terror is so cruel and ruthless that it bends the people to slavish obedience. But let us remember that even slaves cannot endure slavery and oppression indefinitely, that even their patience has a limit. And today we are witnessing that, despite the terror, the wide masses of people are beginning to lose their patience and that their hatred and discontent is being voiced more and more loudly. What a while ago they could only think of, what they were afraid even so much as to hint at among friends, today they talk about openly. It is this scandalized protest, its continued growth and open expression, on the one hand, and the fact that the Soviet government cannot prevent or prohibit these manifestations, on the other, which helps our movement. This dissent will eventually lead to a revolution, and also to our victory.

We will win in the end because there is no force that can erase or bridge these contradictions that exist between the

people and the Communist chieftains, contradictions which inevitably will lead to the destruction of the Soviet Russian oppressors and their criminal system.

We will win also because the Ukrainian people are not alone in this struggle against the Soviet Russian enslavement. Our position and our sentiments are shared by all other peoples of the USSR and by the peoples of the newly occupied countries of Central and Eastern Europe. This dissatisfaction and hatred, the essential ingredients of revolution, multiplies from day to day among these peoples. Moreover, dissatisfaction and the spirit of resistance are also growing among the Russian people, especially among the laboring Russian masses. All the flirtations with and praise of the Russian people by the Soviet leaders—the blown-up and exaggerated “superiority,” “the leading role” of the Russian people in the USSR—all this will not avail the Kremlin leaders, just as the flirtations with the German people by Hitler availed him nothing in the end.

All these circumstances strongly help in the expansion of our anti-Soviet front and in strengthening its forces. For what can the enemy present to oppose this front? What forces does he command? What the enemy sends against us is the Communist Party, the MVD and MGB, the corrupt administration and the army. But we must underscore that the Red Army is the least reliable element in that it consists in good measure of the sons of peasants and workers of the enslaved nations. The more intense the dissatisfaction among the people, the more openly it expresses itself in revolutionary fervor, the more dangerous becomes the army for the oppressors; the army always will join the oppressed people, and thus seal the fate of the enslavers. Thus, against the party, MVD, MGB, the officers corps and the party administration—there stand the millions of enslaved peoples of the USSR. There is no doubt that finally these peoples will prevail, and not the Russian Bolshevik oppressors.

The Enslaved Nations Will Not Defend the Oppressors

The Kremlin leaders by their very nature are im-

perialists and aggressors. They elected the path of conquest and aggression from the very day of their advent to power. And they have been following the policy of aggression to this very day. They have annexed as a result of World War II a number of new countries, and they are planning further conquests as well.

Today, the world virtually and actually is divided into two camps: the Soviet Russian and the Anglo-American. The contradictions between these two political and ideological blocs are so great that they may not be solved by the process of peaceful negotiations. These contradictions have already led to the division of the world, and may eventually lead to open war and widespread destruction. During any forthcoming war all the weaknesses of the Soviet regime will come into bold relief; they will act against the brains and ganglia of the USSR: the Communist Party and its terror-laden policies.

The vast masses of the peoples of the USSR are in no way interested in defending their jailers and oppressors. On the contrary, they will do everything in their power to bring about their destruction. Once these centrifuged forces of freedom are unleashed to act with fury against the Kremlin center, they will immeasurably facilitate the liberation struggle of the enslaved nations. In such a war, even if the Bolsheviks initially should occupy some new countries, this would only distend their military possibilities and consequently weaken their overall power. This we already have seen in the case of Nazi Germany. The Bolsheviks may count on some sympathy and support only there where they are unknown. As soon as they stay in one country only a few days, they will antagonize the entire populace.

The danger of the takeover of certain countries by Communist Russia also engenders a keen interest in these people in our struggle against the USSR. We know that many foreign peoples entertain great admiration for our struggle; this interest will grow a hundredfold during a war against the USSR.

Thus we shall win because the contradictions between the Soviet and Anglo-American blocs will inevitably lead to an armed conflict. A new war will unfold before us new pos-

sibilities and new perspectives which will enable us to expand our operations and secure the eventual support of those ranged against the USSR.

Finally, we will win because our national liberation movement commands highly idealistic cadres and because this movement has gained great experience in guerrilla warfare. No other political organization in any other nation possesses such varied and battle-tested experiences with enemy troops as we have had.

The very fact that we are still in a state of war against the USSR speaks eloquently of our strength, our vitality, and the determination of the Ukrainian people, all of which provides a certain assurance of the eventually successful struggle of the Ukrainian and other peoples of the USSR for their freedom and independence.

Chapter 10

Why in Our Struggle We Rely Exclusively on Our Own Strength

Everything that man possesses comes to him through hard labor and effort, whether in his personal life or that of his family, his community or his nation. Consequently, our ultimate liberation will not come about easily; we must fight for and attain it. It is an intimate struggle. History knows no people whose liberation came about without their having fought for it. The Greeks, Serbs, and Bulgarians achieved their liberation from the Turkish yoke because they actively struggled for their deliverance. The Irish attained their independence in the course of a long and drawn-out struggle with England, a struggle which cost the little Irish people gigantic sacrifices. India, too, achieved its freedom as a result of a stubborn struggle against England. Today the Jews have their own national state after two thousand years of a stateless life. And they have been able to do this only because in the past few decades they have actively sought the establishment of their own national state. Had they not struggled so stubbornly, they would certainly not have attained their national goal.

Understandably, the liberation struggle of individual peoples is not and cannot be the same. Some people must

struggle longer under extremely difficult and adverse conditions, while others attain national statehood in a much shorter time, even without bloody uprisings and struggles. This in larger measure depends on the nature of the oppressor-country and on the strength and determination of the enslaved people aspiring to freedom. But regardless of the various forms of the struggle, the time and the circumstances, the essential factor remains; the *driving necessity* of the struggle.

Thus, we are relying on the strength of the Ukrainian people themselves, for we know that liberation will not come about by itself and that the Ukrainian people must struggle arduously for their national emancipation. This is the law of life. In such struggle our people are being hardened and strengthened, regardless of and even because of temporary defeats and failures. It is our strength that we ourselves understand, a nationally conscious and highly patriotic people, fully aware of our national objective. Doomed otherwise is a people who are inert, who are unaware of what the struggle is about, a people who are not ready to make the most drastic sacrifices for the achievement of national freedom, a people who cannot develop a political organization and capable leadership to implement the liberation program.

