

VALENTYN MOROZ

PROTEST FROM UKRAINE



UKRAINIAN INFORMATION SERVICE

VALENTYN MOROZ

# AMONG THE SNOWS

PROTEST WRITINGS FROM UKRAINE

Translated and edited  
by W. Mykula, B.A., B. Litt.

UKRAINIAN INFORMATION SERVICE  
LONDON 1971

## CONTENTS

THE TRIAL OF VALENTYN MOROZ	3
HOW THE TRIAL OF MOROZ WAS PREPARED .....	4
FURTHER DETAILS ABOUT THE TRIAL	10
"I AM ANXIOUSLY WAITING..." Open letter to Chairman of the KGB from Raïsa Moroz	13
<i>Valentyn Moroz</i> : AMONG THE SNOWS .....	15
SOME UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS IN THE USSR	36
EXAMPLES OF ADMINISTRATIVE PERSECUTION FOR CONVICTIONS	43
<i>Mykhailo Horyn</i> : LETTER OF PROTEST TO CAMP COMMANDANT .....	49
<i>Mykhailo Horyn</i> : LETTER OF PROTEST TO MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE UKRAINIAN SSR	51
KARAVANSKYI'S SENTENCE EXTENDED	55
THREE YOUNG UKRAINIANS CONVICTED IN DNIPRO- PETROVSK .....	57
TRIAL OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL FRONT	59
REPRISALS AGAINST MOROZ' WIFE AND FRIENDS .....	61
THE TRAGIC DEATH OF ALLA HORS'KA .....	65

*Published by Ukrainian Information Service  
London, 1971.*

*Printed by Ukrainian Publishers Ltd.,  
200 Liverpool Road, London, N1 1LF. Tel.: 01-607 6266/7.*

# THE TRIAL OF VALENTYN MOROZ

A 14-year sentence for expression of opinions



**VALENTYN MOROZ**, a Ukrainian teacher of history, has been sentenced altogether to 14 years imprisonment for daring to speak up against the present terror regime in the USSR and to expose Moscow's Russification policy.

This cruel and barbarous sentence flies in the face of the UN General Declaration of Human Rights which guarantees to each individual the right to voice freely his opinions (Art. 19).

The mock trial of Valentyn Moroz is typical of Soviet "justice." He is only one from among thousands convicted to long terms in prisons and concentration camps for attempting to voice their honestly held opinions. Even today there are still 500,000 political prisoners in Russian jails and forced labour camps, and the majority of them are Ukrainians.

## HOW THE TRIAL OF MOROZ WAS PREPARED

(Information from the *Ukrains'kyi Visnyk*, No .3, unofficial journal, published clandestinely in Soviet Ukraine)

On June 1, 1970, the KGB again arrested the Ukrainian public figure, historian and writer, Valentyn Moroz, in Ivano- Frankivsk.

Valentyn Yakovych Moroz was born on April 15, 1936 in the village of Kholoniv, Horokhiv district, Volyn region of Ukraine, into a peasant family. After completing his secondary education he took a degree from the Faculty of History, University of Lviv in 1958. Later he worked as a teacher in his native district and afterwards taught history at the Lutsk and Ivano-Frankivsk teacher's training colleges. He was also carrying on research for M.A. thesis on the revolutionary struggle of workers and peasants in Western Ukraine against the Polish bourgeois regime [before 1939].

On September 1, 1965, Valentyn Moroz was arrested at Ivano-Frankivsk and sent for preliminary investigation to Lutsk. He was charged with "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation aimed at subverting or weakening the Soviet regime" (Art. 62, § 1, of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR) for reading and distributing unofficially published articles and foreign publications (the book by I. Koshelivets, *The Present-day Literature in the Ukrainian SSR*, the articles, "Concerning the Trial of Pogruzhal'skiy", "The Answer to Vasyl Symonenko's Mother", and others). Disoriented by the unexpected arrest and investigation methods, V. Moroz confirmed the testimonies by a number of people and partly admitted committing an offence by his actions. But he did not give up his views and at a trial in Lutsk in January, 1966 (his trial was open), he defended them. He was sentenced to four years of imprisonment in hard labour camps and sent to Mordovia. During his imprisonment he actively protested against his conviction and sentence and against the actions on the part of the prison camp authorities and was punished for it several times. Moroz spent only several months as ordinary prisoner in the concentration camp. The rest of the time he spent in penal cells, strict regime barracks (BURs) and prisons.

During imprisonment Valentyn Moroz finally formed his system of views. This is reflected in his publicistic work *Reportage from Beria Reserve* (dated 15th April, 1967) [which was smuggled out of the camp and was copied many times in Ukrainian and Russian clandestine publications.]

In autumn 1967 V. Moroz was transferred from Vladimir prison (near Moscow) to investigation prison of the KGB of the Ukrainian Republic in Kiev where he was kept for a time as witness in the case of V. Chornovil, and later as accused for preparing and disseminating the *Reportage*. V. Moroz fully boycotted the investigation

which lasted more than a year and was closed at the beginning of 1969 owing to lack of evidence regarding his authorship. V. Moroz was then sent back to Vladimir prison from where he was released on September 1, 1969.

After the release and until his new arrest, V. Moroz was all the time unemployed. He made attempts to find a job (as an apprentice wood-carver, meteorological assistant, etc.), but obstacles were always put in his path. He was permitted only to work as building worker which he refused.

From his very first days at liberty, V. Moroz actively joined in the public life. He wrote three publicistic works ("Moses and Dathan",\* "The Chronicle of Resistance" and "Among the Snows") in which he touched on the acute problems of the national existence of the Ukrainian people and national ethics.

Valentyn Moroz's articles written in a talented manner and dealing with crucial problems became popular and called forth lively, and sometimes sharp polemics among the Ukrainian intellectual circles (especially his article "Among the Snows" written on the occasion of I. Dzyuba's letter [of contrition] to the Presidium of the Union of Writers of Ukraine). Prior to his second arrest V. Moroz started to work on a big article about the national outlook of [the famous 19th century Ukrainian woman writer and poet] Lesya Ukraïнка (on the occasion of her 100th birthday).

In April, 1970, during Easter holidays, a provocation was staged involving V. Moroz in the village of Kosmach in the Hutsul area of Ukrainian Carpathians. Apparently following the instructions from above, local authority representatives wanted to arrest V. Moroz merely because he recorded the traditional Easter [or Spring] songs (*haïvky*), but the inhabitants of Kosmach prevented the arrest.

As soon as Valentyn Moroz returned from the Hutsul area, a group of KGB functionaries from Ivano-Frankivsk regional HQ (Major Baranov, Capt. Pryhornytskyi, Capt. Basystyi, Sen. Lt. Ostrolutskyi) came to his flat at the hostel belonging to the Teachers' Training College where he lived with his family, and carried out a search. They took away many old books (all of them he had in his room during three previous searches in 1965, 1967 and 1968, but they had not been impounded then), letters, notebooks, work diaries with various quotations and rough notes (most of them from the period of imprisonment, already checked by the KGB of the Ukrainian Republic), as well as tape recordings of folklore material.

During the search one copy each of the typescripts of V. Moroz's articles, "The Chronicle of Resistance" and "Among the Snows", as well as a number of letters or brief notes privately passed to V.

---

\* A negative personage from I. Franko's poem "Moses" (1905). Dathan leads a rebellion against Moses and tries to persuade the Jewish people to return to Egypt under the rule of the pharaohs.

Moroz where his articles had been mentioned, were also taken away. As became clear only later, a case against V. Moroz had already been initiated at that time, although Moroz himself was unaware of it.

In the middle of May, a search was carried out at the home of the Rev. Vasyl Romaniuk, the parish priest of Kosmach, in connection with V. Moroz's case. Note-books with various occasional notes and a great number of items of religious literature (mostly published prior to the Revolution) were taken away from him and have not been returned yet. Nothing relating to V. Moroz was found at Rev. Romaniuk's.

On June 1, 1970, Valentyn Moroz received the summons to appear at the regional office of the KGB where he was arrested. This happened exactly nine months after his release.

Simultaneously with the arrest of Moroz, on June 1, searches were carried out in Kiev, Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, and Ivano-Frankivsk region, at the residences of former political prisoners: Lyubov LEMYK (Ivano-Frankivsk), Oksana MESHKO (Kiev), Iryna SENYK (Ivano-Frankivsk), Vyacheslav CHORNOVIL (Lviv). Searches were also made at little town of Yaremche in the Hutsul area, at the homes of Moroz's acquaintances, where Moroz sometimes stayed during holidays, as well as at the house of the parents of the literary critic Volodymyr IVANYSHYN in the Rozhniativ district (Ivano-Frankivsk region). Another search was carried out at V. Moroz's flat, and all notes made during the month since the first search (especially the notes relating to the article about Lesya Ukraïnka) were taken away.

