

THE FACETS OF CULTURE



BY
STEPAN HOVERLA

Rostyslav Hlurko

LONDON 1988

STEPAN HOVERLA

THE FACETS
OF CULTURE



THE FACETS OF CULTURE

by

Stepan Hoverla

London 1988

THE FACETS OF CULTURE

by

STEPAN HOVERLA

Cover designed by Rostyslav Hluvko

ISBN 0 902322 37 0

This book has been published with the financial assistance (£3,000)
of the members of the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain Ltd.
— Felixstowe Branch, to whom the publishers wish to extend their most
sincere thanks.

Published by
Ukrainian Central Information Service
London, U.K.

Printed in the United Kingdom
by
Ukrainian Publishers Limited
200 Liverpool Road, London, N1 1LF.

CONTENTS

Foreword	5
Introduction — Bohdan Stebelsky	10
The Facets of Culture	
Introduction	27
National and world culture	30
Coexistence of nations and their cultures	31
The rights of the subjugated nations	33
Mutual influence not the levelling of cultures	34
Ethnocide — the main aim of Moscow's strategists	39
The realisation of the policy of ethnocide	40
The sapping of Ukraine's creative potential	44
The lower strata of the nation — saviours of the Ukrainian national culture	46
The organisation of the opposition movement	49
The reality of socialist realism	54
The historical conditions of the colonial yoke	59
National culture reduced to a peripheral level	63
The élite compelled to falsify history	65
Subjugated peoples are forbidden to know their past	67
The press and periodicals	69
The scientific and cultural intelligentsia — the mainstay of the opposition movement	72
Censorship of underground literature	73
The multi-million strong minority — the mainstay of the occupant	75
The unitary phenomenon of the Ukrainian soul	80
The position and activity of the Ukrainian Churches	81
Aid to Ukrainian Jewry	84
Traitors and collaborators	87
Transmigration and intermixing of the population	91
The Russian system breeds crime	98
Conclusion	104

The Dissident Movement

What is the “dissident movement”?	115
An authentically national phenomenon throughout the empire	116
National opposition	120
The delimitation of principal aims	121
The national-liberation and the human rights movements	123
The Russian opposition	125
The West and the nationalities problem of the empire	127
The Russian opposition forces and the national movements	130
Mutual actions or hostile relations	133
The factor of preserving the empire	135
Human rights or the right to sovereignty	138
The censorship of national documents	141
Parallel movements	142
The right to the title of nationalist	143

The “Tree of National Tasks”

The sacred goal of the Ukrainian nation — an independent sovereign Ukrainian state	147
The nation is a gift of God	149
The pathos of renewal has embraced human spirits	151
The maximum activation of all Ukrainians	152
For the strengthening of the external political activities of Ukrainians	154
A White Book about the black crimes of the Russian occupants	157
The KGB and its collaborators	161

INDEX	165
--------------	-----

FOREWORD

The Facets of Culture is one of the most important and mature political works to come out of Ukraine in the late 1970s. It is a collection of three separate essays: "The Facets of Culture", "The Dissident Movement" and "The 'Tree of National Tasks'". Writing under the pseudonym Stepan Hoverla, the author, himself a prominent member of the Ukrainian national movement, who has spent many years in Soviet Russian captivity, offers an in depth analysis of the situation not only of Ukrainian culture, but of the whole Ukrainian nation, in the conditions of Soviet Russian occupation. He gives an accurate evaluation of the vast power and the goals of the Soviet Russian regime, whose forces are geared towards the complete annihilation of the Ukrainian nation and its engulfment into the Russian national organism, and the strength and resilience of the Ukrainian nation in its struggle for an independent and sovereign national state. His evaluation of both the past and the present, and his prognosis and the plans for the future, which he so clearly puts across to his contemporaries both in Ukraine and scattered throughout the free world, especially Ukrainian youth, is destined to become a major set of political directives in the Ukrainian nation's fight for independence and freedom.

This work was intended as a reaction to Ivan Dzyuba's pamphlet *The Facets of a Crystal*, in which the morally broken Dzyuba, in order to "earn" the trust of the KGB, wrote about the "sublime picture of the development and flourishing of Ukrainian culture as an organic and inseparable component of the whole Soviet culture", in contradiction to his previous brilliant work *Internationalism or Russification?* With the "wide-scale assault of the totalitarian imperial regime on Ukrainian culture and the Ukrainian nation as a whole" in mind, Hoverla gives not only a most able and worthy reply to Dzyuba's pamphlet, but also convincingly underlines and supplements what Dzyuba had previously written in his *Internationalism or Russification?* about the colonial status of the Ukrainian nation and the unenviable fate of the Ukrainian culture. Suffering constant repression and persecution, the author of *The Facets of Culture* did not have the opportunity to study and make use of source materials, as Dzyuba once did when writing his *Internationalism or Russification?* But his book is written from the heart, based on the

knowledge of the harsh realities of Soviet Russian occupation, and is a valuable supplement to Dzyuba's *Internationalism or Russification?* To date, it is perhaps one of the most politically accredited works of the Ukrainian clandestine publications (samvydav).

In the words of the author, the material presented in this book "would not have seen the light of day in this imperfect and incomplete state were it not for the dire necessity of exposing, at least partially, the verbal screen of demagoguery that conceals one of the greatest crimes of all centuries and nations: the destruction of ill-fated nations and the annihilation of their culture". But the author has yet another purpose in mind. His work is aimed at the youth for whom "it is not always possible to obtain objective knowledge about our history, national values, the protracted and powerful aspirations of Ukraine for her sovereignty and statehood". Dzyuba never wrote so openly and boldly.

Whereas in *The Facets of Culture* Hoverla writes about the colonial status of the Ukrainian people, the planned implementation of genocide and ethnocide, and the subsequent destruction of Ukrainian culture, in the next essay, "The Dissident Movement", he shows the growing strength of the opposition to the Soviet regime both in Ukraine and throughout the Soviet Union as a whole, and makes a deeper analysis of opposition movements pointing to their diverging aims and interests. In Ukraine and other subjugated nations, the author sees national-liberation movements whose aim is the struggle for liberation and statehood. "...Ukrainian, Armenian, Lithuanian and Georgian nationalists", he writes, "have set as their goal the liquidation of the colonial yoke, the self-determination of their nations and the establishment of sovereign national states.

The Russian democrats and the Russians, who are simply opposed to the Bolshevik dictatorship. . . seek alternatives to the totalitarian model for a future political system. For this reason, they, in contrast to the democrats (who in large measure acknowledge the importance of the nationalities question as an important factor), devise their 'tree of national goals and tasks' solely from chauvinistic imperialist positions and maintain a hostile attitude towards the national-liberation movements". At the same time, the author asserts that "the most mature segment of Ukrainians, who participated in the struggle of the 1960s and 1970s, call themselves nationalists not dissidents".

The third section of this book is entitled "The 'Tree of National Tasks'". In this section, the author elaborates on the tasks of the Ukrai-

nian national-liberation movement. "Today", writes Hoverla, "Ukraine is in a situation far more tragic than that of a colony. We are not citizens of our own state. We, in essence, are not even full-fledged members of our national family who live and work on their own land for the good of our nation and ourselves. We are miserable Russian prisoners and lackeys, whom the imperialist nation exploits for its own aims, takes advantage of us as cannon fodder and as servants and serfs on agricultural land converted from untamed steppes, and as a select genetic source for the enrichment and enlargement of its intellectual, spiritual and human potential. For that reason, for Ukrainians the 'tree of national tasks', or its primary branches, should be the formation and elaboration of the unity of national goals, which would become a powerful force in the movement of the nation to its ultimate goal. This is the liquidation of its colonial status, programmes, which would return sovereignty, statehood, a normal national life and equality among the nations of the world to Ukraine".

Secondly, the author stresses the importance of maximum efforts to activate all Ukrainians for the task of mobilising the world community in defence of the Ukrainian nation. Jointly coordinated measures, which would make the world community and the governments of Western nations aware that the Ukrainian national question, by its very existence, is one of the exceptionally important and pressing problems of European and world politics, are needed. Having recognised Ukraine's right to statehood and sovereignty as a real political objective of their own policies, Western nations should recognise the necessity to unite on this issue and carry out coordinated measures to realise this goal through diplomatic channels.

In connection with this, the national-liberation movement should prepare an official document calling on the UN to recognise the Ukrainian question as a crucial problem and to pass a resolution on independence for Ukraine and the establishment of a sovereign Ukrainian state, based on the national right to sovereign life, the right of a nation to independence and on the UN Declaration on Decolonisation of 1960.

Separate documents should be sent to the member nations of the UN explaining the true situation in Ukraine and stressing the need for decisive action on the part of governments of the free world and the international community. On the basis of these demands, a resolution should be passed by the General Assembly of the UN calling for a halt to the ethnocide in Ukraine and the unjust mass resettling of Ukrainians in

territory alien to them. This resolution should include clauses on the necessity of reintroducing the Ukrainian language into Ukrainian schools, technical institutes and higher educational institutions. The official language in the conduct of daily business, in technical documents and administrative agencies of Ukraine should likewise be Ukrainian.

It is also necessary to show the world the true situation, which exists in Ukrainian academic life and Ukraine's educational system: the absence of sovereign rights of higher educational institutions as national centres of learning, the total control of opportunities of scholarly and other contacts of Ukrainian academicians with colleagues in other countries, and the suppression of the strivings for freedom of thought and independent creative work.

Materials relating to this should be sent to scientific institutions of member nations of the UN and the world academic community to expose the imperial policies of Moscow in the sphere of academic study and science. Demands for the establishment of a sovereign and independent Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and the full and equal participation of Ukrainian schools in academic activities of the UN and an end to the appropriation of Ukrainian intellectuals by Moscow should be made. The situation of Ukrainian culture is even more tragic. Therefore, it is necessary to expose the plundering of national cultures, the oppression and the colonial Russification policies of Moscow in education and spiritual and cultural life.

As far as sport is concerned, an appeal should be made to countries participating in the Olympic Games, the International Olympic Committee and individual national Committees on behalf of the legal rights of Ukrainians to establish a Ukrainian Olympic Committee, a separate sovereign national entity. The establishment of a Ukrainian Olympic Committee and its admission into the International Committee would be the basis of the participation of Ukraine in the Olympic Games with its own national team.

Analogous documents should be sent to international sports organisations stressing the necessity of the acceptance of Ukraine in defined organisations as a full-fledged and sovereign member, and the need to admit a Ukrainian national team into athletic competitions in the same capacity as national teams of other sovereign states, especially the team of the USSR.

Next, the author thinks it imperative to gather, edit and publish

materials and documents clarifying all the aspects of the Ukrainian national tragedy, which should appear in the form of a "White Book" presented to all the governments of member nations of the UN, government and political leaders, influential international organisations, political parties and associations, academic and public libraries. The national-liberation movement should gather materials and documents about those tortured, those destroyed by famine and those murdered in prisons and concentration camps, exposing all the crimes of Moscow. This should include the forced collectivisation and artificial famine, and the mass deportations of Ukrainians in inhuman conditions to the barren uninhabited Siberian fringes, hundreds of thousands of whom perished. It should also contain materials about the genocide and terror in Ukraine in the 1930s and 1940s, which resulted in the death of millions of Ukrainians, the destruction of national monuments and cultural treasures, the forced liquidation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox and the Ukrainian Catholic Churches, the exploitation of Ukraine's natural resources, as well as the forced assimilation and systematic resettlement of millions of Ukrainians after WWII.

The last two essays in *The Facets of Culture*, "The Dissident Movement" and "The 'Tree of National Tasks'", are from a series of "political lectures for the Ukrainian youth". However, because the content of all three essays is so important, it is essential that they appear together as one book in order to give an opportunity for the reader, particularly Ukrainian youth in the free world, to discover and understand the difficult position of the Ukrainian nation and its culture in the Soviet Union and to become acquainted with the real aims of the Ukrainian national-liberation movement. These essays have been acclaimed as among the best in modern times to tackle the theme of Ukrainian culture and the current situation in Ukraine. For this reason, *The Facets of Culture* appears in English as a major work dealing with Ukrainian culture. The omissions in the text are due to difficulty in transcribing the original text, which was handwritten.

S.O.

INTRODUCTION

Among the great works of literature of the Ukrainian resistance, *The Facets of Culture* paints the widest and deepest picture of the colossal struggle with which the enemy, after physically subduing our nation in the armed clashes of the 1940s and 1950s, is attempting to crush the nation's spiritual strength and its cultural uniqueness, a uniqueness that is fundamental to national consciousness and the desire for national independence.

The enemy is no longer satisfied with despoiling the land, but, like wind and water, enters into all the crevices of the thoughts and emotions of the conquered in order to enslave them and enable them to live only in the organism of the conqueror. And at such a moment, at the very time of the enemy's aggression against the mind and soul of a nation, a decisive battle takes place for the existence of a nation, its very life or death.

Every nation is an individual, with its particular biological, mental and perceptual characteristics, which are reflected in a people's culture. Every people has its beginnings in some birth, in some formative event; it has its own paths of development, its own life experience, which is translated into its life's ideals and is reproduced in its spiritual creativity, its customs and beliefs, its arts and its world view. All these elements of the style and content of a people, created by it from the very beginning of its existence, are called a people's culture.

A nation ceases to exist from the moment that it loses its own culture and with it its historical memory and its concrete experience of life and the ideals to which bygone generations have contributed and for which they have lived. That is why we dare to say that the most important and decisive battle that our nation is waging with the aggressor is being waged on the cultural front, on the instinctive and conscious feelings of one's separateness and individuality, around an individuality that the occupant is trying to erase from memory and substitute for it his own cultural content.

This struggle takes place formally under the slogan of national cultures according to the class principle and of the foisting upon enslaved nations the concepts of a "bourgeois-nationalist" as opposed to a "prole-

tarian internationalist" culture. This division is created with the intent of destroying individual cultures and of creating the possibility for the real goal of the Russian occupants under their theories of the "merging of cultures", the "friendship of peoples", and the "union of nations" for the eventual creation of one "Soviet people", educated in the spirit of "proletarian culture". The model for proletarian culture is Russian culture in which are carefully preserved all the characteristics of Russian "bourgeois" culture. The Russian language is regarded as the language of the future Soviet people, since, because of its influence on the languages of the enslaved nations, these people experience a "blossoming" and "perfecting" reaching to the very peak already attained by the "most developed" Russian language.

All the conquests of the tsarist, and later Russian Bolshevik, empire are regarded as a "progressive historical phenomenon" because they influenced the cultural and economical "development" of the conquered peoples. The "most progressive phenomenon" is the drawing together and merging of all cultures into one nation of Russian, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian peoples who, at the time of Kyivan Rus', presumably made up a Rus' people and who, so it is said, later disintegrated into three separate nations under the pressures of Tartar and Lithuanian occupation. Soviet history, archaeology, anthropology, ethnography, literature and all the branches of the arts have the task of showing not only the "close connections" of these three nations and the "common roots" of their cultures, but also the historical tendencies and desire for "union", the complete cultural merging of these three nations and the eradication of everything that prevents or contradicts this. Thus, in the historical disciplines, the "cultural workers" make use of the method of falsification and Leninist "dialectics", while in the sphere of the arts the method is changed to the physical destruction of creative styles and the traditions of the so-called socialist realism.

Does there really exist an original parent country of these three nations — Ukrainians, Byelorussians, and Russians? In particular, there is the question of whether there exists a common culture of these three nations that are called Slavic? Do they have, other than their family of languages, a common character? Do they have common ancestors so that one could speak of an estrangement and the necessity of restoring the unity of three Slavic-speaking peoples?

Nations change their languages during the course of history. True, they do not change these as often as they do their names, but under the

influence of historical circumstances nations have changed and continue to change their language; for there have always existed conquering and conquered nations. Most often, the conquerors have forced their language on the conquered. The Romans forced their language on the peoples of the Pyrenean peninsula, and Latinised Gaul; in the Balkans they Latinised the Dacians and Slavs, thus creating the basis for the Rumanian language and people. From as far back as the paleolithic age there have been no large tracts devoid of population centres in Europe. Every ethnic group that changed its territory occupied the territory of another indigenous population. It was not always necessary to destroy the original inhabitants; usually the invader mixed with the natives. This process is explained by the theory of substrata. The Eastern Slavs, whose territories are marked out by archaeologists and linguists, consolidated their homeland between the Carpathians, the Prut and the Danube in the west, the left-bank tributaries of the Dnieper in the east, the Black Sea in the south, and the Prypyat and the Oder. The Greeks designated the Slavs as the Sklaviny and Antes; the Romans called them Vanadians. As has been stated, we are not concerned with the name and the language of our ancestors, whom history does not remember; but they are clearly noted in archaeology, anthropology, and the remains of their material culture. The latter testifies to the social and spiritual culture of our ancestors, which has sustained itself to the present and which had the name of Antes and Rus' in the past and is now called Ukrainian.

We are concerned here with the permanence of the indigenous population of the geographical area on which, from neolithic age until the time of Kyivan Rus', a unity of territorial, material, and spiritual culture, a community of beliefs, customs and folkways has sustained itself from one epoch to the next. The thesis of the indigenous character of the culture of the Ukrainian territories was formulated by the father of Ukrainian archaeology, V. Khvoyka; it was upheld by Ya. Pasternak and the majority of Ukrainian archaeologists.

Beginning with the mesolithic age, from the 6th century B.C., the Buho-Dniester culture showed signs of a continuous agricultural community in Ukraine, which is at the same time one of the oldest agricultural societies of Balkan Europe. At the beginning of the 4th century B.C., it transmitted its agricultural characteristics to the Trypillian culture, which reached as far as the Dnieper and lasted until the 2nd century B.C. Afterwards, there appeared the string culture, known in

Ukraine as the Middle-Dnieper. In the white-breasted culture, in which elements of the Trypillian reappeared and which ended the bronze age and crossed over into the black forest age, we have the beginnings of the iron age, which entered into the age of the Scythians and Iranians. The majority of professional archaeologists see in this culture the tie to the Eastern Slavs, who gradually developed the Zarubинetsky and, finally, the Chernyakhivsky cultures, and which correspond to the historical Antes. These created the first forms of a Slavic state on the territory of Ukraine from which Kyivan Rus' later emerged.

As we see, the population of Ukraine continued to occupy its geographical territory for over 8,000 years as a stable population concerned with agriculture, and the development of its material and spiritual culture, which resulted in the construction of living quarters, tools, ceramics, and ornamental symbols. The belief in the purifying force of fire, a belief exhibiting itself since the Trypillian age in the custom of cremation and continuing in various forms until the christianisation of Rus', shows the continuity of culture of the native population. Having an almost uninterrupted contact with South-western Europe, this population created a complex culture whose development was broken by the migrating pastoral tribes of Asia. These nomadic tribes, looking for grazing lands for their flocks, moved across the steppes and, from time to time, drove the farming tribes into the forests, where they found shelter and from which they re-emerged into the steppes in safer times. The nomadic tribes crowded each other in their continuous migrations from the Caspian, Azovian, and Black Sea steppes into the Danube valleys.

North of the Prypyat stretched the lands of the Baltic tribes, the ancestors of the historical Prussians and the present-day Latvians and Lithuanians. They were settled cattle-raising tribes, which gradually, under the influence of their southern neighbours, turned to farming. Linguistically the Balts were related to the Slavs, as they were, to a great extent, in their material and spiritual culture as well.

We get a totally different picture north-east of the Desna and the mouth of the Oka to the Volga basin and from the eastern coast of the Baltic to the White Sea and the Urals. In that region lived hunting and fishing tribes of Ugro-Finnish stock from mesolithic times, through the neolithic and bronze ages until the colonisation of those lands by Slavic conquerors in the first five centuries A.D.

According to contemporary chronicles, the Slavs who colonised the

Baltic and Ugro-Finnish lands were unable to drive out the local populations, which outnumbered the colonists, and gradually intermingled with them ethnically. The present-day Byelorussian and Russian territories were colonised by northern and western Slavic tribes. The latter include, according to the chronicles, the Viatychi, the Slovens and the Radymychi, and some archaeologists also add the Kryvychi. The Slavs, surrounded by a sea of Finnish tribes, were centred in the large city of Novhorod, and there developed a complex culture, which was, quite likely, imported from the south. Anthropologists see in the physical features of these Slavs traces of Pontic racial characteristics; their language also retained certain Slavic elements.

The Viatychi and the north-eastern Kryvychi took over the culture and beliefs of the indigenous local hunting tribes, although they retained their linguistic dominance. Some archaeologists deny their Slavic origin, regarding the Dryhovychi, Kryvychi, Radymychi, Slovens, and Viatychi as Slavicised tribes rather than true Slavs.

It is hardly surprising that with the disintegration of the Kyiv empire, which was multinational in its ethnic composition, foreign tribes began to build their own states on the basis of their age-old traditions and territories. The Ukrainian people retained its agricultural character within the boundaries of its ancient Slavic culture; the Byelorussian people formed and separated itself within the cultural boundaries and territories of the former Baltic tribes north of the Prypyat. And around the Oka and Volga rivers, on the former territories of the Ugro-Finns, there began to form the embryo of the Russian nation, built on the traditions of a hunting and trapping culture. One can speak of the unity of the Slavic peoples in a linguistic sense, and here only as concerns the Byelorussian and Ukrainian languages with their Balto-Slavic language heritage. One should be careful about the Russian language, which consists mainly of lexical similarities, but is different from the Ukrainian language phonetically, syntactically, and morphologically. One can translate almost literally Shevchenko into Byelorussian or Kupala into Ukrainian. But it is impossible to translate Pushkin into Ukrainian or Byelorussian in the same way. The languages differ in character.

As in the north of Eastern Europe, a similar process of Slavicisation occurred in the Balkan peninsula, where the Antes and Sklavyne were assimilated by the native tribes of Traky, Macedonians and Illyrians, as well as by the invading Tyrsky Bulgars. Thus, new nations were formed from local cultures with which the Bulgarians, Macedonians, Serbs,

Croatians, and Slovenes were connected. They were called Slavs and their culture, similar to that of the Ukrainians, was based on ancestors, who spread the Trypillian culture and were neighbours, in the west, of other long-standing agricultural tribes of Europe, the carriers of the so-called Lentochna culture, contemporaneous with the Trypillian.

The theory of substrata is important in the formation of nations; according to it we can explain the appearance of, for example, Mexicans, who are not Spaniards although they speak Spanish. We can prove that Peruvians, Bolivians, and Paraguayans in South America are also not Spaniards. Thus, we conclude on the basis of archaeology, anthropology, ethnography, and the history of culture as a whole that the Russian nation arose from different cultural and ethnic origins than the Ukrainian, and that it has its own character, which influences its style of life with its biological, social, and spiritual roots. The character of a Russian is diametrically opposite to that of a Ukrainian.

The Ukrainian, a tiller of the soil with a sense of personal dignity and of private property, is freedom-loving, equable, and hospitable even towards foreigners. Ukrainian society, whether in the times of the Antes, in the Kyivan Rus' era, or in Cossack times, knew of no serfdom or slavery. The system of exploitation and plunder is a characteristic of the subjugator of the Ukrainian people, whether today or in the past.

The Russian phenomenon is a product of a communal social organisation that has no basis in private property. It stressed the discipline of the group and its subordination to its leader. In its forms of Bolshevism and proletarian internationalism it serves as a classic example of the old hunting cultures. In its character, as in that of every hunter, there are traits of hunting and pillaging. Hunters live according to the rule of might, not of justice. Such traits developed over the course of thousands of years of hunting life of the Finnish tribes, the ancestors of present-day Russians. A strong element of Tartar racial characteristics entered into this stream and with it that of the horde, a faceless mass that acts obediently on the order of the khan's whip.

The Russian has not changed either with the coming of a system of agriculture, or under the influence of Christianity (imposed by Kyivan Rus'), or with the arrival, from the Kyiv-Mohylansky Academy in Ukraine, of an educated clergy, or with the European reforms of Peter I, or even under the influence of the Polish-Lithuanian and later the German and Cossack nobility on the Russian boyars. All this was

instinctively rejected by the Russians, who, liberated by Lenin, showed once again their hunter's teeth. This Russian character was described by Alexander Blok in his poem *The Scythians*:

Millions of you, but hordes and hordes of us.
Our might is irresistible.
Yes, we are Scythians! Yes, we are Asiatics!
With slanting, greedy eyes.

See! The day has come. Misery is flapping its wings.
The time of destruction is nearing,
And perhaps there where your temples have stood
Now only weeds will be growing.

You antique, sagacious world! Before you
Tumble into the grave from wealth and boredom,
Stand, like Oedipus, before the Sphinx
And try to solve its riddle.

Russia is the sphinx, sombre and bright
And soaked in dark blood.
It gazes into your eyes
With love and hate.

It loves, our blood loves.
For long no one of you has loved so!
You have forgotten that there is love in the world
That burns and destroys.

We love flesh, its colour and taste,
And its tainted, mortal smell.
Are we to blame when your skeleton cracks
In our heavy and delicate paws?

Widely, in powerful dress
We will spread out in the wild spaces
Before Europe. We will show you
Our Asiatic faces.

We won't move when the cruel Hun
Greedy searches corpses,
Burns cities, drives cattle into temples,
Roasts the flesh of the white captives.

Even to the author of the Kyivan chronicles the character of the two cultures of the Kyivan Rus' empire was readily apparent. In the south live "wise and thoughtful men"; in the north men live "like animals".

Mykola Chubaty writes: "Two different minds and two different ideologies can clearly be detected in the relations of Kyiv and the Suzdal-Volodymyr state, the forerunner of Moscow, towards the Tartars, when the Tartar wave engulfed Eastern Europe. Kyiv, carrying on the traditions of its ancestors, decided to resist the barbarians of the steppes; the forerunners of Moscow decided to capitulate and cooperate¹". And he writes further: "No one has so definitively described the mentalities of Rus'-Ukraine and Muscovy as the Russian writer Alexey Tolstoy, author of the well-known historical novel *Prince Serebryany*. According to Tolstoy, two attitudes revealed themselves on the part of the two halves of the ancient Rus' lands towards the Tartars: 'One Rus'', he writes, 'has its roots in universal, at least European culture. In this Rus' the ideas of goodness, honour, and freedom are understood as in the West. But there is another Rus', the Rus' of the dark forests, the Rus' of the taigas, the animal Rus', the fanatic Rus', the Mongol-Tartar Rus'. This last Rus' made despotism and fanaticism its ideals. Certain historical data make it possible for us to see the first ideal in the Rus' of old Kyiv, and to see all the negative features of the opposite tendency, the eastern and despotic, in Moscow, which rose on the spiritual ruins of Kyiv. Kyivan Rus' was a part of Europe; Moscow long remained the negation of Europe'²".

A similar opinion was stated by historian Yuri Vernadsky about the "something" that separated Kyiv from Moscow: "That 'something' was the spirit of freedom — individual, political, and economic — which prevailed in the Rus' of that day and to which the Muscovite principle of the individual's complete obedience to the state was in complete contrast³".

1 Mykola Chubaty: *Medieval Rus' and the Emergence of the Three East-Slav Nations*, p. 101.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 101.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 101.

Similar to Tolstoy, Mykola Khvylovy perceived, with great intuition, the contrasts between Ukraine and Muscovy. In his novel *Editor Kark* he described two opposing forces: "Hryhoriy Savych Skovoroda — this is how the Russian intelligentsia likes it: Hryhoriy Savych, Nikolai Romanovych, Vladimir Ilich, Taras Hryhorovych. And in this there is something of the northern sweetness and stubbornness, of marshy forests and Ivan Kalyta, of Russian strength — a great strength, fatal, and coming from Varangian guests. And there are no cherry orchards here — in June, stars grow on the cherry trees — and there are no pretty girls' songs, far off near the villages. . . Smoke. . . There has always been smoke over Ukraine, he thought, and all of it has been enveloped in the smoke of uprisings, in the smoke of suffering. . . And there was fire and also a great, immense strength, a fatal strength, only it did not come from Varangian guests⁴".

It is not important whether Khvylovy was correct in naming Russian strength Varangian; the important thing is the opposition of two great, overwhelming, and fatal forces — that of the northern hunters and that of the southern farmers. The former, in order to live, must kill and plunder; the latter earn their bread in the sweat of their brows, by work. They kill only to defend their lives or their possessions. The "truth of Rus'" is a Ukrainian creation, the result of life experience of thousands of years. Moscow did not act according to this truth because it lived by a truth of its own. It did not know the freedom of the individual, his dignity, the right of private property, the two-member marriage; it lived by the commune. The "truth of Moscow" takes no consideration of personal freedom or individual privacy; it takes no consideration of the lives of millions of people or of whole nations. It subjugates nations according to the law of the hunter-plunderer. Thus were subjugated the lands of Ryazan, Tver; thus was Novhorod destroyed and its population, or what was left of it, was transferred to Muscovy.

In war, Russian imperialism lacks the courtly ideal of Kyivan Prince Svyatoslav's "I am setting out against you". In a direct open struggle Moscow would lose; it always uses cunning, like the hunter. It conceals its real aims by fictions that confuse its victims, fictions like Russian orthodoxy, pan-Slavism, or internationalism. Under the guise of Marxism, Russian imperialism forges a communism, first, by the creation of a "Soviet" people in the USSR and then nations of a world proletariat

4 Mykola Khvylovy: *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 37.

through the “fusion of peoples”. Russian imperialism has as its goal the mission of its race — to melt into one all the nations of its empire and, eventually, the whole world in accordance with the Russian character and style of life. At first they desire to instil the language and culture of Lenin into the Ukrainians and Byelorussians, the Baltic peoples, and the Caucasian, Turkic and Central Asian peoples; and when this is done, then the Europeans in the West, the Americans, and the Asians will be next.

Russian imperialism does not use the words “conquer”, “subjugate”, or “occupy”. It has its own terminology for these acts — “unite”, “free”, “aid”, “make friends”, “draw near”, “bring together”, “develop”.

A classic example of the essence of Russians “liberation” and “aid” is Lenin’s statement that “only through the united efforts of the Great Russian and Ukrainian proletariat is a free Ukraine possible; without such a united effort all such talk is useless⁵”. Any other kind of Ukraine, that is an independent Ukraine, is impossible! There can be no “talk” of an independent, only about a “free” Ukraine and, constitutionally, a “sovereign” Ukraine, since such a designation is empty when the power is in Russian and in imperial hands. When Ukraine is socialist, when it is Soviet, when it is part of a union, when its capital is in Moscow, when a “republic” provides a “state” with everything it produces, when the whole empire, from the Carpathians to Kamchatka is an indivisible “fatherland” — only then can one speak of a “free”, even of a “thriving” Ukraine.

The Bolshevik system of total dictatorship cannot transform itself into a democracy, just as the system of a collective economy, which originates in the social and racial characteristics of the Russians, cannot transform itself into a system of private ownership or individual initiative. The Bolshevik system gives the Russian nation boundless capacity to control the physical, material, and spiritual life of other peoples as never before. But this does not mean that the character of this nation differed in earlier times. The Russian historian Solovyov, in the work *Nicholas, the Gendarmes, and Literature*, states: “Everyone was assigned a strictly delimited place, and from everyone it was required that he should talk, think and feel exactly as ordered to do... The system destroyed everything that was in its way”.

Behind the screen of the social transformation of the nations con-

5 Lenin: *Works*, Vol. XX, p.14.

quered by Moscow, the main goal of the occupant has been and is to make these nations totally dependent, to create an economic system that would control the life of every person, direct it, and form it into a helpless brick in the construction of the empire. The physical destruction of nations and the terror against their governing classes have laid the foundation for the mass transfer of native population into other peoples' territories. The centralised rule in Moscow, developing its empire's industry and urbanising individual republics, makes use of the direction of the productive sectors of nations by means of "aid" to and "friendship" among nations. Under the pretext of aiding the "labour force", Russians, Byelorussians, Georgians, and even Uzbeks are brought into the industrial centres of Ukraine. Meanwhile, the Ukrainian peasantry is displaced into the virgin lands of Kazakhstan, and the Ukrainian worker is forced to leave the industrial cities of Ukraine in order to construct trade centres in Siberia such as Tyumen, BAM, and others.

The transfer of population under the façade of economic productivity takes place at the cost of young people of both sexes, usually single, who marry in an environment of mixed nationalities and become pliable material for assimilation. Assimilation is furthered by the heterogeneous national composition of the empire's industrial centres, where the only conversational language of these people is Russian and where the schools and the cultural services available to all nationalities use the Russian language exclusively.

As a result of this policy created in Moscow, there are fewer and fewer members of the younger generations from the native populations of the "national republics" who start families; the national make-up changes, and the natural increase in the native population becomes smaller. The population growth is the result of immigration from other national republics, most often from the RSFSR. The result of this planned policy is that the Russian minority grows proportionally larger than the majority of Ukrainians in the republic.

The cosmopolitan character of Ukrainian cities, especially of the industrial centres, gives the Russian occupant the chance to stress the thesis of the importance of the Russian language as an intra-national means of communication.

The First Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine V. Shcherbytsky, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the creation of the USSR, said, "The Russian language, consciously and freely chosen by

all the peoples of the USSR as an instrument of intra-national communication, plays an extraordinarily large unifying role; it serves the goal of intra-national fraternity of workers, of the exchange of material and cultural achievements, and of the enrichment of national cultures⁶". The author in whose work this quote is found goes on to state: "The working class, as V. I. Lenin emphasised, supports everything that erases national differences and welcomes assimilation... Life has fully proved the Marx-Leninist thesis that socialism is impossible without defeating all inherited... national exclusivity and national bounds. Socialism... has found the road to the drawing closer of all nations, to their grouping into a single multinational community, to the realisation of their complete unity, to the future merging of nations⁷".

The same author proceeds to write: "From the specific nationality there is excluded all that is outmoded and reactionary in the sphere of customs, traditions, and culture, all that impedes the course of the drawing near of nations and nationalities. The drawing together of nations is a natural process... and there is no basis for artificially halting it, especially by preserving those "unique" national traits that have already grown old with age and over which anti-communists 'lament' so much⁸".

One could cite many more passages from various authors, Russian and renegades from the enslaved nations. But this would be pointless: they are all the same. Behind them stands the chauvinist, imperialistic Russian axe that destroys the individuality of other peoples and nations, their cultures and traditions, and their rights to be themselves, to live according to their ways, to cultivate their own cultures, and to surround themselves with the borders of their own national states.

All the means available to the state apparatus are used to further the programme of the merging of nations and the creations of a new Soviet people on a Russian pattern. To this end are mobilised all levels of the school system, youth organisations, the military, the press, and artistic, academic, and professional organisations. All these carry out the programme of the Communist Party of the USSR in all spheres of life of the empire's peoples. These agencies have the goal of turning these peoples into Russians. Their goal is to cultivate the "language of the

6 See L. Nahorna: *Against the Bourgeois Falsification of the National Policy of the CPSU*.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 149.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 170.

revolution", "the language of the great Lenin", the Russian language, which is the "means of joining the Soviet people to cultural achievements of all the people of the USSR, to the achievements of world culture".

The goal is to "remove everything that is outmoded and reactionary" in the Ukrainian nation. This includes the destruction of Ukrainian churches, the extirpation of the customs and traditions of the thousand-year-old Ukrainian culture, the extirpation of the styles and works of Ukrainian poets, writers, artists, composers, and even the forcing of Russian folk art into Ukrainian national centres under the pretext of "innovation". Everything native and original in Ukrainian culture is regarded as outmoded and as "obstructive to the drawing near of nations and nationalities". Thus, for example, the geometrical ornaments of Ukrainian art, which have existed on Ukrainian lands from paleolithic times, are suppressed and in their place is substituted the naturalistic motifs of Russian folk art, with its animal, plant, and anthropomorphic ornaments. The deformation of Ukrainian culture, its de-stylisation, and its dislocation are conducted by plan in all the territories of Ukraine. It will suffice to compare pre-Soviet publications on 19th century and earlier folk art with the art of the so-called "Soviet" period in order to see the catastrophic decline of Ukrainian culture, which is produced by Moscow-schooled folk artists in cooperatives and factories.

Moscow keeps a sharp watch for artists, who grow out of the roots of Ukrainian culture and strive to bind the present to the past, or those whose talent strays from the programme of destruction of nations and which creates genuine cultural values. Then Moscow destroys with its hunter's hands these talented individuals. Thus, the composer Mykola Leontovych, who opened the doors to the treasures of the Ukrainian national folk songs died at its hands; Volodymyr Ivasiuk, who led Ukrainian youth away from the influence of Russian popular songs, also perished in this way. Mykola Khvylovy, whose motto was "Away from Moscow!" met the same fate. Les Kurbas, the creator of the Ukrainian modern theatre; the creators of Ukrainian modern art Mykhailo Boychuk, Vasyl Sedlyar, and Ivan Padalka perished in exile. Poets perished, as did the ablest scholars. But so did archaeologists, historians, linguists, literary figures, and art critics. Similarly to Leontovych and Ivasiuk, Alla Horska was murdered because in her works she exposed, as did Symonenko, the hell of the Russian "heaven".

Today, there exist two cultures in Ukraine. The first is the culture that, along with its practitioners, the occupant is destroying, but which continues to be preserved and developed; the second is an anti-culture, which the occupant is attempting to force on the population. This official anti-culture is cultivated, in each enslaved nation, by those with vested interests — the members of the academies of sciences, the professional art unions, theatre, music, and ballet ensembles, journal and book publishers, radio and television, and all other communication and information media. Everything that the latter “create” is assigned by the communist party, which is directed by Moscow. The first culture, the real one, is erased and extirpated along with its undaunted creators. This true culture has found itself in the underground self-publishing organs and its creators in prisons and concentration camps. The officials have the powers of an occupational force because they have their orders and, out of weakness and greed, have agreed to stupefy and paralyse the consciousness of the nation with Moscow’s propaganda, to kill in the people the awareness of their uniqueness and individuality. Ukrainian official literature has as its goal the “building of communism”, the development of “a feeling of one family”, — one fatherland with its capital in Moscow. The propaganda of these officials not only inundates Ukraine, but is sent abroad by Moscow. It is sent in the name of contact and cultural “exchange”. Ukrainians abroad, who do not know what anti-culture is, or what real Ukrainian culture is, become victims of Moscow’s lies. They take anti-culture for Ukrainian culture and help Moscow to poison them and their environment.