True, in some cases, liberation comes about even though an enslaved people may not possess a highly developed national consciousness and cohesion, nor a powerful leadership. Success here hinges on the strength of the adversary and on a variety of other circumstances as well. In 1918-1920, such small nations as Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, or the less numerous Polish people (compared with the Ukrainians), succeeded in establishing their own independent states. This was due, besides outside influences and other circumstances, to the fact that these peoples possessed in high degree national consciousness, political leadership, and a superior organization of political forces. In our struggle in 1917-1921 we counted too lightly on our own strength, and did not work hard enough to build up our own forces; this was enough to add up to our defeat. There are, of course, other reasons for this defeat, but they are supplementary, not basic.

What would it mean for us as a people today if we did

not struggle against the implacable enemy of the Ukrainian people, the Russian Bolsheviks, who are exerting every effort to suppress our national consciousness, to destroy every aspiration for independence and, through insidious terrorization and Russification, to eradicate all manifestations of the national, political, and cultural life of Ukraine? What would it mean if we did not resist these crimes of the enemy? It would certainly mean that the problem of our ultimate liberation would again be delayed for a long time, because we would have lost the all-important national-political consciousness and determination, as well as organization of political forces.

Thus, we are relying on our own strength because it is this strength only that will decide and insure the liberation of our enslaved people.

The Ukrainian people also had experienced another illusion, namely, that the liberation of our nation could come about through the assistance of other, removed, nations. First, the problem of our liberation has been wholly a matter of indifference to other states and nations. For instance, in 1917-1922, both England and the United States were virtually apathetic toward the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people. On the contrary, they were supporting, regretably, the enemies of Ukraine. Second, the other states, in helping their allies, had more or less unwittingly sacrificed the Ukrainian people for their own political gains and interest.

We all know that during our liberation struggle in 1917-1921 France supported an "indivisible" Russia as a possible ally against Germany. France also strove to establish a strong Poland to offset a possible German-Russian alliance. Therefore, France was decidedly against an independent Ukrainian state, which, it thought, would weaken both Poland and Russia. Needless to say, this attitude of France in great measure decided our defeat. At that time, France played a prime role among the Western allies. Yet this political maneuvering of France did not pay off: twenty years later France paid in full for it with the loss of its independence (1940-1944) and its primary in the world, becoming a second-rate power after World War II.

Third, reliance on foreign powers may merely mean a

change in enslavement. In 1941, Hitler's much propagandized "liberation" of Ukraine turned into a new, Nazi enslavement. In 1944 the USSR "liberated" Ukraine from the Nazi occupation, only to introduce a terror and an oppression much worse than it practiced before.

Therefore, we place a total reliance on the strength of the Ukrainian people, *because we are convinced that the liberation of Ukraine will not be delivered to us by some outside power. We know that reliance on the strength of others will lead only to defeat, because foreign powers are indifferent to our liberation, at best imposing upon Ukraine their own colonial rule.* We remember these memorable words of Lesya Ukrainka, "Who liberates himself will remain free; he who liberates will take you into slavery."

The fact that we reject reliance on foreign strength does not necessarily mean that we reject any and all assistance on the part of political allies; that is, that the assistance of other peoples for an enslaved people is *a priori* rejectable. By no means is this the case. For instance, owing to the political, military, and financial assistance of France, England, and the United States, the Czechs attained their liberation in 1918. Similar aid on the part of these states contributed substantially to the establishment of the Polish state.

Understandably, we not only do not reject such allies, we are seeking them. We reject only those allies who would, through proffers of help, enslave us. But in our search for allies, we cannot rely on them exclusively. We do not seek nor expect some political manna, but we do seek that kind of help which would flow from mutual interests. In seeking allies, we must at the same time organize our own strength, which would attract such allies. Those who are fighting will find allies more rapidly than those who do not fight for their liberation at all. The fact that before 1917 our liberation cause was extremely weak, inasmuch as we were taking then only the first steps, was the reason that the other nations knew little about us in 1917-1921, when we arose to fight for our own statehood. At that time other peoples naively took in all the propaganda that was spread about Ukraine and the Ukrainian people by the enemies of Ukraine, namely, that there is no Ukraine, that, in fact,

Ukraine was an Austrian and German invention. Clearly, under those circumstances, they preferred to assist Poland, whose liberation struggle and uprisings were widely known. The struggle of 1917-1922 did uncover Ukraine for the world and did bring the Ukrainian people into the world arena. But it was a matter of too little and too late.

Again, we are relying on the strength of the Ukrainian people; such a policy allows us to find our true allies. It permits us to find such allies much more easily, and this circumstance alone puts the problem of the necessary assistance on firm ground.

A very important aspect of conducting the liberation struggle of an enslaved nation are favorable conditions and circumstances, favorable enough to facilitate this struggle and precipitate a successful outcome. Such favorable conditions may arise as a result of antagonism among individual powers, one of them being a state-enslaver; the state-enslaver also may appear to be militarily weaker, and so forth. For instance, the liberation struggle of the Greeks, Bulgarians, and Serbs enjoyed all these favorable circumstances: the Ottoman (Turkish) empire was internally rotten, the wars with Russia, England, and France having sapped its strength. Finally, the antagonism between England and Russia led to the end that both these powers approved the independence of Greece, Bulgaria, and Serbia (England would never allow these countries to fall under the Russian domination, nor, equally, would Russia countenance them direct English influence, nor were the two of them in any position to parcel these countries between themselves).

Regardless of these favorable circumstances, the Greeks, Bulgarians and Serbs had fought valiantly against the oppressors and for their national liberation. It was in the course of this long and drawn-out struggle that they succeeded in building a solid national nucleus of dedicated fighters. Their favorable image in the international arena was but a secondary factor in the outcome of their liberation struggle.

* * *

Consequently, we are relying on our own strength in order to be able to avail ourselves of any and all favorable in-

ternational situations for a successful completion of our liberation struggle, for we know that even the most promising international circumstances will not bring us this much-desired freedom without our being prepared and struggling for it.

Throughout their long history the Ukrainian people have demonstrated their high-powered vitality and driving force. Even in the darkest hour of their history, namely, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, they not only did not cease being an ethnic entity and a nation, but even subsequently have increased greatly from the viewpoints of numbers and territory.

Today, the Ukrainian people number over 40 million people, and by virtue of their number, territory, and natural resources they constitute one of the most numerous and richest nations of Europe.

In the course of their entire history, the Ukrainian people have demonstrated their great creative capabilities and talents, as well as their passionate love for freedom. These values and characteristics the Ukrainian people possess in great abundance today as well. The Ukrainian people assuredly belong to the family of cultured and civilized peoples of the world.