In Kiev and Lviv the KGB men behaved reasonably politely during the searches, but in Ivano-Frankivsk, where former members of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists movement were searched, they behaved in a rough manner, made use of threats and swear-words. For instance, the KGB men, Andrusiv and Zavhorodniy, who carried out a search at Lyubov Lemyk's house, used foul language (particularly Zavhorodniy), addressed her in a rude manner, and even carried out a body search, having completely undressed Lyubov Lemyk, her sister Maria and her niece Daryna, as well as completely strange person — Oksana Popovych, who accidentally came to see L. Lemyk, during the search. The brutal procedure of the body search was carried out with professional skill by a certain Anastasia Lavrentyeva [a Russian woman — Translator's note.] brought specially by the KGB men.

The KGB men behaved in a similarly brutal manner at Iryna SENYK's home.

During the searches, old editions of books, notebooks, manuscript notes, typescript material of a completely neutral character (poems, language and literary study articles, etc.), were taken away, and at V. Chornovil's even an old ikon has been impounded. Nothing forbidden, no article by Moroz, or anything relating to Moroz's case was

discovered at the premises of those searched (papers and other belongings or a part of them have already been returned to some of them).

A few days after Valentyn Moroz's arrest it became known that he was charged under Art. 62, § 2 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR which envisages a term of imprisonment from three to ten years. The case was conducted by the investigating officer of the Ivano-Frankivsk region KGB, Baranov [a Russian — Translator], assisted by the investigating officer Pryhornytskyi. Baranov is known as an old hand in the KGB where he was serving still in Beria's times. In 1949, for instance, he conducted a case of a group of students of the Polytechnical Institute in Lviv and of teen-age pupils from Zolochiv district in Lviv region. They had been accused of attempting to carry on anti-Soviet propaganda. On the basis of the investigation carried out by him, the three-man OSO (Special Conference) sentenced the students to 25 years imprisonment each, and the teen-age pupils — to 10 years each.

In 1965-1966, Baranov conducted the case of the painter Panas Zalyvakha who was subsequently sentenced under Art. 62 (anti-Soviet propaganda) to 5 years' imprisonment. Considering the "crime" uncovered by the investigation, the sentence given to P. Zalyvakha is regarded as exceedingly cruel even compared to the then similar sentences. Baranov was also one of the investigating officers who conducted the case of the Ukrainian National Front in 1967 which also ended with very severe sentences (from 6 to 15 years imprisonment).

The indictment against V. Moroz originally made much of the articles, "Moses and Dathan", "The Chronicle of Resistance" and "Among the Snows", as well as the humoristic story "I Saw Mohammed", whose authorship has been ascribed to Moroz by the KGB without sufficient evidence. But in so far as the above mentioned articles could hardly be termed anti-Soviet and sufficient proofs as to their "dissemination" could not be collected, the KGB went for a very doubtful — from the legal point of view — as well as inhuman and cruel step — from the ethical point of view.

Having no fresh incriminating material or testimonies regarding the "Reportage from Beria Reserve" at their disposal, the KGB nevertheless arranged for the annulment of their own decision about the closing of the case in connection with which Moroz had been charged for having written the "Reportage...", adopted in Spring of 1969. It appears that the KGB thus smacked itself in the face and gave its signature under the fact that it did not recognise any guarantees of justice and inviolability of person. Consequently, it seems that it would have been perhaps "more humane" and "more decent" to convict Moroz for his "Reportage..." in 1969 than to close his case then, to lure the man by short-lived liberty — and then to throw him again behind bars on the identical charge. Some people



connect this decision with the change of the boss of the KGB in the Ukrainian SSR (instead of Col.-Gen. Nikitchenko, dismissed in the summer of 1970, there came Fedorchuk).

About 30 people were questioned in connection with Valentyn Moroz's case. Testimonies by Volodymyr Ivanyshyn and O. Meshko (Kiev), O. Antoniv and Sheremetyeva (Lviv), D. Vozniak, L. Voly-niuk, L. Lemyk, R. Moroz [Valentyn's wife], O. Popovych, I. Senyk (Ivano-Frankivsk), B. Bobyak and Rev. V. Romaniuk (Kosmach) and a number of other persons have been more or less similar. All of them denied ever having read Moroz's articles or having heard about them. O. Antoniv, R. Moroz and L. Sheremetyeva who, apart from that, were again questioned about the "Reportage...", stated that they could not give any new testimonies in addition to those given in 1968.

Testimonies by B. Antonenko-Davydovych, A. Hors'ka, M. Plakhot-niuk, Yevhen Sverstiuk (all from Kiev) and V. Chornovil (Lviv) whose letters or notes had been taken away from V. Moroz, as well as by Ivan Dzyuba, to whom the article "Among the Snows" had been addressed were somewhat different. The painter Alla Horska stated that lines from her postcard mentioning "the flower among the snows" had been incorrectly interpreted, because they did not mean that she was acquainted with the article, "Among the Snows." Similarly, medical doctor Mykola Plakhotniuk denied any knowledge of Moroz's articles, having stated that he used several general phrases about these articles in order not to offend the author's vanity by admitting to Moroz that he had not read his articles. Vyacheslav Chornovil explained his letter in a similar way. He, too, refused to give any new testimonies about the "Reportage..." referring to the veracity of his statements in 1968-69. For several months before V. Chornovil refused to give any testimony at all until his papers and effects unlawfully taken away from him during the search were returned to him.

Only the critic Ivan Dzyuba and the writer Borys Antonenko-Davydovych confirmed that they were acquainted with some articles by Moroz. I. Dzyuba testified that V. Moroz gave him his article "Among the Snows", because that article had been written on the occasion of I. Dzyuba statement and was in fact addressed to him. B. Antonenko-Davydovych testified that V. Moroz gave him to read the unfinished article "Among the Snows" and "Moses and Dathan" and asked the writer to express his opinion which he did in a letter to Moroz.

It is noteworthy that all those questioned denied that Moroz's articles or conversations had anti-Soviet bias. V. Chornovil, in particular, insisted that his own statement on this matter be included in the record of the questioning, which was done. B. Antonenko-Davydovych, although viewing Moroz's ideas as mistaken, nonetheless denied that they were anti-Soviet. He also protested against the

attempt to interpret the fact that Moroz turned to him for literary advice as a fact of "dissemination." None of the questioned persons admitted that he had read or even heard about the work "I Saw Mohammed."

Thus the investigation which ended in the middle of October 1970 failed to assemble any fresh evidence that V. Moroz was the author of the "Reportage from Beria Reserve" and in fact did not prove that he was the author of the humoristic story "I Saw Mohammed" either. It is not clear how the investigation has managed to prove that the article "Moses and Dathan", "The Chronicle of Resistance" and "Among the Snows" had anti-Soviet bias. The fact that V. Moroz showed two articles which in one way or another touched on the literary process, to two members of the Union of Writers of Ukraine — is an absolutely insufficient ground to assert that it amounted to "dissemination" of his articles by him personally. Nevertheless, without even having collected some formally sufficient evidence of guilt, the KGB found it possible to hand over his case to the court.

It is known that Valentyn Moroz behaved steadfastly, in a manly and dignified manner in prison. Immediately after his arrest he demanded that the investigation be transferred from Ivano-Frankivsk, basing his demand on the lack of competence and prejudice against him on the part of Ivano-Frankivsk KGB personnel. His demand was not satisfied. Then V. Moroz refused to take any part in the investigation. He departed from this principle only when B. Antonenko-Davydovych's testimony was read to him. Having denied the latter he nevertheless did not sign the record of the questioning. There was a confrontation arranged afterwards, during which V. Moroz again denied that he gave his articles to Antonenko-Davydovych personally. V. Moroz did not sign the record of the confrontation.

It is known that during the investigation V. Moroz wrote a letter to P. Yu. Shelest, in which he stated that his arrest was without any grounds, that it was the expression of powerless anger of the reactionary forces of society doomed to collapse. The letter was written in a sharp and principled manner without any requests to lighten his personal lot.

The "case" of Valentyn Moroz has now been handed over to the regional court. The date of the trial is not yet known. Moscow barrister Kogan (who conducted Sinyavsky's case in 1966) will defend V. Moroz. At first the well-known barrister V. B. Romm agreed to defend Moroz, but soon afterwards he was forbidden to hold brief at any political trials.

*Ukrains'kyi Visnyk* (Ukrainian Herald),  
No. 3, 1970.

## FUTHER DETAILS ABOUT THE TRIAL

The *Chronicle of Current Events*, No. 17 (31 December 1970), published clandestinely in Moscow, brings further details about the trial of Valentyn Moroz, the Ukrainian history teacher, now aged 35, about which we reported in the *Ukrainian Review*, No. 4 (1970).

Valentyn Moroz was arrested at his home in Ivano-Frankivsk (in Ukraine [60 miles SE of Lviv]) on 1 June 1970. The charge was brought under article 62 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR (equivalent to article 70 of the Russian Code).

The case of V. Moroz was heard behind closed doors on 17-18 November 1970 by the Ivano-Frankivsk Regional Court. The prosecutor was the Regional Assistant Procurator Horod'ko, defence counsel was E. M. Kogan (Moscow).

A few days before the trial twelve inhabitants of Lviv asked the chairman of the court to admit them to the trial. Two days later many of them were warned at their place of work that if they went to the trial they would be dismissed. Opanas Zalyvakha was reminded by the police that he was under surveillance, and was forbidden to attend the trial. Nevertheless people came to the trial from various towns. They were not admitted to the court-room.