For a long time, we have not had any works that might have thrown light on the struggle in the area of culture, the struggle for the mind and soul of the nation. The author of this book has in some degree filled the void, giving a picture of this struggle, its methods, sacrifices and goals. The reader will profit from the experience of an eyewitness and indomitable participant in the struggle for a true Ukrainian culture; he will feel the pain of the author and his warning that Ukraine is in danger.

If the reader feels and understands this, the author will have achieved his goal.

Bohdan Stebelsky

•

THE FACETS OF CULTURE

•

THE FACETS OF CULTURE

Introduction

In 1976, the Ukraina society published a pamphlet by I. Dzyuba entitled *The Facets of a Crystal*¹. The work, average among hundreds of works with an analogous theme, can be distinguished because of Dzyuba's style of writing, his linguistic culture and because of two or three ideas that appear on the last few pages of the work, and in which at least the shadow of the former Dzyuba comes to life. The publication does not excel as a criticism, not only because *The Facets of a Crystal* is an ordinary propagandistic "mayfly", a super-official trumpet, an attempt to present a "grandiose" picture of the "development" and "blossoming" of Ukrainian culture — "an organic and inseparable constituent element of Soviet culture" (I. Dzyuba). It is a part of a major offensive launched by the totalitarian imperial regime, aimed in particular against the Ukrainian nation as a whole with the sole intention of draining its life-blood to result in its total engulfment, — but also because it was specifically prepared for readership abroad and as a bellicose assault against their people and ideas, and thus against the linguistic activity of the Ukrainian emigration and its most important representatives — that section of the Ukrainian population, which for completely comprehensible reasons, played a role in the materialisation of that sacred national concept: sovereignty and statehood. For these reasons, the book — a testimony to the achievement of the KGB — was personally delivered by its true editors to some Ukrainian political prisoners, who also find themselves beyond the frontiers of Ukraine — in Russian concentration camps — for such activity.

Also, and obviously most importantly, the publication was not publicly acclaimed because its author was, in the distant past, one of the most active members of the opposition. He was arrested in 1972 as one of the leaders and ideologues of the movement, and, while in a KGB prison, he renounced his views, his activities, his earlier works, in particular his most popular work *Internationalism or Russification?*² Now, he merely "earns" his trust. I Dzyuba's "extraordinary transformation" is not an everyday occurrence in our community. Indeed, similar events have rarely, occurred throughout the whole of Ukraine's social horizon,

and among people of Dzyuba's character and standards, it is simply exceptional. For this reason, the devotion, dedication, and uncompromising idealism shown by such social activists as A. Horska, O. Berdnyk, M. Horyn, I. Svitlychny, Ye. Sverstyuk, V. Chornovil, L. Lukyanyenko, M. Rudenko³ and many others — with whom Dzyuba stood as a companion in arms until recently — have today become the symbol of the determination of Ukrainians, the measure of state wisdom and the bearers and creators of national values.

Without directly referring to the phenomenon of Dzyuba, I shall simply add that, as a product of communist society and as a typical representative of its morals, he clearly demonstrates the schizophrenia that it produces in an individual and the psychology of terror, which results in a consistent devaluation of words, and which culminates in the prostitution of deeds. At the beginning of the 1960s, Dzyuba was carried to the crest of the turbulent wave of the Ukrainian renaissance and became one of the most important bearers of our rebirth.

However, under the pressure of repressions he was confronted with an alternative: either to remain in position with the fighters against the Ukrainophobic policies in Ukraine and be sentenced, and thus corroborate Moscow's colonial policy, the mass genocide of Ukrainians, and through self-sacrifice, broaden the scope of the national-liberation process; or to reject and renounce his principles and hire himself to the services of our colonisers. Dzyuba opted for the second alternative. This was not because his views had changed or because of a "sincere belief" in the "blossoming of Ukrainian culture", but because of his pusillanimity, his tragic indifference to those important processes that were taking place and growing in Ukraine, and because of his underestimation of his role in them. He had been convinced of his talent as a literary critic by excessively "pliant" advisors and "admirers" — people who had consciously committed a similar error, and who, perhaps unintentionally, were trying to gain the "optimum" variant from the situation, "attempting to obtain the best from the present, past and future" for themselves at a time when objective and independent study of the history of Ukrainian culture "blossoms side by side with other cultures". It seems that they are trying to say: "I am not the only apostate. There are more of us, and not only us average men, but there is Tychyna⁴ in poetry, Dzyuba in criticism".

However, the different types of behaviour manifested by Ukrainian cultural workers as a consequence of psychological terror shall be dis-

cussed at a later stage. I shall only mention that, having consciously raised and linked the question of culture, spiritual, historical, psychological, legal, political, material and economic values and national characteristics, I am mainly dealing with political concepts, or to use Dzyuba's words: "the facets of culture". In using these concepts as a set complex of meanings, let us not imagine that we are using precise terms, formulas or definitions, or that we are dealing with the full extent of the questions raised. The material presented, given the conditions facing its authors, is not particularly deeply researched, nor does it consider the questions it has raised in their entirety, and does not present any solutions to the problems. It is a reaction to Dzyuba's book *The Facets of a Crystal* — a book assigned and virtually written by the KGB. It is also a reflection on the situation our nation is presently in, the true state of her culture, and also several constructive ideas for possible directions that the opposition movement could take, and its perspectives. The material presented here would not have seen the light of day in this imperfect and incomplete state were it not for the necessity of exposing, at least partially, the verbal screen of demagoguery that conceals one of the greatest crimes of all centuries and nations: the destruction of ill-fated nations and the annihilation of their culture.

I, to a certain extent, have consciously not attempted to specify or elaborate any detailed descriptions of the questions raised and their many nuances that would allow a deeper analysis of the problems. This is the task of those who are truly deeply troubled by the position of our nation and its culture and who study or work independently for the Ukrainian community. These observations are directed at Ukrainian youth, and it is to the youth of Ukraine that I dedicate them. The youth must and should know the truth, and most vitally of all, should be devoted to the Ukrainian nation. However, under the control of schools, and universities, they are disinformed, and live under the constant pressure of the bureaucratic machine and its propagandistic mass information reproduced in transatlantic television, the cinema, and the theatre. In such conditions, intended to produce total deception, it is not always possible to obtain objective knowledge about our history, our national values, and the protracted and powerful aspirations of Ukraine for her sovereignty and statehood.

National and world culture

Culture is an aggregate of ideals and symbols, norms and principles, achievements and values, the organisation and methods of human activity in the spiritual, material, creative and heraldic spheres that have been assimilated by a nation (or mankind) throughout its whole history. Culture, as a multifaceted totality of all these concepts in their causal and consequential appearance, as an aggregate of imperatives, as an organic need of man, becomes a reality that is determined and controlled by the aspirations of man's soul, his biological development, the individual and general nature of the artist, by social factors and conditions, by the means of existence of both the creative individual and the nation to which he belongs. The incessant flow of life gives culture its continual progress, its variations and the transformation of its forms, methods and means. Culture continually evolves and develops, and is enriched by the new values brought by each successive generation of its community. It unites and embraces language, religion, art and science, the means of social existence and the existing level of production. Culture, through this development and evolution, simultaneously appeals to its past generations, to their deep spiritual, biological and historic origins, their sources and traditions. The harmony between the past and present is the guarantee of the opportunity and right of a nation to take full advantage of its national achievements. Their free and incomplete synthesis, their spiritual unity and organically reciprocal traditions, are the precondition and guarantee for the natural, independent and free development of national cultures, and the basis of their development and evolution. This is also the basis that makes it possible for a national culture to make a worthy contribution to the culture of all mankind.

World culture is an aggregate of national cultures, which are integrated through a system of functioning organisations and which are united through a common circulatory system, through the assimilation of past cultural achievements, mutual influences and exchanges, and the mutual historic rivalry of opposing nations, and in the present culture is united by analogical processes. The culture of mankind is an aggregate of national cultures united into a single system in which the universal nature of mankind, of different nationalities, has been harmoniously interwoven into the wide breadth of general human values with their multifaceted manifestations. Global unity does not preclude, but rather anticipates, the continual rivalry of cultures, which stimulates the indi-

viduality of national characteristics because of the inherent need of each organism to verify its uniqueness. Without this rivalry and without continual mutual exchange the process of both national and world culture is impossible. Thus, I affirm the organic necessity for freedom, the right of an independent life of the free evolution of each national culture and the right of national cultures to compete against each other as a precondition for the development and progress of both national and world cultures. This is so because world culture can only develop through the concomitant development of national cultures. Indeed, there is no such thing as an abstract world culture. World culture is composed of thousands of national cultures, and the richer these are, and the more original they are, then the richer and more original world culture becomes. For this reason, the troubadours of international culture, in their attempt to obliterate and merge national culture, are the gravediggers of world culture. Also the conflicts of chauvinist mutation result in the aggressive aspirations of one nation and culture against others.

Coexistence of nations and their cultures

The interrelations of nations and their cultures presents a complex of problems and contradictions, religions and relations. Despite this, the culture of mankind is an aggregate of coexisting national organisms — of independent organisms with a natural historical progress of development and with a natural and legal guarantee of the right of life of each nation and national culture, whose independence is stipulated through the very use of the term nation, its spirit and traditions, its psychology and biological factors, its geographic regions and climate, its protracted historical existence, the coefficient of the creative potentials of its community and the realisation of these factors, which are dependent on the size of the coefficient and the historical fate of the nation.

Independently of these factors, of the size of the nation, its statehood, of its historical, political and economic factors, of the involvement and influence of the consolidating processes of world evolution, each national culture — a complex set of concepts relating to other national cultures — can either be on a higher or lower plane of development. As an organic whole and as an aggregate product of a community, culture encompasses different strata of society, regional differences that have been assimilated by the national language and by the bodies concerned with cultural achievements. It evolves through its own development and

through that of world culture, through the process of international relations and through the free exchange of ideas and values. It is from this that the genii of nations develop their own specific cultural characteristics while simultaneously assimilating the achievements of all mankind. Also this synthesis of complex and multiple interwoven concepts forms part of the treasure-house of the world values. Because of the complexity of these processes, and because of the natural uniqueness of each nation, the historical rivalry of nations and the communality of their achievements, it is not possible to precisely measure the contribution of each nation to world culture. However, the effect of these contributions is quite obvious, and without a doubt, the more developed a national culture, the greater its contribution to world culture, and the more independent organisms that constitute mankind, then the more varied, the more original, the more developed and higher world culture will be. The harmony between national and world culture is the guarantee of the right of the full development of national and world cultures and their free and incomplete synthesis, their total unity and the mutual coexistence of their traditions is the precondition and guarantee for the natural evolution of national culture and the foundation for its development and progress.

Different regions that evolved as a result of geographic, racial and biological factors, through their common inheritance of their ancient cultures, through the differences and similarities of the nation's psychology and soul — determined by national frontiers, and also a result of protracted historical relations, migrations and mutual exchanges — can have national cultures that are more or less related to each other; they can be affected most deeply by their own internal achievements or by the more pronounced influences of another culture. However, they all belong to certain civilisations, cultural regions or cultural branches (European, Eastern, Slavic, Anglo-Saxon, Romany, Latin American and so on). And even within the boundaries of these regions the existence of a nation with a historic community with a functioning culture, the consolidating process of the mechanism of relations bore and bears a complex, competitive and even a hostile character. The history of mankind — as an evolutionary process and as the development of general human values — both through international relations and the mutual exchange of values and national achievements, and the assimilation of foreign values, has experienced invasions, captivity, plunder, genocide. Having brought mankind countless sufferings and causing world culture

to suffer irretrievable losses, the politics of aggression, occupation and colonisation, and “the compulsory merging of nations regardless of the practical method of its realisation and political ideals”, the unification of national cultures and their compulsory assimilation is qualified by both natural and international law as a crime against humanity.

The rights of the subjugated nations

This is why subjugated nations have the right to defend the lives of social individuals and have the right to fight for the independence and sovereignty of their nations with the available optimum means, both on their own territory and in the liberation process of the national diaspora, regardless of country of residence, views, party affiliations, the means and methods of the struggle (this is an internal-national question and can only be resolved by a national-liberation forum). A subjugated nation also has the right to the aid and solidarity of the world community and the active defence of the UN.

This is why each national culture — “the pride of the nation and its priceless historical heritage” (I. Dzyuba — *The Facets of a Crystal*) — in the context of world culture should not be coerced, pressurised, unified and thus destroyed, but it should be free, free to contribute as a sovereign nation, independent from other nations and a complete individual. It is only as such an individual that a national culture can play its role within world culture.

Thus to treat a national culture as a part of another national culture is to degrade it. Such treatment can only result in discrimination and in the deprivation of the right to independent development. If the author of *The Facets of a Crystal* had this in mind, if his book was intended to present the true state of Ukrainian culture, if it was to confirm and supplement his previous objective research presented in *Internationalism or Russification?*, then we could agree with the author. The Ukrainian nation and its culture within the boundaries of the empire are placed into a subordinate position, they are discriminated against, and as a result of political assimilation, mass transigrations (the deportation of the Ukrainian population from the boundaries of Ukraine), the Ukrainian nation and her culture find themselves on the verge of decay. However, the author, in repeating the statements of the apologists of chauvinism and disciples of the imperial politics of Moscow towards

Ukraine and its “development”, attempts to refute reality, and by trying to prove that this is the so-called Ukrainian culture. . . that is developing and which is “an organic and integral part of Soviet culture”, he betrays the truth.

Such a unitary affirmation in respect of a separate Ukrainian culture and of the subjugated nations, which have clearly pronounced and obvious differences, which have different historical traditions and different aspirations for the independent and sovereign functioning of their culture, and different interests, justifies their compulsory maintenance within the confines of one state, with a uniform, compulsory ideology, which controls all the nations and their means of existence, but which is incompatible with their natures, spirits and religions. While such an affirmation is a conscious and hypocritical mutilation of the true state of all national cultures, and of the Ukrainian in particular, it also acts as a mediator for the ruling nation both in the sphere of international relations and in the sphere of culture, and it also maintains the totalitarian imperial-chauvinistic character of the state.

Although the cultures of social groups, which exist within the regional branches of a national culture are an organic and indivisible part of national culture, in principle, they are separate due to their origins, spirit and national cultural traditions. As an integral part of a national culture — on “the facets of a crystal” — it can be seen that such cultures were once independent, but have now been fully assimilated by the nation and as a result of inauspicious historical conditions, have fallen into decay and dissolved into another culture. As such, they are included into the category of unfunctoning cultures, but were absorbed and now constitute the branches and elements of a living culture. With certain reservations, the whole culture of a nation can be degraded to “the facets of a cult”, a phase, which in the distant future our Ukrainian culture could find itself in given the present rate of assimilation.

Mutual influence not the levelling of cultures

A fundamental error — committed through ignorance — is the affirmation that the Ukrainian national culture is an organic and indivisible part of Russian culture. It cannot be denied that Ukrainian and Russian culture share certain influences and characteristics, which were consolidated during the three centuries of enslavement suffered by Ukraine.

But the separate cultures, origins and history, national psychology and spirit, anthropology, ethnography and customary traditions, mutual hostility and the difference of national interests of both nations, already appeared, in practice, in the Middle Ages, that is before the well-known union⁵. This fact also appeared in the works of our best known political activists and ideologists, scholars and writers (whose works are now proscribed). This is the reality. It was and is irrefutable proof and indisputable testimony that these two nations are completely different and totally incompatible. And these three centuries of a policy of the consistent violation of agreements, of uncertainty, of prohibitions, of genocide, of the theft and assimilation of our national relics and cultural values, of pogroms, mass annihilations, and migrations — begun by Peter I and continued through to the present, including Stalin, who sacrificed the lives of 10 million Ukrainians — is ample proof that the relations between these two nations were of a hostile nature. In perspective, these relations have the potential of transforming and becoming normal. And as soon as Ukraine leaves the folds of the empire, she must establish equal diplomatic relations between sovereign nations, all Ukrainian ethnic lands that were partitioned must be repatriated (Kuban, the Kursk, Voronizh, Bilhorod regions, and so on). Ukraine must have indivisible territorial unity, which shall be controlled by the jurisdiction of the Ukrainian state, all Ukrainians must be repatriated as must all the national values, relics stolen through the course of three centuries and removed to Russia's capital and towns. However, this is a question for the future. Today, our national culture — in both a legal and literal sense — finds itself colonised and discriminated against (which the author of the book shamefully admits in the last pages of his book). Although it is weakened, it is unbreakable and cannot be destroyed. It is a functioning culture of a subjugated nation and community that lives, fights and strives to realise its national aspirations — sovereignty, statehood, and freedom.

World history does not know of such a precedent where an empire has united its many nations into a single state, where an empire has united dozens of occupied nations all antagonistic towards their occupant, and where culture is intended to function as a single, united harmonious organism of all nations. In such a state, the ruling nation has the dominating (although not necessarily the highest) culture and practices cultural imperialism in various forms. It is a dominant expansionist force and completely subordinates and controls the lives of its captives.

The main aim of the occupant is to sterilise the individual characteristics and national spirit of these cultures and to replace them with its own spiritual values, ideas and psychology.

The “theoretical” foundations and the introduction of economic and cultural exploitation, and in particular the engulfment of both human resources, their creative potential and their labour power (used as cannon fodder during the years of active external expansion) and also the politics of assimilation and various forms of liquidation (with consistent national immunisation particularly implemented during periods of active opposition — even unarmed — is frequently physical and massive) is an attempt to unify the cultures of the subjugated nations and to completely engulf them. Fundamentally, these are the strategic principles intended to fulfil the political ambitions of the empire; they are methods of survival, power and expansion, and were inherited from the tsarist administration and adapted to the needs of the time. After the overthrow of tsarism in 1917, only the form of demagoguery and propaganda changed, while the strategic aims remained unchanged. Thus, the fundamental ambitions of the tsarist empire — both in external and internal politics — were inherited in full by the present regime. Today, rulers of the empire and its ideologists, in seeking justification for their internal politics, are not ashamed of directly and openly relying on history, of leaning on the authority and despotism of the legal state structure of the past epoch and the imperial ambitions of tsarism and Pan-Slavism: “our conditions, our traditions” and so on. The appearances of ideologues, “scholarly literature, historic essays, publications, periodicals, artistic work bear a similar tone to that of tsarist days, but are more candid and abundant in their terminology. (Let us note that while tsarist Russia was a prison of nations, it had a relatively moderate regime, but Bolshevik Russia transformed this prison of nations into a regime that condemns everyone to death within a framework of a perfectly worked out, organised plan, like no other state mechanism, — a concentration camp of ethnocide).

In Russia, the dominating postulates were always those of a super-state, pan-Slavism, the expansionist chauvinism of a ruling group operating against a background of passivity, obsequiousness, the excessive humbleness and weakness of the community, where it is hoped, no opposition will be able to form. But the regime was actively supported during the war years or when national-liberation movements were completely suppressed. Despite this, a degree of freedom still existed and

the pressure exerted over the colonial nations was not all-pervasive. But having almost succeeded in destroying the roots of the sown seeds of democracy and because of the tolerance developed through almost three centuries of relations with Europe, after the ruling nation became a total chauvinist, community thought and free expression were totally suppressed while simultaneously an attempt was made to completely deceive the peoples with "heated" communist ideology, which, in essence, provides an abundant field for the development of a totalitarian regime. The above enumerated tendencies have developed into a megalomania that permits any abuses of power, that allows total dictatorship and terror, and which was transformed into a desire for world hegemony, which constitutes the crime of all epochs and the crime against all nations and which is committed within the boundaries of the empire and which is intent on destroying all nations. Communist demagoguery is a myth intended to camouflage the so-called unity of interests and the blossoming of national cultures, the harmony and friendship with the hegemonist-thief. Communist ideology and, in particular its practice, is a disease-ridden negative mutation controlling a national organism that has been deprived of its control over its ethnic and normal development, and has totally lost control over its politics. Communism, as it developed, became pathological, particularly aggressive, despotic and chauvinistic.

These inherited ambitions, and to some extent methods as well, leave no room for any doubts. On the basis of the ruling ideology, new economic factors and the exploitation of the favourable world political situation, the empire became a super-nation with global interests and has fully utilised the disorganisation of Europe and its traitorous indifference — leading to the desertion, fear and retreat of nations whose duty it was at least to guarantee the relative freedom and life of small and stateless nations, on which the subjugated nations placed and place so many hopes and expectations. This empire used this capitulation of the West to the maximum and, granted full freedom of action, the unleashed hands of the agents of the Bolshevik administration of Moscow developed new, faster, more efficient methods for the practice of ethnocide, means, which were the catalyst of Russification and the unification of cultures. These occupy chronological periods (for example the years of the establishment and consolidation of the regime, the war years when it was intended to stabilise the reformist intentions of the regime, the economy of the post-war years and the assault of the last 15-20 years)

when it was attempted to envelop the different social strata of society. The different periods were not equal in their results or intentions, but were the same in principle and had the same totalitarian nature that has controlled the empire for almost half a century.

The cynical formulation of these concepts and the so-called “reawakening” is that, which constitutes the so-called “internationalism”, “socialist realism” that exists in the so-called “single national economic complex”, and the “methods of socialist realism” in literature and art within the so-called “single Soviet nation”. Even the simplest of theoretical postulates are highly discriminating and are far from being democratic. Also the dictates of the party caste and the ruling nation are strengthened through state laws, which legalise the usurpation of the regime. The closed and clandestine means of government result in the total prohibition of elementary political freedoms — both individual and national. The formulated legal-state norms — excessively evasive and prevaricating — are calculated to totally deceive the population with the help of propagandistic slogans and the repressive apparatus. The existence of nations in these conditions and “norms” is without precedence in the history of mankind. This is the boundless despotism of the ruling nation over all its captives with an incomprehensible insanity, over-bureaucratisation and voluntaristic centralisation, which first embraces the party-administrative apparatus, the economy and academic, cultural and enlightening institutions. The brutal chauvinism of the ruling nation and its intolerance towards the national-social life of the suppressed nations has resulted in the compulsory influx of a Russian population to the ethnic territories of our nation, the Russification of our people in Ukraine, their migration into the lands of the metropolis, the introduction of huge numbers of non-Russian populations in the new economic regions of the metropolis, the enforcement of the Russian way of life and mass ethnocide. It should be noted that I am not speaking of natural objective processes that are noticed in the lives of many nations, small ethnic groups or international diasporas. I am, rather, speaking of the single-minded, conscious and well planned internal policy of an imperial nation — a policy that has been raised to the level of one of the most important strategic aims that is intended to guarantee, safeguard and strengthen the expansion of the empire. It is also important to emphasise that the term culture is not understood as being some separate component, but is interpreted as being an aggregate product of the community (communities) — the primordial historical legacy of a nation.

Ethnocide — the main aim of Moscow's strategists

The destructive elimination of this legacy as a whole — including natural and economic resources and human resources — is thus an encroachment on the genetic origins of a nation, on its spiritual legacy. This is the main aim of Moscow's strategists, the aim of their long-sighted and single-minded activities. In the sphere of economics — under the slogan of a “single national economic complex” — the exploitation and exhaustion of all existing resources has already had a total character for several decades and has been allowed to pass without reprisal (the world community merely observes these crimes in silence, obediently signing agreements on “non-interference” in “internal matters” and thus sanctions these crimes and the complete defencelessness and weakness of the colonies). The relatively ineffective acts of self-defence, produce inappropriate results in relation to the loss of strength and thus to some extent explains the weakness of the opposition of the subjugated nations. The reasons for this are manifold, but it originates in the epoch of the tsarist colonial exploitation of nations and the assimilation of national élites. The basic reason for the weakness of the liberation process lies in the devastation and liquidation of organised national powers following the October Revolution of 1917 and the unquenchable protracted Bolshevik Russian terror that drained the nation of its life-blood and completely demoralised any opposition strengths by “proving” the futility of the struggle to the outside world.

This problem is complicated and tragic and for several small nations (the Baltics, Transcaucasia, Central Asia) the question is not only one of statehood, but primarily of elementary physical survival. Small nations cannot afford an active opposition and the loss of millions of lives, as Ukraine had heroically lost in the fight for her freedom. Because of this, and also because of the lingual, religious and cultural proximity of Ukraine to her occupant, the size of the nation, her territories, historical fate and geopolitical position made Ukraine, until very recently, the object of political genocide and now the object of political ethnocide. The alternative between battle and self-preservation, the advantages of one over the other, the conscious union of both — despite their lack of results in the last half century — have had some results, but depend on many factors, primarily on the existence of an organised or at least of an elemental opposition, the stability and the

power of the imperial regime, the external political situation. However, each of the questions raised here demands deep research. I shall merely say that small nations of the empire, not mentioning the political, economic, or the considerable strategic losses they have suffered and the threat posed by the might of the empire itself, undergo and experience a substantially smaller pressure than can be said for Ukraine. But, having said this, I must also say that they are more defenceless. The vast majority of them are deprived even of their ethno-culture and their national territories only bear formal administrative titles. This is why the criminal indifference of the governments of Europe and the USA and the whole world community is simply unforgivable. However, now that they have become the next potential victims of the ensuing communist expansion of a totalitarian superpower, encroaching on their own freedom, recently they have begun to show a more active interest in the internal situation of the empire, in the position and fate of its subjugated nations. And although the results of this interest are still barely perceptible, the solidarity that they show gives moral support in the subjugated nations' fight for their right to life, and to some extent has slowed down the process of ethnocide. The growth of the strength of this support is one of the most positive methods of safeguarding the freedom of the nations of Europe. But the true state of existence of the nations on the frontiers of the empire literally dictates the necessity for more decisive forms of defence. However, even the passive help recently given produces optimism and encourages the growth and consolidation of the strength of the opposition, which is vital, given the present conditions facing the human resources and the culture of the subjugated nations. These conditions are now much more dangerous, more threatening and more tragic than the colonial nature of their economies and the policy of exploitation, which is exhausting their natural resources.

The realisation of the policy of ethnocide

The policy of ethnocide was actively put into practice by the Bolshevik regime at the end of the 1920s. In the 1930s and 1940s, ethnocide as a permanent process in the internal policy of the hegemonist power was transformed into an unprecedented and brutal mass genocide. The only analogous situation of this is the destruction of Jews by the Germans during the Second World War. Both the Russian and German regimes

have to account for tens of millions of deaths. In both their practice and nature, the two regimes are as alike as “two drops of water”, with Bolshevism being the “inventor” of planned artificial famines that killed millions of people in a vast territory. It deserves a “patent” for its constantly active dense network of concentration camps with their exhausting and dystrophic deaths — all in the name of “socialism”. The Nazis borrowed the idea of the concentration camp system from “a good neighbour” and added their own “discovery” — the gas chambers. Is this not a striking example showing the identical nature of the two regimes?

In the 1950s and 1960s, the strategists of imperial politics, taking account of the international situation, the military might of the empire and the mercantile needs of the economy, drew the conclusion that the internal ambitions set for the 1930s and 1940s had been achieved and that mass assimilation in the existing conditions was the optimal variant available to enable them to perpetuate the established policies. They set themselves the aims of eliminating the existing nations within the ensuing decades. And as this cynical exploitation produced its results, it served as a demonstration to the world of the regime and showed that it did not fear reprisals, and for more than ten years the black hand of death swept our nation intoning the requiem “one united Soviet nation”. Even more tragic circumstances may await us in the future, but the present reality is such that for over two decades now ethnocide, taking into account its crucial significance for the interests of the empire, has received the most important attention and was given the most peremptory forms. The destruction of the nation, the resettlement of huge sections of non-Russian populations from their ethnic lands to the territories of the metropolis and to other regions of the empire, their enforced merging and the enforced concomitant Russification of the settler in difficult conditions, the enforced assimilation of ethnic populations on their ethnic territories through educational establishments, the press, publishing houses, Russian control of industry, the army, the organised influx of a Russian population and their privileged positions on the territories of the subjugated nations, the predominance and penetration of great-nation chauvinism in every branch of national life and its huge army of informers, spies, the KGB state apparatus with its absolute control, limitless powers, insane repressions and provocations — all this forms the complex of methods available in the arsenal of the political strategists implementing the policies of ethnocide — and this

list is by no means complete. The means of ethnocide are total in nature and are used by propagandistic demagoguery to deceive the masses, and provides the ideology for export in the guise of "internationalism". The mechanism of these policies is extremely complex. Their technology and implementation have many levels. In the instituted industry of deceiving the nations, two vectors can be distinguished. The primary objective of the traditional and historic interests inherited from tsarism, was the assimilation of the élites and intelligentsias of the suppressed nations, of their most talented creators and the bearers of culture that exists in each branch of human activity. It was and is intended to deceive, assimilate and absorb the gifted, the youth, great scholars and philosophers, political and social activists and organisers, talented writers and artists, prominent cultural representatives, academics and economists into the culture of the ruling nation, and thus make them serve the occupant. Should they not willingly do this, but instead declare their patriotism, the ruling nation tried and tries to neutralise them, deprive them of the opportunity of manifesting themselves, silencing their talents and crippling man's and man's family's fate. Should this not succeed and should there be any opposition or resistance then they are discredited, deformed, repressed or physically destroyed. These are some of the methods that Moscow uses against each successive generation of the élites of the subjugated nations, methods, which were inherited from tsarism.

In order to consider the effect (identical for all the nations within the boundaries of the empire) on the behavioural patterns of the élites one has to consider the effect of the complex conditions of a protracted colonial occupation with a single-minded programme of ethnocide conducted against a background of constant pogroms, suppression, brutal mass repressions that result in a peculiar national memory of the psychological terror experienced by successive generations, and which first affects the enlightened and socially active strata of the population. This has the result of one group of people terrorising another and stimulating fear and deception, in which process the élite is either totally or at least partially ridiculed and assimilated. Living with the permanent possibility of repression, collaboration, the loss of the national "ego", virtual unemployment, total neglect, results in the loss of many talents, intellectuals, creators and bearers of national cultures that flow into the ruling culture, and their resettlement in the metropolis. In order to avoid potential terrorisation, and in order to realise oneself as an individual

(although in the final account — despite their predominance, talents or professionalism, the majority of international activists, and in particular politicians, administrators, militarists and ideologists — due to Moscow's mistrust towards "national minorities" and because of the ruling Russian ethnocentrism, are relegated to secondary positions and the backyards of history) one has to serve the imperial state machinery and the culture of the hegemonist. Thus, numerous highly talented representatives or potential representatives of all branches of human activity consciously transfer their allegiance to the hegemonist. The practice of physical or cultural genocide is dependent on the internal and external political position of the empire at any given time. The strength of the opposition of the subjugated nations thus demands that "optimal" methods be used to repress them, and demonstrates the stability and certainty of the hegemonist of avoiding any external reprisals and also proves its need for the economic and human resources provided by the subjugated nations, and is proof of the absolute chauvinism and sadism of the fractionist clique that usurped the regime and subordinated the general imperial party bureaucratic oligarchy while depending on genocide or ethnocide or both to maintain their power. Despite the means of physical destruction or mass elimination, they undoubtedly produce the desired results for the occupant. Firstly, they actively strengthen his position in the occupied territories, at the same time raising the standard of this functional culture. Secondly, they greatly increase his genetic arsenal in future generations and raise the number of his population. Thirdly, the subjugated nation, along with its culture, is drained of its life-blood, and is thus unable to deviate and loses its ability to oppose and fight for its freedom, and is deprived of its cultural development. Also the actual population of such a nation declines rapidly. Does not the following speak for itself? At the beginning of the 20th century, there were 35 million Ukrainians. Today⁶, there is approximately the same number while in the same period of time the Russian population has almost doubled. Thus, today there are almost 120 million Russians, with 15 million⁷ of them constituting the fifth column that tramples Ukraine's culture underfoot, that almost completely occupies our towns and Russifies them. And with the majority of them belonging to the party administrative apparatus they are able to usurp each sphere of human activity, while millions of Ukrainian fulfil an analogous function beyond the frontiers of Ukraine. They are assimilated themselves and realise the policies of the occupant by assimilating other nations — *Divide et impera* (divide and rule) as the Romans used to say.

The sapping of Ukraine's creative potential

The creative potential of our nation is drained of its life-blood to such an extent that, to take literature as an example, no literary phenomenon has arisen for a long period, while the Union of Writers of Ukraine does not fill its ranks with truly talented authors and the creative individuals that are demanded by elementary literary progress. Instead, many of its members are Russian cultural workers while many talented Ukrainians, undesired by the regime, try to survive outside the Union, which virtually means that they are deprived of the right to have their works published. The Union of Writers is an organisation totally subordinated to the party bureaucracy as a branch of the same machine that controls the arts, ideology and propaganda, and which, without a doubt, functions efficiently. It does have some talented people in its ranks — people who, although they are sincerely interested in the development of national culture, have their hands tied. Thus, the basic membership of the Union — as a result of the loss of talents for propagandistic and political reasons — primarily consists of artisan “literateurs”, people from the so-called literary circles and the propagandistic apparatus of “literature”, but who are people very distant from true literature, and indeed have nothing in common with it. But, because of the established “regulations” governing the Union, anyone who is “ideologically sound”, who is not recognised as a “dissident” by the KGB, who has the right recommendations from the party organs, and who has published one or two books can become a member. Although the literary value of publications is taken into account when membership is being considered, it is by no means the essential criterion. Unconditional apologetics of the ruling ideology is the first criterion demanded of an author and then this is followed by the “value” of his publication. Often membership is directly supervised by the orders of the party apparatus, the KGB and its literary agents in the regional and central branches of the Union, by publishers, protégé “pupils”, and such members are accepted after the “publication” of one or two literary ‘mayflies’. The vast majority of the Union’s members do not produce anything worthwhile and as a rule do not rise above average while they are in the confines of their professed ideology. Further, the perpetrators of imperial politics entrust administrative posts within the Union to party-literary functionaries, who faithfully serve the propagandistic requirements of the

imperial regime. Indeed, they are entrusted with the function of realising and controlling the literary-artistic process and are responsible for its external and internal development, and for the stimulation and mood of the creative intelligentsia. In these very technical methods used by the totalitarian regime, these functionaries play a vital role. Firstly, they provide support for the regime, and as they are an organic part of it, they provide necessary new ideas and methods or controlling culture, ideology, propaganda and the administrative apparatus. Secondly, the members that are formally accepted by the Union are of such a level that they create a vacuum of talents in the culture of the subjugated nation, which further crushes the nation and drains its life forces. Also the work of the Union, the work of the "literateurs" and their "production", acts as good camouflage for the official thesis of the "blossoming and development" of national literature (including culture and art). An analogous situation exists within the technical cadres, which serves to emphasise the leading role played by the regime in all artistic unions and all cultural institutions. But such organisation and its effect are not limited to the spheres of art and culture — they are used as an effective narcotic means for deceiving the masses and are intended to produce conformity and weakness within the subjugated nations, and thus to induce their decay and cruel exploitation. Thirdly, the Union of Writers, as an organisation of cultural workers, is permeated with people of a similar calibre and level, and thus it becomes the foremost conformist by virtue of its composition. In as far as the Union is completely dependent on the bureaucratic apparatus, and in as much as each "member" is conscious and well aware of his low creative ability, he is also aware of the favours he owes to his "literary patrons" and thus fulfils their wishes, and who, on the orders of the party or Moscow's "leaders", baits active patriots, talented literateurs and artists with an original style, with a Ukrainian patriotic soul or with avant-garde tendencies. Talented and recalcitrant creators are psychologically broken, their creative work is slandered at secret or semi-open meetings. Their books are not reviewed, nothing is mentioned about them themselves although the press and periodicals maliciously mutilate the essence of their creativity. The most holy of values are profaned and the talents and lives of true artists are ruined. The subject of these assaults either breaks, "recants" and, although he has not committed any crime, pleads for forgiveness. In this way, outstanding national activists with great talent are transformed into frightened, ingratiating and insignificant figures. They become psychological and creative chameleons who assimilate and

merge with the grey uniformity of the general masses, and produce analogical "literature", that shows no traces of their former talent. If such individuals withstand and do not break under this pressure, then they completely vanish from the literary and artistic scene. Their works are not published, they are not read and their talent is lost for whole decades (often forever). They are frozen out of literary or artistic processes, decay and are lost from our culture completely. When an artist opposes (this is particularly in reference to the role played by the samvydav in the last decade), he remains a true son of his nation. However, he is accused of anti-state activity and the KGB prepares a case against him and confines him in concentration camps for many years. This is just one method which causes Ukrainian culture to suffer irreplaceable losses, with the creations and creators dying or ridiculed as were the works of Opanas Zalyvakha, Vasyl Stus, Stefania Shabatura⁸ and many others. This merely serves as a brief description of the true picture of the existing state of life and the conditions within the spheres of human activity. The full effect on the lives and work of the creative intelligentsia presents an impenetrable wall. The repressive, single-minded totalitarian nature of the regime controls everything — mutual relations, administrative organs, schools, industry and production, academic establishments and the creative unions. This oppressive nature and destructive mechanism is felt by the teacher and book-keeper, engineer and student, scholar and artist. Furthermore, the strategists of Moscow's policies fully understand the mobilising power of art and, in particular, of the written word, the authority and the social weight carried by literateurs and scholars and they have thus been placed under special surveillance, total control and systematic pressure — which affects each creative individual — the writer, artist, academic, journalist, social scientist.