And so we rely on the strength of the Ukrainian people because we believe in the vitality of the Ukrainian people, in their creative genius and capabilities and, above, in their dedication to and love of freedom. We believe that the Ukrainian people possess every prerequisite for the establishment of their national statehood and to blossom forth as a free nation-state in the family of free peoples of the world.

Chapter 11

Summing Up of Our National Liberation Struggle

A series of various causes are to be considered in understanding why the Ukrainian liberation struggle in 1917-1921 ended in defeat, a defeat that meant the Ukrainian people again found themselves in alien slavery. The basic fact, however, is that in 1917 the Ukrainian people, in their entirety, were not as yet fully ready for the establishment of an independent state. Held for more than two centuries under foreign domination, the Ukrainian people had lost most of their upper strata; national consciousness among the rank and file of the people was low, while a good part of the people lived in abject poverty, their only concern being to survive. True, the people craved liberation, freedom, more land, hated the oppressors, and even were willing to fight, but what was lacking in them was a firm determination and a faith national in scope that all these could be won and secured only in a free and independent Ukrainian state.

Consequently, the great national upheaval which erupted with such fury in 1917 was not properly channeled, much of this volcanic national energy being wasted or exploited by the enemies of the Ukrainian people.

The Ukrainian political leaders of the time failed to take advantage of this great upsurge of energy, not realizing it

had to be directed in but one direction: the establishment of a free and independent state of Ukraine. Many of these leaders did not grasp the import of the events and developments which were engulfing Ukraine. Many of these leaders were enchanted with the Russian Revolution; they believed that a new Socialist order would descend upon Russia and Ukraine, and that the millennium was in the offing. They also believed in the good will of the Russian Socialists despite the fact that the latter group, even before the advent of Bolshevism, had tried by every means to prevent the establishment of a Ukrainian independent state. As a result of the low national consciousness of the Ukrainian masses and the inadequate organization of the political forces, the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people in 1917-1921, despite the establishment of a Ukrainian independent state which lasted almost three years, was doomed. All this despite the great heroism and the countless sacrifices, despite the fact that Ukraine mustered its own national army, established its own administration, courts and Ukrainian schools, and secured the recognition of several foreign states.

We admit this with a great deal of pain, but such is the fact, and it must be accepted. In recalling these tragic times, we wish to point out the great changes which have occurred in the Ukrainian people since the time of the Ukrainian National Revolution.

The liberation struggle of 1917-1921 failed to result in the establishment of a *durable* Ukrainian state. But this struggle inaugurated a period of a powerful Ukrainian national rebirth, a period of growth of the national-political consciousness of the Ukrainians. After the demise of Ukrainian independence in 1921 the Ukrainian people did not cease their liberation struggle against the occupiers of the Ukrainian lands. This struggle continued to be conducted on a number of fronts: the cultural-educational, the economic and political and, especially, in the vast underground system. In this struggle, especially in the last decade, the Ukrainian people have made great strides in the organization of political force, a force to be reckoned with by the enemies of Ukraine.

State of National and Political Consciousness of the Ukrainian People

Today the Ukrainian people have become nationally conscious in the highest degree. They have recognized that only a free and independent Ukrainian state can liberate them from all other "liberators," that it alone can bring them the desired freedom, well-being, and a decent life. Today the Ukrainian people will not suffer anyone to mislead them. All foreign agents and provocateurs are met with resolute opposition; the foreign domination of Ukraine is sustained only by terror and the police system.

The Ukrainian people today are a people of fighters in the fullest meaning of the word. Are any other people engaged in such a liberation struggle as are the Ukrainian people? Are any other national groups challenging the most cruel kind of dictatorship and ruthless terrorization and waging a struggle of such gigantic proportions as are the Ukrainians? The answer is no. We need only compare our anti-Bolshevik struggle with similar struggles of other peoples, for example, the Poles or the Hungarians, and we see the difference.

Owing to the different historical processes of the individual parts of the Ukrainian land, the liberation struggle developed unevenly. The most intense liberation effort developed in the Western Ukrainian lands, and therefore its success there has been the most outstanding. This struggle has radically changed the spirit of Ukrainians in Western Ukraine; they are wholly imbued with the ideal of a free and independent and sovereign Ukrainian state. The national-political maturity of the people, reflected in their challenge and opposition to the alien power of Moscow, has attained a sophisticated level.

The prolonged Bolshevik terror in Eastern Ukraine, especially in 1930-1933 and thereafter, contributed greatly to the decline of the national-political life of the Ukrainian people in these lands. The Bolsheviks succeeded in terrorizing the people to such a degree that they fell into despondency, unable to see any prospect of a successful struggle for

freedom. Such a state of fear and dejection enormously eased the Bolshevik ruination of our national organism.

But as a result of the expansion of the Ukrainian liberation movement to the areas of Central and Eastern Ukraine in 1940-1941, the national spirit revived and steadily grew until the new advent of Soviet Russian occupation (1944-1945). After the war, a new upsurge of that national spirit has been in evidence. Today the anti-Bolshevik mood is much stronger in Eastern Ukraine than it ever was in past years. The people have overcome fear and apathy, and this is a strong indication of the rise of a new faith in the future of Ukraine on the part of the Ukrainian people in these eastern areas.

Awakening of Backward Areas

Enlisting in the liberation struggle in the last few years have been Ukrainians from the most backward areas of the Ukrainian ethnic territory. This sweeping process of a national reawakening, kindled by the struggle elsewhere in Ukraine, has been as rapid and awesome as a forest fire.

Prior to 1939, Polisia, the northwestern part of Ukraine, was totally isolated from the mainstream of the Ukrainian national development. A Polisian would not even identify himself, preferring to be called a "local man." But a few years later, the same Polisia was a cradle of the UPA, and Polisions by the thousands had joined the Ukrainian underground resistance movement to fight and die for Ukraine. There, where once was situated a Polish concentration camp (Bereza Kartuska), the place where hundreds of Ukrainian political prisoners were molested and persecuted at will by the Polish police; this area, has become a strong base for the Ukrainian independence movement.

In 1944 the Ukrainian Lemkos in the Carpathian Mountains (the westernmost part) were unwilling to become embroiled in the Ukrainian movement. But the following year thousands of Lemkos already were carrying arms in the ranks of the UPA. In 1946 they carried the ideas of Ukrainian independence into Czechoslovakia. And in 1947 it was

in the Lemko Land that the UPA ambushed and killed Lt. Gen. Karol Swierczewski, Polish Defense Minister ("General Walter" of the Spanish Civil War). Today the Lemkos are intrepid fighters to be found serving in every part of the Ukrainian ethnic territory.