I. Dzyuba (Kyiv), B. D. Antonenko-Davydovych (Kyiv), V. Chornovil (Lviv) and V. V. Bobyak (Kosiv) (the latter had not previously known Moroz), were summoned by the court as witnesses.

The witnesses and the accused refused to give evidence at a trial held behind closed doors, which they regarded as unlawful. Antonenko-Davydovych, citing the works of Lenin, declared that the trial was anti-Soviet. He added that he himself had twice been tried behind closed doors, that both sentences had much later been annulled by the Supreme Court as unlawful, and that he, Antonenko-Davydovych, had no wish to take part in a case for which he might later be convicted.

Witnesses Dzyuba, Chornovil and Antonenko-Davydovych stated that they would give evidence only at a public trial, if such a trial were to be held. Despite a protest by the defence counsel, the court resolved to hear the evidence given by the witnesses during the pre-trial investigation.

During the pre-trial investigation the writer B. D. Antonenko-Davydovych had testified that the discovery at his home of a draft of an article by Moroz proved only that he (Moroz) had gone to an older, more experienced writer for advice, but not that the documents mentioned in the charge had been circulated. Neither did the discovery in Dzyuba's possession of the article "Among the Snows"

prove that it had been circulated, since it was addressed to him. In addition Dzyuba insisted that "Among the Snows" was the personal affair of two people — the author and the addressee. (Moroz's article "Among the Snows" was written a propos I. Dzyuba's statement in the newspaper *Literaturna Ukraïna* of 6 January 1970.

The Procurator demanded for Moroz ten years' imprisonment and five years exile. Defence counsel asked the court to change the basis of the charge to article 187 — 1 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR (equivalent to article 190-1 of the Criminal Code of the Russian SFSR).

The court sentenced V. Moroz to nine years' confinement (six years in prison and three years in special-regime camps) and to five years' exile (V. Moroz was judged to be especially dangerous recidivist).

During the delivery of the sentence, party secretaries, directors of local establishments and officials of the KGB were present in court; of all the relatives and friends of the accused only his wife and father were admitted.

The witnesses submitted a protest to the appeal court.

*Ukrains'kyi visnyk*, No. 3 (1970), the clandestine publication appearing since Jan. 1970 in Ukraine, carries the following report:

"V. Moroz spent the night from 17th to 18th November, 1970, on the premises of the court. It seems that there were fears that attempts might be made to rescue him or to stage an ovation when he would be led out of the court-house... Valentyn Moroz was brought to the court-house under escort armed with automatic weapons. He turned to people who stood in front of the court-house with both arms raised and with clinched fists, which reminded one of Shevchenko's figure from the well-known picture by Opanas Zalyvakha.

The trial was accompanied with unheard-of in recent years in Ukraine security measures. Almost all the Ukrainians of Ivano-Frankivsk and Lviv, who were in the least likely to organise some sort of counter-action were put under the surveillance of secret police informers. Apart from maximum readiness of all the local security cadres, a great number of them arrived from other cities during these days, so that any possible opposition could be crushed in a quick operation.

Even before the trial KGB officials warned individual people that if they did not wish to be dismissed from their jobs they should not come near the doors of the court-house. The majority nevertheless elected to come to the court-house (e. g. Hrytsko Chubay, Opanas Zalyvakha).

Many leading people in Lviv and Ivano-Frankivsk responded to this trial behind closed doors with a great number of individual and group protests addressed to the appropriate government organs.

Apart from this response to the imprisonment of V. Moroz, there were other gestures, too. Two well-known Lviv poets (Ihor Kalynets and Hrytsko Chubay) devoted their new collections of poems to V. Moroz.

Valentyn himself was in good spirits (at least he made such an impression) and said that he was confident that changes would come as a result of which he would not have to spend full 9 years in those places to which he had been condemned by the laws of the "most democratic constitution" and of the "most progressive country in the world" . . .

Many witnesses were called to V. Moroz's trial, among them the well-known writer Borys Antonenko-Davydovych, Ivan Dzyuba, Vyacheslav Chornovil, who refused to give any testimonies."

# ***“ I AM ANXIOUSLY WAITING ... ”***

## **OPEN LETTER**

**To Chairman of the KGB (Committee of State Security) at the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR, comrade Fedorchuk.**

From day to day I am anxiously waiting for the end of the investigation and trial of my husband, MOROZ Valentyn Yakovych, charged under Art. 62, § 2 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR for “anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation.” While it is still not too late I beg you to intervene in Moroz’s case and, setting aside any prejudice, to consider well who will benefit from this trial. Will the condemnation of a person for openly expressed convictions, even if differing in many points from yours, contribute in any way to the strengthening of the prestige of our society, the prestige of socialist democracy?

I am wife and mother, you may consider my opinions biased. Therefore I do not express them. But I know that my husband’s arrest did not occur unnoticed. As Moroz’s wife I have been informed about a series of collective and individual statements in his defence addressed to various official bodies. It is likely that there have been more of them but I do not know about all of them. It means that a section of the society who signed the protests (for these people do not live in isolation and express not only their own opinions) regard Valentyn’s arrest illegal and even harmful to the moral sanity of our society. Is it worthwhile to throw away their opinion from the scales of consideration?

Finally, I have been greatly alarmed by the fact that the investigating officer of the Ivano-Frankivsk regional HQ of the KGB, having failed to find, of course, anything anti-Soviet in Valentyn’s articles written since his release, has again included in the indictment the “Reportage from Beria Reserve...”. After all Moroz has already been under investigation for a period of more than a year regarding the authorship and dissemination of this work. His case was then conducted by the investigation department of the Ukrainian Republic HQ of the KGB and at the beginning of 1969 found it possible to discontinue the investigation. At present, however, although the investigating organs of the KGB do not have any new evidence about the “Reportage...”, they — as has been stated to me — have included this work into the indictment. Can this not prompt in every thinking person the thought that there exist no permanent guarantees

of justice and legality in our country, and that a man's fate depends only on what trends take the upper hand at the given moment among these or those leading or investigating circles, or even on changes in the personnel of the functionaries of those organisations?

Are you also aware of the fact that foreign propaganda has already been utilising the very fact of Valentyn's arrest, and, without doubt, will utilise the fact of his condemnation to an incomparably greater extent? Or, perhaps, my husband will also be blamed for that and this will be taken as a reason for dealing with him more severely?

For four long years I waited with our small son for my husband and his father to come back from imprisonment the grounds for which still seem questionable to many people. And we were able to spend only nine months together. If one takes into account the article of the Criminal Code under which Valentyn is charged, long years of separation await us again, and prolonged physical and mental tortures wait for Valentyn.

Is this all really necessary for building the most just and the most humane society in the world?

In view of the fact that statements in defence of my husband have been addressed to various official bodies and may be unknown to you, I have decided to collect at least some of them and to send them to you.

Again and again I appeal to your objectivity, justice and humaneness.

Raisa Moroz  
wife and mother

8th October, 1970.  
The city of Ivano-Frankivsk,  
14 Naberezhna Street, Flat 85.

*Ukrains'kyi visnyk*  
(No. 3, October, 1970).

## AMONG THE SNOWS

*Translator's note.* The polemic essay "Among the Snows" published below is circulating in manuscript form in Ukraine as one of the documents of clandestine literature. Valentyn Moroz is reputed to be its author. The clandestine *Chronicle of Current Events* published in Russian, No. 14 from 30th June, 1970, mentions "Among the Snows" among other writings by V. Moroz.

"Among the Snows" reflects the broad discussion which is carried on within circles of Ukrainian patriots in Ukraine about the contents, character and tactics of self-defence of the Ukrainian nation against the pressure of Russification and the gross violation of the natural right of Ukrainians to be masters in their own land. The immediate stimulus for writing this essay was provided, evidently, by Ivan Dzyuba's statement made at the sitting of the Presidium of the Union of Writers of Ukraine in Kyiv on December 26, 1969, which was published in the newspaper *Literaturna Ukraina* on 6th January, 1970. As is known, Ivan Dzyuba made his statement under pressure after the wide dissemination of his work *Internationalism or Russification?* in the West.

---

March 1953. Moscow.

Crowds of sobbing people tightly pressed together, everybody is squeezed... Everyone presses on to get to the bier of the dead Leader. Scores of suffocated people and those trampled underfoot...

Many a foreigner, casual witness of the "nation-wide grief", was thinking: surely, it will take a hundred years before this fanaticism evaporates. But one did not have to wait very long. Three years later, the Leader (dead!) was put in the pillory and proclaimed a criminal. And... nobody breathed a word against. Of course, some people expressed their indignation, but privately... No one burned himself, no one even cut off his little finger. Where were all the fanatics — those who recently pressed on to get near to the sacred bier? There were none, it appears. There were only sleepy jades which did not even notice that they had been turned around and were being driven in a different direction. It became clear that the fanaticism was a tickled out one. It is easy to distinguish between false and genuine diamonds nowadays. It is more difficult to distinguish between genuine and tickled out emotions. By tickling oneself one can provoke not only artificial laughter. In the same way artificial tragicallness or fanaticism can be provoked. The greatest secret of the Stalinist



epoch consisted in that, despite the "tremendous pledges" of "loyalty" and "faithfulness", "readiness", it had nothing except the nihilist — the man who does not believe in anything. That meant that the jades thought they were really loyal, "faithful", "ready." They convinced themselves of it (it is easiest to convince oneself). But these were all tickled out feelings.