The lower strata of the nation — saviours of the Ukrainian national culture

It is important to note that the process of draining the life force of great and living nations — despite the total and constant existence of various means of repression, manipulation, assimilation, and resettlement — can only be enforced for a given length of time. If the coefficient of the creative potential of the creative nation is high, then its culture, even if on a lower level, shall continue to function through the

contribution of its creators. As a rule, the majority of these have emerged from the lower levels of the nation and saved it from national annihilation. They are the source that renews the culture of each nation including ours. The heirs of the national élites, the intelligentsia and their descendants, could raise the level of Ukrainian culture to a higher plane through their genetic inheritance and through knowledge of world culture gained from national activists, diplomats, scholars and cultural workers, economists and traders, the work of specialised institutions, translated world literature and the world culture organically assimilated by our own, through mutual exchanges and friendships with other nations, and thus lead to the true development and blossoming of Ukrainian culture. However, we do not have such an intelligentsia: it has either been destroyed or assimilated by the occupant. This is why today our culture merely functions and is preserved by one source — the national lower classes, and in particular, by the peasantry (in retrospect, the élites, historically assimilated by tsarism, are the main source of the regeneration of Ukrainian culture. Its decisive strength gives the high coefficient of the creative potential of the nation, rises above the uniformity of the national masses. And a significant number of the national élite has been able to withstand the repressions and assimilation and are the representatives of the spirit of Ukraine. In essence, this is not the culture of the national state because the nation is not a super-nation nor an imperial chauvinist, nor, given the existing historical conditions, is it élitist. Given the level of development of Ukrainian culture, it is a culture on a European level, but it is also a national culture permeated with the spirit of pure and holy nationalism — the alpha and omega of a nation — and the essence of each nation, its bulwark and strength, its invincible power in its struggle for independence and sovereignty).

Thus, given that the process of draining the life forces of great and viable nations can only be implemented for a given period of time, each successive generation produces a substantial number of national cultural workers despite repressions, pressure, and assimilation. But, in the extremely complicated and difficult conditions presented by the facts of colonial repression, the conditions for the life of each individual, his talent and courage are dependent on the conditions in which he is formed and his personal ambitions. The creators and bearers of national culture — in each of its component branches — language, literature, enlightenment, art, history, science, production and religion — in crea-

ting or safeguarding, are members of different communities, social groups and thus have different ambitions and methods. The division into strata, social groups, parties, tendencies, professional and international organisations is an inherent fact for each sovereign nation, or these strata can even be dependent on them, i.e. such divisions are subordinate to a nation with democratic forms of government. Our Ukrainian nation, and all the nations of the empire save the Russian nation, are faced with particularly difficult conditions of existence. Total centralisation — taken to an extreme — leads to the total control of social life and the liquidation of the most elementary rights of man by the totalitarian regime and means that the creative intelligentsia can only be united through official bureaucratic organisations, unions, institutions and societies. However, (and often with great solidarity) they are often clandestine members of different groups and make important contributions to the national culture (even though some are negative).

Externally, and in relation to the national idea, they appear to have many different concepts. They do not have rigidly defined organisations with precisely formulated programmes or principles, and disciplined rules of behaviour. The transfer of individuals from one group to another — internal “migration” — is common, and often despairing cosmopolitans join them openly declaring their opposition, while former patriots, suffocated by the repressions, join the ranks of renegades and collaborators. Despite all these fluctuations, when one considers the constructive (or destructive) effects on national culture, each of these groups does have its own specific directions. It is obvious that each has its own particular approach, intentions and most importantly each has its own methods (an important recent development). This provides the basis for the development of a more active and larger opposition movement, or it at least provides a source and hope for the regeneration of national devotion, and the potential of retaining and developing our true national traditions, the spirit of the nation and the forms of its ethno-cultural activity. And although the present situation in Ukraine is difficult, and although the Ukrainian nation is being pushed towards the position of a “nation on the frontiers of culture”, these new developments provide the means of rescuing it from this fate.

The organisation of the opposition movement

The establishment of the Ukrainian Group to Monitor the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords by the Ukrainian opposition movement was an important precedent. Now another even more significant step has been taken, which involves "the activation of all forces, the unification of individual groups and greater co-ordination of activities taking place outside Ukraine and which thus represents an efficient internal opposition to the ruling nation". Although analogous attempts have already been seen, this question demands the utmost attention and is extremely urgent and of great significance. From the perspective of a realistic possibility of a new revival of the movement it represents the mutual reinforcement of its progressive aims and techniques, and thus the achievement of the most significant gains in the struggle for the life and freedom of the nation.

The combination of these factors represents an exceptionally complex set of problems that demand a solution through the efforts of many people, detailed preparations, a sound analysis and a precise evaluation of the existing situation — impossible to achieve in the conditions of a prison. Thus, while not departing from the framework of these observations (whose aim is local), it is the intention of these questions — not always precisely formulated for tactical reasons — and this brief discussion to present an objective (if not always complete) account of the true state of Ukrainian national-social life and the present position of Ukrainian culture. Rest assured that these pressing problems are already being dealt with in Ukraine, or are at least being discussed and are partially embodied. The questions are presented as actual tasks to be accomplished, but in a superficial manner. I intended to present them as batons in a relay race, which are to be passed to the new generation that will infuse the movement. The new generation, which will join the progressive movement, has already inherited that which we have already achieved and placed on a firm foundation and given new methods and structures. It should now continually progress, and not begin again at the starting point — which fate befell our generation as a consequence of historical circumstances.

The present situation of the empire, scientific-technical progress, economic factors, internal and external political circumstances, are conducive to the development of the activities of the opposition and to the success of the liberation struggle, despite the fact of the totalitarian

regime's furious retaliation, which could easily escalate into a total attack with repressions, pogroms, provocations. The regime — fully aware of the “danger” of the existing situation, of the “dangers” presented by the active opposition forces and of the possibility of the growth of this movement — on the one hand is conducting an active external policy, which deflects attention from its internal problems; and on the other, it continues to force the mass resettlement of the subjugated nationalities beyond the boundaries of their territories. The disciples of Moscow's imperial policies colonise non-Russian lands with Russians and foreign populations, and conduct a concomitant policy of enforced Russification of the new settlers, and thus hasten their ethnocide.

In order to distract the attention of both their own and the world's communities from the internal situation of the empire, the regime is forced to conduct dynamic external policies — in “hot spots” (a well tested imperial practice) regardless of their location. And the empire continues this practice. With this intention, the empire is continually developing its military potential, militarising every branch of the economy and using the “screen” of space to threaten nuclear destruction. This has become a means of intimidation, threatening the occupation of other nations — first and foremost of the European nations — which could destroy the world's balance of forces and bring it to cataclysm. This represents the tested, active and precisely formulated strategy of the imperial state machine, which has also acted to prevent the disintegration of the empire by providing the means of dealing with a potentially dangerous threat internally. Thus, it is understandable that, as the activities of the opposition increase, so the repressions of the regime increase. Thus, today, as the strength of the opposition grows, so it is confronted with the new expansion of the repressive apparatus, with its growing system of informants, surveillance, control of social thought through psychiatric methods of controlling behaviour, the expansion of the network of concentration camps and psychiatric hospitals for political prisoners. These are those circles of Dante's hell that the new generation of community activists infusing the opposition movement shall be forced to pass through.

However, the regime is no longer strong enough to eliminate tens of millions of people — to repeat the “genocide” of the 1930s and 1940s. This is not because its character has changed, or that totalitarian Russian communism has become “civilised”, “more humanitarian”, or less blood thirsty. No, its nature has not altered, but the nature of the scien-

tific-technical revolution, and the level of urbanisation have dictated their own demands on the regime, which have involved creating a more open society. Furthermore, the regime now understands that if it were to destroy tens of millions of lives, it would also destroy itself. In addition, high inflation, economic depression, the stagnation and deterioration of science, the progressively worsening living conditions of the population demand greater contact with the outside world. These are the reasons why the beginning of the 1980s shall see large numbers of the intelligentsia joining the opposition movement, and shall also see the development of co-ordinated activities of democratic forces.

The task that lies ahead shall be protracted, intense and difficult. It shall be without illusion and shall not devalue the opposition movement. It shall be a spiritual task, which shall restore the nations to their rightful place in the world community. The components of these forces, their strength, sources of replenishment, open and manifest (although working clandestinely for the moment), are still fermenting and growing internally, with the intelligentsia — whose structure and opinions are still not exactly formulated — forming social thought and harmoniously developing.

I shall attempt to give a brief characterisation of the different groups. They are not organised nor do they have a co-ordinating centre, but the different elements (and they are still simply elements) of the opposition are united in their conscious and openly-declared opposition activities. Their primary task — for which they would sacrifice their lives — is a determined and decisive counter-reaction (non-violent) to imperial policies that are intent on engulfing the nation. The opposition is determined to achieve the democratisation of society, to preserve the national spirit, to mobilise the growing — although scattered — national forces and to co-ordinate those activities striving to attain sovereignty and freedom for the nation.

The work of this section of the national intelligentsia — independently of their spheres of activity in social thought, humanitarian studies, literature, clandestine activities, and so on — without a doubt constitutes the most important contribution to the treasury of the culture of the subjugated nation by prolonging its life, while simultaneously broadening the sphere of the opposition by the inclusion of other loyal groups. Mention should also be made of the contributions of the émigré groups and the diaspora living in the countries of the free world. The size and quality of that contribution is reflected in the general level

of national culture, in the readiness of a nation to defend national existence, its level of consciousness, its vitality and future. The dynamism and the development of the liberation processes is dependent on these qualities. The work of this large group is both noble and honourable. It is precisely for this reason that the Russian imperial administration has developed the "most perfect" system of physical and moral terror, which is without precedent in the history of mankind and which is directed against all the opposition forces of all the subjugated nations; but first and foremost against the Ukrainian nation — a developed, viable nation that is one of the largest in Europe. This is why Moscow is attempting to drain the life-blood of each of our national cells. It seems that they have been placed under a stream of "penetrating X-rays" and that Moscow is trying to impliment an all-embracing control of our national-social life beginning in the village, homes, community, and school, and ending in our industrial centres, city complexes and economic institutions. It is in the face of these difficult conditions that the opposition and a section of the intelligentsia experience the most repressions and losses, and during pogroms — that last for decades — their achievements are either gradually or brutally destroyed, and thus the number of truly dedicated participants is diminished.

But even with the minimal favourable conditions this indestructible force erupts again and again. It is reborn and revitalised, and brings the nation closer to achieving its aims. Let us recall the classically organised activities — the mature perfection of party organisation in a European style when national harmony and consolidation of national forces acted as the powerful flow of a single river in its desire to achieve its aim at the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th centuries, which period also saw the development of our classical literature, social thought and culture in general: the Great National Revolution and its principles of statehood were formulated on the highest principles of world democracy — was this not a unitary phenomenon?

Let us take the example of the development of Ukrainian literature in the 1920s, which took place in conditions of minimal freedom for creativity and which was prevented from any further development because of the genocide of the 1930s. Let us look at the liberation struggle and the protracted partisan warfare and the national solidarity that it achieved — support for the underground in Halychyna lasted until the beginning of the 1950s. Finally, let us recall the renaissance of the 1960s that flowered in impossible conditions. This phenomenon is natural and is in

conformity with natural laws, and for us — Ukrainians — it is completely comprehensive, unique, of immense significance and even mystic, because even after centuries of captivity, brutal repressions, pogroms, prohibitions, national strangulation, the policies of destroying and assimilating the élite of each generation, this phenomenon has revived, even after the implementation of such policies for over three centuries, and in particular after the unprecedented genocide of the last 50 years, which destroyed tens of millions of Ukrainians — that criminal destruction of the nation that took the life of every third and fourth Ukrainian. The explosion of the national struggle had such strength and courage that it proves the Ukrainian culture is eternal and indestructible.

This phenomenon is natural, unique and also mystic because it represents the external state of our national spirit, our internal strength and the essence of the nation, its deep faith, which, along with its language, spiritual imperatives, religion, genetic and geographic factors, constitutes a nation, its history, traditions, and culture.

This phenomenon testifies to the maturity of the community, its civilising role in the immense regions of Eastern Europe. It is proof of the historical age of the nation — whose history stems back over two thousand years — of its high level of social thought and of the level of its culture. It is the guarantee of its life, its greatest strength in its struggle for sovereignty and statehood. For the highly developed — but subjugated — nations in their most critical stage of development, but facing the danger of their own destruction — which faces the Ukrainian nation — the consolidation of the opposition forces, their qualitative and quantitative membership, the activation and growth of the liberation processes and the co-ordination of activities, are demanded and the inherent essence of the national character and the objective needs of the struggle for the life are the prerequisites for the preservation of the nation, for its cultural progress and for the attainment of freedom.

The representative of national culture and as a rule the realistic instigators and potential source of the opposition are the creators and bearers of culture, and shall remain as these creators and bearers until such time arrives that culture is no longer persecuted, or until their lives end. Without entering into direct conflict with the imperial state machine and the official ideology, they are united in their national aspirations and in the national traditions of the subjugated nation, and thus create a complied culture through these eclectic means. This culture is not at its highest level of development, but the creativity of this group is a

process accomplished in a masterly and often artistic manner. Brilliantly talented people join this community and today their work is noticeably reflected in poetry, partially in prose and in particular in the works of young authors, in works with historical themes and in translation of foreign literature. But the regime does not allow even the last of these categories to escape its notice and censure, and it ensures that the literature from the countries of the socialist camp with themes identical to those of Soviet apologists for communism or the pro-Soviet literature of Western countries is given first priority for translation purposes. It is thus under the direct or indirect control of Moscow and such imperial literature cannot always be included with artistic achievements. Simultaneously, the translation of the national literatures of the empire are severely restricted as is the publication of foreign classics — one of the prerequisites for the normal functioning and development of each culture. The subjugated nations are compelled to acquaint themselves with literature from abroad only through Russian translations, which assists the process of Russification and the instilment into the Ukrainian youth of a feeling of the inferiority of their own native culture and the alleged superiority of the Russian culture. Artistic works of an avant-garde nature of which only a limited number of editions are published, and only those of certain tendencies, are circulated, as a rule, only in the major cities and several of the large towns of the metropolis. They either “do not reach the national territories at all, or if they do then in small doses”. The same is true of English language sources — periodicals, cinema, television and theatre.

The reality of socialist realm

The majority of the members of the opposition are nationally conscious and sincerely wish to contribute to the culture of our nation. However, due to the circumstances, which they find themselves in, their contribution cannot reflect the true spirit of the nation, its ambitions and tasks. It merely reflects a superficial cultural character that is only expressed in language, life-style, in individual characteristics of the national stereotype or in geographic or historic features. And inasmuch as a large number of truly talented artists and their creativity bear elements of nationalism (true, external ones), which do not enter into conflict with official ideology and politics (but on the contrary support

them), the imperial administration uses the names of those individual artists as a propaganda screen to prove the “development and blossoming” of national cultures, and proclaims them to be the achievements (although these claims are not always sufficiently realistic) of the whole empire both within its own borders and abroad. Further, it organises favourable responses in the communist or pro-Russian press, publishes works in foreign languages under its own label, and using this thick propaganda screen continues to perpetrate its own black deeds.

Writers are aware of this, but fear and the illusion of success has its own consequences. As national patriots and also involuntary participants of the process of the devaluation of national values and the subjugation of their own nation, a majority of the activists continually feel “schizophrenic”. While having inherited patriotism and a deep calling to create true artistic values for their nation within the limits of their abilities and to donate these talents and achievements to the nation, each of them is simultaneously forced into a conflict and is forced to pay his dues to the ideology of the ruling nation and the politics of the occupant through their own creativity. Thus, that which is alien, and which often prevents creative development, which is unnatural and often loathed is used for propaganda purposes, and is praised and glorified. It authorises the labelling of the colonial status of nations and the downfall of national cultures as “democratic and free”, whereas it is in fact pure animal chauvinism and the oppression by the ruling nation, which justifies Russification by labelling it “international education”, and which serves to confirm the myth of a “single Soviet nation”.

Thus, to take once again the illustration offered by literature and in particular creative literature (a traditional measurement), which should be aesthetically perfect in form and which should thus depict reality, describe the objective, the spirit and task of the nation, which should be the history of the nation, and which should oppose the ideology enforced by the ruling nation. Apart from this, the artist should also have the right to develop freely in any direction he chooses — including the search and development of his own individuality (like the world famous Arkhypenko and “arkhypenkism”)⁹. This is not in principle opposed by the “theoretical formulae” and canons of orthodox Soviet doctrine (as in literature), but which in practice acts to create a myth, a legend — and where there is no room to speak of freedom and creativity.

The methods of socialist realism — expressed through party directives and party dogma — force our literature and its creators to perform

narrow, definitive functions, which they are forced to fulfil assiduously. This is intended to induce assimilation, to suppress national consciousness through the manipulation of human behaviour and to force Ukraine into being the pale shadow of the hegemonist. This reduces literature to a base and synthetic level, and deprives it of its humanistic calling — to act in the name of the deprived. It prevents the development of national culture and reduces the individual to a conformist, into a mere robot. And a robot-conformist is a mere serf, and as he becomes a mass phenomenon, he becomes a social factor, that is a body submissive to the party caste and the imperial machine of the ruling nation, and thus contributes to the totalitarian-conformist social order, which degrades individuality, with surrogates replacing genuine artistic and human values in all areas of human life, but primarily in the area of the human spirit and ethics.

Shackled by the slogan “national in form, socialist in content” each of the national literatures (except the Russian) is not only weak, but within the last decade a sharp reversal to “Zhdanovism”¹⁰ and “Stalinism” has been made, i.e. the limits for creative potential have been reduced even further than before. The idealisation of positive personalities, of national spiritual superiority and national cosmopolitanism — these are the directive and primary dogmas that should guide each national literature.

Let us take as an example several novels that have been published within the last few years, novels that have been widely acclaimed as “achievements” and “literary gains” of Ukrainian literature. These include *Rozhin* by Zahrebelny, *Bila Tin* by Mushketyk, *Krovna Sprava* by Andriyashyk and Hryhurko’s *Kanal*¹¹. None of these novels excel themselves although one could not dispute the talent of the authors’ “technical production”. However, the answer to the question of whether Ukrainian culture has been enriched or benefited in any way by the contribution of these novels is a negative one. The only national element that Zahrebelny’s novel contains, which is accurately recreated, are the settings, the place names, and the nature, temperament and outside appearance of the characters. With such a limited national content in the novel, Karnal might as well be Karnalyov, or Karnelis, or Karnebekov. For the rest, reality, relations between people and the communist hierarchy, the socialist background, relations of production, social optimism and harmony are extremely idealised and glorified beyond recognition. Due to a lack of space in this essay, the evaluation of the novels as a whole has to be simplified. All the novels are written with

some sort of style, but despite the fact that they all obviously deal with different characters, it is extremely difficult to differentiate between the books none of which make any distinguished contribution to the field of Ukrainian literature. They are all panegyrics written on the command of the party hierarchy, in the name of the building of communism. Is this not concrete evidence showing how reality is falsified; of the mutilation of the real life of workers, peasants, intellectuals; of the negation of the national consciousness of Ukrainians — and thus of the decay of Ukrainian literature? However, these novels are related as the “most valuable contributions” that our literary process has gained within the last few years, a process, which does not exist in a genuine form.

In this same period of time, anyone who dared even to hint at a national spirit, of the rebirth of the national character, and who has dared discuss our national problems has been persecuted. The same Andriyashyk, who has already contributed several novels in Ukrainian literature, including *Poltava*, which is destined to leave its mark on history, was severely criticised — and immediately — for the very reasons given above. His novel, printed in a newspaper with a small circulation, was banned, and the author himself was excluded from literary life for many years. Honchar, for writing *Sobor*¹² — a novel impregnated with the national spirit — was attacked by Moscow’s imperial press and a slander campaign was conducted against the author in the Ukrainian press. Ivanychuk’s *Malva*¹³, written exceedingly well, with sound political thinking, was mercilessly criticised and his ensuing and far superior work *Kalnyshevsky* was banned even before publication. Bilyk’s¹⁴ interesting historical novel *Mech Areya*, and in particular his brilliant addendum on the pre-history of the nation, was brutally criticised, but not on the basis of any sound arguments or evidence, but solely from the point of view of imperial ideology. However, the research work of Yugov¹⁵, a Russian chauvinist, proving on the basis of “authentic” historical archives that Achilles was of Russian origin, are widely acclaimed and published. No doubt similar “proof” showing the Russian origin of Caesar, Cleopatra, and Solomon will follow. Herein lies the basis for the future annexation of these territories.

The creative work of a highly talented Ukrainian author — Oles Berdnyk — the sole author-idealist making any contribution to our present literature is totally banned, and all his previously published books have been removed from all libraries and destroyed. This original and brilliant artist has been expelled from the Union of Writers, and has

ceased to have his works published in Ukraine (although some of his works had earlier been translated in Poland and other foreign countries). For his uncompromising patriotism, dedication to Ukraine and to her national interests, he is brutally and systematically persecuted, repressed and defamed in the press. Other renowned Ukrainian cultural activists are also disparaged and repressed in this same way. For their creativity and convictions, the poets Ihor Kalynets¹⁶ and Vasyl Stus, the artists Opanas Zalyvakha and Stefania Shabatura, the literary critics Ivan Svitlychny and Yevhen Sverstyuk, the journalist Vyacheslav Chornovil, the publicist Valentyn Moroz¹⁷ and many others have been imprisoned in concentration camps. Lina Kostenko, Lyudmyla Skyrda, Iryna Zhylenko, Iryna Kalynets, Ihor Kalynets, Vasyl Stus, Holoborodko, Korzhun, Mykola Vinhranovsky and Roman Kudlyk¹⁸ have been eliminated from the literary process for over a decade. One of the most authoritative Ukrainian authors — Antonenko-Davydovych¹⁹ — and the uniquely talented translator of world classics Mykola Lukash²⁰ find themselves in the same position. Deprived of the right to work and thus to contribute to Ukrainian culture, are the writer Plachynda, the critic Ivanysenko, and the well known historian Braichevsky²¹. Similarly, hundreds of talented prose writers of the younger generation as for example Valeriy Shevchuk, Hryhoriy Tyutyunnyk, Yaroslav Stupak²² — who could so easily become the pride of Ukrainian culture — are totally isolated from the Ukrainian creative process and are deprived of any means of expression. Les Tanyuk, one of the most talented modern theatre directors, has been deprived of work in the Ukrainian theatre by being exiled to Moscow. Thousands of Ukrainian theatre and cinema directors and actors now enrich Russian culture by working in Moscow, Leningrad and other towns of the metropolis. The level of opera and the theatre in Ukraine remains at provincial standards and is also in a state of decline. Do these facts not speak for themselves? Do they not illustrate the destruction of “progress” and prove the decline of Ukrainian culture? Does this not explain why our culture in Ukraine has not been able to produce one distinguished work of art which would meet universally recognised standards within the last half of the century. In the same time-span, however, Ukraine has contributed so much in fields that are not directly concerned with national matters, as well as dozens of famous names.

The historical conditions of the colonial yoke

The following questions arise: why these processes have had a similar effect on Ukrainian culture, and is this a natural phenomenon or has it been synthetically created? It would only be possible to give a complete analysis to these questions in numerous volumes of specialised monographs, each specifically concerned with these separate issues. The present Ukrainian underground — established in conditions of terror controlling the means of information — is actively striving to explain these issues to the Ukrainian nation and to the world community through the *samvydav* (the underground press).

The reader is presented with brief explanations of the different aspects of the national problem, with emphasis being placed upon the assumption that he will question and analyse these issues himself, and above all the underground movement hopes to gain the committed allegiance of the youth to the Ukrainian liberation process. The multitude of reasons for why Ukrainian culture finds itself in this position is the most salient issue — as it fully reflects the status of a subjugated nation. The reasons for this state of affairs were briefly mentioned above: they are the historical conditions created by the colonial yoke, by the mass assimilation of the élite and the loss of the nation's intellectuals. This process of destruction was initiated with the mass genocides perpetrated throughout the 1930s and 1940s by the mass resettlements and assimilation; by the legal stance of socialist realism and by the Damocles' sword of terror suspended over artists — continually threatening to destroy them. But a great work can only be created in conditions where creative freedom exists; and it can only become an achievement of world culture on the condition that the artist is not only imbued with the full worth of human values, but is also completely saturated with the national spirit. Ukrainian literature and culture not only do not have the full advantage of these conditions, but even the slightest manifestation of any organic creative national talent is crippled and oppressed. For the sake of objectivity it should be noted that the written word is subjected to a particularly ferocious control by the totalitarian regime — and even the dominant Russian literature is not able to produce a work worthy of achieving world standard. When this control is applied to the world sphere of the national spirit, the selection of intentions and strivings has a limitless

field of activity. This will be proved below by the fact that our culture suffers yet another phenomenon, which adds to the reasons why Ukrainian art lags behind world achievements and which acts as further proof of the determination to weaken Ukrainian national culture, to reduce it to a low level and, in the final result, is intended to completely assimilate it and thus to destroy it.

As has already been mentioned, each national culture is proof of a nation's active existence (as seen through its creative processes) and it is its right to unlimited life — a life, which has absorbed the spiritual and national gains of each preceding generation — a reciprocal, natural and harmonious synthesis of the past and present and of both humanitarian and national values. This is the founding basis for the functioning, progress and development of a national culture. Given that these are the conditions necessary for a culture to flourish, how could it have even been expected that our culture could develop during the course of the last 50 years?

What the Ukrainian National Republic achieved in its few years of statehood — before it was brutally destroyed and Ukraine re-occupied — cannot even be compared to that, which a nation can achieve through the right of self-determination. The slogan of “national problems” raised during the November 1917 Revolution was far from realised, and in the years that followed was far from even the minimum normally granted by national and cultural autonomy. Indeed, the true situation during the period on the already occupied territory of Ukraine was not as it seemed and Ukraine had already been absorbed into the complex of the newly constructed Russian empire.

With the consolidation of the dictatorship and the implementation of its basic theoretical principles in all areas of social existence, and in particular with the implementation of the thesis of two cultures in co-existence within one national culture — the relevant cultural policy was applied to all social components: to history, social thought, literature, art — resulting in the removal of great names and the most valuable spiritual richness of the nation from the existing cultural process including the Russian. In the period when the dictatorship was again strengthened, the following thesis was introduced: with the construction and consolidation of socialist society the class war is strengthened. In practice, this means mass terror directed, in the first place, against the creators and bearers of the cultures of the subjugated nations who are considered to be mobilisers of centrifugal aspirations. Thus, in the 1930s,

totalitarian pogromatic prohibition became the norm used against class inheritance, the national character of culture, which was applied to creative methods. The liquidation of creative freedom led to stagnation caused by genocide and mass repressions, which became the “norm of life” within the empire and the most active means used to maintain the dictatorship, causing regression, to an increasingly severe and extreme censorship. Books by prohibited authors were removed from both large and specialised libraries, and indeed whole libraries were burnt down (as they still are); historical, cultural and national monuments and relics were destroyed, as were churches, the priesthood, cultural funds, archive materials, historical sources, ancient and recent party (naturally not Bolshevik) and government documents that relate to history prior to the 1917 Revolution and in particular to that time when we had our statehood. During these years, cynical Ukrainophobia was openly adopted. The publication of many magazines was prohibited, many cultural institutions were liquidated, thousands of cultural activists were physically eliminated. The literary and general cultural process was reduced to the lowest level possible and had the appearance of an alcoholic who without any dignity whatsoever praised the occupant and glorified the suzerain and torturer. Not hundreds, but thousands of cultural activists were shot and destroyed in the concentration camps, thus raping, humiliating and destroying our culture — one of the many methods used to destroy the international character and the spirit of nations.

During the 1930s, practically every nation was embraced by ruin. However, despite this, the ruling Russian nation, powerful even in the face of an incompatible world outlook, incongruous creative methods and idealistic direction, did not recognise the extent of the human loss nor the destruction of the values of other nations, and in particular of the Ukrainian nation, and utilised — then as now — many privileges in its own development and in an attempt to aggrandise its global aims.

The victory won during the Second World War over Nazi Germany, its own counterpart and an equally totalitarian state system with analogous aims and means of enforcing them, had one sole aim — world hegemony and not only the victory of Bolshevism over Fascism, which merely turned the theoretical Bolshevik aims into practical problems of a global scale.

Since that time, appetites have grown enormously and, within the space of the last two decades, the empire has emerged onto the world arena as a superpower. The global interests of the Russian people — a

factor of scientific-technical progress — and also the absolute necessity to include, as widely as possible, those classes of the Russian population who do not hold communist views, but who are extremely chauvinist, in the running of the empire, especially on the non-Russian territories, have increased, and the emergence and propagandistic demonstration of Russian culture throughout the world as a Russian achievement, but mainly as a means of influence and camouflage, have also increased during those same twenty years or so. In connection with the realisation of the absolute majority of the Russian élite that fundamental differences between imperialist national interests (although in a deformed national spirit) and the traditional, historical forms of rule on the one hand, and communist ideology and its regime, on the other, do not exist, the nation and the regime arrived at a mutual agreement. On the basis of this agreement, today nearly all the Russian cultural, political and social activists, among them active opponents of the present regime and its ideology, have been “rehabilitated” (either officially or furtively). Their most important works are now being published once again and are carefully studied by academic institutions. General achievements, individual activists, and entire trends in Russian culture of the past, along with their influence on contemporary social thought and artistic processes, as well as their current cultural value, are being studied.

These politics are without doubt correct, but the nation does not forgive any regime for a strategy designed to impoverish and strangle its own spiritual heritage. It is true that this mechanism was abandoned by previous governments, as they feared new ideas even from the midst of the Russian élite, which, having foreseen the development of the world processes, desires more freedom. The reformer Khrushchev understood this well and placed party control over the Russian élite, giving this process a progressive appearance. Although the ruling élite is powerless against this process, it still tries to prevent it! This is why it is completely normal that the present Russian generation has heard of Solovyov, Pogodin, Katayev, and Kluchevsky²³, recognises the value of Vladimir Solovyov, Leontiev, Berdyayev²⁴, and eagerly reads Dostoyevsky, Bunin, Andreyev²⁵, and has the opportunity to study and quote from the works of Andrey Bely, Khlebnikov, Merezhkovsky, Nabokov, and Struve²⁶, to name but a few.

Russians, including the Russian youth, are widely, and quite objectively (from the Russian point of view), familiar with the history of their nation in particular of the history of the current empire, and most

importantly this history is not profaned or desecrated. They are aware of the political line, of the programme and activities of all the parties and their activists from the time of the November Revolution to the present day. The external and internal imperial politics of tsarism — apart from some undistinguished invasions — are completely sanctioned and have been prolonged into the present. True, ideology has been altered, and the tempo of change and some other nuances have also been affected. However, the practice of these policies is without precedent in its cynicism, crudeness, cruelty and perfidy. In the first place, as regards the Ukrainian nation, the nation itself, its territory, economy, human resources and talented people, and also its historical process and autogeny, is seen as a threat to the existence of the empire, and from this fear stem the policies of the regime.

National culture reduced to a peripheral level

The Russian occupant is striving to reduce our classical culture of the 19th and the first half of the 20th century, which by its immense achievements in the field of literature, social thought, and history, is equal to the culture of any European state — a time when the Ukrainian nation already stood on the threshold of self-determination and statehood — to a peripheral, regional, provincial level. He does this by enforcing artificially fast tempos, and through a system of mass terror and prohibition. After destroying millions of people, the occupant led to the ruin of our national culture. Little effort was required to retain the culture at a very base level during the 1940s and 1950s, as the majority of cultural activists were liquidated during the 1930s, and those activists who were not removed in the purges, were claimed by the war. Only in Halychyna, Volyn, Bukovyna — the west — are there any signs of opposition. However, the arsenal of the victor contained a well-tried method, unpunished by the world community — terror. And very soon even in Halychyna the national character of the culture, especially the literary process, was reduced to a general all Ukrainian level, and for a mature nation aware of its shame, dishonour and the humiliation of its national dignity, glorification of the occupant and his regime was established as a norm of existence. Thus, it has become a norm for writers and acts as a measure of the value of all publications — whether they be propagandistic leaflets, novels or academic studies.

The psychology of fear dictates that this be done “sincerely”, but how memorable the pre-war years are! Skrypnyk, Kurbas, Zerov, Dray-Khmara, Khvylovy²⁷ were destroyed. Dovzhenko²⁸ was brutally abused. Ostap Vyshnya²⁹ suffered the physical and moral deprivations of concentration camps. Kotsyubynsky³⁰ lost his life in prison. This same fate greeted thousands more Skrypnyks, Zerovs and the best of our cultural activists, as well as millions of ordinary Ukrainians. The memory of fear is especially long-lived in people’s psychology, and today that memory imbues every cell of the artist, teacher, and academic, and thus affects every cell of the national organism. It affects every school, every educational establishment, every newspaper and magazine, every publisher, each scientific and artistic organisation, paralysing national dignity, and thus any work along national lines. Even before a single line is written by an author, he is affected by fear; his work is then subjected to censorship and either it will be published or “arrested” in its original draft form. Should the author’s work suffer the latter fate, he can only expect victimisation or inevitable punishment: he will lose his job; his name will be struck from publishers’ lists and he will thus be deprived of his livelihood or he will lose the mass of privileges guaranteed by party membership and will be forced to languish in a concentration camp for many years. Finally, he will be so paralysed with fear that he will succumb and will produce that which is required of him by the party — for not only will he be freed of repressions; not only will he achieve peace in his life and human happiness; he will also gain fame, albeit of dubious value, but still fame brings its own success and material rewards.

The suzerain is generous when it comes to both terror and enticement. He is only capable of handing out one or the other on the blade of his bayonet, the only thing that maintains him in power. The insubordinate will be run through with his bayonet without hesitation or delay, but we shall have to wait for rewards and honours. Trust can only be won by long and faithful service. The fear that is inspired by the occupant and the instinct of self-preservation dictate the so-called “artist’s sincerity” and take precedence even over human or national dignity. However, complete indulgence, as can be seen in Russian culture, or the partial or complete confluence of interests and harmony between the artist and the party-state apparatus, between the Ukrainian artist and the Russian suzerain, cannot exist. Too much is at stake: on the one hand, the loss of a huge colony along with its countless wealth,

human resources, culture, and, of course, the loss of our historical rights to the ancient capital city of Kyiv — rights which have been usurped by the occupant — and our legal rights as its true rulers — that is — our freedom, statehood, sovereignty, and the fall of the empire; and on the other hand, the preservation of the empire and the strengthening of its might by the continuation of our present state — the colonial yoke. From this stems the merciless cruelty. And this is the reason why the occupant does not discount any means at all, particularly in the field of culture among the élite, deforming the culture and reducing our intellectuals, particularly the cultural intelligentsia into conformists and collaborators. For this reason, teachers, artists, and those who are educated in the social sciences, are delegated the dirtiest job — to serve as a kind of “municipal” service of the empire, working as “cleaners” who bury, clean up, and camouflage the dirty work — the past and present crimes of the colonisers committed in Ukraine against our nation and our culture. However, recognising the deep patriotism of the absolute majority of this section of the intelligentsia, the occupant deliberately makes them an accomplice to his own criminal acts, and thus lays the blame on them, making these people feel guilty before our nation and giving them an inferiority complex. Having subordinated them to his own interests, the occupant continually reminds the intelligentsia of its role as “accomplice”. And by a similar “solidarity” — a forced complicity — the Ukrainian intelligentsia compromises itself before our nation and depreciates the value of its work for our national culture, and devalues its own authority in playing a leading role as an opposition and as a true national element. By its chosen line of behaviour and the content and spirit of its works, the intelligentsia turns away its real brother from the crimes of the occupants, and at the same time from the national problem and from itself as the spiritual leader of the nation, depriving itself of the support and backing of our nation.

The élite compelled to falsify history

In the first place, although under pressure, it is the national élite that is used to distort and falsify the most important eras of our history before the broadest levels of our nation from the earliest times — beginning with the undeniable and inseparable part played by the culture of Kyivan Rus³¹ in Ukrainian history, as the organic heritage of the

Ukrainian nation, and ending with the most recent era of our struggle for liberation and freedom from the Russian yoke. Each tragic event in the history of the Ukrainian nation, and in particular those events, which led to the complete enslavement of our nation, such as the annexation of Ukrainian lands, the liquidation of our autonomy, the ruin of the Zaporizhian Sich³², the pogroms, assimilation, the resettlement of Ukrainians far beyond the territory of Ukraine, the aggressive war with the Ukrainian National Republic³³ and the subsequent re-occupation of Ukraine, the colonial economic policies, the destructive effects of the genocide of the 1930s³⁴ and after, the plunder of our national relics and cultural values, and so on and so forth, is described by our academics in current historiography as part of Ukraine's "liberation" and the "Brotherly aid" of the Russians. Our writers and cultural activists are forced to instil the same interpretation, with "artistic sincerity" and "motivated" plausibility, into the awareness of the nation with their own works or activity. At the same time, in an attempt to finish with the problem of the independence of Ukraine "once and for all", an unprecedented act in the history of mankind, which involved an incredible amount of human sacrifice (for example only in the last 50 years more than 10 million people have been destroyed by means of genocide or ethnocide), our revered national aspirations towards freedom and sovereignty are labelled as "criminal" acts, as the betrayal of national interests, under the pretext of the development of the empire. Similarly, with the same ends in mind, our greatest political activists and national heroes — Ivan Mazepa, Symon Petlura, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Andriy Sheptytsky, Yevhen Konovalets, Stepan Bandera, Yaroslav Stetsko, Volodymyr Vynnychenko, Mykola Khvylovy, U. Samchuk³⁵, and many others, who dedicated their lives to the Ukrainian cause, are accused of being "traitors of their nation". In the field of social sciences and art, Ukrainian national spirit and thinking is distorted and assimilated with the Russian spirit and thinking, and the very essence of Ukrainian culture is falsified. Priority is given to relating unimportant sides of our culture and second-rate activists, as a rule traitors and collaborators, and the spirit of our classical heritage is reduced to something commonplace and is thus distorted by appraisals similar to those of the occupant. The most vital element of our history, the undeniable and inalienable right to self-determination both in the past and at present, and especially the realisation of sovereignty at the present time, are contested and discredited. The ancient role of our nation as the cultural centre of the vast region of Eastern Europe, which spread civilisation throughout the whole area

for many centuries, is concealed. The crystal clear nationalism, part of our historical heritage, as a phenomenon of an enslaved nation, a phenomenon unique in the history of mankind — the organic unity of all the strata of our nation as a way of life without instituting coercion and serfdom, a unity held together through the struggle for freedom, is defamed. It is obvious, therefore, that in this long and complex line of factors and their consequences, in the political and ideological conditions, and psychological factors, which together constitute the totalitarian system with its complex mechanism designed to bury the national spirit, cultural works of a world standard cannot appear. This, however, is only one aspect of the question.