In this struggle the Ukrainian people as a whole have become hardened and well organized, those qualities so necessary for successful waging of a liberation struggle.

Organization and Heroism

Today the Ukrainian people are an example of organization and heroism worthy of emulation by other enslaved peoples. They are not only well organized and disciplined, but they also possess the sort of heroism that often ends in self-sacrifice. The solidarity and superb organization of the Ukrainian people were reflected in the mass boycott of the Soviet "elections," both to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, steps which under the intense Bolshevik terrorization and oppression required a great deal of courage. The same solidarity was manifested against the collectivization of Western Ukraine and against the attempt of the Soviet government to divide the Ukrainian village into "rich" (*kurkul*) and poor peasants, an attempt which was thoroughly thwarted. True, through terror and intimidation, the collective farms have been established, but herein the unity and solidarity of the Ukrainian people have not been broken.

This unity and patriotism are manifested above all by the members of the Ukrainian underground resistance movement. These men accept neither capture nor surrender; very often, finding themselves in a tight spot and facing capture or torture, they have finished themselves off. The Ukrainian civilian population, including women, children, and the aged, frequently physically resist the Communist police, though this means almost certain deportation to Siberia. None of them asks for pardon. On the contrary, they lustily sing Ukrainian patriotic songs and shout at the tops of their lungs that the "day of reckoning" will come. But what about

the village of Verbytsia (near Lubachiv)? This village was surrounded by Polish Communist and Bolshevik bands as they fought a UPA platoon. The mothers of the village begged the UPA fighters to kill them and their children lest they fall into the hands of the enemies. Not a single soul was taken into captivity. . .

Consequences of the Process of Rebirth

This is the Ukrainian people today as the result and consequence of the great process of rebirth and political reformation. It is exactly this high level of the national-political consciousness of the Ukrainian people, the rebirth of the backward areas and provinces, the revolutionizing of the Ukrainian people in Eastern Ukraine, the renewal in the Ukrainian people of such supreme qualities as the readiness to sacrifice, unite, fight fearlessly and organize—it is in all this that are found the prerequisites for the success of our liberation struggle. We do not wish to delude either ourselves or others. But we can state one thing most positively: 1917-1918. And no one today has to be persuaded that had we been so well-prepared in 1917, we would have been capable of solidifying and preserving war independence.

But in stating this we cannot, of course, claim that all the Ukrainian people have reached this high level of national consciousness and national-political organization, nor that all Ukrainian provinces have been integrated into the liberation struggle. We do not wish to delude either ourselves or others. But we can state one thing most positively: owing to the liberation struggle waged by the Ukrainian underground resistance movement, the Ukrainian people in general have attained a high level of development. Today the Ukrainian people are so strong that the defeat of 1917 will not be repeated. Today the Ukrainian people are imbued with such zeal and understanding that they are able not only to wage their own liberation struggle against Moscow, but to provide political leadership for other captive and enslaved nations as well.

Influence of and Confidence in the UHVR in Ukraine

Today the organized forces of the Ukrainian people, directed by the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council, are incomparably stronger than they were in 1917. The very fact that the Ukrainian underground resistance movement has been waging the liberation struggle for the past six years under the terroristic regime of the USSR eloquently speaks for itself. The Ukrainian national liberation movement is the only political force of the Ukrainian people in Ukraine today. There is no other force. The Communist Party of Ukraine is the puppet branch of the Russian totalitarian and imperialist policies in Ukraine. It exists only because of the Soviet terror and police. It has nothing whatsoever in common with the Ukrainian people; it does not begin to represent them. Most of the members of the Communist Party of Ukraine are ethnic Russians. As for the Ukrainian members, in their majority, they are Russified Ukrainians, no more than lackeys of Moscow.

The Ukrainian liberation movement today encompasses Western Ukraine as a whole and is spreading by leaps and bounds to Eastern Ukraine. It has united millions of Ukrainians who have come to realize the validity of its call and who have implicit trust and confidence in its political leadership. Perhaps the best example of their political unity and their confidence in the UHVR is their boycott of the "elections" to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, a boycott which the UHVR called for. This boycott, under such a political regime as is the Soviet, was an unmistakable expression of the will of the Ukrainian people and their aspirations and desires. It was a powerful manifestation of popular support accorded the UHVR. In both aspects, it is a show of strength of the Ukrainian underground liberation movement.

Thus, in the existence of a strong liberation movement, in its political unity and organization, in its close contact with the millions of Ukrainian people, and in its unique leadership in the UHVR, we see the requisite groundwork of

our liberation struggle. This foundation assures both continuation and ultimate victory.

External Political Success of the Liberation Struggle

Our liberation struggle also has attained some outstanding successes in the international field. In 1917 the world knew little about the Ukrainians as a separate ethnic entity. Today the Ukrainian people are recognized in the world arena as an independent element. The freedom-loving peoples of the world now know us as allies. Without our struggle this attainment could not have been possible.

The liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people has become widely known among all the peoples of the USSR. There is not a man in the USSR who does not know about the struggle of the Ukrainians against Moscow, despite the fact that the Soviet Russian regime has done all it could have to prevent the peoples of the USSR from knowing about our struggle. Why? Because our liberation struggle not only wins us friends and sympathizers among the enslaved nations of the USSR, it also helps revolutionize these peoples as well.

Through their inexorable struggle against the Russian totalitarian regime the Ukrainian people have earned for themselves both the sympathy and friendship of the newly enslaved peoples of Central and Southeastern Europe. These peoples must now also combat the Bolshevik aggressors. Without experience in this kind of struggle, these peoples are keenly interested in our methods, following our every move. This was well borne out by the raids of the UPA in the Polish and Czechoslovak territories; the Polish, Czech, Slovak, and Hungarian populations of these areas enthusiastically welcomed the UPA fighters, despite the fact that some of these peoples had been quite indifferent to the Ukrainians, and some, like the Poles, had been hostile.

The liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people also engenders friendship and sympathy among the peoples of Western Europe and America. The Ukrainians are viewed by these peoples as natural consequential fighters against the

Nazi and Communist tyrannies and imperialism, those self-proclaimed implacable enemies of mankind. Very helpful in this regard has been the organization in 1946 of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), with the active support and effort of the UHVR. The ABN continues to stress outside the USSR the important position and political significance of the Ukrainian people.

The fact that the Ukrainian people have emerged in the international arena as an independent factor, with their positions and aspirations known and applauded abroad—this fact represents another important success of the national liberation struggle.