One cannot issue banknotes endlessly because they will become valueless. One cannot endlessly stuff a human head with words — because its result will be a similar devaluation. Devaluation of the word is the main moral problem which the Stalinist period has left behind. Epithets of the superior and superlative degrees, exclamation marks, appeals and summons — all this reached such a pitch of concentration that any real criteria disappeared. A huge air balloon, inflated to the limit, bearing boisterous slogans, left the earth and drifted away. And the leader himself did not know already where he would find himself and what winds were carrying him.

No one believed in any reality — neither in the reality of the obligations accepted by the collective farm brigade manager, nor in the reality of the evaluation given by a critic to a newly published poem. There came into being two worlds — finally differentiated from one another. The first consisted of week-days, where people breathed not only without heroism, but even without elementary honesty. And there was another world — the world of cinema and books, where Young Guardists<sup>1</sup> used to sing arias in front of the coal mine into which they were to be thrown down any minute [by the Germans]. The Young Guardists — as everything else which appeared in this inflated, unreal world — also were bound to become unreal.

No one said this loudly, but doubts gnawed all the time: Maybe all this is the same kind of "eye-wash" as the figure of yield in a collective farm, as the percentage of success in school exams, as the number of lectures organised by the "Knowledge" Society. "Sharks do not exist" — this logic of the excessively sober boy from Chukovsky's book became a tacit creed. A philistine very much liked to enjoy sensations of the kind that "Oleh Koshovyi<sup>2</sup> (did you hear that?) was not killed after all, but lives in West Germany, and that altogether all this is a pack of lies."

Devaluation of the word resulted in a terrible devaluation of all notions. Aim, ideal, heroism, heroic feat — all found themselves in the category of fancied notions. Firmly separated by his nihilism from anything spiritual, the "working man" threw everything overboard. Tychyna<sup>3</sup> was known only as a poet who "writes in verse, each time worse." What could one say about Tychyna's genius in conditions when no one took the very notion of genius seriously, when the mark of genius was associated with Demyan Byednyy,<sup>4</sup> when it was pinned to the trousers of any commissar.

For Ukraine — the tragedy was double — as was the case with all the “nationals” (i. e. non-Russians) of the Soviet Union. For such concepts as nation, patriotism, native language, Motherland, also found themselves in the register of the “fancied”, “bookish” fictions. A person who did not believe in anything was bound to become indifferent to Ukraine, too.

And so to this cold, burnt out place, from where even the ashes had been swept away by the wind long ago, there came the poets of the sixties — “Symonenko’s<sup>5</sup> generation.” Not everything was of value and profound in their first works. Nevertheless their arrival was an epoch. For they restored the lost weight to words and concepts, they compelled people to believe again in the reality of the spiritual world. Theirs was a genuine feat: in an atmosphere of total loss of faith to believe in something. And to kindle the faith in others.

“And people are waiting for nothing else so much as for a living example of heroic civic conduct. People need this example not because without it they cannot imagine genuine civic action, but because they need certainty that even today such heroic action is possible, that even today it is not fruitless.”

These words by Dzyuba<sup>6</sup> about Symonenko’s significance are in fact an evaluation of the role of the “poets of the sixties” as a whole. Each epoch had such awakeners who revived words and concepts after devaluation, gave them living contents again. Moral stupor was caused not only by the “cults” such as that of Stalin. It comes periodically when spirituality becomes senile, exhausts itself and gets covered with a hard crust. It happened so with the late Rome in which the sum of the old moral precepts, based on the worship of Venus and Jupiter, ceased to be obligatory, became formal, in which there was no longer a Mucius Scevola who calmly put his hand into fire.

Rome was renovated by Christians. What gave the strength to the illiterate Christian with his naïve preachings to overcome the Roman philosopher burdened with the load of Greek and pre-Greek wisdom? Maybe the Christian preacher knew something which was not known to the Roman philosopher? No, there was something quite different. The philosopher knew more than the Christian preacher. And in general: the essential difference is not what one knows and what the other fellow does not know. The essence of the matter consists in the degree of emotionality with which a person looks at this or that truth. One man simply knows it. Another lives by it. For one man this truth is simply information, knowledge. For another — it is a revelation without which life loses all meaning. A verity warmed in one’s soul to a certain “degree” becomes a value. Knowledge becomes faith. And only then a man begins to live. Lesya Ukraïnka termed this psychological state *oderzhymist’* (infatuation).

Infatuation is not artisticity. Nor scientificism. Nor even publicistic fervour. Infatuation is a completely different substance, along with others a necessary component for fully valued spiritual life. One can have wonderful ores but they will never become transformed into an alloy, will not become alive without the necessary temperature in an oven. One can have great spiritual values — but they will simply pass unnoticed as long as an infatuated person will not take hold of them and will not melt them in the hearth of his infatuation. The Finnish public in general did not realise what they possessed until Lönnroth collected the epic poem *Kalevala* and showed everyone what it was all about. There was Tychna and there were his verses of genius — but even with such a treasure in his hands he was not strong enough to make Ukrainians even out of those nearest to him, to bring them up so that they would speak Ukrainian. What was lacking? No spark of infatuation remained already on the cold open field covered with Siberian snows, none of those sparks which once used to fly in golden waterfalls and kindled the fire of the Ukrainian renaissance of the 1920s. But Symonenko or Vinhranovs'kyi<sup>7</sup> awakened the sleeping Ukrainian soul in people and made them alive again.

This was precisely the mission of the “poets of the sixties” — to carry a spark of infatuation into the frozen Ukrainian reality. Without it even Shevchenko was powerless. People used to read him but did not notice...

A tiny group of people in Kyiv scattered sparks all over Ukraine and where these fell — the age-old ice of indifference and nihilism thawed immediately. Their every word burned with infatuation, fanatical hatred towards the cold and slimy, with fanatical desire to speed up the end of the ice age in Ukraine.

You — loudmouths, haughty and fat-bodied,  
Bribe-takers, stuffed with grease,  
Who bow before a crayfish,  
And march to meetings in formation.

You — potbellied monks without faith,  
You — speculators with slimy tails,  
You — thick-skinned kettle-drums  
Pinned on ideological bones.

And the main thing was that the avalanche could not be halted. All that was put up against those people was built from ice — and ice instantaneously thawed from their sparks. The greatest surprise of the past decade was that the arrests of 1965 did not slow down, but rather speeded up the present-day Ukrainian rebirth. The era of the Great Terror has passed. The arrests did not frighten, but awakened tremendous interest — not only in Ukraine, but in the entire world. To apply reprisals against someone in the present-day conditions has meant to create an aureole for him, to make him a martyr

(irrespective of the fact whether this person suffered in actual fact or not).

This was a miscalculation... and they began to correct their mistake immediately. Ivan Svitlychnyi was released from prison although he was regarded as the "principal instigator." The tactics was changed continuously. Intimidation did not work? — this meant that it was necessary to compromise and disappoint people. The first achievement in this direction was I. Drach's article in *Literaturna Ukraïna*. It was necessary to force Drach<sup>8</sup> to clean Poltoratsky's<sup>9</sup> boots in public. This could be done by anyone, there was no shortage of candidates, but they wanted precisely Drach or someone from his circle to do it. *It was necessary to kill the legend about the poets of the sixties* — qualitatively a new kind of people, to show that there was nothing new in them, that Drach could write the same lampoons about "nationalists" as could Taras Myhal.<sup>10</sup> It was necessary to kill faith, enthusiasm, to extinguish the spark of infatuation and to turn people back again into a state of jaundiced nihilism. It was necessary to rob people of the example which warmed them and to convince them that their god was no god at all but a stage prop. Ivan Dzyuba announced a boycott of Drach after this article in *Literaturna Ukraïna*. The *infatuated one* could not do otherwise.

Now I recall this fact, reading Dzyuba's statement in the same *Literaturna Ukraïna*. The same foul language borrowed from the vocabulary of Poltoratsky fellows ("provocative hallucinations", "politicomaniac waste of words"), the same anathema on "nationalists"... There is no doubt; the slimy-tailed ones can congratulate themselves on a new success.

I have read the arguments advanced by Dzyuba, and also listened to the defenders of his statement. I listened and wondered: how petty and immaterial all this is... Among the reasons cited by the defenders of the statement are advanced the following ones: had Dzyuba not written his statement, his translation which is about to be published would have been banned from publication. His expulsion from the Union of Writers would have automatically resulted in him losing his job. Well, if these are serious reasons — then in such a case it is necessary to give up any plans whatsoever. Each step, each new work which contains any deviations from the canons of the poor Demyan, automatically results in smaller or greater unpleasantness. And who wishes to avoid it — has to fold his hands altogether and to do nothing.