Subjugated peoples are forbidden to know their past

The reality, however, is much more complex than has been outlined above. I shall briefly examine one more element of the myth of the “blossoming” of Ukrainian culture. In the unrestricted realisation of his political aim designed to achieve the destruction of the Ukrainian nation (one of his active means for achieving his global plan), the coloniser is not interested at all in the spread of, or at least free access to, the values of the classical heritage bequeathed by our culture, created in a period of relatively freer conditions of work by our talented artists, academics, political and cultural activists, both in the past and in the present, and both in Ukraine and abroad. The coloniser shows no interest in access to the spiritual heritage of the tsarist era in the brief moments when oppression was slightly relieved, and especially in the last decades of its existence, to the values of the period of our statehood and the initial years which followed it; to the social achievement of Halychyna prior to its occupation by Moscow³⁶; to the national values created by the Ukrainian opposition, the underground and the émigré communities. However, the words “the coloniser is not interested” do not nearly reflect the reality, inasmuch that, from what has been written above and what is to follow shortly, one can see that the occupant has never limited himself to purely passive means, in imitation of the “civilised” European colonisers. He has inherited and developed the methods of his ancestors the Mongol conquerors, and this is why he has so successfully managed to preserve the existence and integrity of the em-

pire. In order to safeguard the existence of the empire for the future, its subjugated nations are deprived of the knowledge and memory of their past. This is why their classical heritage is subjected to especially severe imperial censorship, and not only are ordinary people not allowed access to their history, but also the intelligentsia is forbidden access to this knowledge. Thousands of authors are banned; thousands of books are removed from public, academic, and private libraries and collections, and are simply destroyed. Only a very small number is retained, but then these are subjected to severe publication limits, as are, for example, the book *Istoria Rusov* (The History of Rus')³⁷, the historical works of Kostomarov, the publications of Kulish, and the academic works of Maksymovych, Sreznevsky, Markovych, Bantysh-Kamensky, and Yavornytsky³⁸. Drahomanov, Podolykovsky, Ziber, and Pavlyk are banned³⁹. One is simply not permitted to mention Antonovych, Yefremov, Hrushevsky, Doroshenko, Mikhnovsky, Dontsov, Ohiyenko, Yurkevch, Shelukhyn, Lypa, Chyzhevsky, Malanyuk, Pasternak, Smal-Stocky, and Mirchuk⁴⁰ without abusive remarks. Nothing is heard of the works of Konysky, Chuzhbynsky, and Hrinchenko⁴¹. Vynnychenko, Lepky⁴², Samchuk, and the works of hundreds of other cultural activists are proscribed. What is more, not only are they banned, but mere knowledge of their works could deprive a Ukrainian of his freedom and he could find himself languishing in a concentration camp for up to 10 years.

It is a crime to silence these aspects of our existence. We, as a nation which is threatened with extinction, must find the courage to voice these facts out loud, both to ourselves and to the whole world. By voicing the truth out loud, one discloses with authoritative words the national problems created by the coloniser, which, nevertheless, call out to our national conscience. To speak out openly about the Ukrainian question, both to the occupant and to the whole world, is an extension of the activities of the movement of opposition, coordinated by a single centre, and at the same time a transfer of the Ukrainian question onto the international arena as a pressing political problem, which calls for the immediate attention of and decisions by the governments of all sovereign states, as well as its inclusion onto the agenda of international fora. In order that this may be accomplished, the questions that have been raised above demand to be developed more fully and comprehensively.

So far I have only given a brief explanation of the essence of the official policies and overt activities of the regime, which are only barely covered up. No mention has been made of covert activities, the main-

springs of the imperial ruling system — the covert activity of the vast army of chauvinists, who carry out acts of Russification in Ukraine; the assumption of national supremacy by the Russian population in Ukraine; and the insolent demonstration of certain privileges possessed by the Russians in their mode of life, such as appointments, employment, a right to education, a housing fund, a higher material standard, and so on. Also nothing has been said of the Russification policies of the whole Russian population of Ukraine carried out by “individual” means, in all walks of life, or the theft of our national values and other similar acts.

The press and periodicals

The state of the Ukrainian press and periodicals also demands attention. For example, the newspaper *Literaturna Ukraina* exists to discuss the present literary process, but is reduced to the level of a backwater. For over ten years now, discussions have been proceeding concerning its size. However, how can its size be discussed when there is “not even enough” literary material to fill four pages (that is an indication of how poor literary life is at present) while the editors (hired by the KGB) fill the columns with materials not even connected with literary or artistic matters, not to mention national problems. Since the beginning of the 1970s, not one article that merits any attention or is worthy of literary criticism, about the “critical” state of Ukrainian literature, and indeed on every aspect of our art, has appeared in this newspaper, which is in essence a literary organ. Similarly, every “central” Kyivan paper has such a provincial appearance. Deprived of the right of having their own foreign correspondents and their own press services, they can only obtain their information from one source — the centralised imperial agency. And further, they receive strict instructions concerning the publication of materials concerned with national issues that trouble the Ukrainian community. The editorial boards are determined by the party and the KGB and are thus composed of planted, faithful and experienced ideological functionaries, who are, as a rule, of mixed nationality, and almost all of them recruited by the KGB.

An analogous situation is found in the editorial boards of magazines and publishing houses. The majority of publications are of low artistic value. They are impregnated with communist values and are of a colla-

boratory nature. On the other hand, items of high artistic value, but imbued with the Ukrainian national spirit are arrested by censorship and transferred to the relevant bodies, which are the starting point for the harassment and repression of the artist concerned. This is one reason for the generally low standard of our literature. Even the official authority — L. Novychenko⁴³, a well-known critic well acquainted with the present literary process — was forced to admit to the low artistic level in current Ukrainian literature in one of his recent works. However, Novychenko is encouraged to ignore the better elements that can be found in Ukrainian works, and is unable to explain the objective reasons and the regularity of this phenomenon. This must be the task of the opposition forces. However, facts cannot be disputed. I shall not dwell on many dramatic statistics and thus facts that speak for themselves. I shall merely tell the reader that 50 million Ukrainians are forced to be content with five thick art periodicals printed in very small numbers, while 120 million Russians have ten times more this number and which are not subjected to any printing limits. Indeed, most Russian periodicals are printed in numbers of over 100,000 and one third in numbers of 300,000 to 2.5 million. Thus, for example, *Novy Myr*, which is printed in numbers as high as 250,000, has a higher circulation than all Ukrainian periodicals put together. Moreover, recently the turnover of Ukrainian periodicals was reduced even more by the replacement (so-called) of most Ukrainian historical periodicals by the revival of an organ of an academic institution — the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. This is a further illustration of the attack against Ukrainian social life by the imperial forces, which was renewed at the beginning of the 1970s with mass arrests and repressions conducted against the Ukrainian intelligentsia and by the removal of the moderate P. Yu. Shelest⁴⁴ from his party post. This attack has reduced all the Ukrainian publications to a state of almost complete decline. The essence of the historical magazine was completely removed and it is being used as a parody of its original purpose and design. It is part of the occupant's joke at the expense of history and its principles, and in particular of Ukrainian history.

The vast majority of our artists, social scientists, cultural activists, among whom there are talents that deserve universal recognition, live in such conditions. But, deprived of creative freedom and forced to work in an atmosphere of constant national, moral and physical pressure, they, understandably, are unable to develop their talents to the full. As

a result of this, the standard of our present literature, drama, theatre, cinema, social sciences, social thought — culture as a whole — is lower than it could potentially be, and indeed is on the verge of complete decline. The true picture of the state of our culture will become even fuller when completed with the statistics of the number of talented people who have been forced to leave Ukraine. At present there are thousands of Korols, Boholubovs, Kozlovskys, Bondarchuks, Chukhrays, Tanyuks, and Romms⁴⁵ in exile. It is impossible to return them all to Kyiv, but it should be possible to keep them within the realms of Ukrainian culture and involve them in the creation of new national values in the sphere of their own particular activity. It is essential that such notable figures are included in the dynamic processes of our nation's struggle for survival. With their active and influential support, with the help of national activists of the same ability and calibre, they can strengthen Ukrainian institutions and help carry our national achievements and burning national issues onto international fora with the aim of influencing the world community to take active measures in defence of Ukrainian culture, and to become more closely acquainted with the tragic situation of the subjugated nations of the empire. Through such activists contacts with the Ukrainian emigration could be established. This is a brief run down of the important tasks, which lie ahead of this section of the Ukrainian élite, which, due to its own creative ability, the authority it has acquired for itself, and its compromise with the occupant, holds an appropriate position in the hierarchical pyramid, and has its own particular sphere of activity and means of making contacts, either through academic works, periodicals, publishing houses, the theatre, and film studios, or through common membership of the unions, and so on. These tasks are very complex indeed. But for the huge community of the active intelligentsia, which occupies these intermediate positions, and whose views are the same as those of the forces of opposition, and which regards as its primary task the preservation, development, and elevation of Ukrainian culture, they are completely feasible. The Ukrainian nation is presently undergoing a powerful ferment in the midst of its active intelligentsia. Its responsibility for the destiny of our nation, the feeling of an obligation towards it, and the awareness of the fact that the present artistic achievements, which are, basically, compiled and of a compromising communist nature, are of no cultural value and will thus never become part of our treasure-house of national culture, and that their creator's name will never make a mark on the history of our culture, become convincing arguments and evidence of

the fact that an ever-increasing section of our talented intelligentsia, genuinely interested in the blossoming of Ukrainian culture (its nationally conscious activists), who today occupy compromising positions, will become engaged in society and will go over to the open opposition.

The scientific and cultural intelligentsia — the mainstay of the opposition movement

The scientific-technical intelligentsia is taking an ever more active role in the activities of the opposition movement, and represents a reliable source of help to the above mentioned groups, of which it could well become the leading power. The present level of urbanisation, the level of the development of science, technology, and the economy all dictate that the totalitarian regime should decentralise these spheres of human activities, and thus allow substantially more freedom for the scientific-technical intelligentsia: otherwise totalitarianism will hinder the further development of science and economics, which would lead to increasing stagnation, with the Soviet Union lagging far behind the West in key branches of economics — which has become notably obvious within the last decade — and thus serve to increase the dissatisfaction felt by the intelligentsia.

It should be noted that, among other things, the effort to find a way out of the progressive stagnation has become one of the most significant reasons for the so-called arrest. The regime can become either more liberal or more repressive. The subjugated nations will benefit from either alternative. The first will stimulate the development of the opposition movement, and the second will stimulate wide dissatisfaction, which again will activate the opposition movement.

Dissatisfaction and opposition is not only directed at the regime by the Russian technical élite alone. As a hegemonist and a powerful driving force of the Russians, the élite is already gradually pushing out the party bureaucracy from governing the empire, at least in the field of economics. The failures that were caused by the increase of centralisation with the help of cybernetics (the idea of party leadership and its academic adherents of the so-called single automatic central system of control over the empire's economy directed from Moscow, failed), the development of many scientific and exemplary centres within the boun-

daries of various economic regions, and of scientific-industrial and purely industrial "incorporations" — Western-type concerns, the updating of economic theories with less emphasis on Marxist dogma, on the basis of which economic relations and calculations have borrowed structures and models from the West — are proof of the centrifugal forces of Russian economic leaders and that the scientific élite desires to free itself from under the control of the party caste; it is also proof of the élite's desire for freedom of action, and that it shall be impossible for the party bureaucracy to fully control the development of science, technology and economics in the future.

Evidence of this development can also be seen in the sphere of politics. There is a frank and harsh return to the Russian national spirit and national peculiarities, and a striking recreation of Pan-Slavism on a new basis. This is proof of the search not only for a wider base for a coalition and a common front of activities of Russian chauvinists of all kinds, but it is also the devaluation and erosion of communism as an ideology and of the élite's expectations of it. This is a demonstration of the various trends and manifestations, hidden on the outside (concealed), of the struggle for power between the communist ideologists and the Russian élite. It is, in the first place, an exemplary factor of the growth and strength of the Russian opposition.

Censorship of underground literature

I advise the younger generation, which will be joining our movement, to rely selectively and with great caution on the Russian movement of opposition as an ally, and only to a certain extent. For certain evidence has appeared showing that the people who, to a large extent, formulate the views and policies of the Russian movement and keep the necessary channels of contact and communication under their control, withhold, and what is more, destroy the most vital documents of the Ukrainian underground, which are designated for wide-scale publication throughout the world. This, once again, confirms our long-standing views concerning the equal basis with which mutual activity of both our forces, in revising the application of forces (purely Ukrainian interests are left aside during the coordination of joint action), but mainly in the improvement of the Russian movement's own systematic, regular and hopeful

channels of communication whatever effort this may require, is conducted.

Thus, the practice of censorship and filtration of the underground Ukrainian literature and samvydav materials, be it programmatical documents or appeals to the President of the USA, J. Carter, to the governments of other countries, or to the United Nations and the world community, bearing the signatures of many individuals or even of whole groups, deliberately creates a false impression of the alleged deep and radical processes, which are supposedly fermenting in the interior of the Russian nation, and also about "democratism" — its opposition movement; and on the other, of the supposed passivity, immaturity and impotence of all the national movements; thirdly, it discredits the ill-intentioned spread of various notions about the minor importance of the national question, and the failure to declare this question a pressing international problem, in this way promoting the preservation of the status quo, together with a simultaneous attack on the development of the national, especially Ukrainian, forces of opposition. Such actions, in their turn, reinforce the widely propagated myth, created by the KGB and Moscow's propaganda apparatus, about the "democratic nature" of the imperial-totalitarian regime, which supposedly permits the activity of the opposition and more or less tolerates it. Together they lead to a search for alternative models of social life and a future Russian state system in which the imperial structure would be preserved, and at the same time camouflaging, disguising, and weakening the dynamic development of the national liberation processes. Thus, whether unintentionally or deliberately, but, nevertheless, to the advantage of imperial interests, and, of course, those of traditional Russian ideals, some members of the influential Russian opposition have an impartial part in the KGB's attempts to suppress the Ukrainian forces of opposition. Their trouble is that they are far too restricted and conscious of their own narrow national Russian interests. They are pragmatists. However, having given this warning, I shall continue with my previous line of thought. Having realised the prospects of the activation of the scientific-technical intelligentsia and its precipitated involvement in the opposition movement, made possible by the tempos of the scientific-technical revolution — today's driving force — as well as the possibility that the scientific-technical élite might then assume overall leadership of the whole liberation movement, Moscow attempts to prevent this by neutralising and suppressing this section of the intelligentsia by its own "pre-

ventive” counter-measures, at the same time attempting to suppress all Ukrainian activity as well. For this reason we are witnessing the forced mass emigration of our national intellectuals and our national talent, and also of potential opponents of the imperial regime from their Ukrainian homeland, their isolation from the Ukrainian atmosphere and milieu — from all those factors that could potentially stimulate their involvement in the movement. The territory of the Soviet Union and the dynamics of its economic processes are conducive to the following. Hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian scientists, economists and other professionals in their field are forced to work outside Ukraine, either in the lands of the metropolis, or on the national territory of one of the other subjugated peoples, where they are separated, isolated, and forced to mix with many other nationalities, and, as such, they no longer present any threat. From the very beginning they are transformed into objects of reinforced assimilation, spying, re-education, and, if necessary, intimidation and blackmail. On the territories of the other subjugated nations they act as trojan horses — assimilators. At the same time, the administrative and governing bodies, academic institutions, technical and business establishments, especially the key positions, are systematically filled with the foreign element which has migrated to Ukraine. In the first place, the key positions are usually filled with Russians, and minor ones with representatives of the other subjugated nations. Thus, in the overwhelming majority of cases, apart from a few posts which are used purely for show, all the posts that hold any responsibility and all key positions — that is, real power and control — are concentrated in the hands of an approved caste of chauvinists made up of party members.

The multi-million strong minority — the mainstay of the occupant

The absolute complement of the regime, realised through the party and the administrative and economic bureaucracy, and maintained by the KGB, the militia, the army, and the fifth column — the 15 million strong Russian population in Ukraine⁴⁶ represents the strategic position and also the support of the regime. For a more effective realisation of its colonial policy and to achieve the ethnocide of the Ukrainian popula-

tion on its own native land, the occupant also employs a complete arsenal of “tactical” active measures. And while our artistic creativity, art and social sciences are oppressed through the falsification of history, through the mutilation of the national spirit, the disparagement of our task, the denial of our right to sovereignty, the denial of our classical heritage, and strict control over all our publications, the sphere of science and technology, the direct levers of oppression, is flooded by the multi-million strong Russian population of Ukraine, which occupies all the key positions in the towns and whose language is dominant. Ninety per cent of scientific works, technical monographs, and text books for institutes of higher education and technical schools — in a word, all technical publications — are printed in Russian. But language is one of the most important components of a culture. Against the background of the national nihilism in the field of humanities, the predominance of the Russian language in science and technology reduces to nothing the development of our own technical terminology. Alongside the widescale spread of national apathy and an inferiority complex among Ukrainians, and the demonstration of Russian superiority, brought about as a result of usurped positions and the upper hand of the imperialist, the complete hegemony of the Russian language in the sphere of technology, the mechanisation of language, the creation of allegories for the electronic calculators, and artificial languages in technical sciences based exclusively on the imperial, become powerful means of assimilation of the colonial peoples and their languages, including Ukrainian, which, from this point of view, is relatively better off than the others. As the years go by, these languages drop further and further behind in their state of development and reach a progressively worse state of decay, and the intellectuals, who work in the scientific and technical institutes, whose duty, apart from the creation of national values, is the perfection and enrichment of their own native language, the search for the creation of new words, work on the detailed development of their language to ensure that it occupies its rightful place in the community of world languages reaching the standard of the most developed languages, are in exile outside Ukraine. Their place has been taken by Russian chauvinists who publish their works only in Russian, and who enrich only the Russian culture and language, those who have settled in Ukraine with the specific aim of Russifying the native population — that is the most reactionary mass of Russian “conquistadors”, who have been delegated with the prerogatives of power for a speedier and more effective realisation of Moscow’s colonial policies. Those Ukrainians who have re-

mained in Ukraine and work there find themselves deprived of the possibility and opportunity to work for the good of their own nation. Everything, including the solution of various problems, all business correspondence, various projects, technical documentation and the work of publishing houses are all exclusively carried out in Russian, in accordance with imperial instructions and the "effort" of the fifth column. The state of the publishing houses and the atmosphere that prevails there, instilled with the spirit of overt oppression and speculation, are even more oppressive. In this way, the process of Russification embraces every branch of science, technology and the national economy of Ukraine, and is transmitted from the élite down to the masses, and like a boomerang is returned from the masses back to the élite. The policy of Russification, especially in the towns and cities, has assumed extreme forms for the purpose of assimilating the subjugated nations.

The economic system of Ukraine is also developing according to the plans of Moscow's colonial policy of attrition. Although Ukraine's economy is powerful, it is not equal to the economic system of the metropolis, either in tempos (in particular the complexity of development) or in integrality and scope of the functioning of its key branches. It lags behind, with quantitative and qualitative indices pointing to the soul of the nation, and is of a specifically colonial nature. The Ukrainian economy is dominated by industrial raw materials, the mining industry, and the metallurgical industry, which are increasingly being developed, that is those branches of the economy, which serve the attrition of Ukraine's natural resources. All the other branches of the economy are left undeveloped and their most important sections are dependent on supplies from the metropolis and far-off territories, which do not share a border with Ukraine and are not part of its infrastructure. This kind of economic stucture is known as the "single national-economic complex". It shows that long-term plans for the complete collapse of Ukraine's economy in the event of our country becoming independent (as was done with Czechoslovakia in 1968 and after), are already being put into practice. This is further proof that political goals dominate over all others. In this case, Moscow's plans are being put into practice by the disregard of rational economic centres. Although Ukrainian science seemingly has a broad horizon, in reality it plays a purely peripheral role. Exemplary fields exist, but their research work is such that it is of purely local significance. Ukrainian scientists are not free to make an independent choice of fields of study and they are limited in their resources. The

Ukrainian Academy, along with its staff and students, is considered to be of a lower calibre, and its teachers, researchers and professors are not allowed to have any independent contact with colleagues abroad. The status of Ukrainian academic and scientific institutions does not allow them to send autonomous delegations to take part in international gatherings of any sort. Their designated field of activity, limited both qualitatively and quantitatively, lowers the standing of Ukrainians even further in the field of science and academic work, as the honour to represent Ukrainian academics and scientists abroad is bestowed on Russians who work in the Ukrainian educational system. Indeed, the candidates themselves are specially selected in Moscow and the criteria for participating in international conferences is not talent, but nationality and loyalty to the regime. Thus, complete subordination, the unconditional subordination of Ukrainian scientific, technical, and economic institutions to Moscow, and the drain of Ukrainian specialists is part of Russia's policy of oppression designed to bestow upon Ukraine a status worse than colonial. Ukraine does not have an independent science nor does she have enough cadres to work in the field of human activity. This merely helps to develop and intensify the processes taking place among the Russian technical élite in Ukraine. The Ukrainian nation is a strong and economically powerful nation, which has vitality and a large national territory. On becoming independent, Ukraine would confront Moscow with a real and particularly dangerous threat of weakening the empire. Thus, because of the serious nature of the threat posed by the combination of all these factors, Ukraine is subjected to particularly harsh oppression, destruction, and assimilation. Official figures and the actual number of the many millions of Russian specialists who occupy key positions in Ukraine's educational system, economy, not to mention the party, the administrative apparatus, the army, and the organs of repression, are kept secret. Those that are published are falsified and do not reflect the true situation. However, to illustrate my point I would like to quote one particular figure. In a conversation with the author, the head of the KGB of the Lviv region, General Poluden, someone who is undoubtedly well-informed, quoted an interesting statistical fact as part of his argument about the "successes" of national policy in Ukraine. According to him, in the mid-1970s the number of native Ukrainian intelligentsia in Western Ukraine, especially in the Lviv region, was 41%. Let us assume that this figure is correct and that it has not been inflated by 5-10%. But even without any inflation this figure is startling, as the Ukrainian national intelligentsia amounts to barely over

a third on its own native territory. And this is in the “specific” areas in Halychyna and the city of Lviv, where the intelligentsia regards national rights, the national problems, and Ukrainian sovereignty, as unitary values, with a sense of duty before the nation and national dignity. Even the imperial élite must take notice of this and create a suitable national façade! For this very reason, Russian officials have given Western Ukraine the secret unofficial name “specific zone”, which is never openly mentioned. The figure 41% is completely sufficient to maintain this façade. But there are certain regions throughout the vast territory of Ukraine where the “façade” is no longer necessary. Throughout the whole of Ukraine the situation is markedly worse in as far as in Donbas, in the Kharkiv region, and throughout the whole of Southern Ukraine even these “façades” have been dropped long ago.

For the Russians the dynamic awakening is a regular occurrence. Internal party discrepancies and friction, divergence in views on trends in internal and external policies, corporative solidarity and rivalry, greater freedom of action, and many other factors form the Russian hegemony and open up many wide-ranging possibilities. These processes, which can be seen taking place among the Russian élite, can be seen in Ukraine. However, at present these processes are not clearly expressed and are merely tendencies and fermentations. But, under the guidance of scientific-technical progress, they will inevitably actively develop and become widespread in Ukraine. Failure to work in this direction would narrow down the opportunities open to the Ukrainian liberation movement, and ignore objective regularities of progress and the appearance of powerful new vectors of power. What had been renewed in its present form at the beginning of the 1960s was continued and developed in subsequent years mainly by our humanists and professional activists in the field of social sciences. The scientific-technical intelligentsia, in conjunction with the humanitarians as the organic whole of the nation, will continue, strengthen, improve the quality and expand the national liberation movement on a massive scale. Today, the era of the scientific-technical élite is approaching and it is already inheriting a wide field of activity and a movement, which is not yet completely formed. Now I would like to say a few words about the scientific-technical élite itself — the leadership and the moving force behind this movement.

The unitary phenomenon of the Ukrainian soul

If the activation of the opposition movement and, in particular, the activation of the technical-scientific intelligentsia is still in its early stages, and the coordination of the general Ukrainian acts of opposition are at present merely tendencies and consist of a search for likely directions of activity, and structure, then the same cannot be said of matters pertaining to the soul of the nation. For, as a result of scientific-technical progress and the phenomena to which it gives rise: (a) the enhancement of the de-centralising aspirations of the subjugated nations, made possible by the progressive devaluation of communist values, (b) deep disillusionment of the masses with the manner in which everyday life is being run, and (c) the fast spreading realisation, which seeps into every level of society, of the unnatural character of the way of life enforced on the subjugated nations by Moscow and the semi-open obstruction of communist channels and norms by a large part of the population, especially youth, made possible by these and a whole string of other factors, reducing official propaganda to a state of relative impotence, which, in such cases usually creates a vacuum which needs to be filled, society is fermenting, and, side by side with the search for new qualitative values, better models on which to base their lines and the needs dictated by it (to become familiar with new philosophical and sociological systems), and the need for self-assertion through avant-garde forms in art created in the national spirit, there is an ongoing dynamic spread of religion, a return to God, and a spontaneous revival of Ukrainian rites, customs, and traditions, a process which affects every subjugated nation and all levels of their society. After the terror against the Church in the 1930s and 1940s⁴⁷, and, it would appear, its complete devastation and the ultimate victory of the Bolshevik regime over faith and the Church, the explosive upsurge and dynamic revival of spirituality in conditions of unfaltering and lasting oppression are especially gratifying.

When talking about Ukraine, this phenomenon of a renaissance has already become a recognised norm and is proof of the unitary nature of the Ukrainian soul, of its originality, its organic needs of God, and its unique psychology. It is also proof of the indestructibility of the Ukrainian national spirit, of Ukrainian individualism, genetic difference, disinclination to foreigners and to the way of life, which has been forced

upon the people of Ukraine. On the one hand it is a form of both subconscious and conscious protest, and on the other an indication of the feebleness of the options open to the regime in exercising its control over the spirituality of our nation, in fact of every subjugated nation. Thus, the large mass of religious believers, regardless of their creed, are perhaps our most faithful allies. Faith in God and the nation are indissoluble concepts. The indissoluble bond between these two concepts has been determined for a thousand years in the history of our people, in the steadfastness of the Ukrainian national character, in the painless transition to Christianity and the deep spiritual affinity of, and to a certain degree succession between, Ukrainian paganism and Christianity, in the introduction into Christianity of the national originality of the Ukrainian rite and customs, and in the national life of our two most important Churches — the Ukrainian Catholic and the Ukrainian Orthodox Churches. They are indissoluble in essence and fundamental principles, and belong to the same religion. It is the sacred duty of our forces of opposition to defend these two Churches, to analyse their activity, and to spread their teachings.

The position and activity of the Ukrainian Churches

The Orthodox Church, which functions today on Ukrainian territory, apart from the fact that it is subordinated to the Moscow Patriarchate, despite even its tenets, which are contrary to and irreconcilable with those of communist ideology, belongs to the mainstream of Moscow's imperialist state politics. According to Russian historical tradition, the Church is rigidly controlled by the interests of the state and together with the latter has one aim: the creation of a great state, Pan-Russianism and aspirations of world hegemony. As a result, Ukraine is deprived of its own national clergy and Ukrainian church hierarchy. Consequently, only the emancipation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church from the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate, and subsequently the return from abroad and transfer to Kyiv of the Throne of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church together with its chief hierarch, will return the Russian Church to its proper task, giving the Ukrainian Church national unity, thus ironing out the quite natural conflicts between the two Churches.

The Ukrainian Catholic Church is without doubt our national shrine, which has created imperishable national values and saved us as a nation in the fullest sense of the word. However, the Ukrainian Catholic Church is not only an extraordinary phenomenon of the national spirit. It is an original, major offshoot of the Universal Catholic Church. By its progressive growth, far-sighted reconstruction and historical proximity to the people, it has become an example, a prototype for many reforms in the present development of the Catholic Church. As the incarnation of the spiritual uniqueness of the people, for centuries the Ukrainian Catholic Church has been the bastion of its originality, the protector of national interests and the Apostle of our Sovereignty on the political crossroads of the world. This is particularly true of modern times during the office of Metropolitan Sheptytsky and Cardinal Slipyj. This very Apostleship of Faith and national interests and the unshakeable unity with the people, provoke the savage hatred, intolerance and the treacherous, perfidious attempt to destroy the Ukrainian Catholic Church by the imperialist Muscovites, who strangle anything that is genuinely national.

For three decades now, the Ukrainian Catholic Church has existed underground in the catacombs, as in the days of Nero. Condemned to death, subject to unbelievable persecution and a campaign of mass terror "against its clergy, the Church naturally is not as powerful as it was in the past. However, the invader is powerless to destroy it. The Church has "conquered death by death"". It lives on and has faithful in each parish. Masses and Holy Communion take place illegally in safe, private houses in villages and towns. This has been the state of affairs for the last three decades. Only in the last few years, as a result of the internal political situation, by virtue of the sacrifices made by the priests of the Ukrainian Catholic Church together with the simultaneous support of the population, which erupted in spontaneous outbursts of protest in many villages or individual communities united by parishes, legal Mass is now being celebrated in certain villages in Western Ukraine. The Liturgies are said in closed churches not functioning officially due to the "lack" of Orthodox clergy, but saved by the inhabitants from ruin, fire and similar crimes committed during the period when churches were plundered by groups of bandits under orders from party headquarters, and criminal brigades provoked into doing this "job" by operation sections of the political gendarmerie as a form of penance for earlier crimes; or this "job" was sometimes given to prudent collabora-

tors, the “Herostrates” of the 20th century for a reward, privileges, and a career. The colonialist power treated these people as colleagues and partners in the destruction of Ukrainian shrines, rites, traditions and cultural values.

The colonialist’s arsenal bristles with methods of destroying churches, chapels and synagogues, ranging from direct destruction by fire to their conversion into warehouses or production plants. Nevertheless, some of the village churches are still intact. The possibility of semi-legal Masses and the partial, essentially only nominal *de facto*, emergence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church from the undergropund can be explained by several factors. First of all, this has been brought about by the influence of world events — a change in the internal state of affairs in the empire and on the outside, the forced retreat of the regime to the benefit of our Church; and also the exceptional steadfastness and sacrificial spirit of the pastors of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, who, together with the faithful, have for more than 30 years kept and preserved the national faith like the first Christian martyrs.

The partial emergence of the Catholic Church from the underground was also made possible without doubt by the action of Ukrainian resistance movements during the last decade and the unremitting wave of national opposition to the policy of ruining the faith and the Church as one of the means of ethnocide. The resistance was strengthened by the considerable authority of the Ukrainian clergy, its organic unity with the people, its readiness to sacrifice itself in the name of preserving the national spirituality, the prototype and symbol of which is His Holiness Patriarch of the Kyiv-Halych Patriarchate, Cardinal Josyf Slipyy, and the clergy of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. The extensive activities of the clergy and the selfless work of our émigrés abroad in defence of the Church, helped her to withstand and survive the most difficult years. All this together brought about the formation of separate national parishes of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. However, one of the most important facts involved are the profound changes in politics as a whole in the empire, the atmosphere of increased public activity of the population and the influence on it of foreign mass media information, on the one hand, and the gradual retreat of the caste of party bureaucrats on the other. The third factor is the West’s awareness of the threat to itself from the aggressive totalitarian regime and in conjunction with this the pressure of world opinion on it, which has resulted in the minutely perceptible restraint in the arbitrariness of the empire’s repressive

machine, the attempt to act secretly (which is not always easy when one has wider contacts with the world) and utter deviousness, the search for more treacherous, tactical nuances ranging from the traditional well-tried campaigns of wide repression to the “legality” and “legal principles” game in the face of the West. Included here are the legal norms of conduct fixed by the Final Act signed in Helsinki.

Naturally, we should be prepared for further sacrifices and repression. Moscow will not accept the fact that its imperialist position is visibly weakened. The long-term major aim of strangling the Church has not been achieved, and who better than Moscow, doubtless in its own way, appreciates the boundless devotion to God and the unparalleled service to the people of the Ukrainian Catholic clergy. Who better than Moscow understands the danger to itself inherent in the singleness of interest, the organic unity of the nation and the Church, the joint struggle for the life of the people and the faith, in the preservation of today's values and the national spirit? For this very reason, Moscow strives with ferocious hatred to stifle and destroy the Church, spreading lies about its activity, continuing persecution, progroms, harassment, and it has waged and will continue to wage a terrible war against the Ukrainian Catholic Church. Nevertheless, the Church is on the threshold of a major rebirth, while her decisiveness even her sacrifices at opportune moments in history, during the birth of national consciousness, do not bring extinction, but life-growth and increased morale. They are of exceptional value since they bring us closer to the ultimate aim.

Aid to Ukrainian Jewry

One of the most important tasks and principles (belonging to the national problems as a whole, the deep, organic purposeful solidarity of two peoples related spiritually and by historic fate, connected by close historic bonds and who, for a long time and today in particular, have been in the grip of the jaws of criminal ethnocide) of the Ukrainian liberation movement and all national forces, was and will remain in the coming years the struggle to reopen Jewish synagogues on Ukrainian territory and concentrate actively on fully renewing the national and cultural life of Ukrainian Jews.

Ukrainian Jewry is an inseparable and organic cell of the Jewish nation, a huge tract of virgin soil, an independent and unique, spiritually powerful entity in the Ukrainian organism. According to Ukrainian State Law, its own national and social life is guaranteed. The existing communities and synagogues, which unite Ukrainian Jewry first and foremost, have the right to print newspapers and publish in Hebrew-Yiddish, have access to information channels, educational establishments, internal government and autonomous military detachments and without question, the guaranteed right to vote in free, public elections, leave for the home of their fathers and have Israeli organisations or an economy functioning on their territory.

However, severely restricted by the empire's system of "law and order" throughout the USSR, particularly in Ukraine, an elementary unit of the empire, the Jews, even to a greater extent than other oppressed nations, have been deprived of national rights, subjected to constant forced assimilation and in recent decades, in conjunction with the empire's interest in the Middle East, and the collapse of Moscow's politics in this region, Ukrainian Jews have become exposed to a violent campaign of anti-semitism, as part of Moscow's global anti-Israeli strategy. Via the empire's information channels, a mechanism of unprecedented debauchery and infamy has been set in motion and a campaign of total zoological anti-Semitism, persecution and attacks has been launched. Cynical propaganda and mass dissemination of slander, malice and hatred is transmitted through every possible channel and in every social echelon. However, the press and publishers, radio and television, on account of world public opinion, are forced to limit their use of Goebbelian "black propaganda", unleashed without restraint or any elementary moral norms. Its source, its system of spreading rumours, operate according to the principle "anything goes". It does not stop at the most vile means, pouring out torrents of filth maligning the Jews. The OUN⁴⁸ and the active Ukrainian emigration abroad are perhaps the only ones in a similar position. The dirt splashing from the "black stream" is relished by the Russian settler on other national territories. It incenses him, firing the genetically inherited "Kill the Jews, save Russia" and the historical destructive streak of this fifth column. This infects the local inhabitants thus masking the actual colonisers — those really responsible for the material shortages and the difficult predicament of the masses. The aim is to make the Jews the object of "ridicule, malice and letting off steam".

Anti-Semitism is the result of a dangerous inferiority complex, the malicious psycho-pathological state of the Russian chauvinist philistine whatever his rank. The mentality of the riff-raff and criminal element is a mass phenomenon, which requires decisive, principled opposition, exposure and neutralisation. Ukrainian Jewry is our long-standing dependable political ally. We do not need to make historical analogies of the Ukraino-Judean type, or talk about political unity and the joint struggle against the occupant during the time when we were a state, or research into Ukrainian-Jewish connections and alliances in the past. Today, the political situation is different. The Jewish people have regained their statehood, while we have a thorny path to tread before our statehood is regained.

However, the Jews in the empire need our help, protection and co-operation. The Jews are subject to callous Russian-style pressure. Their rights are severely curtailed, which means in effect restrictions on education, similar restrictions on most jobs, and the persecution of anyone who openly and proudly calls himself a Jew.

The Jewish question is inseparable from the national problem in the empire, including Ukraine. This subject should be dealt with extensively in the manifesto of the Ukrainian opposition and they should devote to it as much attention as to our question. It is one of the most important tasks of the Ukrainian liberation movement. The level at which this problem is formulated and the measure of its conception will be evidence of the maturity and scope of the Ukrainian liberation movement. Defence of the rights of Ukrainian Jewry, the fight for the development of its national culture and the reinstatement of Hebrew in the press, publishing houses, and actual transfer of Russian-language Jewish cultural workers to their native sphere or the Ukrainian sphere; demands to reopen on Ukrainian territory all the former synagogues, Jewish schools, newspapers and journals; the struggle for legislation to guarantee dual citizenship and exit to Israel, are the minimum components of the Jewish national problem in Ukraine. They require everyday attention, purposeful action and have in recent years become more urgent in the joint struggle with the Jews for a renaissance in national and social life. They remain topical and are inseparable from the great responsibility of each mature Ukrainian to the fate of his nation.