The Liberation Struggle Prevents Annihilation

In addition to these basic successes the liberation struggle has brought about a series of other positive results for the Ukrainian people. It checked the deportation of Ukrainian youth to slave labor in Germany by the Nazis; today our resistance inhibits Moscow from deporting our youth to slave labor in the Donbas, the Urals, and the Kuzbas. The resistance of the Ukrainian people also has prevented the wholesale destruction of Ukrainians by the imperialistic regimes of Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. It has preserved in great measure the Ukrainian people before the depredations of Gestapo and MGB terror. It also has prevented the complete collectivization of Western Ukraine, thus forestalling the dreadful famine which hit the Eastern Ukrainian lands in 1946-1947. Saved from starvation were thousands of Ukrainians, Russians, Byelorussians, and Moldavians.

In their struggle against the totalitarian enemies of Ukraine and for the restoration of the independence of the Ukrainian people, the Ukrainians have made great sacrifices in terms of human lives, material resources and suffering. Millions of Ukrainians have been killed outright, tortured to death, killed slowly in innumerable Soviet and Nazi death camps, and resettled in the far-flung areas of Asia.

But the successes attained at the cost of these enormous sacrifices are by no means insignificant. Indeed, they are immense.

Chapter 12

Perspectives on Our Struggle

The year 1945 brought the termination of World War II. The Soviet Union, finding itself in the ranks of the victorious powers, threw all its armed forces into an effort to liquidate the internal fronts, especially the Ukrainian liberation movement. The well-known "appeals" of the Soviet Ukrainian "government" of Khrushchev and of the various Soviet organs, lesser or greater, have since called on the Ukrainian insurgents to throw down their arms and capitulate, as their "struggle against the USSR has no chance of success." Yet, the Ukrainian revolutionary insurgents have not responded to the insidious and insincere approaches of the enemy and have continued to wage their struggle against a power that dominates one-sixth of the world since the end of the war. The heroic stance of these revolutionary insurgents who have refused to surrender evokes great admiration not only among their own people, but among their enemies as well.

In addition to sentiments of admiration of our people for the continuance of this unequal struggle, we often hear critical expressions which clearly indicate a lack of understanding of our struggle for liberation. Many people, wittingly or unwittingly, engage in a whispering campaign upon the instigation of the enemy. Its purpose is to undermine the high morale of the Ukrainian underground fighters, which constitute the greatest obstacle for the enemy in his overall at-

tempt to destroy the greatest internal enemy ever faced by the Soviet government. Hence the enemy is using subversive propaganda and infiltration in order to undermine the revolutionary underground of the Ukrainian people.

Another category of people who do not understand us are those people who are despairing and who are wilting under the moral and physical terror exerted by the enemy. These have lost faith in the basic ideals of the nation.

From these people we often hear of the disproportion that exists between our forces and those of the enemy. Others believe that the positive solution of the Ukrainian problem lies exclusively in the hands of the Western states. Still others contend that the policy of the Ukrainian revolution should be based not on a cold appraisal of events, but rather on exclusively emotional and moral moments.

All these people are undoubtedly of good will and their criticism is motivated by their understanding, or lack of it, of the Ukrainian problem. It is to these people that we should like to address ourselves with a basic explanation of our stand and of our perspective so that they can be with us not only with their hearts, but also with their minds and intellects; so that they might become convinced that our activities are not solely the offspring of patriotic emotions, but are also the result of logically analyzed and conceived political actions, designed toward the attainment of our basic objectives.

For the purpose of reviewing our liberation struggle, let us dwell briefly on our general *premises*. We have a basic tenet: through the well-being, development and growth of the nation as a whole we will attain the well-being, happiness, and development of the individuals compromising it. Therefore, we are subordinating all to the ideal of the nation, in so doing automatically caring also about the parallel development of the nation and a better life for each of its members.

Here we want to stress most emphatically that under the term "nation," we do not envision an abstract idolatry, a fictitious idea, for which the individual person must surrender everything without receiving anything in exchange. Indeed not. Under the concept of the nation we understand a community of "all living, the dead and those to be born," for

which community we work, fight, and die, but from which we receive all that which is necessary to promote the welfare of the individual member of the community. It is on this union of development of nation and of individual that we base our program and premises.

In advancing this basic belief, we clearly have adopted and stand on a *national level of struggle*. We Ukrainians consider the nation to be the beginning and the end of all our activities. We are advancing national slogans because we have been thoroughly convinced that all other slogans, such as the "class struggle," "Pan-Slavism," or "internationalism," were invented for the sole purpose of deceiving the peoples in order to enslave them. We can also see that all other nations of the world stand firmly on their national basis. True, these nations sooner or later must undergo inevitable social changes, aimed at the improvement of the status of man, which in consequence brings about the improvement and advancement of the national community as a whole.

We remember that during the French Revolution the French people, having thrown off the feudal yoke and regenerated themselves with new forces, erected a new and better social-political system, in which all the productive forces could manifest themselves and which assured a fuller development of the individual and the community. Repercussions of this revolution were strongly felt in the whole of Europe in the nineteenth century. Every people that learned something of the salutary principles of the French Revolution underwent greater or lesser changes, sometimes with great upheavals. Also, we know from history that as far back as the seventeenth century, the English people, imbued with democratic beliefs, would no longer allow their kings to exercise absolute power, but demanded and gained instead a system of parliamentarianism which contributed greatly to the development of England thereafter. We are now witnessing great and deep social changes that are taking place in almost every country and that are making for improvement and progress in every sector of life. Before our own eyes the nationalization of banks and heavy industries has occurred in such states as France and Belgium, and even in conservative England. We also witnessed how the Russian people in

1917 abolished the Czarist system in order to build a new order which would be more responsive to the people and their needs. True, during that revolution, international slogans were advanced that heralded a world revolution and the eventual conquest of the world. But the revolution of 1917 was soon channeled into the great Russian riverbed. Lenin himself said that the Russian worker saved Russia from collapse, and Stalin in 1945 officially identified the policy of the USSR as a Russian national policy. So we can see that even pseudo-international states are treading national paths as they use internationally colored slogans for the purpose of aggression. That all present-day states, including the USSR, stand firmly on national positions may also be seen from the fact that the United Nations Organization cannot make much progress because of the "national pride" of some of its members.

How can we otherwise explain the Russification policy of the "older brother" (Russian) in the USSR? Thus, national concepts are by no means outdated, but are very much alive and play a vital part in the functioning of all modern states.