The main sin which the defenders of Dzyuba's statement ascribe to us, its opponents, is *Don Quixotism*, absence of realism. Well, there is no need even to answer by their own arguments. One can take them from Dzyuba's speech made in 1965 when he still was of a different opinion about Don Quixots and the "realists":

"While they were magnanimous realists, knew well what was permissible and what was not, which cause was likely to win and which was not — at that time, in their period of commercial sobriety, Vasyl Symonenko was a hopeless Don Quixot, in Lesya Ukraïinka's words, he refused to admit the "historical gap" as a real gap and demanded something quite impossible: "Let Americas and Russias be quiet when I am talking with you" — and with whom he was talking [Ukraine — Transl.] was well known, and that was that; how impossible and hopeless was this all from the point of view of the learned and all-wise piglet."

"From the point of view of the learned and all-wise piglet" Dzyuba's speech at the ["Ukraïna"] cinema [in Kyïv] on September 4, 1965 was stark madness. It was the apogee of Don Quixotism: in the middle of a wave of arrests to come out with protests. "Commercial sobriety" dictated otherwise: sit still, stay silent and rejoice that not everyone has been apprehended. But "hopelessly Don Quixotic" Dzyuba was not satisfied with that even. He also published his book... and it became clear that this Don Quixotism produced greater results than the "realism" of all the all-wise piglets taken together. It so happens that flowers sown in the frost grow best. Those who, disregarding the weather, are weather for themselves, catch a cold least frequently. Here the paradox is purely external. The "realist" and the infatuated do not represent logic and illogicality themselves. They are simply representatives of *two types of logic*. The "realist" makes use of the short-legged earth-bound logic of the *present day*. But the point is precisely that the future is built in accordance with a different logic — the logic of *tomorrow's day*. And it can be discovered only by the infatuated. All discoveries, inventions, all that was new — was the handiwork of the Don Quixots. It is not always that the Don Quixots gropingly find a path into the future, sometimes they go astray. But it is not possible to get off the ground at all with the caution of the "all-wise piglets." Not all the flowers sown in the frost, grow. The majority of them die. But there is no other way. For the nation which for hundreds of years has been living through an ice age, in conditions of permanent winter, this is the only way out: "I shall sow flowers in the frost." And Ukraine herself is a flower — which has grown in the frost. Ukraine is the flower, breakstone. Ukrainian vitality is an a-logism, irreality, paradox, if one is to apply the logic of the "realists" — in the same way as the flowering of the edelweiss on the icy peaks. Ukraine lives thanks to a different logic the logic of infatuation. Only the infatuated one could be a Ukrainian in the conditions of Kyïv or Kharkiv in the 19th century when Ukraine was considered inexistent, buried. Only the infatuated one can be a Ukrainian in the same Kharkiv today when "all-wise piglets" are convinced that all the nations will soon be merged together into one and that there will no longer be a Ukraine in the next Seven Year Plan period. "Realists" in Ukraine never were Ukrainians,

they inescapably became Little Russians. Let us fear a "realist" like fire, if we want to be Ukrainians! From the point of view of the "realists" the Ukrainian cause has always been hopeless. Therefore it was always espoused by those who said to themselves: "to hope without hope", those who were not frightened by the "hopeless reality" and stubbornly followed their dream "like Israel followed the pillar of fire."

It has become a tradition among us to complain about our weakness. In actual fact Ukraine has shown a unique example of strength. Other nations in our conditions have long ago disappeared, became a Provence.\* We on the other hand have stood fast. What other prohibited language has produced such a rich literature? The firmness of the Ukrainian character must be truly considerable if both the Russians and the Poles said independently from one another the same: "Upryam kak khakhol" and "Uparty jak rusin" [Stubborn like a Ukrainian — Transl.] This is the basis of the strange Ukrainian firmness to find strength and hope in oneself, to be independent of outside sources of strength and hope. The command of Hryhoriy Skovoroda — "search for everything in yourself" — comes back to life in a Ukrainian again and again. A Jehovah witness once asked Levko Lukyanenko<sup>1</sup> in the Mordovian concentration camp: "Are you sure that your Ukraine is eternal?" He answered: "No, I am not sure because one cannot have any certainty in such matters." The Jehovah witness roared with laughter and drew the conclusion: "So you do not even know what you are fighting for. But I know that we, Jehovah's witnesses, will gain eternal life. What do you know then?" Lukyanenko then said: "Even if I remained the only Ukrainian in the world — I would continue my fight for Ukraine." Ukrainian vitality has been upheld precisely by this logic for several centuries already. Ukrainians who would not love Ukraine are miserably few. Ukrainians who would wish Ukraine to disappear from the face of the earth are fewer still. People are being Russified not because they do not love Ukraine or do not want her to exist. People are being Russified because they have not enough strength to believe in Ukraine, to keep up their faith in the filthy atmosphere of Kharkiv or Odessa where "dressing up in the language as in a suit — is not a shame, not a horror, but a norm." They need an example. "And people are waiting for nothing so much as for a living example" . . .

Not everyone discovered something new for himself in Dzyuba's book *Internationalism or Russification?* Nevertheless this book has become an eye-opener for everyone. That it was necessary to fight

---

\* ) It is interesting that Lunacharsky called Provence "French Ukraine", wishing thus to stress similar conditions which fell to the destiny of the two peoples. In these conditions, Ukraine survived while Provence ceased to exist as a nation and fell back to the level of a French province. — (The Author's note.)

against Russification — everyone knew. But this was not enough. It was necessary to see a real person who really fought against Russification. A spark was needed to kindle the bonfire in a man which was ready there long ago. It is precisely in this that lies the meaning of Dzyuba and of other poets of the sixties, in that spark of infatuation which they brought into the frozen Ukrainian reality. It is precisely here that an answer should be sought to the question why even some comparatively minor facts and events of the sixties have awakened such a great interest and evoked such a loud resonance. People searched in Dzyuba's book not for arguments — they searched there for *faith, a charge of infatuation*. From outside it looks as if a person is first being persuaded and then he begins to believe. In actual fact it is precisely the opposite: at first a person catches fire, is infected with faith — and only then arguments are selected for the already held conviction. In order to believe, arguments will be found. Sometimes they are naïve — but this does not matter.

Let us look around: are there many conscious Ukrainians in the Russified, shattered Kyiv? To increase their number means to fight really against Russification. Without it our work loses all meaning. A Russified, ruined Ukrainian, a person without his own "I", stands before us. What will awaken his sleeping Ukrainian soul? Arguments? It has not happened yet that an apostle converted anyone by arguments to his faith. Rhetorics and eloquence are powerless in this case. Christian apostles had neither.

"Limited, narrow-minded, uneducated, without any experience in the matters of propaganda, Jesus's disciples were small men in the full sense of the word." "The language of the authors of the New Testament is poor to such an extent that each of them has his own small vocabulary", Renan writes about them (E. Renan, *The Apostles*).

And those uneducated people without experience made the Roman Empire Christian within a short period of time. The Apostles! The present-day Ukraine needs apostles, not well-fed opportunists — "realists" with their arguments! No spiritual revolution happened without the apostles. Nor is the present-day Ukrainian rebirth possible without them.

The meaning of such figures like Dzyuba lies in their apostolic burning. Without it they vanish, become nothing. For them to become cool means to die. Let us be afraid of losing the sacred flame of infatuation! For only arguments will remain then, fat monographs will multiply, but all this will not awaken anyone. A cool sceptic with his rhetorics has never kindled anyone nor ever will. Dzyuba himself said best about it in 1965: "There are epochs when decisive battles are waged in the field of social morality, civic conduct, when even elementary human dignity, resisting brutal pressure, can become an important rebellious, revolutionary force. In our opinion,

our epoch, too, belongs to such periods (...) This is why nothing else perhaps is of such an importance as the standard of civic conduct."

Yes, one's position is more important nowadays than *word*. Words are no longer believed — they have been terribly devalued. One's word must be strengthened by one's position. We live through an epoch when both Sverstyuk<sup>12</sup> and Shamota<sup>13</sup> utter identical words about Shevchenko:<sup>14</sup> both call him a genius. The difference between them is determined therefore not by a word but by their position.

A lecturer once happened to attend a conference where Dzyuba made a speech. "Well, how was it?" he was asked. "Well, that chap wanted to show off", answered the lecturer. The short-legged realist will never understand what is a position. And will sincerely take it either as a theatrical posture or, in the best case, as naïve Don Quixotism. Defenders of Dzyuba's statement tell us now: "Enough of theatrical postures. It is necessary to work." And argue how important it is for Dzyuba to be in the Union of Writers, for many people like Dzyuba to be there, and in general to capture "posts." Only they waste their powder in vain. Nobody has any intention to deny what they say. Of course, we should very much like such people as Dzyuba to take the upper hand. And not only in the Union of Writers.