Traitors and collaborators

The total implementation of propaganda, the skilful utilisation of local people prepared to compromise themselves in order to strengthen their own positions, the consolidation of the imperial regime, the camouflaging of the politics of colonialism, Russification and of deceit, the attempt to appease the masses with the aid of gangs of collaborators of all types — all these factors enable the Moscow regime to give its full attention to national problems. With this as an aim, a large and efficient system of propaganda has been constructed. It employs a relatively small yet active band of collaborators, motivated by the organs of the propaganda machine and the KGB, in the campaign of propaganda. In the history of the struggle of the Ukrainian nation for her independence, neither the betrayal of national ideals nor collaboration have had any place in our relations with the occupant (although similar examples can be found in the critical moments of other nations). It is only in the recent Bolshevik period of our history that traitors of our nation have emerged from the ranks of our national intelligentsia and who infiltrate the liberation movement, the cultural movement, our history faculties (in an attempt to falsify our annals), the Church and party and attempt to disfigure the aims and ideals of the opposition movement; to disparage the activists of the national-liberation movement. These factors are now more or less an ordinary feature of our society.

Betrayal occurred as an exception once in the past: with Halan⁴⁹ being the “founder” of this “school” of shame and its most typical representative. This Ukrainian Judas left in the Ukrainian field a poisonous family of degenerates — “microhalans”, various Melnychuks, Tsokhs, Kychkos, Myhals⁵⁰ and others. Similarly, Myhal was a typical representative of the repulsive gang of quislings. This degenerate, alcoholic collaborator was, at the beginning of the 1960s, entrusted, along with others such as he, with “cultivating” Ukrainian political prisoners in one of the Mordovian concentration camps and obtaining their “recantations”, and a condemnation of their underground activities. This is a testimony to his degenerate activity. When, on an improvised stage set up in the dining hall, a group of our political prisoners appeared, Myhal, thinking that he was about to be punished for his betrayal and the foul and slanderous pieces in the press was so scared that he began

to lament: "Brothers — I'm one of you, I'm with you. It was the Russians, the communists, who brought me here and forced me to act against Ukraine, against you". But when he was sure that he was not going to be subjected to physical punishment, he reverted to his former self — a prostrate traitor. The behaviour of these base beings could be disregarded if it were not for the fact that they are encouraged by the party centres and by the KGB and if their activities did not lead to the repression of members of the opposition movement. However, the fact that these degenerates have been encouraged to climb out of their holes testifies to the fact that the national-liberation struggle is now activated and the opposition movement has become much stronger, but most importantly, it testifies to the silent support and concern of wide masses of the population for our national problems.

In the last ten years, as a result of many factors already noted here, the ferment of the population, along with the government actions to quell it, has taken on an ever more dynamic appearance, which has been influenced by the need for objective information about world affairs. And thus the role of Western sources of information, and in particular "Radio Liberty", have played a vital part within the confines of the empire, particularly within Ukraine. They have filled the vacuum created by communist ideology and the mistrust felt towards government information and propaganda. The regime, in an attempt to prevent the vacuum being filled by the samvydav (and thus increasing its growth, the stimulation that it provides, and its development) and by the transmission of Western radio broadcasts, in the first place mobilises Ukrainian collaborators in combatting the liberation movement. Their word carries more "authority" in the struggle where the coloniser's primary target is to prevent any activity on the part of the opposition movement (inasmuch that any information that it manages to print on the national question, can serve to stimulate further interest in this matter, and the strength of its attraction is incredibly powerful). With the intention of silencing the opposition movement and covering up the true extent of the liberation processes, the regime's apparatus of repression fabricates criminal cases for a large number of the members of the opposition movement, as a rule little known to the public, and locks them away in concentration camps for criminals. This practice has increased considerably in the last few years.

In these conditions of massive hypocrisy, the value of the official word is devalued to its least possible level. However, this does not pre-

sent a threat to the opposition movement as regards its beliefs, nor can it quell our national patriotism or change our views in favour of the occupant, as the absolute majority of the literate population that is concerned with these problems is able to distinguish and judge where right lies, and to take an objective internal stance. This is why the publication of the works of, for example, Yevdokymenko, Rymarenko, Cherednychenko, Danylenko⁵¹ and so on, although in principle are less damaging than the press or other written propaganda, are unable to “fill” the existing vacuum. They are of a poor quality, pseudo-educational and completely false. The treachery of collaborators such as Halan and his “heirs” — all sorts of Melnychuks, Myhals, Kychkos, Tsokhs (who do not even deserve to be mentioned by their Christian names), Dmytruks and so on, can merely await a relentless vengeance to be taken by us in thunderous words, because the desecration of religious shrines, the blasphemies of degenerates, betrayal, and the disparagement of Ukrainian patriots cannot be left unanswered and demands to be exposed. In the second place, because the exposure and distribution of such literature and material as the samvydav and also the materials translated by the Ukrainian editorial board of “Radio Liberty” (it is rare to find a family in Ukraine, and in particular those from educated backgrounds, who do not listen to these broadcasts) help create a wider interest in the national-liberation movement, and what is especially important, many of these people, from all classes of society, will then actually take an active role in this movement.

Thirdly, because this exposure (one of the methods of work used by the opposition movement) produces an even stronger reaction from the imperial propagandistic apparatus and its collaborators, and thus serves to awaken the masses to overcome their inertness and stimulates their engagement in matters of national interest. It encourages the polarisation of different groups, and thus such exposure will act as one of the catalysts in the development of an active opposition movement; or otherwise, the imperial administration will continue its present practice of silencing burning national questions and eliminating the existing opposition movement. This is the reason why the initiative for action lies with an active opposition, which has to dominate and disperse itself and its works within the nation, as happened with Dzyuba’s popular book *Internationalism or Russification?* and the materials printed in the samvydav. If this course of action is not taken, the existing vacuum will be reinforced. It is thus the duty of the opposition movement to fill this

vacuum with its own information, with broadcasts from “Radio Liberty” and other media, which will, in the long run, have analogous or even greater results. These are then the nuances of the given question.

The ever more frequent publication of the problems that Ukrainians supposedly cause for the Russians and the empire speaks for itself. Indeed, this provides convincing proof of the vigour and strength of the Ukrainian opposition and is, simultaneously, proof that Moscow treats the opposition very seriously by planning an offensive strategy in its very centre. It is also evidence of an attempt to set the Russian inhabitants against Ukrainians, as was done with the Jews, and to remind the chauvinistic urban dweller of “old wounds” and thus rekindle the Ukrainophobia, which has just barely died down. It is also proof that the Ukrainian question is once again assuming international importance and is again becoming an actual international problem. The imperial regime does not entirely trust any of its collaborators, regardless of their status or specialisation. Neither Ukrainian “writers”, “journalists”, “publishers”, nor “historians” are allowed access to important documentary sources, archives or investigative matters that bear any relation to the Ukrainian question or the national-liberation movement. As this was true in the past, so it is true today. And the “back entrance”, where the very methodology of the struggle with the movement is to be found, is completely prohibited ground. Thus, the appearance of K. Dmytruk as an author discredits our efforts to gain independence and to restore the Church to its rightful place. His appearance in the publishing world (with others of his ilk) merely reflects the mistrust felt towards local cadres, their “errors” (maybe committed completely consciously) in this “complex and important” work. This also explains why these cadres are ever diminishing in size. Thus, the transfer of Dzyuba’s allegiance to that gang — in exchange for his freedom — represented a considerable victory for the occupant. A. K. Dmytruk — who used this pseudonym to cover his true role as a KGB operative, a colonel of the imperial secret service — is not even a Ukrainian by origin. However, Klym Halsky (alias A. K. Dmytruk) claims to be a “specialist” on the Ukrainian question, but who has in fact long conducted and operated the so-called prophylactic battle against the underground (the author of these notes has had the “honour” of speaking with him on many occasions, to have been arrested by him and to have withstood his questioning as a prisoner), who has the fate of hundreds of lives on his conscience and in particular of thousands of our most active Ukrainian patriots and

Church activists. Thus, his books are merely an extension of his work and activity and need no further refutations. It is enough to know “who is who” as the author of a publication.

Transmigration and intermixing of the population

The migration, the assimilation of the élites, the loss of talented people, the abduction of intellectuals, the predominance of the Russian element in Ukrainian towns, the mass and accompanying compulsory Russification of Ukrainians, beginning at school level and ending at institutions of higher education, industries, administrative institutions, have been noted as being one of the most important strategic aims of the colonial politics of Moscow on the territory of Ukraine and which aim to destroy the Ukrainian nation and her culture. One of the other branches of the imperial politics of ethnocide and bloodless killing is the policy of forced transmigration and the assimilation of many millions of peoples of different nationalities on alien territories. Deportation and forced migration are but two methods used by the imperialists to quell the subjugated nations. They are also a means of gaining control over new lands, and lands that have been conquered, but are not settled, or else are settled by peoples hostile to the occupying power, by making use of those people who have been forced to migrate there. This is an invention of the communist regime. This practice is one that has been long in use, but its totalitarian form has only been realised in the 20th century, and has only been implemented by totalitarian regimes; by the Russian communist and German fascist regimes. While the practices of the Nazi regime have been widely publicised and received their due condemnation from mankind, the murders committed by the Russian imperial regime, which began in the 1930s and continue to this day, instead of being condemned by sovereign nations; instead of them isolating the Russian empire, boycotting the regime and defending the expiring nations instead of this, they conduct business with it as an “honourable partner”; they hold meetings on international fora, support diplomatic relations, sign treaties, which for Moscow only hold the meaning of a “scrap of paper”, (as seen in the way that Moscow fulfils those obligations that she has undertaken. It is the same with both internal state law and international law — merely something that has been declared on a scrap of paper. It is dishonourable for us to be serfs; but is it

not also dishonourable for the world that one of its nations — the Ukrainian nation — a nation of 50 million people with a territory the size of France (even when taking into account half the lands annexed by the occupant), that has the capacity for a creative and independent economic existence, with an equally great and equivalent (in terms of age, development and capacity) cultural life — is it not shameful that this great and ancient nation has seemingly been placed on the level of a small African tribe in the pyramid of international relations, national freedom, the right for sovereignty and the right to life, and is being destroyed as such life could only be destroyed in the Middle Ages. There exists a strange passivity (even though there exist analogous situations) even though the same fate awaits other sovereign nations of Europe. This is why it is incredible that the leaders of the West — of the USA, France, England, West Germany, the EEC and the United Nations — resort to passive resistance instead of following a course of dynamic, instigative pressure, one aspect of which should be the inclusion of the Ukrainian question in the sphere of international relations and in the resolutions of international fora, and which should be, in particular, on the daily agenda of the UN General Assembly.

The historical forced exiling of Ukrainians from their motherland began with the perfidious devastation of the Zaporizhian Sich and with the liquidation of our autonomy⁵². Then, utilising our common religions, the similarity of our languages, the higher level of our culture, education and our already developed economy, the subordinate status of our national relations (i.e. between the Ukrainian and Russian nations) and our colonial status, Moscow transformed Ukraine not only into a long-term supplier of clergy, artists, cultural activists and learned men — the middle levels of the state and administrative apparatus, both within the metropolis and in the newly conquered territories — but Ukraine has also been turned into a supplier of colonists, who are to absorb these new lands. Then, during the latter part of the 19th century and at the turn of the 20th century, the tsarist regime gave a further intensity to mass resettlement. In that very decade, the policy of mass resettlement was begun and also at that time the role and the meaning of ethnocide were realised, as was their role in strengthening the position of the empire by destroying the roots of the nation, and by assimilating it. Thus, since that period — a period of intensive development of the economy of the Russian nation — the national masses have been the target of mass assimilation. However, in the last years of the tsarist

regime, the migration from Ukraine did not really affect the life of the nation inasmuch as the numbers of émigrés were relatively very small and infrequent, and because rapid demographic growth concealed the losses. Apart from the above, the place of the emigrating masses was not then filled by colonising Russians, whose number in Ukraine at that time was, in comparison to today, very small. The question of agricultural upheavals, the stabilisation of the regime in the period of the so-called collectivisation, industrialisation and five year plans at the end of the 1920s and at the beginning of the 1930s resulted in great changes in the structure of the population, and had a threatening, pogromatic character. In the last period, and particularly during the last decade, the practice of mass intermixing has produced one of the most outstanding problems for the state politics of Moscow.

After the man-made famine, as a result of which between 6 and 10 million Ukrainians died⁵³, the million-fold deportation of Ukrainians was introduced. Nearly all of the Ukrainian population was banished from Kuban, followed by the attempt to eliminate the so-called kulaks, who formed about 10-20% of the population of Ukrainian villages. The deliberate unification of the policies of genocide, mass repression and mass resettlement of Ukrainians beyond the boundaries of Ukraine have become the norm for the behaviour of the totalitarian regime. For the present generations, for the majority of us, genocide, repression, deportation are words with little meaning. They present only abstract concepts, but they form the basis for millions upon millions of human tragedies; they are responsible for creating millions of orphans and also for creating aggressive janissaries. Together they form Ukraine's tragedy, her crucifixion. Mankind is well aware of the horror of forced labour. But the Russian totalitarian regime destroyed tens of millions more people in the 1930s and 1940s. And only the unbelievable secrecy of the terror machine, only the merciless repressions, including death by firing squad, only the attempt to conceal all crimes, only the concealment and deceptive propaganda machine are able to deflect the attention of new generations from the true nature of the Bolshevik dictatorship. Rather, the fear of the older generation permits the totalitarian regime to erase traces of past crimes and thus enables it to commit new ones, all with the sole intention of destroying other nations.

The concentration camps of the 1930s and 1940s brought mass deaths caused by dystrophy and exhaustion from forced labour. It is impossible to measure how many tragedies the words Bilomorka, Magadan, Koly-

ma, Norylsk, Komsomolsk-na-Amuri, Vorkuta, Tayshet⁵⁴ hold. And there are thousands more of such Russian "Buchenwalds". And many more thousands of Ukrainian villages that bear the stamp of death with black signs on their houses. Thousands of village belfries have rung out the death of those millions, who died from the famine, artificially created in order to punish those, who refused to join the collectives. And there are still more thousands of towns and hamlets, which bear the weight of thousands of tortured sacrifices: tens of thousands of people were murdered in Vynnytsia between 1937-39; more than 5000 prisoners were tortured in Lviv between May-June 1941 and more than 1100 in Sambir; several hundred prisoners were burnt alive in pits in Dobromyl; more than a 1000 people were murdered in Drohobych, about 2000 in Kovel, approximately 350 in Berezhany, 750 in Zolochiv and even in the tiny place of Komarno 25 men were murdered. Apart from this, in June 1941 the NKVD murdered either all or at least the majority of the prisoners held in Ternopil, Chortkiv, Berdychiv, Uman, Lutsk, Stanislaviv, Stryi and in other towns of Ukraine.

And in every town, men, women, villagers, the intelligentsia, and priests were tortured to death. Nearly all these had their nails torn out, their tongues cut out, their noses cut off, their ears and sexual organs cut off, while wives of priests had long Russian bayonets rammed through their breasts. Men and women alike had their arms and legs tied together with barbed wire, they had petrol poured over them and were lit like living torches. This was while the Russians were fleeing from the Germans. To fight against such an invader without the aid of any allies was impossible. Moscow had no hope of ever returning again and that is why she destroyed everything that was Ukrainian, and, in the first place, destroyed that, which was the most vital to our nation — Ukrainian patriots. All this took place both before and during the war. Even after the war, as a victor, when Ukraine did not present any direct threat, the coloniser renewed an equally horrifying terror campaign in the Western regions of Ukraine. But today our youth knows practically nothing about the famine, genocide, repressions, terror and deportation of millions of Ukrainians from Ukraine. The revelation of these facts of Ukrainian history is decried as anti-Soviet propaganda by the imperial regime, as nationalistic lies, as slander of the national policies of the party and so on and so forth. Without doubt, from its present position of power, the regime can present these facts as being the fabrications of Ukrainian nationalists, as their calumny against the communist regime.

But this was a well thought out strategy, as was the murder of millions of the most educated, talented and active people from all levels of Ukrainian society. The policy, which aimed to suffocate all national strength and to prevent any further development of Ukrainian culture, has been carefully nurtured and implemented.

Thus Moscow, in order to strengthen her colonial yoke, to increase her economic exploitation of both human and natural resources, has, in order to gain the optimal variant, implemented the policy of denationalising the subjugated nations, which, with its ever increasing tempo, brings closer her goal of world domination. Therefore, with the aim of Russifying all the peoples, Moscow continues her policy of mass resettlement, develops the as yet undeveloped regions of the empire, intending to populate these areas with non-Russians.

The Ukrainian area of the empire is flooded with Russian schools, where the language of education is that of the ruling nation, where Russian rules prevail, where there is no tolerance for national manifestations of Ukrainian patriotism and our way of life. This results in the total assimilation of our characteristics. This represents a loss of the realistic rights of returning to Ukraine as a result of the loss of the right to make a living, the place of work, of town visas, a loss of place in society, social relations and so on. A demographic vacuum is thus created on the ethnic territories of the subjugated nations, which are first filled with chauvinistic elements of the Russian population and then with the émigrés of other nations, and then mainly with those most foreign in national characteristics, culture, spirit, i.e. those, who are completely unable to adopt a Ukrainian way of life. In this way, a system is formed whereby Ukrainians become the Russifiers of the Kazakhs, of the Uzbeks, the Azerbaijanians or the Baltic nationalities, and where, in turn, the Latvians, the Tadjiks, the Chuvash or the Moldovians assimilate the Ukrainians. And, above all this, the Russian chauvinist takes precedence.

The enforced realisation of the politics of ethnocide have placed these nations in a catastrophic position. This is the reason why the number of Ukrainians today remains almost the same as at the turn of the century. However, during the same time span, the number of Russians in analogous "equal" (i.e. with the same conditions of collectivisation, the repression of the 1930s, equal participation in the war effort and so on) conditions, has almost doubled. There are numerous statistics that present proof of our national ethnocide. According to official statistics, in

the 1970s, there were almost 10 million internal migrations per annum. Let us assume that this figure has not in fact been reduced and that it genuinely reflects the true state of affairs. Taking these figures, and taking the fifth that relates to the proportion of the Ukrainian population, the figure is then 2 million émigrés. But when only a fifth is taken from this figure of 2 million people, who emigrate from Ukraine, then this means that 400,000 — almost half a million — people emigrate annually. Is this not a tragic figure for the development of the Ukrainian nation and for the development of her culture?

However, the people, who compose the mass of the internal émigrés — including the half million Ukrainians — are not, after having completed their education, even allowed to leave their mark on their native land. Secret instructions to the so-called “organised conscriptions”, the “komsomol homes”, are in effect a completion of military training — and only Ukrainian unassimilated youth, nationally conscious people, are directed to settle beyond Ukraine after completion of their education. Thus, girls and boys from 17 to 25-30 years of age — the very flower of our nation, the very foundations of our nation, the very people, who carry our creative potential, who are able to rebuild our nation — these are the ones, who are resettled beyond our national boundaries, and who are forever lost to Ukraine without trace.

The tragic implications of the above can be verified by a long list of varying factors. Due to a lack of space I am able merely to present several of these. Using official statistics, and therefore facts for political consideration, reduced to their absolute minimum the number of Russians on the territory of Ukraine in the space of a single decade increases by 200,000 per annum. The majority of these have settled in towns and cities, and as a rule, they are our colonisers as they fill all party and administrative posts, all high posts in the field of education and technology, in industry, i.e. they occupy all positions related to earning a livelihood. In addition to this, they have privileged housing, and thus this combination gives them a dominant position within Ukrainian life. The overflowing stream of colonists creates, at the same time, an excess labour force among the Ukrainians. These are the grounds for their transfer to other areas. This fact alone is sufficient and convincing proof of the unequal position of the nations and the development of their cultures, even if the “mass reshuffle” of populations is not part of the hegemonist’s colonial policy. This matter has one other major aspect, which ought to be mentioned: the Russian population of Ukraine

consciously demonstrates its national superiority through the administrative system, its privileges, its material superiority and acts as a Russifier of our towns and cities, and practically implements in everyday life the secret directives of the Russian imperial hierarchy, and while this is, admittedly, today a bloodless process, it is bringing about the destruction of our national life and the erosion of our culture.

In the face of these official statistics and factors, the demographic renewal of the Ukrainian population is faced with a regeneration of barely above zero. Further, when one takes into account the 400,000 Ukrainians that are deported annually from Ukraine to other regions of the empire, then the official statistics should reflect the decline of the actual Ukrainian population on the territory of Ukraine. Even though the ever smaller number of Ukrainians actually living in their ethnic land is an undeniable fact, it is not accurately reflected in official statistics. That the figures are juggled with cannot be denied and it is even understandable, that if accurate figures were presented, they would present a dramatic picture of the results of the policies of ethnocide, assimilation, decline and would provide proof of the regression found not only in the natural rejuvenation of Ukrainians, but also would show their startling decline as a whole. The growth of the population is shown by including the continuous stream of Russian settlers in Ukraine in statistics. Although there is an attempt to conceal these figures, it is not done with enough care. Demographers confirm that the general population of Ukraine increases by 4 million per decade, but this figure does not account for the 300-400 thousand Ukrainians deported per annum. Thus, the 4 million increase is a result of the migratory transfer (because of the general unemployment, especially in Ukrainian villages, which is kept quiet) of foreign inhabitants, primarily Russians, into Ukraine. The 1959 census showed that there were 7 million Russians in Ukraine. In 1970, there were already over 9 million, and the ensuing census will show that there are now more than 11 million. And this only according to the statistics issued in Moscow. The true number of Russians in Ukraine is much higher — at least between 15-16 million.

Thus, aside from the direct implications of these figures, i.e. showing the destruction of a nation, the total genocide committed during the 1930s, the genocide committed through resettlement and assimilation of Ukrainians today (the most lethal methods, which can be implemented in the process of destroying a nation) — these factors have become a reality in our lives and are realised by Moscow's total control and bruta-

lity. Furthermore, the means of colonising Ukraine by Russians created the “judicial” foundations (such precedents have already been seen) for Russian control of the whole nation in the event of a critical moment in our history. Thus, in its time, the prior annexation and in due course the falsified census and the mass resettlements of Ukrainians became the “judicial justification” for the segregation of Kuban from Ukraine. In a similar manner, Voronizh, the Kursk and Bilhorod regions were separated and annexed from Ukraine. The whole of Ukraine is being encroached upon in such a way today. It is policies such as the deportation of Ukrainians and their dispersal beyond the boundaries of Ukraine that Moscow is implementing with the sole aim of destroying our nation.

The Russian system breeds crime

An important indicator of the health of a society and the development and level of its culture is the number of offences against the criminal code in relation to the population. The level of democracy and humanitarianism of a regime is proportioned to the measure and guarantee of civil rights and the lawfulness of the repressions. Crime exists and has its reasons and characteristics in every state. The higher the level of culture and the more democratic the system, the lower the index. Thus, in Sweden and Switzerland criminal offences as a social phenomenon were liquidated a long time ago. In the USA, according to data published in the USSR, the prison “population” is 270,000, as against a general population of 215 million. In Europe, the overall percentage of crimes is even smaller. At the same time, statistical data on the number of criminal offences, the most frequent crimes and the percentage of offenders in the USSR is kept secret. However, according to unofficial calculations made by competent members of the Russian opposition, who had certain access to relevant sources of information, “the population” of the empire’s concentration camps and prisons is 5-6 million. If in Western countries prison terms vary from 6 to 12 months, then the corresponding figure for the USSR is 35 to 45 months. Thus, if the lack of elementary civil rights attests to the anti-national character of the Bolshevik regime and its usurpation of state power, then the heavy prison sentences and the severity of the prison regime are indicative of the brutality and violent nature of the system.

The official legal demagoguery attributes the existence of crime in "socialist society" to two basic causes. Firstly — to external influences from the capitalist world (in spite of the "iron curtain"!); that is "anti-Soviet activity", the direction to this aim of official institutions and propaganda services, copying the capitalist way of life, moral "corruption" of the Soviet population, particularly the youth, through private ownership and the urge for profit and luxury, psychology of individualism and other similar "subversive" expedients. Secondly — to internal reasons, although here again by the remnants of "influenced capitalism" in people's consciousness, the surviving influences of faith, opinions, habits and traditions left over from the past, and their "amoral" effect on people's minds. Why then is it that the number of crimes in tsarist Russia during the greatest increase in crime, together with the quite considerable number of political prisoners did not exceed 200,000, while one of the most important causes, the historical context of crime, as a product of the social system, is hushed-up completely? The reason is clear.

For this reason, explanations of the causes of inveterate, mass crime given by official criminalists (the most reactionary apologists of the regime) are, to put the case mildly, "narrow-minded" and hypocritical. The cause-effect relationship and the motivation of mass crime in the USSR are so broad that it is impossible to explain the problem and deal with it comprehensively in sketch form as one of the frontiers of the empire's communist culture. However, it is essential for our study to pose the problem, trace the fundamental causes and indicate the basic stages in the "development" and "blossoming" of this "facet" of culture: the reverse side of the culture in whose sphere the totalitarian regime proved to be a major inspiration and "considerable creative force". The crimes are not only moral and legal; the humanitarian system is a façade. The forced slave labour of 5-6 million people has become a potent factor in rapid industrial development and growth; and from this point of view a whole system via the cruel exploitation of workers, particularly those on collective farms. Preaching "complete emancipation" and "the harmonious development of the individual", the system has even transformed the right to work into a new form of slavery and the workers into serfs and automatons of work; this occurred during the first two decades of its existence.

Today, scientific and technological progress means that new kinds of relations are necessary, which the regime is searching for. However, the

share and pace of the bureaucratic machine, which came to power by terror, established itself by terror and exists by force, is incapable of changing its coercive nature.

The epidemic of crime was in fact begun by terror. The Bolshevik takeover, civil war, mass terror and repressions during the first decades of the Bolshevik dictatorship caused famine and ruin, while the victims of this monstrosity left behind them hundreds of thousands of orphans and waifs, and anarchy. In addition, the newly formed regime declared as its own the classless elements and vagabonds, dredging up hundreds of thousands of people from the depths of society to the most elevated ranks. Given the prerogatives of power and carte-blanche to do anything, they became a caste and gradually the essence and mirror of society, its basic product, growing faster than electrification, collectivisation and industrialisation, and so on. Since new blood was needed for self-protection and the strengthening of the regime, the masses were corrupted by mass violence, mass demagoguery and hypocrisy. The "product" formed became the criterion of social morality, law and culture (interfering once again in the chronology of events may I say in parentheses that crime has become the scourge of society, which has today been transformed into an urban bureaucracy. However, the regime is powerless to prevent it. Radical changes in social policy and democratisation are necessary and their implementation would mean the dissolution of the empire).

The growth of crime and social malfunctions during radical upheavals is not peculiar to the Russians alone. We know that wars, revolutions and historical cataclysms, repressions and pogroms, and urbanisation, together with the mass displacement of population, form the best feeding-ground for outbreaks of crime. It is also well-established that when long-standing or formed governments exist peacefully and make constructive decisions, provided that the content of the decisions are in keeping with and satisfy the needs of the vast majority of the population, there is a drop in the crime rate. It falls even in multi-national states, where it is difficult to reconcile social and national interests without causing sharp conflict. In the USSR, the crime rate has grown rapidly, another pointer to the regime's anti-national politics, collectivisation being one of the most important weapons. Collectivisation, depriving the peasants of private ownership of land, the means of cultivation and the fruit of the peasant's work, was aimed not only at strengthening the usurpation of power by the regime thus breaking

down village structures, but, and this is one of the chief motives, the weakening of national-liberation movements, particularly in Ukraine, the mainstay of which were the villagers and the national intelligentsia. With this aim in mind, Ukraine was the first to suffer mass repressions. An artificial famine was organised and tens of millions of Ukrainians perished. By these very means, during the 1930s, the Ukrainian liberation movement was bled dry and destroyed, including general aspirations to independence and statehood. These did not only continue, but even spread during the time of the dictatorship. The forced collectivisation effected by all means available to the dictatorship, from psychological pressure to confiscation of property; the destruction of kulaks and the mass deportations to the North and Siberia led to violence, arbitrariness, the ruin of millions of lives and thousands of homeless orphans, and subsequently to fresh outbreaks of crime. This was the aftermath in Ukraine of the artificial famine in this large and most densely populated area. The famine, a crime against Ukraine, will be a constant weight on the Bolshevik dictatorship, exposing its coercive nature and colonialist character not only because it brought about the demoralisation and decay of national life, which caused the next outbreak of crime.

Forced industrialisation and the transfer of millions of inhabitants (15 million migrating annually) had similar effects. The liquidation of the clergy, the destruction of Churches, the debauchery of militant atheism, violence and anarchy accompanied by the unprecedented break up of established structures and traditional morals are also a major cause of this phenomenon. The culmination of this and the highest point of crime was the formation of a tight network of concentration camps, which were filled with the victims of mass repression. An integral part of the Bolshevik system, acknowledged by the then functionaries and subsequently by the leaders of the state, the camps could hold up to 20 million people, almost half the number of people, who died during the Second World War.

The sacrifice and liquidation of the national life of the subjugated nations are the direct results of the deliberate policy of the regime. As a result, the whole complex of these processes produced over 2 million real criminals whose lives the regime had no right to ruin. The same applies to the millions of innocent victims. The war and the results of the anti-social policies of the Stalinist leadership after the war increased the total number of criminal offenders. Only after the Khrushchev

amnesties and a whole series of social reforms, which to a certain extent satisfied the needs of the empire's inhabitants, was there a significant drop in crime in the late 1950s and early 1960s. By the end of the 1960s, it was already beginning to show signs of rapid growth and today the regime has at its disposal an army of criminals, 5-6 million people, about 2% of the population. Thus, the USA has 270,000 criminals and the USSR has 5 million — a striking ratio between two countries with approximately the same population, but with a different way of life and a varying degree of civil rights.

The vast majority of these 5 million belong to the most active, energetic and able-bodied age group, 18-20 to 45. This multi-million army is essentially a free (75% of the "wages" after food and clothing deductions, goes to the state) work force. It is not only a mass means for economic growth, but primarily a pointer to the nature of society, its health and the level of its culture. In recent years, even the newspapers have abounded with articles on problems, the decisions of the highest courts and bureaucratic campaigns shaped from above with a suitable range, calculated not so much to remove existing problems as to soothe the man in the street: "the fight against hooliganism", "the fight against theft of socialist property", "the fight against anti-social elements". In other words, the struggle against mass crime, the "problem of the juvenile", the larger number of young delinquents, "young drug addicts" and so forth. Although the name and nature of the problems and campaigns are very significant, crime in comparison with the gross national product, which is to be increased by a series of stimulating measures, is increasing in geometrical progression and has become the scourge of the regime. However, apart from the increased repression, harsher sentences, more severe regimes in concentration camps and prisons, particularly the methods of stultifying military drills and starvation, which have been practiced with particular persistence in recent years, the bureaucratic regime is incapable of implementing absolutely essential reforms and taking radical measures in this sphere of life. Each campaign ends in either complete failure or half-hearted temporary resolutions or, forgetting, which is tantamount to failure, followed by the next series of campaigns. The resolutions pile up, campaigns fail, while advertisements change like film captions. The actual cause is hushed up: the root of evil is the regime itself and its social politics.

The criminal world is aware of this to a certain extent and protests. True, in its own way, spontaneously and unorganised. There have not

been strikes and mass riots in recent years, though there have been tens if not hundreds of individual protests. The most frequent kind is the slashing of veins. It is such a mass occurrence that the organs of repression, accustomed to this, call it common "blood-letting" and ignore it. Now other forms are spreading: cut-off ears, noses and pieces of flesh are sent by post through various channels to the highest state organs, to Brezhnev, Rudenko⁵⁵ and others. Convicts tattoo slogans on their faces: "Slave of the CPSU", "Death to the communists", "Down with Bolshevism" and so forth. The repressive system does not ignore such protests and some protesters are sentenced to long terms while others are condemned to death. The prisons and camps are ruled by the arbitrary repressive system and joint responsibility. The convicts live according to their own rules. Piracy exists between them, knife fights, as well as other malpractices such as banditry, gang warfare and the terrorising of the weak, robbery, blackmail and extortion, card games, homosexuality and drug addiction. For every thousand convicted criminals there are on average 150-200 sodomists and approximately the same number of drug addicts. Depending on the regime and the criminal contingent, their number may be bigger or smaller: nevertheless, the figures as statistical means are an objective reflection of the real state of affairs.

Open anti-Semitism reigns in the concentration camps. Every Jew behind barbed wire, particularly traders, jewellers, stomatologists and so forth, and also those on fabricated criminal charges because they want to leave for their homeland, are cruelly persecuted, insulted by filthy Judaeophobic obscenities and contempt. Ransoms are demanded or they are physically liquidated.

Traditional Russian Judaeophobia is stoked up by official anti-Semitic propaganda. The same applies to Ukrainians, who consciously regard themselves as Ukrainians. This practice is particularly widespread outside Ukraine in the camps where criminals from various nationalities are concentrated. The policy of deliberate assimilation in all spheres of social life, with no less marked and even more powerful and effective results, is carried out in the camps. The system of mutual responsibility in the administration works as a catalyst for these processes since the organs of repression consist mostly of Russian chauvinists or vetted communist collaborators.

A member of a different nationality having committed a crime is given the heaviest possible sentence. This is particularly the case with

inhabitants of villages, towns and cities if they show signs, though in no way overt, of a natural inner as it were maternal national consciousness. They form the overwhelming majority and as a rule are not kept in local district concentration camps. They are sent out of Ukraine to camps with a mixed international contingent of criminals, where the lingua franca is exclusively Russian, to places where the prisoner feels particularly isolated from his national milieu, is alienated and open to contempt and intolerance. If he tries to fit in and “merge” with the background, he consciously rejects national particularism and is assimilated more quickly.

In this way, on national and even ethnic territory the non-Russian inmates face concentration camps (the same applies to the army) transformed into a gigantic mincing machine for denationalising people, obliterating their national individuality, habits, mode of thought converting them into a uniform, monolingual, plain form, an army of multi-national workers assimilated by a degraded social structure, its nature, and the level of its social and legal justice, which is indicative of its level of culture.

Conclusion

Having dealt with only individual sides of society in the empire and Moscow's imperialist policies towards the subjugated nations, I have only traced certain “facets” of social life. For obvious reasons, I took Ukraine as an example. The notes have not been expanded either vertically or horizontally. Nevertheless, even from the traced contours I have given in relief a realistic picture of the state of the Ukrainian people, their national life, culture and also the real face and strategic aims of the coloniser: to bleed the nation dry and destroy it in the all-consuming cauldron of the empire's Eurasian territory. Moscow's colonial policies, the bleeding dry of the nation and suppression of national-liberation aspirations of the peoples, are always implemented without mercy. Ukraine is one of the largest nations in Europe and at the same time a colony of Moscow: a nation, which gave Moscow a name, a historical pedigree and a tremendous potential of creative and human resources. Ukraine's enormous natural resources, her soil, the most fertile in Europe, are exploited, bringing the coloniser huge profits and enabling him to increase his power and intensify exploitation. Ukraine is a geographic

region whose location not only caters for considerable expansion, but can prevent it, quickly change and shift the balance of power, begin and establish the decolonisation of a huge region of the Earth and many nations, and thus recivilise and bring (or help establish) real freedom and another "pedigree" for Russia. For these very reasons, Ukrainians and Ukraine have been and continue to be a matter of top priority to Moscow and were subjected in the past and are still subjected today to particularly cruel oppression and ethnocide.

Consequently, the picture of our life based on these notes is dramatic in content. It could have been even more tragic had it not been for the national achievement in resisting the coloniser, the heroic dedication and devoted selfless efforts of hundreds of thousands of the best sons of Ukraine in the fight for the nation's right to life, sovereignty and statehood. Today, the achievements of past generations, personified by Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Symon Petlura, Yevhen Konovalets and Stepan Bandera, Yaroslav Stetsko and Roman Shukhevych, Mykhailo Soroka and Zenon Tereshkivets⁵⁶ are regarded with a feeling of national dignity, honour and pride, and belong to the most precious values in our national treasury. The work continues. It grows and its scope widens. After unprecedented ruin, the baton has been passed on to new generations of apostles of freedom. Ukraine is on the threshold of qualitative changes in our national-liberation struggle. The youngest generation is about to enter the arena. It has great potential and a favourable atmosphere both inside the empire and internationally.

We are about to see the development of new forces and coordinated action. Generations and methods may change, but the ideal of our freedom remains eternal, inviolable and steadfast.

NOTES

1. Ivan Dzyuba: *The Facets of a Crystal*, Ukraina Society, Kyiv, 1976. Recantation of Dzyuba's former nationalist views. **Ivan Dzyuba** was born on 26.7.1931 in the village of Mykolayivka, Donetsk region. He graduated from the Philological Faculty of the Donetsk Pedagogical Institute and worked as a literary critic. His works were published in several Soviet Ukrainian newspapers and journals. In 1966, he spoke at a meeting in Babyn Yar, and protested against the arrest and trial of Ukrainian intelligentsia in 1965-1967. He spoke out in defence of Ukrainian culture. At the end of 1965, he wrote a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine and the Council of Ministers of the UkSSR enclosing his work *Internationalism or Russification?*, critical of the Russification of Ukraine.

Dzyuba wrote an open letter to *Literaturna Ukraina*, together with **Yevhen Sverstyuk**,

Lina Kostenko (see notes 3 and 18) and others condemning libellous statements against **Svyatoslav Karavansky** and **Vyacheslav Chornovil** (see note 3). For this and other intercessions on behalf of Ukrainian culture and the persecution of Ukrainian intelligentsia, Dzyuba was expelled from the Writers' Union of Ukraine, his works were not published, he was dismissed from his work and was persecuted by the KGB. As a result, he wrote a recantation to the Presidium of the Writers' Union of Ukraine. He was reinstated.