But, assuredly, our national stand does not generate a nationalistic egoism or a negative attitude toward universal human ideas. On the contrary, we have advanced the most progressive slogans: "Freedom to Nations! Freedom to the Individual!" We are in favor of such an international system that would embrace all free states of all nations, with no supremacy of larger nations over smaller and weaker peoples. We contend and profess that all international problems can be solved by free peoples. Such was true of our attitude and policy as expressed and adopted at the Third Extraordinary Assembly of the OUN. Only our enemies are wild enough to compare us with the man-hating nationalism of the German type. We know that no people can live in isolation; they must live in communion with other peoples. In order to avoid constant wars and conflicts, every people should and must reach agreement and understanding with every other people. Only thus can be solved all those problems which might upset harmony and amity.

Consequently, our road is the national road, but this is not all: *this road is a revolutionary road*. Our objective is the

Ukrainian National Revolution, and we shall endeavor to show why we have chosen the revolutionary road.

Without overanalyzing the notion of "revolution" itself, which is defined by the Bolsheviks differently than it is by the Western nations, we shall try to provide some of the basic characteristics which distinguish it from the other types of developing processes. To begin with, there is the *overturn*, or the introduction of new forms of system, featured by *suddenness*, as opposed to the slow evolutionary processes which consume long periods of time. This process is also characterized by the *fundamentality* of change, and not only of some of the existing aspects of the regime. *Force* is usually utilized to bring about these revolutionary changes, and is always present in any social and political revolution. As we see, the notion of revolution is opposed to that of evolution, reformism, and legality.

We need not argue that all Ukrainian groups that actively stand on the platform of Ukrainian independence should accept the revolutionary road. No one would believe that any former occupier of the Ukrainian lands, or the present USSR, would willingly and voluntarily grant independence to Ukraine as a "gift." Those among us who do think so cannot be taken seriously as political leaders. Thus, what remains for us is the second road, the illegal (from the viewpoint of the occupying power) and revolutionary one. Standing on the position that the independence of Ukraine can be attained only by overthrowing the occupation regime, we thus acknowledge the principle of political revolution.

But political revolution does not assure of itself the stability of a new system. What we need is the basic rebirth of the Ukrainian spirit, a full mobilization around the ideal of the independence of Ukraine, the one prerequisite to assure that our victory be not short-lived. Thus, in addition to the political revolution, we need equally urgently a spiritual revolution. For almost a century the occupiers of Ukraine have been imposing upon us not only their political order, but their spirituality as well. All the manifestations of the Ukrainian cultural rebirth were hampered and put down by various legislation, as, for instance, the infamous *ukase* of 1876 and its subsequent police censorship. The short life of

Ukrainian independence was filled with an uninterrupted chain of wars on several fronts, nor had it allowed for the national rebirth of the Ukrainian people. The present Soviet Russian occupation is even worse than the Russian Czarist occupation, as far as the aspirations of the Ukrainian people are concerned. All the creative forces of the Ukrainian people are being suppressed by ruthless and barbaric methods. A Ukrainian cannot aspire to the liberation of his own country without being sent to Siberia; he cannot learn his own history, he is forbidden to cultivate his national traditions, he has to accept a subservient status, that of the rule of the "older brother," that is, the Russian. The soul of the Ukrainian is being twisted, molded, and crushed on a scale unprecedented in the history of mankind. In short, the Ukrainian is forced to deny his own identity, his national ideals and traditions and, instead, to espouse the history and culture of Russia. We cannot overemphasize this enforced process of denationalization which Russia is imposing and implementing in Ukraine. This process has already made deep inroads in the Ukrainian spirituality, inasmuch as it embraces all the strata of Ukrainian society, unlike the situation in Czarist Russia in which only the upper strata of Ukrainian society were affected.

This is why, in addition to the political revolution, we need a spiritual-ideological revolution to supplement, strengthen and assure the success of the political one. Indeed, seen in this light, the spiritual revolution is even more important than the political.

As far as our premises and programs in the social field are concerned, we espouse the principle of well-being and the freedom of development of each individual, and within its framework we shall entertain certain changes and modifications. But inasmuch as we believe that these objectives can be realized only in a free and independent Ukrainian state, we have not and will never depart from the ideal of the independence of Ukraine. This principle has acquired for us something approaching a sacred quality.

Is, then, our concept of national revolution a realistic political concept?

Again, in order to answer this question, we have to fall

back on history. The past nineteenth century has seen a series of victories for this concept. After a long period of political slavery, liberation was won by the Italians, Serbs, Greeks, and others who succeeded in throwing off the foreign yoke through national revolutions.

World War I brought about a series of new independent states which were established on the ruins of three former empires; these new states were Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the three Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Today, the Indian people are standing on the threshold of their independence. Thus, we clearly see that the concept of national revolution is not fictitious or unrealistic, but is based on hard logical premises and borne out by numerous historical precedents.

Now let us analyze more thoroughly the perspectives of our revolutionary liberation concept. Our victory is dependent on three factors: a) the capability of our own forces; b) the capability of the forces of the enemy; c) the international situation.

Let us review these three factors, postponing the first factor to the last.

The first condition for a successful outcome of our struggle is that the *forces of the enemy* must be drastically depleted. No one would issue the call for a national uprising against the enemy at a time when the enemy is very strong, as this would mean failure. Therefore, the leadership of the Ukrainian underground resistance movement has not issued such a call. The forces of the USSR are sufficiently strong to suppress such an uprising. But the forces of a state that oppresses enslaved nations do not always stay the same; they grow or diminish depending on circumstances. Factors which may adversely affect the ruling regime may be either of an external or an internal nature. The external situation which weakens the enemy forces is usually a war, which very often provides excellent opportunities for the enslaved nations. The occupying power, engaged in a war with another state, cannot summon all its forces to cope with the liberation struggle of the subjected peoples within its own borders. Thus prospects for liberation increase substantially inasmuch as the enemy forces are extended. Here, again, we

should like to refer to examples from history.

Serbian King Kara Georgiy, taking advantage of the Russian-Turkish war at the beginning of the nineteenth century, made his move for the independence of Serbia and succeeded. The same Serbs, taking advantage of the weakening of Turkey by virtue of its new war with Russia after the defeat of the Turkish forces at Plevna, attacked Turkey, captured the city of Niz, and brought about the liberation of Serbia. The same opportunity was grasped by the Montenegrins and the Rumanians; the former attacked Skutari and the latter Videnö, and both won independence for their states as a result. And a number of new states arose as a result of the humbling of Austria, Russia, and Germany at the end of World War I. Against the will of the occupying powers, a series of new states came into being: Finland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. Clearly, when the occupier stands on the threshold of defeat, national revolutions may be merely political revolutions, with no need of armed encounter. Such was the case with the peoples of Austria-Hungary in 1918. The old Austro-Hungarian empire was weak and exhausted, not remotely capable of resisting the centrifugal aspirations of the alien peoples, and thus had to accept and agree to their independence. In other cases (Serbia in 1878) an armed struggle had to decide the political independence. Likewise, the Ukrainians took advantage of the collapse of Russia and proclaimed their independence in 1918 through a revolutionary process. Here the occupier was weakened not only through external factors (war), but also through internal chaos and strife. Another example of this is afforded by the liberation struggle of the Greeks vis-a-vis Turkey. The Greeks launched a national uprising in 1821 and by 1830 had succeeded in gaining their full independence.