It would be ridiculous to deny also the need for methodical everyday work. Yes, infatuation will not replace talent or industriousness — but without it both the former and the latter will remain a dead slab. Talents have existed always and everywhere — why then are there epochs of flourishing and epochs of greyness? Infatuation is not extremism and not explosivity. It is tickled out emotions that are more frequently explosive. The flame of infatuation burns evenly and calmly. It is not obligatory to immolate oneself. I, for instance, am more fascinated by the philosophy of Shveyk who said: a good soldier is not one who dies for Fatherland, but one who compels his enemy to die for his Fatherland. So that accusations of Don Quixotism and lack of practical sense are not addressed correctly. We are not against work — including the dirtiest one. There must be someone to make idiotic official speeches in order to have the possibility to do something for a good cause utilising his official position. There must be someone to write worthless jubilee poems in order to retain his post with the same purpose in mind. But must it be Dzyuba? Not only he must not, he has no right to be. There are at least three reasons for it.

First, there has never been a shortage of people who wanted to love Ukraine a little and to have a little comfort. There has never been any need to specially cultivate Pavlychko<sup>15</sup> — he always grows himself. No one says that Pavlychko does not love Ukraine. Pavlychko sincerely loves Ukraine and wishes to do as much as possible for her — on condition that it will not be necessary to sacrifice comfort for it. He feels that he is on a weak ground, he is tortured by his conscience, but he knows wonderfully well how to deal with it. Pav-



lychko has convinced himself that he, too, is a great martyr, that he is persecuted, that they look askance at him etc. In general: the more a person is afraid, the more he tends to look on himself as on a great martyr. And it is true — for he who fears most, is tortured most. Of course, Pavlychko will never in his life admit even to himself that the reason for his behaviour is ordinary prosaic fear. No, he will invent for himself an entire theory. You see, he takes upon himself consciously such an ungrateful, unheroic role — in order to serve the cause. There is nothing new in it. It always happens like this: the pettier stimulus that directs a man's actions, the more grandiose and more romantic reasons he invents.

We know that Pavlychko will reply to it with a sceptical smile. But we know too that the source of this scepticism are fear and tiredness. Dzyuba once said best about such people, about people who hide behind "melodramatised scepticism into which they eagerly and "elaborately" escape from heavy civic responsibility, they escape out of idleness, they escape out of fear, and out of blindness; behind the miserable scepticism of philosophising slave who wants to deceive himself and pretends that he is so fascinated by the play in paradoxes that he fails to notice the yoke on his neck." It always happens like this: at first a man gets tired of maintaining a position, and then finds for it a "theoretical basis": what is it all needed for, after all this is no position at all allegedly, but a theatrical posture, and altogether it is time to finish with Don Quixotism.

The infatuated and the sceptic are eternal antipodes. A squeezed out, enfeebled sceptic always ascribes to a man with elastic muscles Don Quixotism and lack of practical sense. Tired by the burden of his erudition, the Roman philosopher could produce any number of "irrefutable" arguments against a Christian neophyte, and from the point of view of short-legged practical sense he was right. Christians did not overturn the world and did not build God's Kingdom on earth. But by building it they resurrected the moribund spirituality. And their opponent, the sceptic, with his irrefutable arguments has forever remained dead.

On the other hand there are epochs when scepticism is the most valuable thing. This has to be admitted. These are epochs of mass psychosis, periods of tickled out fanaticism.

We are living in different times, however. What the present-day Ukraine has to fear most is precisely the sceptic. There is nothing to extinguish in Ukraine as yet — it is still necessary to kindle. So that Dzyuba has become "reasonable" and said farewell to Don Quixotism somewhat prematurely.

No, it is not necessary to build special glasshouses for the cultivation of Pavlychko. HE will cultivate himself quite simply, and moreover with self-service ease — that is he will convince himself and his near ones that he, too, is a martyr, that he, too, is a victim. Not that we propose to proclaim Pavlychko an absolutely negative figure.

*Pavlychkism* — is a complicated and contradictory phenomenon, it carries within itself both negative and positive contents. Pavlychko will do a lot for Ukraine — we have to recognise it. But this is beside the point. What matters is that there are always a hundred Pavlychkos for one Dzyuba. Therefore it is simply not reasonable to re-qualify Dzyuba into a Pavlychko — not only from the point of view of Don Quixots, but also from the point of view of all-wise piglets. There are too few people in Ukraine who have within them a spark of infatuation and are able to kindle others. And another point is that Pavlychkism is an attacking, aggressive phenomenon. Psychologists know it well: he who finds himself in a quagmire, always wishes (mostly subconsciously) to pull to himself one who stands on dry land. It is precisely this desire which is dangerous with the Pavlychkos. No one else but they have “inspired” Drach to write his article. Now they have “inspired” Dzyuba to produce his statement. It is namely the point that Dzyuba made a concession not to the *Kozachenkos*<sup>16</sup> but to the *Pavlychkos*. It is easier to resist an external pressure. It is more difficult to fight against one who is corrupting from within. And Dzyuba has not proved himself to be up to it.

As we see, arguments taken from Dzyuba's speech are sufficient to justify the first reason. They are also sufficient to justify the second. A few words more from the same speech made in 1965:

“After all, the majority of young poets and literateurs started and are starting from not a worse level than Vasyl Symonenko, and quite certainly they did not have any less “spontaneous talent.” Thus many of them could have become such as became Symonenko, but only a few individuals equalled him. The others do not go up but down. How many talents have become petty, banal and declined before our eyes! What is the matter? (...) When a person speaks at full voice — his voice grows stronger. When he accustoms himself to speak in half-whisper — this half-whisper becomes his normal voice. Vasyl Symonenko spoke truth in a manly fashion, and the truth made him ever greater and greater. A poet needs space to apply his forces in order to multiply his forces. Who however narrows this space for himself, who does not use his forces, does not strain them to the limit and continually, his muscles unnoticeably become weaker, his strength declines, he becomes feeble. There is a medical term “idle heart”. ”

How dangerous it is: to regulate one's voice so as not to be expelled from the Union of Writers.

How many “talents have become petty, banal and declined” already by relying on the logic: now I am writing for printing but the true thing will come later. Life has passed, however, and the true thing just did not appear!

No, we do not call for recklessness. It is not necessary to found “The Secret Union of Sword and Eagle.” Someone has to adapt his voice to the Union of Writers, and to the journal “Notebook of the

Agitator." Someone — but not Dzyuba. There are too few people like him in Ukraine. Endless hard times have given birth in Ukraine to a flat, one-dimensional person. If infatuation — then guerilla-like, anarchist. If practicicism — then obligatorily a slavish one, without any principles. Let us be more profound at last. Let us learn to accomplish everyday, prosaic matters *without losing the pure flicker of infatuation*.

And, at last, the third reason. It so happens that the most weighty document of the present-day Ukrainian renaissance, its condensed expression, has become Dzyuba's book. The world now studies Ukraine "through Dzyuba." Dzyuba has become a symbol. He has become an example — and he himself said about the significance of an example. An idea is not enough. An idea is bare and dry as dust — what is needed is its living embodiment. The truth is known — what is needed is *faith*. The shabby Ukrainian fate has chosen Ivan Dzyuba. The shabby Ukrainian fate has placed upon his shoulders the *burden of the symbol*. And it is not dignified to hurl it underfoot. Dzyuba has written and said too much to carry now around written excuses to Kozachenko.

Dzyuba has forgotten about thousands upon thousands of people all over Ukraine for whom he has already become a god. O, I understand, I understand how ridiculous this sounds to some people: "god", "symbol." For him who "elaborately escapes into scepticism", all this is "primitive." But let us remember: there are forty million of these "primitives"! They make up the Ukrainian nation. And as long as they are not awakened, as they are not unfrozen, — they will be generals *without an army*. I do not know, may be they are "primitive"! But I know firmly something else: *those who have a god are happy!* "No God — no people" — I heard these words first from a woman in Polissia region, and only later read in a work by a European philosopher. Dzyuba has become a god for people and they believed. His statement has breathed a frosty gust of nihilism on the thin shoots of faith. One can hear the following said: "There was one principled man in Ukraine — and even he has written a statement" [of renegation]. This was precisely what they wanted: that Dzyuba should poison the awakened faith and turn people again into a state of dead nihilism. Therefore his statement was immediately published in a great number of copies. Would it have seen daylight if it was to our advantage, if it was not compromising us? Would Kozachenko and Korniychuks<sup>17</sup> have voted against his expulsion if he had not made a mistake? Let us not be naïve . . .

Well, let us suppose for a minute that the destiny of mankind depends on Dzyuba's stay in the Union of Writers and that for its sake one can sacrifice principles. It appears, however, that he did not achieve anything by having written his statement! It appears that his statement is being considered "merely as the first step", and his continued membership in the Union will depend on the second, third

and fourth... Has Dzyuba not yet comprehended the elementary police verity: he who has said "A" is put under three times greater pressure to get "B" out of him. Many a man has already said "B" having entered upon this path.

Ukraine expects new work from Dzyuba. But the first page written not in Demyan Bednyy's key will again place the problem of his expulsion from the Union of Writers on the agenda. As a matter of fact it is already on the agenda. Another routine "anti-Dzyubist" article by I. Bass in the latest issue of *Radyans'ke literaturoznavstvo*<sup>18</sup> considers *post-statement* Dzyuba the same "nationalist" as the pre-statement one, impudently demanding that Dzyuba should prove his innocence "not by verbal declarations" (p. 70). Ink has not yet had time to dry in the spot where Dzyuba wrote "A", when a pressure has begun to be put on him to write "B." What then has the statement achieved? As we see, the logic of the "infatuated" is more *realistic* than the logic of the "realists." He who reproaches others of Don Quixotism has shown himself to be naïve and impractical.