In 1970, Dzyuba and others wrote a letter to the head of the Writers' Union of Ukraine in defence of **Valentyn Moroz** (see note 17). Dzyuba, Chornovil and **Antonenko-Davydovych** (see note 19) refused to testify at Moroz's trial.

On 2.3.1972, Dzyuba was expelled again from the Writers' Union of Ukraine and was arrested in April 1972. On March 16, 1973, he was sentenced to 5 years of imprisonment for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda". While under arrest, Dzyuba wrote a statement recanting his former views and was subsequently released. In 1976, he published his pamphlet *The Facets of a Crystal* in which he praised the Russian people, defended Russification, propagated a "new historical community — the Soviet people", and defamed Ukrainian nationalists.

2. **Ivan Dzyuba**: *Internationalism or Russification? A Study in the Soviet Nationalities Problem*. Ed. M. Davies, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1968.

3. Prominent Ukrainian cultural and political activists and members of the opposition movement in Ukraine. **Alla Horska** (1929-1970): Artist. Murdered by the KGB on 28.11.1970. **Oles Berdnyk** (b. 1927): Writer, poet and artist. First imprisoned from 1949-1956. Participated in the activity of the Ukrainian Helsinki Monitoring Group for which he was arrested on 6.3.1979 and sentenced to 6 years of imprisonment and 3 years of internal exile. Renounced his views in 1984. **Mykhailo Horyn** (b. 1930): Literary critic and psychologist. Arrested on 26.8.1965 in Lviv and sentenced in 1982 to 6 years of imprisonment. On 3.12.1981, he was again arrested and sentenced to 10 years of strict-regime imprisonment and 5 years of internal exile for his participation in the Ukrainian national movement. In 1984, he suffered his second heart attack. **Ivan Svitlychny** (b. 1929): Literary critic and writer. Arrested in 1972 and sentenced to 7 years of imprisonment and 5 years of internal exile for Ukrainian nationalism. **Yevhen Sverstyuk** (b. 1927): Literary critic and writer. Arrested on 14.1.1972 and sentenced to 7 years of imprisonment and 5 years of internal exile for writing articles about Ukrainian problems and oral statements critical of the regime. **Vyacheslav Chornovil** (b. 1937): Journalist. Arrested on 12.1.1972 and sentenced to 6 years of strict-regime imprisonment and 3 years of internal exile for writing and circulating samvydav (underground) articles about Ukrainian and general problems, and participation in the publication of the samvydav journal *The Ukrainian Herald*. Re-arrested in exile on 8.4.1980 and sentenced to 5 years of strict-regime imprisonment and 4 months 4 days of internal exile (remainder under previous sentence) for membership of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group. He was previously imprisoned from 1967-1969. **Lev Lukyanenko** (b. 1927): Lawyer. In 1961, he was sentenced to death for attempting to form a Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union, and for stressing Ukraine's right of secession from the Soviet Union, guaranteed by the Constitution of the USSR. The sentence was commuted to 15 years of imprisonment. Lukyanenko was re-arrested in 1977 and sentenced to 10 years of strict-regime imprisonment and 5 years of internal exile for participation in the work of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, for the authorship of samvydav articles, and for human and national rights activities. **Mykola Rudenko** (b. 1920): Writer. Arrested on 5.2.1977 and sentenced to 7 years of strict-regime imprisonment and 5 years of internal exile for participation in the work of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group. Arrived in the West in December 1987.

4. **Pavlo Tychyna** (1891-1967): Official poet and writer of the Soviet regime in Ukraine. He was one of the founders of Soviet Ukrainian literature and author of many books of verse, long poems and poetry translations.

5. Reference to the Treaty of Pereyaslav (March 1654) between Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky and Tsar Alexis Mikhailovych. As a result of this treaty, Muscovy established its protectorate over the Ukrainian Hetman State. Russian historians refer to the Treaty of Pereyaslav as the "Union" of the Ukrainian and Russian people.

6. This document is a reaction to Ivan Dzyuba's *The Facets of a Crystal* (see note 1), which appeared in 1976. *The Facets of Culture* was written sometime after the publication of Dzyuba's booklet, most probably in the late 1970s.

7. According to the official census of 1979, there were 10.472 million Russians living in Ukraine.

8. Prominent Ukrainian cultural and political activists and members of the opposition movement in Ukraine. **Opanas Zalyvakha** (b. 1925): Artist. Arrested on 28.8.1965 and sentenced in 1966 to 5 years of strict-regime imprisonment. He has suffered continuous repression and persecution since his release in 1970. **Vasyl Stus** (1938-1985): Poet, literary critic and publicist. Arrested in 1972 and sentenced to 5 years of strict-regime imprisonment and 3 years of internal exile. Stus was re-arrested on 14.5.1980 and sentenced to 10 years of strict-regime imprisonment and 5 years of internal exile for his participation in the work of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, and for his personal letters, poems and oral statements. He died in a labour camp on 4.9.1985, as a result of medical neglect. **Stefania Shabatura** (b. 1938): Artist. Arrested on 12.1.1972 and sentenced to 5 years of imprisonment and 3 years of internal exile.

9. **Oleksander Arkhypenko** (1887-1964): Modernist sculptor, painter and pedagogue. "Arkhyphenkism" refers to his artistic style.

10. **Andrey Zhdanov** (1896-1948): Soviet Russian government and communist party official and close associate of Stalin. Russian cultural policy during the Cold War, which called for stricter government control of art and promoted an extreme anti-Western bias, is known as "Zhdanovism". Initiated in 1946 by a resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU, this cultural policy continued until the death of Stalin in 1953. Originally applying to literature, it spread to other arts gradually affecting all intellectual activity.

11. **Pavlo Zahrebelny** (b. 1924): Philologist and writer. Member of the CPSU and the official Writers' Union of Ukraine. **Yuriy Mushketyk** (b. 1929): Literary critic. Member of the CPSU and the Writers' Union of Ukraine. **Ivan Hryhurko** (b. 1942): Philologist and prose writer. Member of the Writers' Union of Ukraine.

12. **Oles Honchar** (b. 1918): Journalist, literary critic and prose writer. Member of the CPSU and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, and Head of the Writers' Union of Ukraine from 1959.

13. **Roman Ivanychuk** (b. 1929): Philologist and prose writer. Member of the Writers' Union of Ukraine.

14. **Ivan Bilyk** (b. 1929): Journalist, publicist and prose writer. Member of the Writers' Union of Ukraine.

15. **Aleksey Yugov** (1902-1979): Soviet Russian writer.

16. **Ihor Kalynets** (b. 1939): Philologist and poet. Prominent Ukrainian cultural activist and member of the opposition movement. Arrested on 11.8.1972 and sentenced on 13.11.1972 to 6 years of imprisonment and 3 years of internal exile.

17. **Valentyn Moroz** (b. 1938): Historian and publicist. Imprisoned from 1965-1969 for his Ukrainian nationalist convictions. Re-arrested in 1970 and sentenced to 9 years of imprisonment and 5 years of internal exile. Released and deported to the West in 1979.

18. **Lina Kostenko** (b. 1930): Poet. Member of the Writers' Union of Ukraine. **Lyudmyla Skyryda** (b. 1945): Literary historian. Member of the CPSU and the Writers' Union of Ukraine. **Iryna Zhylenko** (b. 1941): Philologist and poet. Member of the Writers' Union of Ukraine. **Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets** (b. 1940): Poet and Philologist. Arrested in 1972 and sen-

tenced to 6 years of imprisonment and 3 years of internal exile. Wife of Ihor Kalynets (see note 16). **Vasyl Holoborodko** (b. 1942): Ukrainian poet of the sixties banned by the Soviet regime. **Viktor Korzh** (b. 1938): Poet. Member of the CPSU and the Writers' Union of Ukraine. **Mykola Vinhranovsky** (b. 1936): Poet, actor and film producer. **Roman Kudlyk** (b. 1941): Philologist and poet. Member of the Writers' Union of Ukraine.

19. **Borys Antonenko-Davydovych** (b. 1899): Poet, writer and publicist. Member of the Writers' Union of Ukraine.

20. **Mykola Lukash** (b. 1919): Lecturer in French, German and English, lexicographer and translator of poetry and prose.

21. **Serhiy Plachynda** (b. 1928): Philologist and prose writer. Member of the CPSU and the Writers' Union of Ukraine. **Viktor Ivanysenko** (b. 1927): Philologist, literary critic and writer. Member of the CPSU and the Writers' Union of Ukraine. **Mykhailo Braichevsky**: Well-known Soviet Ukrainian historian, archaeologist and senior member of the Historical Section of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR.

22. **Valeriy Shevchuk** (b. 1939): Academic assistant at the Kyiv Museum of History, literary critic and writer. Member of the Writers' Union of Ukraine. **Hryhoriy Tyutyunnyk** (b. 1931): Writer. Member of the Writers' Union of Ukraine. **Yuriy Stupak** (b. 1911): Art critic and writer.

23. **Sergey Solovyov** (1820-1878): Russian historian. **Nikolay Pogodin** (1900-1962): Soviet Russian writer. **Valentyn Katayev** (1897-1986): Russian novelist and dramatist. **Vasiliy Kluchevsky** (1841-1911): Russian historian.

24. **Vladimir Solovyov** (1853-1900): Russian philosopher and mystic. **Konstantin Leontyev** (1831-1891): Russian essayist. **Nikolay Berdyayev** (1874-1948): Russian philosopher.

25. **Fyodor Dostoyevsky** (1821-1881): Russian novelist, journalist and short story writer. **Ivan Bunin** (1870-1953): Russian poet, novelist and stylist. **Leonid Andreyev** (1871-1919): Russian novelist.

26. **Andrey Bely** (1880-1934): Leading Russian theorist and poet of Russian Symbolism. **Vladimir Khlebnikov** (1885-1922): Russian poet and founder of Russian Futurism. **Dmitry Merezhkovsky** (1865-1941): Russian poet, novelist, critic and thinker. **Vladimir Nabokov** (1899-1977): Russian-born novelist and critic. **Pyotr Struve** (1870-1944): Liberal Russian academician and chief exponent of the Russian Legal Marxist philosophy.

27. **Mykola Skrypnyk** (1872-1933): Political and party activist of the Soviet Ukrainian Government. Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine. Head of the Soviet Government in Ukraine from 1918. Committed suicide in 1933. **Les Kurbas** (1887-1942): Official stage director, film producer and actor of the Soviet regime in Ukraine. **Mykola Zerov** (1890-1941): Official Soviet Ukrainian literary critic, poet, professor and translator. **Mykhailo Dray-Khmara** (1889-1939): Official Soviet Ukrainian poet and literary critic. **Mykola Khvylovy** (1893-1933): Official Soviet Ukrainian political and cultural activist and writer. Committed suicide in 1933.

28. **Oleksander Dovzhenko** (1894-1956): Prominent official Soviet Ukrainian film producer and writer.

29. **Ostap Vyshnya** (1889-1956): Prominent official Soviet Ukrainian writer, satirist and humorist.

30. **Yuriy Kotsyubynsky** (1895-1937): Party and military activist of Soviet Ukraine. In 1917, he became the deputy and later the People's Secretary for Military Affairs of the Soviet Ukrainian Government. In January 1918, he became Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces of the Soviet Ukrainian Republic. He was also a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine.

31. **Kyivan Rus'** (9th-13th century), the first historical state in Eastern Europe, is the fatherland of present-day Ukrainians. It was first organised on the territory of the Polyany

(Polyanians) tribe in the second half of the 6th century by the semi-historic Prince Kyi, the founder of Kyiv, the capital of Ukraine, around 560 AD. In the 9th century, the Dniipro (Dnieper) River became an important trade route between the Baltic and Black Seas, and Kyiv became Eastern Europe's major political and cultural centre. In the 11th century, under the rulers Prince (later Saint) Volodymyr the Great and Yaroslav the Wise, Kyivan Rus' reached the height of its power. As a result of internal crises caused by the decentralisation of power, the Kyivan realm entered into a period of decline. The Mongol invasion of the mid-13th century marked the end of Kyivan power. However, the Galician-Volhynian Principality in Western Ukraine, which inherited the institutions and traditions of Kyiv, continued until the 14th century when Ukraine was incorporated into the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

32. In the 1540s, Prince Dmytro Vyshnevetsky, called Baida, united the Cossack groups, which had formed in the steppes of Ukraine, founded a Cossack stronghold (**Sich**) on the island of Khortytisia and began the military organisation of Cossacks. The Sich was situated in the land south of the Dniipro's rapids (**Zaporizhia**). Hence **Zaporizhian Sich**.

33. The **Ukrainian National Republic (UNR)** was created in 1917. On January 22, 1918, Ukraine declared national independence. The rebirth of the Ukrainian state in 1918 came about when it did largely as a result of the fall of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires, both of which controlled Ukrainian territory. The Ukrainian state was reborn against the background of the great social revolution in Russia. In Ukraine, however, the revolution immediately took on an essentially national character. Ukrainians in all corners of the empire — at the front, in garrisons of Russian cities — formed groups which put forward demands concerning the use of the national language, the creation of Ukrainian schools, the organisation of Ukrainian military units, and the complete independence of Ukraine. The Ukrainian masses created a powerful movement which led to the emergence of the UNR in 1917. After the creation of the UNR and the declaration of independence, Ukraine fought an unsuccessful war of national independence (1917-1921) against Soviet Russia.

34. Reference to the man-made famine of 1932-1933 which caused the death of several million Ukrainian peasants.

35. **Ivan Mazepa** (1644-1709): Ukrainian statesman and diplomat. Hetman of Ukraine from 1687. **Symon Petlura** (1879-1926): Commander-in-Chief and head of the Ukrainian state. **Mykhailo Hrushevsky** (1866-1934): Ukrainian historian and political activist. President of the Ukrainian Central Rada (Council) set up in March 1917. In November 1917, the Rada set up the UNR (see note 3). **Metropolitan Andrey Count Sheptytsky** (1865-1944): Head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. **Col. Yevhen Konovalets** (1891-1938): Commander of the Sich Riflemen. Formed in 1917, this unit actively promoted the idea of Ukrainian independence and the unity of all Ukrainian lands. Head of the Ukrainian Military Organisation (UVO) in the 1920s and Leader of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) from 1929. He was assassinated by a Soviet Russian agent in Rotterdam in 1938. **Stepan Bandera** (1909-1959): Revolutionary, politician and ideologue of the Ukrainian nationalist movement. Leader of the OUN and the Ukrainian Liberation Movement. Assassinated in Munich in 1959 by a Soviet Russian agent. **Yaroslav Stetsko** (1912-1986): Politician and statesman, ideologue of the Ukrainian nationalist movement. Prime Minister of the Ukrainian Government of 1941, Head of the OUN and President of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN). **Volodymyr Vynnychenko** (1880-1951): Political activist and writer. Head of the Ukrainian Government from November 1918 to February 1919. **Ulas Samchuk** (b. 1905): Prose writer, journalist and publicist.

36. 1944.

37. **Istoria Rusov** (History of the Rus' People) was prepared by an unknown author sometime at the end of the 18th or the beginning of the 19th century. It is an impressive history

of Ukrainian national political thought, and one that had a tremendous influence on Ukrainian historiography of the 19th century.

38. **Mykola Kostomarov** (1817-1885): Well-known Ukrainian historian, writer, poet and political activist. **Panteleymon Kulish** (1819-1897): Historian, writer, poet, philosopher and political activist. **Mykhailo Maksymovych** (1804-1873): First rector of Kyiv University. Outstanding scholar with wide interests and distinguished ethnographer and literary historian. **Izmail Sreznevsky** (1812-1880): Ukrainian scholar, philologist and professor. **Oleksander Markovych** (1790-1865): Ukrainian historian and civic activist. **Mykola Bantysh-Kamensky** (1737-1814): Ukrainian archaeographer and historian. **Dmytro Yavornytsky**: Historian.

39. **Mykhailo Drahomanov** (1841-1895): Ukrainian scholar, civic leader, publicist, and political thinker. **Mykola Ziber** (1844-1888): Prominent Ukrainian economist and sociologist. **Mykhailo Pavlyk** (1853-1918): Prominent member of the Ukrainian Radical Party founded in 1891. Minor, almost forgotten, Ukrainian literary figure.

40. **Volodymyr Antonovych** (1834-1908): Ukrainian historian, archaeographer and archaeologist. Professor of History at Kyiv University from 1878, editor-in-chief of the publications of the Kyiv Archaeographic Commission, patron and Head (from 1881) of the Historical Society of Nestor the Chronicler in Kyiv, and organiser of archaeological conferences in Ukraine. **Serhiy Yefremov** (1876-1937): Academician and prominent Ukrainian political activist. Secretary for Nationality Affairs in the Central Rada (see note 35). Leading member of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (SVU) and the Association of Ukrainian Youth (SUM). Arrested and deported to Siberia, where he died sometime in the 1930s. The exact date of his death is unknown. **Dmytro Doroshenko** (1882-1951): Eminent Ukrainian historian and historiographer and moderate conservative political thinker. **Mykola Mikhnovsky** (1873-1924): Lawyer and prominent Ukrainian political activist and thinker. **Dmytro Dontsov** (1833-1973): Political journalist and theorist, and literary critic. **Ivan Ohiyenko** "Ilarion" (b. 1882): Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Linguist and Church historian. Religious and cultural activist. **Pamphil Yurkevych** (1826-1874): Most distinguished Ukrainian philosopher of the 19th century. Professor at the Kyiv Academy and later at Moscow University. **S. Shelukhyn**: Ukrainian political figure. **Yuriy Lypa** (1900-1944): Poet, essayist and publicist. Member of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA). **Dmytro Chyzhevsky** (1894-1977): Prominent Slavist, leading authority on Ukrainian literature and intellectual history. **Yevhen Malanyuk** (b. 1897): Ukrainian poet and essayist. **Yaroslav Pasternak** (b. 1892): Ukrainian historian and archaeologist. **Roman Smal-Stocky** (1893-1969): Ukrainian linguist and political activist. **Ivan Mirchuk** (1891-1961): Philosopher and historian of Ukrainian culture.

41. **Oleksander Konysky** (1836-1900): Ukrainian populist prose-writer. **Oleksander Chuzhbynsky** (1817-1875): Poet. **Borys Hrinchenko** (1836-1910): Ukrainian prose-writer.

42. **Bohdan Lepky** (1872-1941): Ukrainian prose-writer.

43. **Leonid Novychenko** (b. 1914): Official Soviet Ukrainian literary critic and writer. Member of the CPSU and the Writers' Union of Ukraine.

44. **Petro Shelest** was First Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine from 1962 until his removal from the post in 1972 for "deviation" from officially sanctioned Soviet Russian nationalities policy.

45. **Mykhailo Korol** (b. 1912): Activist of the working class Ukrainian emigration in Canada. Member of the League of Communist Youth in Canada. **Mykola Boholubov** (b. 1909): Soviet mathematician and physicist. **Ivan Kozlovsky** (b. 1900): Official Soviet Ukrainian lyrical tenor. **Serhiy Bondarchuk** (b. 1920): Soviet actor. **Hryhoriy Chukhrai** (b. 1921): Official Soviet film director. **Mikhail Romm** (1901-1971): Soviet film director.

46. See Note 7.

47. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was liquidated in the 1930s through terror and oppression. In 1946, the Ukrainian Catholic Church of the Eastern rite was

forced under terror to submit to the Patriarch of Moscow and renounce its allegiance to Rome. Its entire hierarchy and most of the clergy were arrested and deported to labour camps before the break with Rome was announced.

48. Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists.

49. **Yaroslav Halan** (1902-1949): Communist Ukrainian journalist and writer. Wrote pamphlets and stories against nationalists and activists of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

50. Publicists who wrote against Ukrainian nationalists and religious activists.

51. Pro-regime Ukrainian writers who write pamphlets against Ukrainian national and religious activists.

52. The **Cossack Sich** (see note 32) was destroyed by Catherine the Great of Muscovy in 1775 spelling the end of Ukrainian autonomy.

53. 1932-1933.

54. Notorious Soviet Russian labour camps.

55. **Roman Rudenko** (b. 1907): Chief Prosecutor of the USSR from 1953.

56. **Gen. Roman Shukhevych "Taras Chuprynka"** (1907-1950): Deputy Minister of Defence in the Ukrainian Government of 1941, Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), Head of the OUN in Ukraine, and Chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (UHVR). **Mykhailo Soroka** (1911-1971): Civil engineer by profession. Spent 7 years in a Polish prison for his political activity. Arrested in 1940 and sentenced to 8 years of imprisonment for being a leading member of the OUN. In 1952, he was again arrested and sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment for membership of the OUN. He died in a Mordovian labour camp in 1971. **Zenon Tershakivets "Fediř"**: Commander of UPA-West and OUN leader of the Lviv area. Killed in action on 4.11.1948 near the village of Lyuben Maly.

THE DISSIDENT MOVEMENT

THE DISSIDENT MOVEMENT

What is the “dissident movement”?

The Western concept of the “dissident movement” is one of a major, although not homogeneous, force, which emerges from the exceptionally complex social processes in existence in the Russian empire. It influences the formation of ideas, social consciousness and outlook of the entire population of the empire. The involvement of the intelligentsia — both Russian and that of the subjugated nations — is based on humanistic tendencies in culture, which gravitate its leaders to openly oppose the regime and binds them with the opposition forces in the empire.

The dissident movement significantly contributed to the total revelation of the amorality of the principles and ethics of totalitarianism and its aggressive psychology and aims. The dissident movement, following two decades of activity and the promulgation of its standpoints, achieved without reservation the recognition of being a powerful ideological force, one, which rendered an especially valuable service in the resolution that the problem of human rights is one of the highest priorities of today and a universal means of influence on totalitarianism. It helped to consolidate the awareness of the Western nations of the threat from Moscow and influenced those processes that resulted in the far-reaching re-emergence of this issue in the entire Western world. One common term from Berlin, Warsaw and Prague to Kyiv, Vilnius, Moscow and Yerevan, is a phenomenon without precedent in the strength of its influence on the formation and expansion of national and world societal trends.

The roots of this present day democratic renaissance extend back two decades, and the dissident movement today is still in the process of formation, strengthening and qualitative change. This demonstrates at the same time the depth, the great potential, timely fundamentality and intransigence of the rebirth, and the regime’s response of opposition to the growth and strength of these influences on society through the use of continual pogroms. As a result of these pogroms, the still relatively small numbers of adherents are unable to organise this resistance into all-encompassing national organisms and to enter into a complete and

widespread contact with the general population. From this viewpoint, the concept of the dissident movement or that of non-official thinking as a defined social phenomenon, is adequate for its structure nationally and organisationally — that is, adequate from the viewpoint of national inequalities, lack of organisation, a variety of ideological outlooks, the level of their ideological refinement and social worth. But as to the content and goals of all the opposition forces in the empire, which appear under the title “dissidents”, the term is too general, abstract and often combines two discordant and conflicting outlooks: a dissident as a Ukrainian nationalist, a fighter for Ukrainian independence and statehood; and a “dissident” as a Russian chauvinist, who reacts only against certain aspects of the communist system.

In general, the dissident movement, or non-official thinking, is a coherent, clearly formulated and often an elemental philosophical concept of the world by individuals, at variance (fully or partially) with the officially proclaimed communist ideology. This is also the case with the establishment, on the basis of this ideology, of a one party totalitarian dictatorship of the ruling imperial nation and its execution of policies in foreign affairs, internal security, social and economic affairs, in the spheres of religion, culture, education, civilisation and so on. This is a stated active (or passive) system of the individual's viewpoints, those who belong to different nationalities, social classes, groups, and who live under the conditions of a totalitarian regime, within the confines of the Russian empire as well as in its satellite countries. The dissident movements of these unequal nations, are found in different degrees of formation, in general numbers of active participants of the movement, their intellectual and social position, practical results of their activities and, therefore, their influence on their own nations, on the world community, and their reaction to the penetrating processes.

An authentically national phenomenon throughout the empire

The dissident movement is at the same time a social phenomenon, related to the entire Bolshevik system, and truly a national product of the collective empire. It incorporates a substantial unity and range of common characteristics, and, coupled with this, it wards off the non-homogeneous complexity of the national existence of many nations, which exist in various states of totalitarianism. At the same time, it also rejects

the various levels of enslavement of these nations, the result of the various levels of oppression, which the regime is able to apply to each individual nationality, and also the affiliation of dissidents to nations that are subjugated, satellite or governing. Even these separate, essential signs of each national dissident movement reflect the difference and autonomy of their own status and the depth and extent of the regime's supremacy. To these must be added the burden and length of time of the colonial yoke, the extent of national tragedies, the size and scale of human sacrifices, the extent the plundering of the national culture, and from this point — the state of national forces of resistance as a measure of their volitional strength on the path of the nation to freedom. In that matter, they reflect all these various levels of strength of the active dissidents and the whole complex of national uniqueness, that is, they reflect the specific life of their own nation and, as a result, the construction of various "trees of national tasks". The dissident movement, as a term for a social phenomenon, generally reflects the essence of this phenomenon, although not rejecting at the same time the argumentative internal processes, which reverberate in it, especially between the often confrontational elements of the phenomenon — the opposition movement of the ruling nations in the [Russian] empire and the national-liberation movements of the subjugated nations.

There also exist other aspects, which level off the quality of this phenomenon. For example, the concept of the dissident movement encompasses:

The opposition in Czechoslovakia, which by the massive activity of the general population, the structural format and coordination of activities, the well prepared theoretics and elaboration of methods for waging a struggle for liberation and the construction of an exemplary democratic society does not have an equal among the nations of Eastern Europe.

The Ukrainian, Armenian, Lithuanian and Georgian nationalists, who have set as their goal the liquidation of the colonial yoke, the self-determination of their nations and the establishment of sovereign, national states.

The Russian democrats and the Russians, who are simply opposed to the Bolshevik dictatorship, and who seek alternatives to the totalitarian model for a future political system. For this reason, they, in contrast to the democrats (who in large measure acknowledge the importance of the nationalities question as an important factor), devise their "tree of national goals and tasks" solely from chauvinistic imperialist positions

and maintain a hostile attitude towards the national-liberation movements. (The “dissident” Ogyrtsov wrote: “Whatever established Ukrainian government you like will be destroyed by us in the course of one day”).

There are tens of millions of religious believers. Since atheism is an integral part of the state ideology, the government not only does not have the obligation to protect freedom of religion, but cruelly persecutes people for religious beliefs and affiliation.

There are the tens of millions of people, who do not belong to the ruling nation, who ridicule and despise their occupant and exploiter, dreaming in the depths of their souls about national freedom. (Their dreams and expectations are generally passive as were the expectations of the majority of the general population in the past).

Tens of millions of dissatisfied and deceived workers of all nations without exception, ethnic groups, which the government has burdened with a destitute existence, exploitation, injustice through unfairly low wages and forced into membership in the oppressively narrow framework of communist unions, thereby losing the right to have their own organisations and press.

Millions of peasants, who for half a century have lived with much worse economic exploitation and lack of political rights than the workers.

With minor exceptions, those millions of intellectuals and government employees mercilessly exploited economically and who have lost all opportunities to organise freely, can also be viewed as dissidents.

Taking into consideration that almost every individual is oppressed by several of the above-mentioned communist constraints at the same time, and that he/she appropriately reacts to this, then, without reservation, to be called a dissident is, in reality, the right of the entire population of the empire. (Naturally, this does not include those several million, who belong to the privileged caste of Bolshevik functionaries, political gendarmes, administrative and management élites and so on). For all these classes and groups of people there exists one innately fundamental aspect. The communist magnates and experts of totalitarianism demand voluntary labour (in the name of building communism), and through a complex of mechanisms of coercion, compel the people to perform this labour. The population generally evades this type of work, strives for a minimum payment, and in essence, personal gratification has become a

philosophy of life, a common behaviour of the masses. The communist regime forbids the stealing of socialist property, severely punishing for this "offence". But it is doubtful whether an individual, who systematically does not adopt the maximum opportunities, to acquire material goods, the government's production of raw materials, instruments, in a word everything that can be taken from the workplace and which can be used for personal use or sold as products, can be found anywhere in the empire. Thus, the communists have 200 million thieves and just as many entrepreneurs. This has happened not only because of enforced necessity, from the viewpoint of an elementary excuse as a result of poverty, substandard wages and exploitation, but also from a general norm, the needs of the individual, the response of the population of the empire to communal property, and the occurrences of defensive immunity against savage exploitation by the regime. Needless to say, the communists, as the élite functionaries of the whole bureaucratic apparatus, are the biggest pilferers of communal property and not only set an example, but also thoroughly morally corrupt the masses; a similar moral (with the knowledge of the possibility in any given moment of being placed in prison for expressing a political form of protest, or having expressed freedom of thought), one of the most promising buttresses, and with such help it curtails the population of the empire from other more radical forms of protest by maintaining the status quo.

And thus, taking into account that the psychology and range of behaviour of the masses outlined above is a primary reaction to the social policy and morale of the communists, and the reaction itself is comforting to the convention of this policy, which is not acceptable, the scorn of the masses for the communist doctrine is proof of its unfeasibility to life — a doctrine as alien to human nature as a virus of amorality and oppression. Taking into consideration the basic coherence of these factors, it is reasonable to consider that the manners, psychology and outlook of the masses is undoubtedly dissident and that the majority of the subjugated nations, the millions of religious believers, entire social classes, in other words, the majority of the population of the empire, are dissidents.

There exists an opinion that this type of behaviour and psychology of the masses is not dissident and that it is necessary to relate it to processes, which in academic science have an established name "traditional national discontent". One is able to agree with this postulate under the following condition: the "growing national discontent" is leading to a

major social upheaval. And (...)” history does not know of a society where thievery of government property by the entire population and the massive evasion from productive labour as a form of protest existed in a period of domestic peace and stability (external) of political systems. These factors do not normally create revolutionary situations, therefore, the other form became an indivisible part of social morality, which, without question, stands closer to sabotage, spontaneous outbursts of resistance and protest rather than amorality and disintegration. There is evidence that there is a progressive decay in the masses, which reaches all strata of society [decay being in terms of anti-Soviet feeling]. Nearly 100% of the population of the empire are interested in the radio broadcasts of “Radio Liberty”, the “German station”, “BBC”, “Voice of America” and there is a widespread interest in samvydav [clandestine publications by individuals or groups criticising the Soviet Russian regime], the conspicuous growth of activities by religious believers, frequent outbursts of worker and intellectual unrest, resulting in a continuing loss by them of the psychology of fear, and, especially significant, the insolent attitude and conduct of the youth towards the regime. For these reasons, the corresponding elements of the “traditional national discontent” with its schematic behaviour and psychology can at the same time be viewed as clearly dissident and oppositional.

National opposition

If such a position is correct, then several questions arise:

Is the West, by labelling the active leaders of the opposition to totalitarianism as dissidents, involuntarily reducing their general number to ten to twenty thousand individuals? By doing this, does it not impoverish the strength of the dissidents, the capacity and scope of the masses, especially the national opposition, which is directed against the occupant, the quisling elements and Russification; against the privileges of the newly settled foreigners [Russians], the resettlement of people beyond the boundaries of their national territory, and the policies in the sphere of religion and religious denominations?

By exaggerating the conformity of the masses, is the West not simplifying the condition of society, perceiving it as hopelessly complacent and immovable?

* (...) denotes illegible words.

After decades of underestimating, and in essence ignoring the nationalities factor, is the West not mistakenly neglecting the powerful and active levers of influence on internal reform and the external political situation, the general balance of power, and thereby perspective assistance for itself and for us? (In Lviv, the young composer Ivasiuk was murdered. He was hanged. His death evoked a general, literally massive, revolt of the population in Lviv itself and throughout Western Ukraine. Spontaneous demonstrations took place with tens of thousands of participants, particularly youth. These continued for weeks). The nation is not dormant! It is being cleansed! What is needed is a good combustible element!

And if the above mentioned mass of people, not considering their individual specifics, who possess in one measure or another a social organism of independent thought, is inert and without a comprehensively declared protest and allows itself to be exploited, then further questions materialise:

Is it correct to group together under one generic term “dissident”, the Ukrainian, Armenian, Lithuanian, Georgian nationalists — individuals, who possess a noble ideal, inspired with a noble goal and feeling of responsibility for the fate of their own nations; individuals — defenders, who are fighting with dedication, ready to sacrifice themselves and are sacrificing their lives for the independence and statehood of their respective nations — to uniformly identify them with the generally dissident, but passive mass of the general population?

Is it objective to place in one rank the Jewish idealists, who dedicated their energy, intellect, organisational talents to the idea of a democratisation of Russia and, without remorse and complaints, suffer for this ideal in Russian prisons and concentration camps? Is it objective to identify these people with the millions of “dissident Russians”, who only furtively listen to “Radio Liberty”?

The delimitation of principal aims

Analogous questions could be further pursued. For a better orientation and more precise presentation of information, and primarily a deeper understanding of each factor, in our opinion, it is necessary to differentiate this social phenomenon on the basis of principles, aims and tasks. It can be grouped together under the general term the dissident

movement, which is still in a phase of conception and establishment of the democratic renaissance. The processes and the disintegration, which are taking place in the masses, should be termed dissident or independent thinking. The conveyors of national ideals, the active community leaders of the subjugated nations, should be restored to the national-liberation movements and the realisation that these types of movements exist should be firmly fixed, especially in the memory of the foreign reader (and particularly government and political leaders and editors of mass information publications). They should be accepted as an important factor in the formation of their own strategy in regards to the empire. Russians and Jews, who raised their voices in defence of human rights, should be regarded as members of an individual rights defence movement. None of these opposition tendencies exist in the “real” (unadulterated) aspect; each of them has its own aims and craving for parity of principles in the existing exchange. The Western reader, as well as the listener to whom the radio broadcasts to the Russian empire are addressed, should be aware of this.

The movement today is in that stage of development, where a clearer gradation of its ideological direction and the nature of feasible activities is needed. This is really dictated by the condition of the social phenomenon and, in recent years, the general growth of active opposition forces of the nations of the empire was instrumental in the branching out of the activities of the dissident movement. There is an expansion not only of the essential basis (*sine qua non*) of our work, the inherited traditional fight for independence, but also a variety of forms of activity, which are leading to an evergrowing narrow specialisation, especially with the resolution of questions, which are united by the formula “defence of human rights”.

Moscow, having absolute power of violent force and terror and being accustomed for decades to the total control of society's thoughts and existence, is at the present time paranoid and does not tolerate any opposition. Democratic decisions and tolerance are alien to its experience and does not even recognise them theoretically. So the reaction of the regime to its own moral defeat (which is being repeated!) was again numerous repressions, thousands of innocent victims, new crimes against humanity, and new individual tragedies of dissidents — defenders. This is the cost of each step to freedom in this temporary “barbed wire manger” of licentiousness and evil, where frenzied violence is opposed (as was the case with the first Christians in the reign of Nero) only by

the boundless faith and self-sacrifice of the sons and daughters of Ukraine, Lithuania, Israel, Armenia, Georgia, Russia and other nations.

The national-liberation and the human rights movements

The regime, without doubt, still totally controls the situation, but it is quickly and unalterably losing its position. At the same time, the national-liberation and the human rights movements, already in possession of strong roots and their own traditions, are steadfastly gaining on them and gathering strength. Their power is growing, reinforcing, and they are tightening their links with the masses. These are not spontaneous or irresistible processes. They are conforming to established principles. The elements, which cause the activation and growth of the two tendencies of the democratic rebirth in the countries of the Communist bloc are so numerous that the scope of these notes do not present the opportunity to detail them fully. I will pause only briefly on several factors.

The first and most universal of these is the eternal and indestructible striving of the human soul to freedom, both personal and national.

The second exceptionally important factor is the relatively high level of growth of productive forces, which the Russian communist hierarchy cannot now attain or repeat by practising, as in the 1930s-1940s, their bandit-like behaviour, which in the full sense of the term can be described as massive crimes against humanity, resulting in the martyrdom of tens of millions of innocent people, which exceeds by double (and certainly even more!) the victims of Nazism. Today, society and its productive forces are at that stage of development where Russian imperialism, which is capable of and willing to attain its global aims of provoking and starting a Third World War, is, nevertheless, in peacetime unable to repeat the total terror of the 1930s-1940s. The attempt to "detach" (into concentration camps for isolation and slave labour) even a relatively small number of that spiritual, intellectual and creative force would totally disrupt the functioning of the colossal imperial (bureaucratically unregulated) economic mechanism and would for decades curb even a spasmodic progress in economics and the sciences. To stop progress in science, technology and economics would mean total self-destruction; the era of extensive management, supported by a bureaucratic organisation and the utilisation of the threat of terror for directing an enormous economic machine has long since past. The imperial regi-

me, even though belatedly, now understands this (previously it did not understand, did not inform its forces and did not overcome the psychological barrier of fear of the productive forces, because, being informed of their strength, they would be more active and decisive). For this precise reason, the Russian hierarchy is searching intensively in the midst of its own nation for an extensive base of support for the regime. Directing such an assignment, the Moscow bureaucratic apparatus is deliberate enough to allow the existence of a chauvinistic "Fronde", which in various forms and manifestations exists in the metropolis. Even though it is actively fulfilling the strategy of mass assimilation and the resettlement of nations, because of the high rate of growth of productive forces, Moscow presently is forced to endure an already emasculated, but until recently actively intriguing and unacceptable, ethnic patriotism of the subjugated nations.