In 1830, encouraged by the "February Revolution" in France, the Belgians rose against the Netherlands. After a series of bloody battles they compelled Holland to recognize the establishment of a separate Belgian state. The Italian revolutionaries of Garibaldi took advantage of the chaos existing in the Naples-Sicilian Kingdom and united the whole of Italy in one national state. Also, Ireland under the

leadership of da Valera, through its long and drawn-out struggle against England and through a series of bloody uprisings (1918 and 1919-1920), succeeded in attaining, first, a dominion status and then full independence.

The second decisive factor in a successful revolutionary struggle is the *international or external situation*. It may be a case of either an ally or an enemy of the enslaved people. If the international situation is favorable for the enslaved people, it is by definition unfavorable for the enslaver. The enslaved people can ill-afford to reject an ally in their struggle against the occupier; to spell it out once more, their forces, being much weaker than those of the government, ought to take advantage of every opportunity to improve their lot. Sometimes the international situation may provide but some sympathetic public opinion for the people striving for liberation; less frequently, concrete official or unofficial support is given on the part of states that are interested in the weakening of the enslaver-state.

The power and influence of a favorable international situation may again be seen in the struggle of the Greeks for their independence at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Greek uprising against the Turks evoked a strong sympathetic reaction throughout the whole of Europe; pro-Hellenic committees mushroomed everywhere, providing financial support and even volunteer fighters for the Greeks. The opinion of Europe was so strongly mobilized that some of the greatest men of the time enlisted in the Greek cause (Byron), while the governments of England, France, and Russia, all of which were interested in the weakening of the Ottoman Empire, provided military aid toward that end. They defeated the Egyptian fleet at Navarino, which decisively influenced the outcome of the Greek uprising. In two years the Greeks attained their independence.

Sometimes the international situation may be such a decisive factor that the enslaved people can contribute little to the achievement of their own objective. This case is perhaps best exemplified by the creation of the new states following the end of World War I, namely, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Baltic States. It was in the interest of the victorious powers, France, and England, to establish in the east of

Europe a series of states which would form a bulwark against a resurgent militaristic Germany and a barrier against Communist Russia, then preparing to march on Europe. Those states—Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Baltic States—received considerable support, including military help, without which, Poland, for example, would have been unable to beat back the Soviet forces and so would have ended up as another national victim of the USSR.

Furthermore, international circumstances may uniquely be a decisive factor in contributing to the establishment of an independent state: for instance, the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, whereby Switzerland was born.

But we must also take into consideration the fact that the international situation may be, and usually is, in a state of flux. It changes constantly, and liberated countries which arise solely as the result of the swirling international situation may also disappear as rapidly as they came into being. On the other hand, as the international situation may influence the success of a stateless people in their struggle for liberation, so may the very struggle of the people in question sway international public opinion in their favor, as was the case with the stirring liberation movement of the Greeks.

The third factor of a successful liberation struggle is perhaps the most important of all: that of the people's *own forces* in action for the achievement of their own national statehood. If the people fail to organize their own forces, they may eventually become a speculative international target, a pawn between great powers, and no longer an equal partner in the game. When the enslaved people have organized their own forces and wage an active struggle for liberation, they must be taken into consideration by all who are playing the international political game. Their significance and weight will be commensurate with those forces they dispose of. Well-organized forces of a given people, or of several enslaved peoples, may even bring about victory without and independently of a favorable international juxtaposition. If all the other enslaved peoples in the USSR would wage such a determined struggle as is now being waged by the Ukrainian underground resistance movement, we would be assured of a common victory. Thus, it is clear even today, that

the matter of our victory depends not so much on the strength of the enemy as it does on our own forces.

History provides us with many examples of peoples with their own organized forces achieving full victory in their struggle for freedom and independence. We already have singled out the Greeks, who without any outside help, rose up against Turkey and, in the period of a few years at the beginning of the nineteenth century, succeeded in attaining their statehood. And there are the Serbs who, under the leadership of Kara Georgiy and Myshol Obranovich, achieved great gains for Serbia which in a few years resulted in full independence. The Irish, fighting with their own forces alone, compelled England in 1919-1921 to capitulate, achieving dominion status first and, ultimately, full political independence.

In Central and Western Europe, after World War I, conditions jelled which favored the organized revolutionary forces, resulting in a series of new states. Neither the Versailles Treaty nor the League of Nations really had to say anything. The Poles on their own carved out their frontiers in the wars against the Ukrainians, Lithuanians, and the Bolsheviks. Also, as a result of their own total organization of forces, the Finns established their own independent state. And, regrettably, the reverse is true; because of the weakness of the Ukrainian people—the lack of a girding together of internal forces in the period of 1917-1921—Ukraine lost its independence and became a colony of Communist Russia.

Such forces of a people may become more or less immunized against the pressures to be expected of the imperialist states, which are endeavoring to enslave or to keep in enslavement a given people. We Ukrainians know from historical experience that our neighbors, the Russians and the Poles, have taken advantage of all possible opportunities to hold us under their domination, in this regard exerting all the pressure they could. This only proves again that our own forces must be well-organized and coordinated so that they may become truly effective in the struggle for liberation from the domination of "older brothers" or "western sisters." All international shifts may not help. Not even the fall of the Kremlin will guarantee victory, for if the Ukrainian

people are internally not well organized, have not cemented together for the struggle for independence, they may well fail. Stalin may be replaced by another typical Muscovite ruler who will faithfully continue the oppression of Ukraine. For the Ukrainian people the experience of 1917-1921 could not go by without imparting an important lesson.

We have evaluated briefly all the three factors which are most important in the eventual victory of an enslaved people: their own forces, the forces of the enemy, and the international situation. And we have seen that the internal disposition of an enslaved people is uppermost in importance.