Ukraine has already seen many who first spoke and then crossed out, then again spoke and crossed out their own words. May be it is for this reason that there occurred loss of faith on a mass scale, that the highest ones fell down before everyone's eyes. Pigmies have always licked the heels of the corporals. But probably never before has it happened that such giants as Tychyna bowed to "sergeants who without a warrant put on generals' shoulder-straps." And — who knows — it is perhaps this which has inflicted the deepest wound on the people? What and in whom is one to believe when *everyone* renounces, when gods become batmen?

Ukraine has already seen Ostap Vyshnya who came out of prison and immediately announced that he had never been there and that "nationalists are lying." Ukraine has already had Epik who wrote in 1935:

"In preparing terrorist actions we, with an innocent look, assured the Party of our loyalty and honesty and in the course of many years played such roles, in comparison with which the activities of a highway robber are examples of honesty and humaneness. I have come to understand that the most merciful verdict of the proletarian court would be to deal with me as people deal with a rabid dog, to destroy me as a horse sick with foot and mouth disease, to take me out of the body of society. The Communist Party has magnanimously believed in my repentance. The Party has granted me my life, having given me thus the greatest from all the possible prizes on earth — the right to life, to joy of work."

Enough of it. Ukraine is thirsty for such people who do not renounce anything and do not make excuses before anyone. We have a great many people who, having said a good word about Ukraine, immediately make three curtsies towards Russia. They will never write

"Shevchenko and Pushkin." Always it becomes "Pushkin and Shevchenko" with them. Not intentionally, no. This happens with them mechanically. The slavish feeling of *secondariness* has firmly eaten into their blood. There is the word "and" before anything Ukrainian. Pushkin and Shevchenko and Franko, Nekrasov and Lesya Ukraïna. Their subconsciousness could never get rid of the feeling that Ukraine was an *appendix* before which there must stand something more important, separated by the word "and." Some of these men voted against the expulsion of Dzyuba from the Union of Writers. Many sincere thanks for it to them. Perhaps, for the first time in many years, they felt themselves to be men, having mustered enough courage to defend Dzyuba. They can have talent, work a lot and be of great use to Ukraine. But they will not thaw the Ukrainian winter. For a vaccine has been introduced into their organism, which serves as a reliable guarantee that a spark of infatuation will not burst into flame there.

The Ukrainian rebirth needs *people of new quality, aristocrats of spirit*. We have got used to roar with laughter at the word "nobility" and have forgotten that "nobleness" also originates from it. The greatest tragedy of Ukraine consists in the fact that permanent bad times have made of us a *nation of plebeians*. But only an aristocrat can have *constructive*, elitarian qualities. This was well understood... Stalin assured us that the main force of history was "proletariat", but for some reason he destroyed our intelligentsia, our elite. When religion was dominant and socialism was persecuted — a decent person did not say a word against socialism even if he considered it unworthy of attention. This was namely an aristocrat. Now when socialism is dominant, and religion is being strangled, a decent person will not say a word against religion. He is an aristocrat of our epoch. Dzyuba has the right to view "nationalism" in any way he likes. But to come out against it in conditions when any decent person is called a nationalist (including Dzyuba himself) — this Dzyuba is doing for the first time.

In the Mordovian concentration camps there were Jehovah's witnesses. Having had a closer look at them we understood that they were our most fervent enemies, the most reliable agents of Russification, because, by becoming a Jehovah's Witness, a Ukrainian becomes hopelessly deaf to the national problem. Yes, Jehovah's Witnesses were extremely unsympathetic to us. Yet to write against them in the camp wall newspaper, to which exclusively informers contributed this would have been shameful. Dzyuba can evaluate the Ukrainian emigration in any way he likes — this is his own affair — but to write against it in the sergeant-major's newspaper with which Kozachenko cleans his boots, in the "*Literaturna Ukraïna* edited like the wall newspaper of the district HQ of militia" — this was not expected from Dzyuba.

"I do not accept the name "nationalist" whatever one may put into it", writes Dzyuba and hastens to assure that in the nationality question he keeps to the "principles of scientific communism, the teaching of Marx-Engels-Lenin." But it is difficult to believe it. Absolute rejection of nationalism "whatever one may put into it" — is a *Stalinist* and not Leninist thesis. Lenin did not do like this. Lenin, as is known, put into nationalism of an oppressed nation positive meaning. Dzyuba departs in this not only from Lenin, but... from himself. Five years ago, in the book *Internationalism or Russification?* he wrote:

"One has to know and respect Lenin at least a little, to know his direct injunction about the inadmissibility of a formal approach to the question of nationalism "in general", his injunction about two types of nationalism, about the fact that the source of local nationalism is Russian big power chauvinism" (p. 223).

Five years ago Dzyuba opposed his present position — that is was against the rejection of nationalism "in general", "whatever one may put into it", strengthening his arguments with the words from the 12th Congress of the Russian Communist Party: "Survivals of nationalism are a peculiar form of defence against the great power chauvinism" (*Verbatim report from the 12th Congress*, p. 38).

It means that those who say that Dzyuba did not renounce his book, or his positions, are not right. They have perhaps read Dzyuba's book inattentively.

Having rejected the name "nationalism" whatever meaning one may put into it, one can find oneself not only in a ridiculous but also in a shameful position. For then we have to reject Shevchenko, too, about whom Lunacharsky wrote:

"Certainly, there is enmity in Shevchenko's nationalism, but only towards the oppressors. His nationalism, just as his entire tender soul, is first of all full of love. One cannot, however, deny that Shevchenko is not only a national poet, but also a poet-nationalist. The question about the destiny of the Ukrainian nationality occupies the first place in his poetry. This is understandable even from the political reasons which made Shevchenko's nationalism kindred with the nationalism of Mickiewicz, Foscolo, some Irishmen, with the nationalism of the great folk poetry of the Serbs" (p. 19).

"I used to place Shevchenko alongside other poets-nationalists, but none of them, even the greatest of the great — Mickiewicz, expressed his love of Fatherland in such a moving way, with such an almost demented strength!" (p. 20).

"Shevchenko as the *littérateur* supported Shevchenko the citizen in his nationalism" (p. 21).

"This democratic nationalism of Shevchenko does not contradict the new socialist world outlook in any way" (p. 25)

"... the noble nationalism which opposes any violence, which demands equal rights for all nations" (p. 30-31).

"Therefore we, socialists, ought to support deeply the popular, fraternal to other nations nationalism of such people as Shevchenko" (p. 26)\*

And here are a few more evaluations of nationalism:

"the spirit of freedom as the consciousness of a nation, as *nationalism*" (p. 106); "in the national consciousness, in nationalism consists that force which can open the path to a better future" (p. 107); "Our nationalism ought to be positive, ought to be constructive nationalism" (p. 107); "Without nationalism there is no progress, without nationalism there is no nation" (p. 108).

No, I am not quoting from an emigré journal. All these phrases have been taken from Sukarno's book *Indonesia Accuses* published in Moscow back in 1961. As we see, in the Soviet Union such evaluations have been printed without commentaries for a long time already. Similar things have been published even prior to the 20th Party Congress. In Nehru's book *The Discovery of India*, published in Moscow in 1955, we read:

"In present-day India nationalism has been and remains inevitable; it is a natural and healthy phenomenon (...) Events of the recent period in the entire world have shown that the opinion according to which nationalism allegedly disappears under the pressure of internationalism and proletarian movements is incorrect. As before, it remains one of the most powerful stimuli motivating the nation (...) At the time when the stratum of bourgeois intelligentsia gradually departed from nationalism or was thinking that it was departing from it, the workers' and proletarian movement consciously relying on the principles of internationalism, increasingly tended towards nationalism" (p. 50): "the principle of nationalism has deeper and firmer roots; it is not something obsolescent without any importance for the future" (p. 51).

One can add Sun Yat Sen's words from the above-mentioned book by Sukarno: "Nationalism is that priceless value which gives the strength to a given state to strive towards progress; it gives the strength to a given nation to defend its existence" (p. 103); and Pavlo Hrabovs'kyi's<sup>19</sup> words:

"Nationalism is a necessary condition of mankind's progress; not only a nation itself but all humanity in general suffers from the death of a nation."

Dzyuba rejected the "name 'nationalist' whatever meaning anyone may put into it" — at the time when even in the official brochures dealing with the nationalities problem they have already started to

\*) Lunacharsky, A. — *The Great Ukrainian Poet Taras Shevchenko*, Kyiv, 1961 [In Ukrainian].

write that the word "nationalism" is also used in the meaning of "patriotism." Thus in the above quoted article by Lunacharsky published in Kyiv in 1961, there is an editorial remark under the text in which it is stated that "when the author writes about Shevchenko's nationalism, what is meant is Shevchenko's love of his country" (p. 19).