This is the condition of social reality at the present time. But the social situation that we have is a result not of the transformation from a totalitarian to a more democratic regime; this is not a result of a voluntary rejection by the regime of characteristic Bolshevik oppression and its aggressive nature, nor is it a more compliant attitude of the imperial regime to processes, which are penetrating the social fabric of the subjugated nations. The national character of the Russians and the inherent nature of their product — totalitarianism — is incapable of this. The societal conditions, which we have today are the result of the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution. It was precisely this and the rapid growth of productive forces that assisted the ever increasing circulating pulsations of the national-liberation movements. This was the case not only within the borders of the empire, but in the satellite countries as well. In the majority of them, especially in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania and Hungary, they are noticeably stronger than within the Russian empire. This is perfectly natural. It has been shown that their strivings for independence stem from both the bottom and the top stratas of society: the societal work of the opposition and from within the governmental hierarchy. This type of multi-level structure is not only a catalyst for liberation struggles but also is a higher stage of the movement and at the same time a significant blow against Marxist theories of the nation — the class character of its struggle. A nation is one organism with common national aims, not an aggregate of classes in constant conflict. The incidents of overt actions for independence, which expanded in both the lower and higher classes in the 1960s, had a place

(in truth, on a more modest scale than in Czechoslovakia) also in Ukraine and Georgia. As in Czechoslovakia, they were halted by pogroms and additional repression by Moscow by its purge of the "nationalistic" and somewhat liberal administration. (In its place dedicated collaborators of Moscow in the persons of Shcherbytsky, Fedorchuk and others were installed). The pogroms were carried out, the hierarchy was changed, but the aspirations of the nation for independence were not eradicated. A return to decentralising processes are being more deeply embedded and are gathering momentum. In the countries of Central Europe, the tempo of restructuring is especially high. With each succeeding step in the realisation of the full sovereignty of these nations, the actuality of the Ukrainian question as a major European geopolitical problem will become more and more apparent.

Thirdly, Russian Bolshevik Leninism with its government apparatus — that of a totalitarian dictatorship with more than half a century of political-social practice — is revealing its inherent flaws and is in the process of dissolution. Faced with this prospect, it has openly discarded the mask of a utopian model created at one time for an "ideal society" and transformed itself into the undisguised and massive instrument of oppression of the imperial policies of the ruling nation. The time-worn mask has been taken off. But, because of the openly criminal and repressive methods used for the furthering of its aims, it has evoked the fear and hatred of the nations of the world. For this reason, totalitarianism already does not reflect the spirit of the age and from the viewpoint of the Russians, discredits the Russian nation, and so, finding themselves in a blind corner of their own making, it is inflexibly losing its support even among that strata of Russian society, which had previously supported it. Suddenly, in this environment it is generating progressive opposition. Previously, it enjoyed a well rounded foundation and enough broad support in the decades of dissemination of Bolshevik demagoguery.

The Russian opposition

It is true that the most enlightened, mature and the most far-sighted segment of Russian society never avowed Leninism. A major proportion of this group was physically destroyed or emigrated, but the greatly reduced segment that remained, nevertheless, insured the Russian nation of a constant pulsation and tradition of an opposition struggle,

though as a rule, not organised or always actively manifested. Regardless, it survived the darkest years of Stalinist reaction and carried on the regime's decay in various forms of ideological tendencies and engaged in group protests and individual actions. It is precisely this branch of the Russian élite that continues to be entrenched in the foremost social positions, and clearly perceives the progressive erosion of Russian communism as an inevitable process. It informs others of the inevitable disintegration of the empire with its contemporary structure: political, territorial and national. And having informed others of the near 100% possibility of a catastrophic global war to which Russian totalitarianism is leading, this élite is attempting to prevent these consequences, while at the same time making its priority the protection of the empire from inevitable and complete ruin. For this reason, this section of the Russian élite is urging society not to spare any effort and personal sacrifice in the search for alternatives to communism and also, at least partly, democratic mutual relations that would be closer to the spirit of the times, between the patricians and the slaves (Russia and Ukraine, Lithuania, Armenia, and others), the suzerain and the vassals (Russia and Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania) and finally Russia and the rest of the world.

Thus, the democratisation of the system by devising other ideological models of societal structure, the future synthesis of which would change the face of totalitarianism and the search for ways to create more tolerable relationships between the nations both within the empire, on the periphery and externally, became an unavoidable need created by the state of society. These are the principal stimuli and motives of the Russian opposition movement. Its moving force became a firm union of the leading Russian élite and the Jews of the empire, who being faced with the prospect of extermination as a national entity on the territory of the empire and indignant with the aggressive and dangerous policy of Moscow in the Middle East, became active in the struggle against communism. All of these factors taken together not only stimulate, accelerate and broaden the base for a rapid growth of the Russian movement, but also guarantee the success of both movements: the Russian and the national-liberation.

It is necessary to add one more incontestible and very significant aspect to the above-mentioned factors: that, regardless of systematic and violent repressions, neither the Ukrainian nor the Russian, nor any other national opposition not only were not totally eradicated, but on

the contrary are growing dynamically and amassing both strength of numbers and quality of personnel in their progressive movements. In this process an exceptional service is being rendered by international society by its active solidarity with the movements of our nations. To better understand the motives for these broad actions of moral support and defence of the dissidents, it is necessary to take into account the deep-rooted and strong democratic traditions of the West, the pivotal role of society's thoughts and ideas and their pre-eminent influence on the sources of mass information and the policies of the governments of Western nations.

The West and the nationalities problem of the empire

Coupled with this, there exists a "prosaic" pragmatic motive: the euphoria of the West's imprudent certainty in its invincibility is dissipating, there is a progression towards seeing the harsh reality, an increasing awareness of the danger and distinct possibility of actual enslavement being transported to Europe by Russian imperialism. Having compromised itself as an ideal society, totalitarianism still does not refute its ideology as a propaganda vehicle, but does not rely entirely upon it. Having developed a colossal military potential behind this propaganda smokescreen, as a result of the cruel exploitation of its workers and the millions of slaves in concentration camps, Moscow is currently relying exclusively on the element of strength. The pressure of this factor enables it to continually realise its expansionist aims.

As a result of this, in Europe a situation has been created where there is nowhere to retreat. The fear of further aggression is compelling the Western inhabitant to reject the once egotistical belief of living on an "invincible bastion" and prepare for self-defence, and to view the opposition forces of the empire as yet another promising ally. When the threat becomes more ominous — and it is growing every year — then greater protection, more acceptance and more sincere support will be given to our movements.

In general, the West was excessively and in simple terms, catastrophically (and thus shamefully), passive for a long period of time, indifferent to the internal problems of the empire, thus allowing the administration of the empire to engage in political brigandage without fear of punish-

ment, to destroy or disperse to the limitless expanses of Siberia and the North tens of millions of people — the noblest and most knowledgeable representatives of the subjugated nations. This is a strategic error of the West of such a magnitude as was its alliance with Moscow during World War II.

In the formation of strategic goals and practical policies in the post-war years and essentially until the present day, the governments of the West allowed themselves yet another strategic blunder: a “quiet agreement” between Moscow and the West, with the latter knowingly keeping silent about the nationality problems of the empire. It was possible to comprehend this simplistic position to a certain extent until the end of the era of colonialism and the creation of numerous new government organisms in Asia and Africa. But at the present time to keep silent and not place before international fora at a governmental level such dramatically pressing problems as the question of the necessity to create the sovereign states of Ukraine, Lithuania, Armenia, Georgia and others on the basis of the 1960 Declaration on Decolonisation by the United Nations; not to raise the subject of the establishment of full diplomatic relations with these states with ambassadors and accredited correspondents of leading newspapers and information services in the capitals of the nations subjugated by Moscow; not to be incensed at the entire world and not protest with the authoritative voice of the United Nations against the policy of ethnocide and the resettlement of great numbers of people to, for them, foreign territory; to keep silent about these problems or not raise them; not to discuss them at the General Assembly of the United Nations, in the European Parliament and in other international fora, and also with diplomats of the foreign service and others at the highest levels, indicates a condoning of the criminal, an association with a bandit, who has expertise in political brigandage and the destruction of nations. This is also a form of political infantilism, a fear before a non-retreating occupant, a position, which is directed towards the detriment of their own national interests.

The exceptionally dramatic nationalities problem of the empire is just such a sensitive and forceful political instrument. “The spirit of instability” can pass through not only Asia and Africa. . . There exist realistic essential conditions for other “spirits”: the Baltic nations, Ukraine, Transcaucasia. . .

Maintaining silence and, in essence, ignoring the extensive needs of

national-liberation movements of the empire, in the first instance that of the Ukrainian movement as a movement of a large and competent nation, which has the potential to radically change the balance of power in Europe, the West obstinately concentrates its efforts on supporting the Russian opposition movement. This statement is not intended to imply that the “saddle was placed on the wrong horse”. The Russians are a leading nation and this attention is understandable. But to concentrate on “only one horse” is an additional strategic error. The fate of Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Armenians, Georgians and Estonians can become the fate of the French, Swedes, Danes, Spanish and others. By not altering their present orientation, they will in the future be forced into the same abnegating fight for freedom and sovereignty that we — the Ukrainians — are fighting. And to maintain independence is without question far easier than regaining it!

As to actual support and assistance for Ukraine, in reality it never existed. “We, Ukrainians, are a nation of martyrs. They can be enthusiastic about our heroism, mourn over it for a long time, and feel sympathy for our situation, but they have never come to our aid. To fight and die for freedom — theirs and ours — we have always had to do by ourselves”. And this has been the case since time immemorial. Therefore, we can only depend on ourselves. The heroic generation of the 1940s realised this. This is known by the present generation. This covenant is to be remembered by those to whom these notes are addressed — to the generation of Ukrainian youth, who today are engaging in and will be engaging in our courageous work in the future.

In this way, the eternal striving of the soul for freedom, the scientific-technical revolution and the resulting rapid growth of productive forces, the exposure of the criminal essence and undisguised aggressive aims of totalitarianism, the continual notification of its danger to the West and the active solidarity and moral support of the dissident movement by international society — these are the most fundamental elements, which, in particular, benevolently influenced the dynamic growth of the democratic rebirth. Tightly interwoven in this rebirth are two major orientations: the national-liberation movements of the subjugated nations of the Russian empire and the human rights movement of the democratic forces of the Russian, Jewish and incontestably of those same subjugated nations. The greatest anarchy reigns precisely on the territories of these nations.

The Russian opposition forces and the national movements

The national-liberation and human rights movements are not limited only to certain successes. Their significant gains are the result of self-sacrificing community efforts of the dissidents and the movements themselves are continually suffering losses and encountering difficulties. One of these effects is that, as a result of ruthless terror, constant repressions and a long list of other reasons, the movements have a diverse, individualistic and narrow group character. They were not able to structure themselves and they do not have a clearly formulated programme. For these reasons, they have not established a multi-national coordination centre. Therefore, from the viewpoint that "the dissident movement" is a manifestation of individual independent thought, it is without doubt fully adequate in this format (although the content of this phenomenon is much deeper and has a more orderly plan).

Terror, systematic pogroms and the destruction of established links do not give the movements the opportunity to structurally unite, to broaden and deepen their activities, vary their methods and to enrich their resources. The acts of systematic pogroms by the repressive apparatus of the regime, which longs to destroy the smallest efforts of united coordinated activities in their embryonic stages, and not to allow continual international contacts of many movements, are at the same time motivated by both "external" and "internal" factors.

In the first place, the national forces of the subjugated nations, having learned through bitter past experience, have lost faith in the Russians and perceive them, regardless of the anti-communist direction of their activity, as the mouthpieces of the great power interests of their nation. In addition, each national force gravitates to the construction of their movements on political principles and is not prone to bonding itself to complicated (with the prospect of new tragic results, which are especially dangerous for small nations) obligations with the Russian opposition forces. This is an absolutely correct position. The Russians, with regard to the foremost problem of today, the nationalities question, not only do not clearly state their position, but also politically avoid it, attempting to relegate this problem to one of secondary importance. In this type of understanding of the national enigma and democracy, there

appears the perspective that is imminently natural only to a Russian — the traditional two faces of Russian democracy. Assigning itself the goal of defence of human rights, it at the same time egotistically, if not with outright hostility, accepts the right of nations to sovereignty and statehood. Being made aware of what this really implies, these “democrats” not infrequently change their outlook exclaiming “they dare to demand the break-up of our state” and turn into fierce enemies of democracy and find themselves in the camp of unadulterated chauvinists.

Secondly, precisely because of the provincialism of the dissident programmes, the individuality of power, the comparatively small numbers of active participants, and consequently the limitation of possibilities, we cannot yet discuss (except perhaps infrequent ties and the understanding of the need for their expansion) a tighter alliance, systematically established contacts, agreed-to activities and mutual aid to the actively functioning national-liberation movements of nations subjugated by Moscow both within the empire and in the satellites. The co-ordination of activities, the exchange of literature and the means of its production, the reciprocal exchange of information, arbitration in establishing ties with the diaspora, transit points of mail delivery, joint publication of prepared documents, the accreditation of selected representatives in international fora, joint programmes and the need for joint and synchronised demonstrations are the starting minimum, which can be achieved by a planned and prepared co-operation with the Czechs, Slovaks, Poles and other national forces of Eastern Europe.

We also do not have direct and systematic contacts with the national forces of the nations of the Baltic states and Transcaucasia. Only separate, individual and infrequent forms of joint action have been planned. It is precisely here that there exists a broad and receptive field of activity. The actual situation is that we, Ukrainians, have much weaker established contacts with Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians and others, than with analogous forces in Moscow. In turn, the representatives of these nations (even of one province) have still weaker links between themselves. At the same time, contacts and co-operation with Russians in each separate national opposition is much better planned and are both stronger and more systematic. The reasons for this situation are typical because they reflect the real situation as to the possibilities and strength of the national-liberation movements and the Russian human rights movement. The capital and everything connected with this connotation of superiority, has produced inordinately easier working con-

ditions for the dissidents of the ruling nation. To this must be added the élite composition of the participants of the movement: academics, writers, well-known scholars and so on; wide-ranging opportunities for contacts, liaison and popularisation of their activities due to direct access to international resources of mass media and support by the world community. This also, in part, denoted the level of intensity of ties and co-operation between movements and helped convert Moscow into a base camp. In this situation, it is necessary to stress that the greater part of the participating Russians, and primarily the Jews, understand the interests of the national-liberation movements and support a certain level of co-operation with contacts and intercession with the West. Coupled with this, we have to acknowledge that the present situation is manifestly abnormal — the prerogatives of the initiative and base camp belong to forces, which although democratic belong to that nation from whose oppression we should without reservation be freed. Therefore, the content, quality, stability and reciprocal relations between the Ukrainian and other national forces of the opposition are far from being on the necessary plateau. They should be on the same level as that of the established contacts and co-operation among our political prisoners in Soviet prisons and concentration camps.

Thirdly, the empire, as a multi-national state, by its very nature promotes a multitudinous variety of national goals and programmes, which are often not only in confluence, but frequently enter into conflict with each other. This is perfectly understandable in that the representatives of the nations in defence of their national interest will direct their activities, formation of ideals, goals, content and norms of relations and co-operation with the other opposition movements of this or that nation accordingly, with their national interests as the primary concern. This is true especially with regard to the ruling nation. Simply stated, the nations are constructed in response to the specifics of their national goals and programmes. As a result of this, relationships in the era of the dissident movement (one which is still continuing) are built, as a rule, on individual contacts and not on the basis of organised programmes. In such a situation, the concept of “national interests” are dependent in the first place on the personal qualities of the individual who establishes the contact and assumes responsibility for it. This, quite naturally, detracts from the understanding and interpretation of its content, the construction of these conceptions and incontestably from the understanding of a specific national reality, an accurate appraisal of

society's condition and a clear distinction of the framework of concrete programmes from political conjecture and tactical aims.

Mutual actions or hostile relations

It is from dependence on the confluence of these interests, their unity, neutrality or non-confluence, rivalry or confrontation that these ties are forged, goals are set, an alliance and co-operative activities are formed, or conversely — collision of purpose and hostile relations. In the series of complicated problems, which arose in the daily agenda of the national forces of the empire's nations throughout the last two decades (and in effect before), one of the most complex was and still is the unity and diversity of the goals and programmes of the ruling nation and those of the subjugated nations. Today, this driving need for the status of parity for the national forces, coupled with the complete and total education of the Russian opposition, is of exceptional importance to the nationalities question, as is the acceptance in principle of the gravity of this problem by the Russians. Neither one nor the other of the above mentioned events has occurred and the subjugated nations have not received the necessary recognition of the right to independence, sovereignty and statehood. It is precisely this fundamental issue that forms the basis for dissension between the two groups.

The Russian opposition, as the inheritors of all the historical traditions of the Russian empire, have distinguished themselves with a fierce bigotry towards the national-liberation movements. The expression of basic human needs for individuality and autonomy were classified as "criminal separatism", and the natural and sacred strivings of large and competent nations to independence were crushed mercilessly and with Asiatic cruelty. "Destroy separatism in the foetus", "Tempered steel will destroy nationalism" and "This is an infringement on the integrity of our national territory" were the maxims, which served as "last wills and testaments" through the centuries and are being transmitted from generation to generation to Russian chauvinists of all varieties. The machinery of a great power was the bearer of these maxims and the instrument of implementing them. The communist regime inherited these traditions, endowing them with barbarian methods and totality in

the application of repressions, and in the destruction of nations and their cultures. The unheard of purloining of national treasures and resources, the open political brigandage, authoritarianism, genocide and ethnocide, the massive resettlement of people, are all conditions in which dozens of nations have been forced to live for more than half a century. For the crimes against individuals, nations and humanity, the Russians must assume a complex of national guilt, similar to the one assumed by the German nation for the crimes of Nazism. By simply experiencing this guilt they will truly comprehend the principles of democracy. But this has not yet occurred. Presently, the souls of the Russian dissidents are being moulded in the heat of a massive chauvinistic revelry. In addition, it is difficult to free the majority of them of the addiction to the imperial opiate, from the intertwining of both greatness and power and to educate them in the fact that the principles of freedom and democracy are one and the same for all.

Thus, the individuality of the Russian dissident lies in the “specifics” of his goals as a member of the opposition of the ruling nation. The basic branching out of his “tree of tasks” can be briefly described in this way:

- a) The defence of human rights;
- b) The promoting of the idea of the actual need for a model of a renewed and more open society. The supporting of this model by disclosing the built-in abuses of imperialism and the inexpediency of its political-economic structure to the demands of the present. The directing of the powerful efforts of the Russian élite, which places before itself the task of pressurising the regime to reform some aspects of the system, and, most important, to modernise and to bring the economy closer to the level of contemporary Western models.
- c) The declaration of common goals with the West. Presenting alternatives to communist appraisals and approaches to key international issues with the intent of amending in the West the historically proven stereotype of Russian aggression and designs for further annexations and expansions of the empire.
- d) The easing of the imperial regime and the possible granting by the hegemonist (in his understanding “conformity with a purpose” and

“measure of degree”), of a fuller expression of cultural and national autonomy to the subjugated nations of the empire, although under the Russian “sceptre” and in the framework of the “inviolable” borders of the empire.

The above mentioned aims are optimised (. . .) by us, in that these are the programmes of only an insignificant, but at the same time, the most democratic segment of the Russian dissident movement, which has declared its primary political programmes. The general and most influential mass of dissidents have far more localised aims, although they accept the imperialist regime as a political system of government. Are these demands minimal? Yes! But for a Russian such a limitation of demands is quite natural, since they emanate from the “national complex” — the strategy of maintaining the imperial status quo.

The factor of preserving the empire .

The growth of productive forces is a more objective process and its tempo is a sum of factors and influences of subjective wills, the activity of which the evolutionary movement of a nation can accelerate, brake, halt or turn back. The need for changes and a review of positions, necessitate changes in attitudes towards some fundamental values. This did not happen. In this is seen the deliberateness of the Russians; in every historical period the consideration of safeguarding the empire and its expansion dominated all others and dictated their actions. The indivisibility of the empire was the primary concern, and a democratic system of government, the spiritual growth of the nation, the elaboration of an economic system were of secondary importance and without question — were subject to the primary one. Thus, even after the realisation of their planned goals, the Russians will again find themselves in the backwater of world progress, in terms of a political and economic system, by maintaining the traditional Russian imperial mechanism of force, the oppression and exploitation of nations and the retention of an extensive bureaucratic system of management.

Therefore, on the basis of the communist dictatorship’s quest for world domination, the one-sided democratic demands of the Russian

opposition for a more serious experiment can be viewed not only as an avowal of imperial policies, but also as pressure towards total war, to still another catastrophe in the form of the one, which for Russia and us was the year 1917 and the following decades. In that political situation, the subjective ideology of a small group of people was victorious over the strong democratic forces and over an objective outlook of progressive growth of the economy based on free initiative. Lenin, having established a communist regime, regressed Russia back centuries in terms of spiritual, democratic and cultural growth. Stalin, with all that the concept of "Stalinism" implies, regressed it still further. So, to fully credit the results of the catastrophe to a handful of people, and to regard the communist dictatorship with its real, innate form — Stalinism — as a historical accident is a great mistake. It would be a mistake consciously or subconsciously. Communism as a form of society is, without doubt, a product of the Russian soul.

As a result of the historical growth of the empire by means of wars of aggression, the Russian selected as a natural national trait a zest for expansion and seizure of foreign territories. The wars and annexations were yet again a revelation of the aggressive nature of the Russian, his predisposition to "conquest", that is to robbery and violence. Thus, the communist dictatorship became a logical, natural expansion of the Russian spirit, a consolidation of its imperial strivings. Leninism and Stalinism are also the embodiment of the Asiatic psycho-biological ancestry of the Russian, which affirms itself in the admiration of force and authority and in the unrestrained and unlimited domination of the strong over the weak. It manifests itself further by the inner need of every Russian to break down the freedom of another individual, to lower his dignity, to underscore his inferiority and dispossession, and, at the same time, the absolute silence of the weaker before the authoritarianism of the stronger, in the submission to the aristocrat and a meek acceptance of fate and to conformity. It is precisely from this that the existence of the colossal shifts in psychological ranges in the individual emanates: from contempt for ethical norms, laws and its "uselessness" because "I am strong", to a still greater disdain and "uselessness" of these concepts because "I am weak, absolutely defenceless". "You are a worm, if I want, I will crush you, if I want, I will spare you" and this occurs on every level "from the bottom to the top" and also from the "top to the bottom". One very good analogy is the government mechanism. The façade is European while the essence is Asiatic despotism.

Coupled with this, a deep biological need to affirm oneself whatever the cost, or conversely to become totally subordinated, submissive to the higher authority in whom are entrusted the heroic self-sacrifice and generosity to the ideal whatever it may be is active in the ingrained Russian character. From this stems the manifested fanatical dedication to the realisation of a goal whatever the cost! Let us take for example the millions of communist victims and the criminal oppression of entire nations. The Russian psyche is dominated by a zoological impatience to independent thinking and to an individual's independence. Conservatism, the legal maintaining of dogmas and pragmatism without principle, conformity — these descriptions denote the behaviour of the Russian in everyday life and his reactions in critical situations. The sum total of these characteristics equates to the following. The masses are without regard to themselves in relation to the regime. Because of the absence of restraining factors the regime swells in self-importance, usurps the rights of the people and transforms itself into an absolute power. The absolutism of the landowner, the city governor, the tsar on the one hand, and the deification of and grovelling before these figures by the masses, on the other, is a hereditary and traditional way of Russian societal existence. So Leninism and Stalinism materialised on an established base. They are an innate and natural product of the national characteristics of the Russian people.

It is due to these characteristics that the Russian opposition was able to survive the darkest years of Stalinist reaction. Already in the mid-1950s, the Russian democratic rebirth again took on the format of openly manifested protests, continuously encompassed a wider circle of people, and what is most significant, mobilised the élite to an active opposition activity. During the rule of Khrushchev, dating from his exposure of the practices of Stalinism, amnesty of political prisoners, occasional reforms and also, as a result of a scientific-technical revolution whose influence on society became increasingly felt, there came into existence in the empire a new societal situation, which although weak became a livelier environment for the growth of opposition forces. The process began with the gathering of strength, searches for the most optimal methods of work under the conditions of communism and newer means of achieving freedom. In spite of everything, Brezhnev's regime was not able to eradicate the strivings for democracy or to stem the progress of the opposition movement.

The inherited imperial opinions towards the nationalities question in

the Russian dissident community are so engrained that they do not display any perceptible evolution. They perceive the very need for a "democratisation of society" from the patronising position of a ruling great power nation: how to modernise the forms of the colonial status of the subjugated nations, thereby holding back the process of decolonisation for several more decades. For us, caught in the present tempo of Russification and total ethnocide, each decade is in reality a question of the life or the death of the nation. For this reason, the Ukrainian youth who join the struggle, even during the initial period, do not have the right to exist in an atmosphere of political illusions, but must remember that the single-mindedness of the democratic issues, the attempt to maintain the status quo is a traditional, historical constant of Russian social movements and that this constant is an invincible barrier of discord between the two alien organisms. In their single-mindedness, the Russians show their weaknesses as democrats and manifest a low national self-esteem, the evidence of which is the fear of loss of superpower status; the inability to normally function as a one-nation organism, and the pitiful condition of its spiritual and intellectual potential without the transfusions of the extracted donor blood of the élite of the colonial nations.

Human rights or the right to sovereignty

It is necessary to stress that the insignificant progress in altering viewpoints as to the resolution of the nationalities question in the Russian dissident community is primarily a result of the influence of many distinguished Jewish individuals on the growth of the movement as a whole. They directed it towards taking into account the needs of the time and naturally, without question, the needs of the Jewish population of the empire, the rights and opportunities of which were still limited in the 1950s and at the beginning of the 1960s. From the second half of the 1960s, the anti-Semitic policy of Moscow, derived from internal motives (the Jews are the strength of the opposition movement) and coupled with the realisation of Russian strategic imperial aims in the Middle East, gave rise to more cynical forms of anti-Semitic propaganda and general discrimination in all aspects of societal life. Responding to this

policy, a numerous enlistment of Jews into the Russian dissident movement, a movement, which in great measure is dependent on the Jews for its strong growth, renaissance, the support of world opinion, the formation of ideological directions and its qualitative evolution, began.

The problem of human rights is the essence of the dissident movement. It became its strategic objective, but scarcely the final goal of the Russians. For the rest of the nations of the empire it is simply one of the branches of the "tree of tasks", incontestibly a task of high merit deserving self-sacrifice. It is important, nevertheless, that in the formulation of this strategic objective as a universal final goal by raising it to the level of an all-encompassing "tree of tasks" of all the nations of the empire, that a considerable segment of the Russian opposition forces does not attempt to conceal "the whole forest of tasks" both from itself and also from the national-liberation movements of the subjugated nations, as well as from world opinion. The crux of the matter is that the key problem of human rights should not be converted into an essentially Russian one in spirit and serve conveniently as a screen to cover up yet another fundamental goal — the problem of the liberation of the subjugated nations from a colonial prison and their God-given right to independence, sovereignty and statehood.

For us, Ukrainians, it is this goal that has been made sacred by traditional strivings and the millions of martyrs, who died for the freedom of Ukraine. We do not have the right to repeat again the already admitted and corrected unfortunate historical drama (especially the incredibly tragic first half of the 20th century) of mistaken theses about the priority of social and democratic principles above the national. The harmony of this trinity of principles is not always protected even by great sovereign nations. For us independence, sovereignty and statehood are above all else! This is exactly how the question should be stated!

A democratic occupant does not generally exist in nature and the fate of Ukraine is doubly tragic. The nation is in slavery and in the slavery of the most ruthless occupant in the world, who is mercilessly destroying our culture and ruthlessly deals with any strivings for independence and social freedom and democracy. We have to view the tragic type of "individuality" of the Ukrainian movement from this aspect. Foreign radio stations give the following statistics, based on the analysis of documents of the Ukrainian samvydav, which shows that out of the 100% of the materials that managed to cross the border, 70% are devoted to themes of human rights and only 30% deal with the national question. These

statistics are both glaring and tragic. A similar circumstance can be explained by a series of factors, one of them being that this is a result of the Russification efforts of the occupant, proof that his endeavours in pogroms are directed primarily against the forces of our national-liberation movement. But this is at the same time an indication of the level of political mentality of a significant segment of the participants of the movement! And although an analogous situation also exists outside Ukraine, it is a testament of the limitations of the national demands of the entire dissident movement in the empire, which in recent years has gone arm in arm with the Russian.

The defence of human rights is the burning issue of the day and draws people to itself, like moths to a flame, the absolute majority of whom are dedicated patriots and are willing to devote themselves to activity in the movement, but do not know where to begin, with what to occupy themselves and what duties to perform. But they do know the exceptional popularity of the human rights orientation of the Russian language radio broadcasts (in Ukraine they suffer less interference) so they begin to assail totalitarianism and its violation of human rights. These violations they encounter everywhere as the communist regime is steadfast in its crimes against humanity. Literally mountains of materials in defence of free expression, freedom of thought, freedom of religion, social contacts and so on, have been piled up. The defence of these rights is a noble sphere of endeavour. In addition, it is today a popular and even rewarding one. This type of activity creates obvious results through the broadcast of part of the documents on this theme over the radio. It is viewed by the regime as the "primary evil", as it receives resonance in the West, gives birth to certainty of defence of the repressed by international societies and thus draws into its ranks more new people, quite often from the inventory of primary or potential participants of the Ukrainian movement. Human rights are one of the highest and most heartfelt values of our time and work in their defence is sorely needed. To us, then, it has the appearance not of a final goal, but only one of the many tasks that are in unity with the national problem — the colonial status of Ukraine and the absolute necessity to transform this status.

The censorship of national documents

The regrettable statistics given by the "German Wave" contain yet another aspect. Let us depart from the realities and objectivity (objective only for the West!) of the leading themes of the documents described by it. In reality, this picture does not accurately reflect the real situation of the national and social life in Ukraine. It is not an adequate evaluation of the level and capacity of Ukrainian political thought nor is it a proportional recreation of our national-liberation strength. The materials delivered to the West are only an insignificant part (. . .). This is due, in part, because large numbers of materials of Ukrainian samvydav are created and distributed among the general population, which does not have the opportunity to transfer them to the West. In Ukraine, numerous irrepressible forces of the opposition, whose centres consist of various numbers of people who can never come out "into the open", live in "catacombs"! In other words, leading a sufficiently active illegal activity among the population, these forces do not appear openly and do not have established links with other groups or with the West. They do not conquer a large auditorium, so to say, but direct the necessary educational and propaganda activities, which bring significant results. It is exactly these groups, who, after being discovered, supply the movement with their best individuals. From their ranks came Krasivsky, Lukyanenko, Zdorovy, Lytvyn, Lisovy, Ovsienko, Popadyuk and many others. That is one point. Secondly, there exist irrefutable facts about the deliberate "enrichment" of the above mentioned statistical data by Russian dissidents. (To give an example, it is sufficient to ask whether these notes will be able to find their way out of the country if they are directed through Moscow). The opportunity to control postal contacts allows an individual to achieve this without personal difficulty and responsibility, albeit a moral one. In such a manner, the materials, which touch upon the movement for human rights in the communist regime but do not expose it as a Russian imperial mechanism, these materials "pass the censorship" and are delivered by mail and find their way to the West. However, the samvydav that is seeped with the national idea — documents of a constructive political character, memorandums, appeals, propositions, group and individual declarations, anti-imperial (anti-Russian) materials — proves itself to be "undesirable", is stranded at the points of contact and is "lost" or, in a slightly better event, relayed back to its authors after much delay, having already lost its actual importance.

For a fuller understanding of the situation and the “self-censorship” another illustration merits attention. In the prisons and concentration camps, there often occurs the need for pertinent documents, which are suitable for international destinations. Ukrainians, Jews, Armenians and others sign them. But when such a document contains terms like “Russian imperialism”, “despotic or insidious Moscow”, or “the liquidation of the imperial structure”, the Russian prisoners as a rule do not sign such a document.

This is why the objective statistics in the West do not respond to the real situation of this phenomenon in Ukraine. (For this reason, we need an established system of independent ties as much as we need air!). These two concrete facts fully expose the “individuality and specifics”, and very substantially, too, of the Ukrainian national-liberation movement on the one hand, and the Russian dissident movement on the other, and the differences between the position and opportunities of the ruling nation and those of a subjugated nation.

Parallel movements

In this manner, the national-liberation movements of the subjugated nations and the Russian human rights movement are two parallel, historically composed directions of a general democratic process, which today is again rapidly growing in the Russian empire. They convey in the content of their activity their own specific and traditional problems, each of which demands to be addressed, as was the case 50 years ago; they proceed in parallel and unite in their activities, assisting each other; they are experiencing a flourishing, but also common difficulties, failures, divergence of interests, friction and collisions, which are conditioned by national goals. In the period of formation and entrenchment, after the total destruction of the democratic forces in the 1930s-1940s, a new, suitable level of capabilities of the democratic forces was established. Until recently, this has been done without the mass active participation of the general population in all the processes of the democratic rebirth. Elements that have proved to be detrimental in this rebirth are the imperial status and national character of the Russians and the quite evident weak moral support on the part of the West, in actual fact

the total ignoring by the West of the nationalities problem of the Russian empire and ignorance and misunderstanding of its internal situation, and the indifference, until recently, of the West to such a potent force, which is capable of changing the balance of power to the detriment of the empire.

These are objective hardships. They should not be silenced or ignored. We must discuss them and learn how to solve them, directed by those principles, which are the foundations of our ultimate goal: sovereignty, democracy and justice for all. Otherwise, for a long period of time, we will not be able to progress from the initial stages of disorganised elementary methodology of independent thinking, largely inert in the masses, while their active elements pursue only local tasks, resolve only minor problems, are mired in common contradictions, and which, because of terror and their own dissent, are unable to identify and resolve fundamental questions — questions about organisation and future government.

The right to the title of nationalist

Today, in the background of general, but passive opposition, to be an active dissident is not only to have the willingness to participate in courageous deeds and to face suffering. This is first of all a great honour. And for us, Ukrainians, the slaves of the 20th century, this is a sacred responsibility and a double honour — the right to be called a nationalist. Only this term conveys the all-inclusive feeling of responsibility for the fate of the nation and becomes the imperative of the continual volitional power on behalf of Ukraine, its independence and statehood.

The most mature segment of Ukrainians, who participated in the struggle of the 1960s-1970s, call themselves nationalists, not dissidents. Their position is noble and entirely correct, although objectively this generation of fighters belongs to the era of the dissidents; apart from accepting the ideal, nationalism demands a strict structural formation. It is precisely this qualitatively prominent individuality of Ukrainians that has a continual tendency to unify them in groups and to consolidate these groups and viewpoints into one democratically formulated structure, which takes upon itself a broad range of programmes and resolves them.

The national-liberation movement of Ukraine is historically the most enduring, the most extensive and the one that teaches through rich experience that only a sound structural formation (in keeping with the demands of the time) has the capability to ensure a continuous vibrant movement and provide the strongest, most indestructible and traditional force with one all-national co-ordination centre.

THE ‘TREE OF NATIONAL TASKS’

THE “TREE OF NATIONAL TASKS”

The sacred goal of the Ukrainian nation — an independent sovereign Ukrainian state

In the Ukrainian literature, which is published and distributed by the national-liberation movement of Ukraine, the foremost place is held by the theme of the defence of human rights, the exposure of totalitarianism as a political system, which is built on oppression and is unable to safeguard the civil and political rights of its citizens. At the same time, the national-liberation movement has far from distinguished itself in the development of the basic fundamental theme of Ukrainian national tasks from the perspective of urgent tasks presently required and dictated by the sacred goal of the nation — the achievement of sovereignty and statehood. There are very few works of a general-enlightening informative nature, very few constructive elaborations and very few propositions of goal-orientated activities by individuals or groups. As a result, the youth, which fills their ranks, is not prepared politically, is not familiar either with the accomplishments or the actual tasks, and, as a rule, is forced to begin work not from already established activities, but to start anew, and, in essence, to repeat steps that have already been taken. Having made only initial and often awkward and repeated efforts, these young men and women find themselves imprisoned. Cruel repressions, concentration camps, moral and physical suffering are the uniform fate of the participants of the national-liberation movement. Thus, the results of this suffering and compensation for the many victims should be the spread of the movement, and not inertia and repetition of activities. (It is true, however, that a certain amount of repetition by each succeeding generation of participants of the movement is unavoidable, and to an extent is an objective process in the functioning of the movement).

The works of Ukrainian ideologists, historians, distinguished political and community activists, documents and materials about the activities of once existing parties, organisations and associations are excluded from public libraries and, consequently, are inaccessible to the general reader. In private book collections, the above-mentioned literature is also not available. This is due to the fact that these types of books and materials

are entered into the "index" of "anti-Bolshevik, anti-Russian propaganda" and when they are discovered, they are confiscated and the owners placed onto a list of potential enemies. Until recently, possession of such materials would result in imprisonment. Foreign literature of an academic and similar nature with analogous themes is, naturally, not available in the bookstores. It is also unavailable in public libraries. Everything that is officially published en masse, in both the Ukrainian and Russian languages, is directed towards the falsification and defamation of Ukrainian national goals, the disorientation and lethargy of the Ukrainian, the neutralisation of his national consciousness and patriotic calling to engage in active measures for the achievement of independence. The actual Russian strategy, stemming from the problems of both internal and external policies, the real chauvinistic-imperial aims and programmes, are elaborated and defined in closed institutions by the imperial movement. Numerous monographs, explanations and articles are published under the heading "for the use of the civil servant" as recommendations for implementation by the party apparatus, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the KGB, MVD and other government institutions. Thus, an interested Ukrainian reader does not have access to non-official literature. For, having read such literature, becoming familiar with it and applying the derived information to the needs and goals of Ukraine, he would be able to formulate an objective viewpoint as to the situation of our national life. He would be able to clearly see the tragedy of the actual situation, feel, in both himself and all around him, the disgrace of the colonial yoke and, guided by a responsibility for the fate of the nation, would firmly grasp and assign for himself those tasks, which obligate him to work in society, bringing the optimal results in the advance of the nation to freedom. For this reason, the addressing, the resolution in the agenda of discussion, and the elaboration of these questions in the literature of the Ukrainian national-liberation movement has a very significant role, and appears as one of the leading "branches" of the "tree of tasks".