The international configuration may be influenced by the enslaved people only to an insignificant degree; this factor basically is out of their reach. On the other hand, the enslaved people have the possibility of building and welding their own forces into meaningful power. All the requirements in this regard are solely theirs to be met. Therefore, it is clear why the Ukrainian revolutionaries should rely mainly on "their own forces," rejecting any reliance on fickle "intervention" by foreign powers. The organization of their own forces and their steady strengthening is primary in importance; a favorable international conjecture and the weakening of the enemy forces are secondary; they are welcome but not paramount. To rely on "foreign forces" would relegate the Ukrainian people to the status of a pawn on the international chessboard, thus debasing their efforts and integrity. This concept of relying on one's own revolutionary strength would prevent the Ukrainian people from capitulating in an extremely favorable situation, such as they enjoyed in 1918. Under this concept of one's own forces we do not understand merely material-physical forces; above all, we have in mind spiritual-intellectual forces, those forces which provide the durable basis of the nation and the strength of an independent state.

Material forces have importance only if they are in the hands of a well-organized community, united around the ideal of liberation. We remember very well that in the time of our liberation struggle in 1917-1921, the material resources which were in our hands were not at all small when compared to those of the Bolsheviks. But the Bolsheviks suc-

ceeded in organizing a strong ideological community, and it is this which prevailed over the Ukrainian independence forces. Thus, above all, we need a spiritual revolution, so absolutely essential for the building of our own independent state. We must transform the Ukrainian from an ethnic meaning into a Ukrainian in the fullest and most potent political meaning. Only after such a revolution, when the Ukrainian people as a whole will have been united around the all-consuming ideal of independence, may we sink back, assured of the fate of Ukraine. Given its rightful political and spiritual being, Ukraine cannot let slip its independence again.

And right now we are witnessing this fiery spiritual upsurge of the Ukrainian people, one which is being fanned by the Ukrainian underground resistance movement, a revolution which exacts and obtains great sacrifices. But we know well that such spiritual revolutions, the deepest and longest-lasting revolutions, have been waged only at great cost—the blood of the best sons of the people. The Italians paid with running blood for their uprisings against Austria in 1848-1849, seemingly for naught, except that these uprisings and their bloodshed fused all Italians around the ideal of a united Italy, an objective which was realized shortly thereafter. Poland, from the times of its partitions, had waged an independent struggle against its occupiers. Its uprisings against Russia in 1831 and 1863 cost it a great part of its national elite, but in 1918, Poland not only gained its independence, but it also was able and strong enough to resist a fresh aggression by Communist Russia. Ireland doggedly waged its struggle against England for several decades, a struggle which embraced almost every Irish household; such determination and dedication could only end in Irish independence.

On the other hand, peoples who have not paid in blood for their liberation have failed to make independence their central ideal. Alas, their blood has been shed, but only for alien causes; they allowed themselves to be used by the imperialists in their aggressive conquests and their insatiable enslavement of peoples.

The Ukrainian people have been paying and are now paying dearly for their spiritual revolution, one which en-

compasses the unity of all Ukrainian people around the ideal of the independence of Ukraine. Our great national poet, Taras Shevchenko, for his impassioned patriotic poetry was punished by being compelled to serve in a Russian punitive unit in Asia (1847-1857). The Ukrainian liberation war in 1917-1921 ended in defeat, with tens of thousands of the flower of Ukrainian youth paying with their lives for defending Ukrainian independence.

After the fall of the Ukrainian independent state, a new generation of patriots took up the struggle by establishing a network of Ukrainian revolutionary organizations (the Ukrainian Military Organization—UVO; the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists—the OUN; the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine—the SVU; the Union of Ukrainian Youth—SUM). There ensued a struggle on the cultural and economic fronts, a struggle which was joined even by those Ukrainians who a few years previously had joined with the Bolsheviki to erect a “Ukrainian workers’ state” (Khvylovy, Skrypnyk, Volubuyev, and others). The realization has since spread that only a free and independent Ukrainian state could insure the full development of personal and national freedom—in contrast to pre-World War I times, when there was circulated a number of conceptions of what Ukraine should be—an autonomous state, a member of a Slavic federation, and so forth. Now there is only one Ukrainian ideal: the *unqualified independence* of Ukraine.

World War II gave the liberation struggle a powerful impetus. The proclamation of independence on June 30, 1941, in the face of the Nazis, the new occupiers of Ukraine; the creation of the UPA and the UHVR, and the intransigent struggle against the two aggressors of Ukraine—all this may have touched a new high water-mark for heroism in Ukraine. If today we are not as yet directly establishing a Ukrainian independent state, we shall do so in the spiritual domain and shall continue to wage the implacable struggle, which must finally bring about a full spiritual restitution. Wrong are all our critics who say that we are losing. This is simply not the case. We can *never* lose if our further struggle continues to be as heroic. We can lose only if we lose sight of the ideal of Ukraine. The enemy knows this very well. With

saccharine appeals by the Ukrainian-Russian government, with crocodile pleas and bearish threats by the "ministers of the MVD," the Kremlin has tried to break the revolutionary underground in its ideals and thus to bring it to its knees. But the Ukrainian revolutionary, fully aware of the cost of his blood and conscious of the duty imposed upon him by the nation at such a difficult hour, will carry on the banner of the heroic struggle until the very last gasp, if such be the will of fate. He knows that his blood will not have been spilled in vain. He knows that his blood will call forth new fighters, just as the blood of the heroes who died in the struggle for Ukrainian freedom in 1917-1921 had called him to patriotic action; just as the blood of the heroes who are now laying down their lives call him now; and just as his blood will call forth a future generation of fighters, now children, but who, already, are imbued with patriotic zeal.

It is they, the perennial youthful Ukrainian generation, who will take over the banner of the revolutionary struggle and lead the suffering but unsubdued nation to freedom and independence.

Glossary

Cheka. Popular name of the "Extraordinary Commission," the police apparatus developed by the Bolsheviks.

Gubernias. Bolshevik administrative provinces.

Istrebitel battalion. Self-defense detachment, village militia.

KGB. Commissariat of State Security.

Kolkhoz. Collectivization system initiated by Stalin.

Kurkuls. Merchants and small landholders.

NEP. New Economic Policy inaugurated by the Bolsheviks that lasted from 1921 to 1928.

Oblast. Province.

OUN. Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, advocates of armed struggle against foreign regimes in Ukraine.

Raion. County.

Sek-sots. Secret agents, informers.

Stakhanovism. "Socialist competition" in work performance.

Trudoden. "Piece work" system.

UPA. Ukrainian Insurgent Army, organized initially in 1942 by the OUN to fight the Nazis.

Viyt. Village head.

White Guards. Russian leaders from 1918 to 1920 who wanted to restore the old Czarist regime.