By its very content, extent and depth, the "tree of national tasks" is an exceptionally complex structural system, which is composed of an organic unity and a unity of systems of a low order. By its significance, situation and specifics, each branch of the "tree of goals" should be viewed in a systematic manner and the total work should become an all-encompassing entity, as is the "tree of tasks", by some scientific research. This is an enormous topic and it is not in the power of one

individual to accomplish. In addition, the author does not have the opportunity to work as a researcher. Because of this, he does not touch upon the theoretical aspects of the topic in these brief notes, but merely expresses his thoughts for the reader's judgement in the form of questions raised, and as an illustration of the separate tasks, which confront the movement.

The nation is a gift of God

A nation is eternal. In its eternal essence it is a continual community of blood and psychologically related people, which maintains, in its inviolable inheritance, the recognition and right of sovereignty and statehood and the permanence of the national "I". Independence and a sovereign government mechanism are its highest imperishable and unchanging values. Without them, it is not a fully fulfilled, only a seriously wounded, organism, which but exists, becoming progressively weaker, and dies like an uprooted tree. Therefore, for its own life, self-preservation, and for the continued growth of the nation, it is obligated to retain and defend its sovereignty as a life-blood, as a soul, as an untouchable national shrine, and, having lost it in a period of historical tragedy, to retain it, to return to itself this holy shrine. Insofar as a nation does not exist in a vacuum, but lives and grows in a historical process in a continuous association with other nations as a complex many-sided organism, then having deviated from its sacred goal — the absolute necessity of existence in its own sovereign state — it establishes "roots", proceeds to grow "trunks", forms a "crown" of tasks in such harmony and suitability that they are an immovable safeguard, which guarantees, it the most essential basics of national life. In such a manner, together with the underlined assignments of the "tree of national goals", it is also a revelation, an indication and refinement of the complex of these tasks, which in the present and future perspective, that is, in the historical evolution of a nation and its relations with other nations, are called upon to preserve the sovereignty and statehood of the nation as a God-given gift, as inviolable rights, as a prerequisite of life, to lead the nation to spiritual and economic development, growth, the prosperity of all its members, the enhancement of its international prestige and influence, its role in the general progress of world civilisation and the brotherhood of nations.

These characteristics are applicable first of all to an independent nation. The status of sovereignty is distinguished by many indications, the most important of which are:

- a) The territory of the nation is not incorporated into the framework of another state and its borders are inviolable.
- b) The nation is directed by its own national government, which has full authority to protect the sovereign interests of the nation and express its will in regard to free relationships with governments of other states.
- c) The state apparatus and the national government is recognised by the international community of sovereign nations, who, as a sign of recognition and acceptance, will establish diplomatic relations with it with fully accredited diplomats.
- d) The government directs foreign and internal policies completely independent from other states.
- e) The nation has its own armed forces, which owe allegiance to the national government.
- f) The nation has its own national monetary system (an individual currency, gold and exchange reserves) and foreign trade.
- g) It has the historically traditional symbols of state existence: a national flag, emblem and anthem.

Ukraine does not have these characteristics of independence. The Sacred Trust, to which the entire "tree of national tasks" is subordinate, for which Ukrainians have fought throughout the centuries, is once again being plundered by an occupant. After the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic and a short period of independence, Moscow began an insidious unprovoked war of aggression, occupied the weak young state, which was still in the process of establishment, stationed armies of occupation on the territory of Ukraine and once again forcibly united it into the framework of the new empire. Today, Ukraine is in a situation far more tragic than that of a colony. We are not citizens of our own state. We, in essence, are not even full-fledged members of our national family who live and work on their own land for the good of our nation and ourselves. We are miserable Russian prisoners and lackeys, whom the imperialist nation exploits for its own aims, takes advantage of us as cannon fodder and as servants and serfs

on agricultural land converted from untamed steppes, and as a select genetic source for the enrichment and enlargement of its intellectual, spiritual and human potential. For that reason, for Ukrainians the “tree of national tasks”, or its primary branches, should be the formation and elaboration of the unity of national goals, which would become a powerful force in the movement of the nation to its ultimate goal. This is the liquidation of its colonial status, programmes, which would return sovereignty, statehood, a normal national life and equality among the nations of the world to Ukraine. The task is very complex, but it is realistic and attainable.

The pathos of renewal has embraced human spirits

... We are living in an era of such dynamic growth of productive forces and are in the midst of such a general awakening that the unavoidable change of the situation will occur with lightning speed and explosive phases. Human spirits have embraced the passion of renewal. Emerging from the community of intellectuals, it is spreading dynamically, broadening both “vertically” and “horizontally” in the strata of society, becoming a massive phenomenon, converting into a powerful element of strength, which paves the way to the rebirth. And it is perfectly understandable that the attainment of freedom is not a gift of fate, not a “heavenly manna”, but the result of major efforts, the result of a constantly difficult road to travel. For this reason, everyone who, today, dedicates himself to resolve even one of the principal Ukrainian tasks, awaits years of imprisonment in Russian concentration camps. The issue, nevertheless, is this: either devoted work for the freedom of Ukraine and the awareness of future arrests and the status of convicts for individual sons and daughters of the nation, or the threat of death for the entire nation.

Ukraine chose life and liberty. Thus, before our national-liberation forces there exist a series of tasks, which they already have the power and ability to address. These tasks have for a long time been unavoidable, and for urgency and significance are among the most important and far-reaching. It is true that the selection of this or that means, of this or that direction in the activities of people, that is “specialisation” in the work of individuals, groups or structures, is not conditioned only to the needs of the nation. The formulation of aims, the choice of means,

the form of the activity of the opposition are dependent naturally upon the ever-present danger of repression. The readiness of individuals, who spread the consciousness of these needs and who undertake the means towards their realisation to self-sacrifice, is a major factor. The level of the awareness of these individuals and their political capabilities, and also the growth of the internal situation of the empire, as well as the international situation, are all important elements. And it is important, in the synthesis of these and a series of other factors, to be able to predict the possible turn of events, to anticipate them, in a large measure to direct the evolution of these processes, to give them the essence of a national outlook, and not to act in the wake of this progressive movement, imitating and accepting only foreign forms of activity, acquainting oneself with the prominent, if not the deep idealistic influences, the aims of which are not always in concurrence with ours, but which often are antithetic, and on a collision course with ours.

The nation, without question, is interested in the acceleration and qualitative growth of the liberation processes, in the formation of an all-national structure of the movement and the co-ordination of activities within the territory of Ukraine and with our diaspora, and also between the Ukrainian national-liberation movement and its allies in the other regions of the empire, in Central Europe and in the countries of the West. From here stem the tasks, which are dictated by the tragic situation of the nation and the extremely intolerable political-judicial atmosphere in the empire, and the initial processes of establishing the movement in the social strata of the whole nation.

The maximum activation of all Ukrainians

One of the series of fundamental tasks, which face the forces of national liberation both within the territory of Ukraine and in the Ukrainian diaspora beyond its borders, is the concentration of maximum efforts for the activation of the activities of all Ukrainians and the diplomatic work of their leadership towards the mobilisation of the world community in defence of the Ukrainian nation from the planned total destruction of Ukrainians as a nation. To achieve this on the territory of Ukraine and in the countries of residence of the diaspora, jointly coordinated measures of such an amplitude of efforts of psychological influence that would result in the long awaited awareness by the world

community and the governments of Western nations that the Ukrainian national question, by its very existence, is one of the exceptionally important and pressing problems of European and World politics, are indispensable.

Parallel efforts in conjunction with the activities of the diaspora must be actions that are directed at Western nations, who, having recognised Ukraine's right to statehood and sovereignty as a real political objective of their policies, should recognise the necessity to unite on this common issue and to carry out coordinated influential measures to realise this goal through diplomatic channels, the inclusion of our problem in the daily agenda for discussion, and the adoption of suitable positions in international organisations, particularly in the United Nations and the European Parliament, during meetings of representatives of governments participating in conferences on European security and other important issues.

On account of this, dozens of various more concrete tasks, some of which have already existed for a long time in the form of unresolved questions, appear before the national-liberation movement.

In an official document, the national-liberation movement, through its representatives on the international arena, will make a further emphasis on its previous intercessions on the necessity of the recognition, by member states of the United Nations, of the colonial status of Ukraine, on the ouster of the Ukrainian SSR from membership of the United Nations, on the recognition of the Ukrainian question as a crucial problem of the United Nations and the inclusion of this question into the daily agenda of the sessions of the General Assembly, and in the passing of a Resolution on the granting of independence to Ukraine and the establishment of a sovereign Ukrainian state, based on the natural right of a nation to a sovereign life, the right of a nation to independence, and on the United Nations Declaration on Decolonisation of 1960.

As a result of these inroads, the task of formulating another official document of the movement and presenting it to the component institutions of the member states of the United Nations lies before the national-liberation movement. This document would replace those that are falsified and degrade the national dignity of the Ukrainians, prepared and elaborated by Moscow with the purpose of profaning the historical symbols of Ukrainian statehood. This document would present our real national state symbols, namely: the flag — blue and yellow; the coat of arms — the trident; and the national anthem — “Shche ne vmerla

Ukraina" (Ukraine is not yet dead). A protocol with an accurate description of the flag, a graphic description of the coat of arms, and the text and notes of the national anthem will naturally be added to this document.

The national-liberation movement acknowledges the need to repeatedly turn to the governments of the member states of the United Nations and the world community with these extensive documents as one of its principal tasks. Each of these documents would stress the necessity for decisive action on the part of governments and the international community. On the basis of these respective demands, a suitable resolution should be passed by a session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the halting of the policy of ethnocide on the territory of Ukraine and the unjustifiability of massive resettling of Ukrainians on territory, which is alien to them. It should include clauses on the necessity of bringing over the overwhelming majority of schools, technical institutes and higher educational institutions of Ukraine to the national (Ukrainian) language of instruction and of the need to introduce Ukrainian into the conduct of daily business and technical documentation in commercial activity, in academic research, in research establishments, and in the government administrative agencies of Ukraine.

For the strengthening of the external political activities of the Ukrainians

The continued agitation about the absolute need for the recognition of the Ukrainian question as a very real and enduring political problem of European affairs and its inclusion in the daily agenda of the European Parliament, the holding of hearings on this pressing problem, and the preparation and presentation of pertinent official documents is yet another critical task of the national-liberation movement in Ukraine.

It is necessary to show the world the real situation in the Ukrainian education system, the complete absence of sovereign rights of its higher educational institutions as national centres of learning, the total control of opportunities of scholarly and other contacts of Ukrainian academicians with their colleagues in other countries, the total and merciless suppression of their strivings and rights to freedom of thought and independent creative work in the field of humanities. Thus, the task of utilising the abundant factual materials as a basis for official documents

to be presented to the National Academies of Science of the member-states of the United Nations and to the world academic community, which would expose the imperial policies of Moscow in the sphere of academic study and science, lies before the national-liberation movement. At the same time, these documents would make demands for the establishment of a sovereign and independent Ukrainian Academy of Sciences — a truly national academic organism and not another instrument of Moscow. They would also demand the full and equal participation of Ukrainian scholars in the scientific and academic activities of the United Nations, the cessation of the policy of appropriation of intellectuals by Moscow, the insolent and criminal adaptation by it of foreign spiritual values and academic achievements. They would address the need to invite Ukrainian scholars to participate in international fora and the exchange of scholars with the aim of fostering friendship and cooperation in joint projects as separate entities from the imperial delegations. These delegations are presently selected by Moscow, which determines their number and national composition stemming not from academic achievements of this or that particular scholar, but rather from his loyalty to communism, collaboration and submission to Moscow. They should be replaced by the invitation of independent and fully-accredited academic delegations from Ukraine.

The situation of Ukrainian culture is even more tragic. This situation gives rise to another urgent need to expose the truly critical situation of our culture in the document prepared by the national-liberation movement. Composed as a deposition of accusation and supported by facts, it should be presented to and registered as an official document of the national-liberation movement by national and international cultural organisations. This document would accuse the imperial administration of plundering national cultures, expose the cruel oppression and despotic colonial Russification policies of Moscow in the area of education, and in the spiritual and cultural life of our nation, and in all branches of Ukrainian art. It would expose the appalling conditions of Ukrainian cultural artists, which include writers, poets, journalists, artists, cinematographers, playwrights, composers, and others, “individuals governed by fear”, and the discrimination and lowered esteem they have to face as creators and promoters of the national spirit. The document would expose before the world the scale of this injustice from the viewpoint of the freedom of creativity, the oppression of censorship, the absolute government control over publications, theatre, cinema, the total depen-

dence of our cultural activists upon Moscow and its political party apparatus as regards decisions concerning questions of individual contacts and official relations with cultural leaders of foreign nations, especially those of the West and Ukrainian émigrés.

Of the viable tasks, which are awaiting action, one, which calls for immediate action, is an appeal to the participating countries of the Olympic Games, to the International Olympic Committee, to the individual national Olympic Committees, to athletes and youth of the world, especially to Ukrainian youth, about the legal right of Ukrainians to establish a Ukrainian Olympic Committee. This should be a separate sovereign national entity. The establishment and admission of the Ukrainian Olympic Committee into the International Olympic Committee would be the basis of the participation of Ukraine in the Olympic Games with its own national team.

With an analogous, but separate document, the movement would naturally turn to international sports organisations — European and world-wide — about the necessity of the acceptance of Ukraine in concretely defined organisations as a full-fledged and sovereign member. In addition, this document would stress the need to admit Ukrainian national teams to participate in athletic competitions in the same capacity as national teams of other sovereign states, especially the team of the so-called USSR. In the event of Moscow's disagreement, in order to satisfy the demands of the Ukrainian national-liberation movement and the propositions of international athletic organisations before the world athletic community, there is the obligation to boycott the chauvinistic imperialist athletic policy of Moscow and bar it from entering its all-imperial team into international competitions.

As a political and legal basis for their declaration on Ukraine's right to sovereignty, the world community and the governments of Western countries need materials and documents, which would support their and our demands for the sovereignty of Ukraine. Herein lies another fundamental task of the movement. We are confronted with the need to gather, edit and publish volumes of materials and documents, which, in every instance, would clarify and expose all the aspects of the Ukrainian national tragedy. These materials should be edited and published in the form of a "White Book". This book should be presented to all the governments of member-states of the United Nations, to government and political leaders, to influential international organisations, to political parties and associations, academic and public libraries, and to pub-

lishers with means of national mass information, as one of the notable official documents of the Ukrainian national-liberation movement. This task, in its full capacity and on an appropriate academic and diplomatic representative level, can be accomplished by our diaspora on behalf of, and with the active participation of, the national forces of liberation on the territory of Ukraine. In past years, this extremely useful and imperative work was carried out by various organisations and individuals, who gathered and edited such materials. But they have never been uniformly structured, brought together into one document and presented to official international institutions as the Official Document of Ukraine and this is what is precisely needed at this time.

A White Book about the black crimes of the Russian occupants

“The White Book of Ukraine” must combine the materials and documents on the Ukrainian National Revolution of 1917-1920, the formation of the fully accredited Central Rada, the proclamation of independence, the widespread support, the triumph and uplifting of the entire population, the government and state sovereignty of Ukraine, and its territorial integrity. It should include documents and materials on the unprovoked aggression of Moscow, the military resistance, the establishment of the Ukrainian army and the military campaigns of the newly-formed state and its diplomatic attempts to stop the aggression, as well as documents and materials about the occupation, the general national resistance, the extensive underground and partisan warfare directed against the occupant — a struggle, which has not ceased from the first days of the occupation to the present time. It should include documents and materials on the local puppet administrations established by the occupant — their purely administrative-territorial and not national design and character; on the dense network of garrisons of the occupant’s army, and the general distrust towards Ukrainians (in fact the mutual distrust and hatred); on the illegality of the establishment of the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The collected documents and materials would require careful editing and the inclusion of a scholarly foreword, which would give them such great significance and direction that the foreword itself would become yet another powerful document and base of support for our demands. The “White Book” as a whole

would be an argumentative accusation against the criminal aggression and the political-warfare banditry of Russian communism and at the same time would provide evidence of the rights and political validity even in our own time, of those acts of statehood and government institutions, which were functioning at the moment of aggression, occupation and annexation of the entire Ukrainian territory and were illegally liquidated by the occupant in the ensuing years.

The documents on our history, collected and edited along these lines, and published as "The White Book", are today required as a factual collective document of the national-liberation movement, and also as a historical introduction and foundation of the right of Ukraine to independence and statehood. It is also necessary to have this book as a source of the movement's official materials and documents (or the sum total of such documents) for foreigners, and to convey it to the governments of Western countries, to their parliaments, to congresses, international fora, competent organs of the United Nations and to sessions of the General Assembly during debates. It would be utilised as a primary source by political and social leaders through means of mass information agencies for the illustration and address of this or that Ukrainian problem. This type of "book" is very timely, regardless of the fact that the West has access to various information in a list of established monographs. The *Encyclopaedia of Ukraine* is an all-encompassing academic reference work for a more detailed orientation and understanding of the great complex of the Ukrainian question and our history. What is needed is a storehouse of documents and materials, which has to be collected, edited and presented to the world as the official document of the national-liberation movement.

The "White Book" will also be of service to the younger generation of Ukrainians, who are dutifully interested in that era of Ukrainian history, which is hidden most of all behind the screen of profanity and falsified debris, and, which encompasses the triumph of national strivings, the years of statehood, and our tragedy — the aggression and liquidation of the independent life of the nation, and the existence of the nation in captivity until the present day. It would clearly illustrate the reasons for the loss of independence and evoke searches for means for its re-establishment. This "book", one would like to believe, would become a fitting reply to the occupant, who, in a fervour of propaganda frenzy, terms our right and demand for independence and sovereignty "an attempt to dismember Russia (!)" and bases this argument on "the

historical accuracy of boundaries (!?)". These are precisely "the boundaries" set out by the occupant, which are marked by rivers of Ukrainian blood and paved with 20 million martyrs, who died during and after the unprovoked aggressive war and the annexation of the sovereign Ukrainian state. Bearing in mind that a specific term for crimes against individuals, nations and humanity does not exist, such a "White Book" would become a glaring exposure of the perfidy, falsehood, unprecedented brigandage and insolence of the aggressor and occupant and a "warning beacon" for the Christian free world. With the mottos "People be vigilant", "For our and your freedom" and "Help us and you will save yourself", and edited on an appropriately high intellectual level, it will become one of the strongest and most prized documents of our time. It will set the standard for political and national thinking, gauge the questions and political demands of the generation, which clearly manifested itself in the 1960s and unselfishly worked for the independence of Ukraine in the following decade. It is worth remembering that, once disseminated, the "book" will be of added value both as a school text-book and as an historical source. This is due to the fact that in the major cities of Ukraine we do not yet have the possibility of rebuilding the illegally functioning university centres, in which the youth would systematically be able to supplement their education in the fields of history, sociology and political sciences.

The Nuremberg Trials of Nazi war criminals established a judicial precedent. In their essence and aims, communism and Nazism are two identical models of imperialism. Presently, there are not enough statistical data to make an accurate comparison evaluation in its entirety of which of these political systems generated more crimes against individuals, nations and humanity. Moreover, it has long been accepted that Russian imperialism is no less guilty of such crimes than Nazism.

The time to organise and hold an international trial of Russian communism is getting near. Appearing as the nation, which suffered the most, and at the same time, as one of the primary accusers, Ukraine has substantial material to present against the criminals. In keeping with this perspective, the national-liberation movement is faced with a task of great magnitude — to gather materials and documents about those tortured, those destroyed by famine and those that were murdered in prisons and concentration camps, along the lines of a testament on freedom and statehood, which is passed on from generation to generation. At the same time, these documents would jointly and independently

expose these crimes and serve as an accusation against communist imperialist Moscow. Each particular theme would have to make use of all the documents and materials, which would support the specifics of each of the crimes. For example:

- 1) The forced collectivisation and artificially created famine.
- 2) The mass deportation of Ukrainians, in shocking and inhuman conditions, to the barren uninhabited Siberian fringes of the empire and the resultant death of hundreds of thousands of people.
- 3) Genocide and terror on the territory of Ukraine in the 1930s and 1940s, resulting in the deaths of millions of people.
- 4) The barbaric destruction of national monuments and cultural treasures, that is, crimes against culture.
- 5) Crimes against religion. The forced liquidation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Catholic Church.
- 6) The criminal exploitation of the natural resources of our nation.
- 7) The total forced assimilation and systematic resettlement of millions of Ukrainians from the territory of Ukraine to alien territories after World War II.

This will indeed be a grandiose work — grandiose as regards its meaning for Ukraine and the influence it will have over both our own and world society as a whole, as well as its very size. It will consist of dozens of volumes. To give it impetus and to begin the publication of the documents, materials, accusations of victims, and the testimonies of eyewitnesses to each of the crimes — to realise this even partially, but on a high scholarly and judicial level — is one of the greatest and most pressing tasks of this generation. The documents and materials about the crimes committed by Moscow should also be published in the format of the “White Book” or, more precisely, the “Black Book” of the blood-red communist criminals. Each individual document, or group of documents, which today expose the crimes of the imperialist administration in Ukraine or beyond its borders against the Ukrainian people, particularly in Russian prisons, made public by the national-liberation movement on the territory of Ukraine, or perhaps beyond its borders, should be presented with the motto “To the book of crimes of Russian

imperialism against the Ukrainian nation. For the registration of the blatant violations of human and national rights in this sphere”.

In the above discussion, I gave a brief description of the tasks, which appear on the daily agenda of the two component parts of our forces of national liberation, that is, of the joint activity of the movement inside Ukraine and the Ukrainian diaspora, or so to say, of the external political tasks of the nation. . .

The KGB and its collaborators

The KGB of Lviv prides itself on its experience, its highly perfected organised operating service, its highly qualified members, its all-encompassing means of surveillance and so on (and we will add: primarily its extreme forms of cruelty, high-handedness, total impunity, its complete all-encompassing system of all-round security and its unscrupulousness, exceptional even among the most compromised analogous services in the world, which the KGB applies to the participants of the movement). It boasts that work in the Lviv region is on a higher level than even the Moscow KGB can attain, and that KGB experts from Moscow and other cities of the empire are posted to the administration of this region for an “exchange of experience”. Perhaps the Moscow KGB indeed travel to Lviv for further training and to “polish up” their knowledge. Our information on this lacks verification. But the experience of the Lviv participants of our movement proves this to be, as a rule, only a self aggrandisement! . . . They are experienced perhaps from the point of view of their intolerance, their fabrication of cases, falsification of protocols of interrogations and deductions from expertise, groundless accusations and in their terrorisation of the families of political prisoners! The Lviv KGB always operates on an intense level due to the “specific” conditions, as they are called by the KGB and imperial administrators, of this part of Ukraine — that is, the high level of national consciousness, the political activism of the general population, the traditions of the national-liberation movement, which continuously arises from the ashes like the Phoenix. All of these factors compel the KGB to concentrate the best forces at its disposal in the Lviv region, primarily in Lviv itself. In Ukraine, a similar intense level of work apparently also exists in the Kyiv administration. Taking this and a series of other factors into account, one can see that the optimal opportunities for

printing work, both from the point of view of technical opportunities, as well as conspiracy, lie in major urban centres.

Recently, the collaborators and writers for the KGB, who deal with the so-called nationalistic and dissident themes in the press, have raised their voice. In reality, this is not their voice. They are only mere puppets in the propaganda theatre of the imperial apparatus, who, like puppets, are simply manipulated in an attempt to fill with their writings the ideological vacuum, which surrounds the masses — a vacuum, which has existed for a long time, and is today spreading and growing like an avalanche. Having become aware of the colossal potential of this force, the bureaucratic apparatus and its lackeys are in a state of panic. They are afraid of the population and attempt to frighten and stun it. To accomplish the dirtiest jobs, they recruit renegades, degenerates and the dregs of society. Incontestably, the piping “choir” of all these Myhals, Hamolskys, Toporovskys and others cannot stop this avalanche. The strength of the nation will sooner or later sweep them away without trace, just as all kinds of rubbish disappears without trace. There cannot be any doubt that they are the direct and, at the same time, the most consistent agents of the KGB. Nevertheless, the exposure of their shameful position does not give them cause for alarm. Firstly, they have languished for a long time in an atmosphere of general scorn, boycotted by the Ukrainian community. Secondly, speculating on the total power of the KGB to insure themselves against a boycott in their immediate vicinity, these renegades openly “pride” themselves on their role among the ranks of the recruited agents, with cynical frankness. The amorality and dishonour of such a role is of no concern to them. After all, dregs of society and degenerates have atrophied understandings of honour, dignity and patriotism. Their patriotism is towards their own cravings.

The situation not only concerns them or their human qualities. From a review of the social situation, the progressively larger circulation and the feverish passing of works on favourable themes, and the more frequent “conventions”, “meetings”, “lectures”, anti-Ukrainian evenings and so on, to which people are driven under duress, especially when there are appearances of a derogatory nature about our liberation struggle for sovereignty and independence or against individuals of the movement, is a good indication, proper evidence, of the hatred felt towards the occupant and the anti-national measures he forcibly organises. Coupled with this, it serves as a convincing attestation to the massive gravitational force of the materials of the movement, the mass interest in

foreign radio broadcasts, and the longing for national independence. As a result, neither the efforts of the paranoid lackeys, who attempt to eclipse the sun, nor their manic lies represent a serious counter-force. Naturally, it is not worth firing a cannon at sparrows. And when, following the wave of the imperial conductor's baton, these degenerates gather together in a jackal-like mob and take full advantage of the great possibilities of the resources of mass information with full immunity for their written attempts to eclipse the sacred goal of their own nation — its striving for sovereignty and statehood — or when they insult and publicly persecute the self-sacrificing bearers of these ideals, then the nation must realise what kind of dregs of society are holding the pen; that these renegades dance their snake dance to someone else's tune, and that the occupant relies on them in the pursuit of his colonial policy.

INDEX

- Achilles, 57
 Alexis Mikhailovich, Tsar, 107
 Andreyev Leonid, 62, 108
 Andriyashyk R., 56, 57
 Antes, 13, 15
 Anti-Bolshevic Bloc of Nations (ABN), 109
 Antonenko-Davydovych Borys, 58, 106, 108
 Antonovych Volodymyr, 68, 110
 "Arkhyenkism", 55, 107
 Arkhyenko Oleksander, 55, 107
 Association of Ukrainian Youth (SUM), 110

 Baida, see Vyshnevetsky Dmytro, Prince
 Bandera Stepan, 66, 107, 109
 Bantysh-Kamensky Dmytro, 68, 110
 BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation), 120
 Bely Andrey, 62, 108
 Berdnyk Oles, 28, 57, 106
 Berdyayev Nikolay, 62, 108
 Berdychiv, 94
 Berezhany, 94
 Bilhorod, 35, 98
 Bilomorka, 93
 Bilyk Ivan, 57, 101
 Blok Aleksander, 16
 Boholyubov Mykola, 71, 110
 Bondarchuk Serhiy, 71, 110
 Boychuk Mykhailo, 58, 108
 Brezhnev Leonid, 103
 Bukovyna, 63
 Bunin Ivan, 62, 108

 Caesar, 57
 Carter Jimmy, President of the USA, 74
 Catherine the Great, Empress, 111
 Central Rada, 157
 Cherednychenko, 89
 Chernyakhivsky culture, 13
 Chornovil Vyacheslav, 28, 58, 106
 Chortkiv, 94
 Chubaty Mykola, 17
 Chukhrai Hryhoriy, 71, 110

 Chuzhbynsky Oleksander, 68, 110
 Chyzhevsky Dmytro, 68, 110
 Cleopatra, 57

 Dante's hell, 50
 Danube, 13
 Danylenko, 89
 Declaration of the UN on Decolonisation, see UN Declaration on Decolonisation (1960)
 Desna, 13
 Dmytruk A.K., see Halsky Klym
 Dobromyl, 94
 Dontsov Dmytro, 68, 110
 Doroshenko Dmytro, 68, 110
 Dostoyevsky Fyodor, 62, 108
 Drahomanov Mykhailo, 64, 108
 Drohobych, 94

Editor Kark, 18
 EEC (European Economic Community), 92
 Encyclopaedia of Ukraine, 156

 Fedorchuk Vitaliy, 125
Facets of a Crystal, The, 5, 27, 29, 33, 105-107
Facets of Culture, The, 5, 6, 9, 10, 107

 Gaul, 12
 General Assembly of the UN, 7, 128, 153
 German Station, see German Wave
 German Wave (Radio), 120, 141

 Halan Yaroslav, 87, 114
 Halsky Klym (alias A.K. Dmytruk, colonel of the KGB), 90
 Halychyna, 52, 63
 Hamolsky, 162
 Helsinki Final Act, 83
 "Herostrates", 83
 History of Rus' also History of the Rus' People, see *Istoria Rusov*
 Holoborodko Vasyl, 58, 108
 Honchar Oles, 57, 107
 Horska Alla, 28, 106

Horyn Mykhailo, 28, 106
 Hoverla Stepan, 5, 6, 7
 Hrinchenko Borys, 68, 110
 Hrushevsky Mykhailo, 66, 68, 105, 109
 Hryhurko Ivan, 56, 107

 Illyrians, 14
 Institute of History of the Academy of
 Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, 70
 International Olympic Committee, 8, 156
Internationalism or Russification?, 5, 6, 27,
 33, 89, 105, 106
Istoria Rusov, 68, 109
 Ivanychuk Roman, 57
 Ivanysenko Viktor, 58, 108
 Ivasiuk Volodymyr, 52

Kalynshevsky, 57
 Kalynets Ihor, 58
 Kalynets Iryna, 58, 107
 Kalyta Ivan, 18
Kanal, 56
 Karavansky Svyatoslav, 106
 Karnal, 56
 Kharkiv, 79
 Khlebnikov Viktor, 62, 108
 Khrushchev Nikita, 101
 Khmelnytsky Bohdan, Hetman, 107
 Khvoyka Vikentiy, 12
 Khvylovy Mykola, 18, 22, 64, 66, 108
 Kluchevsky Vasiliy, 62, 108
 Kolyma, 93
 Komarno, 94
 Komsomolsk-na-Amuri, 94
 Konovalets Yevhen, Colonel, 66, 105, 109
 Konysky Oleksander, 68, 110
 Korol Mykhailo, 71, 110
 Korzh Viktor, 58, 108
 Kostenko Lina, 58, 106, 107
 Kostomarov Mykola, 68, 110
 Kotsyubynsky Yuriy, 64, 108
 Kovel, 94
 Kozlovsky Ivan, 71, 110
 Krasivsky Zenon, 141
Krovna Sprava, 56
 Kryvychi, 14
 Kuban, 35, 93, 98
 Kudlyk Roman, 58

Kulish Panteleimon, 68, 110
 Kupala, Yanka, 14
 Kurbas Les, 22, 64, 108
 Kursk, 35, 98
 Kyi, Prince, 109
 Kychko, 87, 89
 Kyiv-Halych Patriarchate, 83
 Kyivan Rus', 13, 15, 17, 65, 108

 Lenin, Vladimir Illych, 16, 18, 21, 22, 136
 Leontochna culture, 15
 Leontovych Mykola, 22
 Leontiev Konstantin, 62
 Lepky Bohdan, 68, 110
 Lisovy V., 141
Literaturna Ukraina, 69, 105
 Lukash Mykola, 58, 108
 Lukyanenko Lev, 28, 106, 141
 Lutsk, 94
 Lviv, 78, 79, 94
 Lypa Yuriy, 68, 110
 Lytvyn Yuriy, 141

 Macedonians, 14
 Magadan, 93
 Maksymovych Mykhailo, 68, 110
 Malanyuk Yevhen, 68, 110
Malva, 57
 Markovych Oleksander, 68, 110
 Mazepa Ivan, Hetman, 66, 109
 Melnychuk, 87, 98
 Merezhkovsky Dmitri, 62, 108
Mech Areya, 57
 Mikhnovsky Mykola, 68, 110
 Mirchuk Ivan, 68, 110, 148
 Moroz Valentyn, 58, 106, 107
 Moscow Patriarchate, 81
 Mushketyk Yuriy, 107
 MVD (Soviet Ministry of the Interior),
 148
 Myhal Taras, 87, 89, 162

 Nabokov Vladimir, 62, 108
 National Olympic Committees, 8, 156
 Nero, 82, 122
Nicholas, the Gendarmes, and Literature,
 19
 Norylsk, 94

- Novy Myr*, 70
 NKVD, 94
 Novychenko Leonid, 70, 110
 Nuremberg, 159
- Oder, 12
 Ogyrtsov, 118
 Ohiyenko Ivan (Metropolitan Ilarion), 68, 110
 Oka, 13
 Olympic Committees, 156
 Olympic Games, 8, 156
 OUN (Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists), 85
- Padalka Ivan, 22
 Pasternak Yaroslav, 12, 68, 110
 Pavlyk Mykhailo, 68, 110
 Peter I (The Great), 15, 35
 Pereyaslav, Treaty of, 107
 Petlura Symon, 66, 105, 109
 Plachynda Serhiy, 58, 108
 Pogodin Mykola, 62, 108
 Podolykovsky, 68
 Polianians, 109
Poltava, 57
 Poluden Nikolai (General of the KGB), 78
 Popadyuk Zoryan, 141
Prince Serebryany, 17
 Prypyat, 12, 13
 Pushkin Aleksandr, 14
- Radio Liberty, 88, 89, 120, 121
 Radymychi, 14
 Romm Mikhail, 71, 110
Rozhin, 56
 Rudenko Mykola, 28, 106, 111
 Rudenko P., 103
 Ryazan, 18
 Rymarenko, 89
- Sambir, 94
 Samchuk Ulas, 66, 68, 109
Samvydav, 6, 120
 Second World War, see World War II
 Sedlyar Vasyl, 22
Scythians, *The*, 16
- Shabatura Stefania, 46, 58, 107
 Shcherbytsky Volodymyr, 20, 125
 Shelest Petro Yu., 70, 110
 Shelukhyn S., 68, 110
 Sheptytsky Andriy, Metropolitan, 66, 82, 109
 Shevchenko Taras, 14
 Shevchuk Valeriy, 108
 Shukhevych Roman (Gen. Taras Chuprynka), 103, 111
 Sklaviny, 12, 14
 Skovoroda Hryhoriy, 18
 Skrypnyk Mykola, 64, 108
 Skyrda Lyudmyla, 58, 107
 Slipyj Josyf, Cardinal, 82, 83
 Slovans, 14
 Smal-Stocky Roman, 68, 110
Sobor, 57
 Solomon, 57
 Solovyov, 19, 62
 Solovyov Sergei, 108
 Solovyov Vladimir, 62, 110
 Soroka Mykhailo, 103, 111
 Sreznevsky Izmail, 68, 110
 Stalin, 107
 Stalinism, 56
 Stanislaviv, 94
 Stetsko Yaroslav, 66, 103
 Struve Pyotr, 62, 108
 Stryi, 94
 Stupak Yuriy, 58, 108
 Stus Vasyl, 46, 58, 107
 Stasiv-Kalynets Iryna, see Kalynets Iryna
 Sverstyuk Yevhen, 28, 58, 105, 106
 Svitlychny Ivan, 28, 58, 106
 Svyatoslav, Prince, 18
 Symonenko Vasyl, 22
- Tanyuk Les, 58, 71
 Tayshet, 94
 Ternopil, 94
 Tershakivets Zenon, "Fedor", 103, 111
 Tolstoy Aleksey, 17, 18
 Toporovsky, 162
 Traky, 14
 Trypillian culture, 12, 15
 Tsokh, 87, 89
 Tursky Bulgars, 14

- Tychyna Pavlo, 28, 106
 Tyutyunnyk Hryhoriy, 58, 108
- Ukraina Society, 27, 105
 Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, 9, 81, 110, 160
 Ukrainian Catholic Church 9, 81, 82, 84, 160
 Ukrainian Group to Monitor the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords (also Ukrainian Helsinki Group and Ukrainian Helsinki Monitoring Group), 49, 106-107
Ukrainian Herald, The, 106
 Ukrainian National Republic, 60, 66, 109, 150
 Ukrainian Olympic Committee, 8, 156
 Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union, 106
 Uman, 94
 Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (SVU), 110
 Union of Writers of Ukraine (also Union of Ukrainian Writers, Writers' Union of Ukraine, Union of Writers), 44, 45, 57, 106, 107, 108
 United Nations (UN), 7, 33, 92, 153, 155, 156
 United Nations Declaration on Decolonisation (1960), 7, 128
- Vernadsky Yury, 17
 Viatychi, 98
 Vinhranovsky Mykola, 58, 108
- Voice of America (Radio), 120
 Volga, 13
 Volodymyr the Great, Prince and Saint, 109
 Volyn, 63
 Vorkuta, 94
 Voronizh, 35, 98
 Vynnychenko Volodymyr, 66, 68, 109
 Vynnytsia, 94
 Vyshnevetsky Dmytro, Prince, 109
 Vyshnya Ostap, 64, 108
- "White Book of Ukraine", 9, 156, 160
 World War II, 9, 39, 61, 101, 128, 160
- Yaroslav the Wise, Prince, 109
 Yavornytsky Dmytro, 68, 110
 Yefremov Serhiy, 68, 110
 Yevdokymenko, 89
 Yugov Aleksey, 57, 107
 Yurkevych Pamphil, 68, 110
- Zahrebelny Pavlo, 56, 117
 Zalyvakha Opanas, 46, 58, 107
 Zaporizhian Sich, 66, 92, 109
 Zarubinetsky culture, 13
 Zdorovy Yaroslav, 141
 Zerov Mykola, 68, 110
 Zhdanov Andrey, 107
 Zhdanovism, 56, 107
 Zhylenko Iryna, 58, 107
 Ziber Mykola, 68, 110
 Zolochiv, 94