Under the banner of nationalism (in the meaning of "patriotism") there takes place the national liberation movement in the whole world — the most significant phenomenon of the present day era. Dzyuba rejects "the name of 'nationalist' whatever meaning one may put into it" instead of asking: "How long shall we remain an anti-deluvial laughing stock? How long shall we go on asserting that the earth stands on a tortoise? How long shall we consider as swearing word a notion which the entire world uses in a positive meaning; which one half of mankind considers as its banner, about which one of the most outstanding marxists — Lunacharsky — wrote that it "does not contradict a new socialist world outlook?"

And a completely mysterious rebus is the so-called "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" which Dzyuba also renounces. To renounce the so-called "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" is about the same as to renounce contacts with devil in Middle Ages. In the Middle Ages godlessness was always "pinned" on an opponent. The Pope called Luther an atheist, and Luther called the Pope the same. And both together considered Calvin a godless man. And all the three of them believed in God. Whoever was not a "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist"! Kostomarov,<sup>20</sup> Hrinchenko,<sup>21</sup> Oles,<sup>22</sup> Kosynka,<sup>23</sup> Mykola Kulish,<sup>24</sup> Ostap Vyshnya,<sup>25</sup> Antonych<sup>26</sup>... All of them had the job of a "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist." And then they were sacked without any explanation. Who after all was Hrinchenko? Among the "nationalists" there were for a time those who with their own hands defeated Petlura:<sup>27</sup> Skrypnyk,<sup>28</sup> Yuriy Kotsyubynskyi<sup>29</sup>... The so-called "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" is a label which was pinned on anyone who had to be destroyed — in the same way as the Nazis pinned a yellow patch on a Jew's back. One has to be deprived of any sense of humour altogether to renounce after all this the so-called "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism."

Five years ago Dzyuba also thought in a similar way:

"They attempt to justify the KGB violence with twaddle about "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" (under which is understood any deviation from the Russified standard") (*Internationalism or Russification*, p. 223). This idea is reiterated several times in the book (pp. 109, 224).

Why should Dzyuba worry that some emigré newspaper described him as leader of the underground in Ukraine? Who said that Dzyuba must be held responsible for it? What if tomorrow someone will call him a money forger? an eskimo? Dalai Lama? Will he have to write



a statement again? For goodness sake, I have never thought that I would have to argue with Dzyuba about such ridiculously obvious matters!

Dzyuba had no right to forget also that with his statement he was putting other people into worse positions. For the fewer people there are in Ukraine who do not write statements — the stronger the pressure exerted on them. In six months' time Opanas Zalyvakha<sup>30</sup> is to come out of prison. How shall we be able to look him into the eyes having written such statements? If we, who are breathing free air, have the right to write statements *under duress*, then Zalyvakha has an even greater right to write them and to renounce "nationalism." But he has not yet written one and has not renounced anything.

It is a very dangerous logic: to place one's position in dependence *on the pressure*. If one is to consider it justified, then Levko Lukyanenko has the right to become an informer.

Zalyvakha will soon be free. But a burden of years of imprisonment still presses on Lukyanenko. Are we not ashamed to complain of pressure, remembering the situation in which this man finds himself? Are we not unlike that fat lady from a film comedy who loved to tell everybody how "awfully unhappy" she was? After all we are men. Let us have shame at least before those women<sup>31</sup> who are serving to the end their 25 (!) year sentences and have not complained even once of pressure.

Have we not become off colour and shabby too early in the milieu of people whose enthusiasm lasted but five minutes, who renounce their signatures under protests after the first unpleasantness, and then nurture, all their lives, noble pretensions with regard to those who suggested such a "reckless adventure" to them: to sign a collective letter. How has Dzyuba grown up in their eyes, how wiser and more serious has he become, how has he gratified and bewinged them with his statement! Now they believe that their retreat is no retreat at all, no flight in panic. Now they carry Dzyuba solemnly and joyfully in front of them. They are carrying an idol — and a procession with an idol in front — is no longer a flight. Now they believe that their retreat — is no weakness at all, dictated by powerlessness and fear, but a clever strategic move. And now they will bite anyone's throat who will dare to oppose his statement.

I was also told the following: Dzyuba's statement is bad, but . . . "One has to swallow this pill" — and that's that. No, a thousand times no. Ukraine has swallowed enough of these pills! And has badly poisoned herself — she is still sick. It is very difficult to understand the logic of those who considered the statement bad, were against its publication, but did not say anything to Dzyuba . . . out of tactfulness (!?). Now they advise us to stay silent . . . out of love for Dzyuba (?!).

Forgive me, this is no love. This is *false love*: to lick and smear tears. It is such people who have licked Dzyuba. True love is active. Love is not always warm compresses. Sometimes a cold shower is of better help. Chekhov was not ashamed to admit *that he was squeezing a slave out of himself drop by drop*. And we have to help one another to free ourselves from the burden of plebeianness. It is bad that there was no one near me to tell me bitter truth straight into the eyes — when during the first investigation I behaved not in the best manner. Drach was luckier — there were people around who sharply and intolerantly reacted to his article — and thus helped him to understand his mistake. There are such people at Dzyuba's side. But does he listen to their voice? This depends already on Dzyuba himself — on whether he will muster enough strength to examine himself with critical eyes, to step over his ambition, over petty egoism. The ability to recognise one's own mistakes is a mark of a strong personality.

Even if Dzyuba's statement were good in itself — he would have had to protest against such an impudent "framework" in which it was put. Some people think that Dzyuba ought to quit the Union of writers demonstratively. Others are less radical. I, for instance, belong to those who think that Dzyuba in one way or another has to renounce his statement in order to neutralise the tremendous harm inflicted by it. This is demanded by elementary ethics.

No one passes "a death sentence" on Dzyuba, as he writes in a letter. People do not die from truth. They die from "realism", from cold scepticism which has given birth to Dzyuba's statement. We, however, do not want Dzyuba to die. We want him to burst again into *pure flames of infatuation* — for this is the greatest wealth in the present-day Ukrainian state of frozenness.

February, 1970.

## NOTES

1) *Moloda Hvardiya* (The Young Guard) — an underground Komsomol organization which allegedly existed during the German occupation in the town of Krasnodon in the Donbas.

2) *Oleh Koshovyi* — one of the Young Guard members executed by the Germans.

3) *Pavlo Tychyna* (1891-1969) — one of the greatest 20th C. Ukrainian poets whose work utterly deteriorated after he was forced to toe the Communist Party line in the 1930s.

4) *Demyan Byednyy* (1883-1945) — a Communist Russian "proletarian" poet, noted for his vulgarity, very much favoured by Moscow.

5) *Vasyl Symonenko* (1935-1963) — a leading Ukrainian "poet of the sixties" who became a symbol of opposition to Russification and official hypocrisy.

6) *Ivan Dzyuba* (1931 - ) — an outstanding Ukrainian literary critic, outspoken opponent of Russian domination and Russification policy in Ukraine, author of the world-famous book "Internationalism or Russification?" (publ. in English by Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1968, 240 p.).

7) *Mykola Vinhranovs'kyi* (1936 - ) — Ukrainian film actor, film producer, an outstanding "poet of the sixties."

8) *Ivan Drach* (1936 - ) — Ukrainian poet, critic and translator, one of the leading men in the "poets of the sixties" group.

9) *Oleksiy Poltoratskyi* (1905 - ) — Soviet Ukrainian critic and writer, editor of the journal *Vsesvit* (Universe), notorious from his denunciations of Ukrainian patriotic writers as "bourgeois nationalists."

10) *Taras Myhal* (1920 - ) — a notorious Communist pamphleteer in Lviv, specialising in denunciation of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists."

11) *Levko Lukianenko* (1927 - ) — a Ukrainian lawyer, founder of the underground organisation, Ukrainian Workers and Peasants Union, in 1960, sentenced in May 1961 to death, later to 15 years imprisonment in hard labour camps, under Art. 56 (1) and 64 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR for attempting to propagate separation of Ukraine from the USSR.

12) *Yevhen Sverstyuk* — Ukrainian critic of the younger generation whose brilliant articles about the fate of Ukrainian culture in the USSR are spreading in manuscript copies in Ukraine. (See his "Cathedral in Scaffolding", *The Ukrainian Review*, No. 3, 1970, pp. 22-48).

13) *Mykola Shamota* (1916 - ) — Soviet Ukrainian literary critic, notorious for his servile pro-Moscow writings.

14) *Taras Shevchenko* (1814-1861) — the greatest Ukrainian national poet.

15) *Dmytro Pavlychko* (1929 - ) — Soviet Ukrainian poet from West Ukraine, translator, film script writer.

16) *Vasyl Kozachenko* (1913 - ) — Soviet Ukrainian Communist writer, chairman of the Kiev branch of the Union of Writers of Ukraine, excessively loyal to the Party and the KGB.

17) *Oleksander Korniychuk* (1905 - ) — Soviet Ukrainian playwright, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, an opportunistic servant of the regime.

18) (*Soviet Literary Criticism*) No. 1, Jan. 1970, pp. 61-70, "In the Campaign against the Truth."

19) *Pavlo Hrabovs'kyi* (1864-1902) — a Ukrainian writer persecuted by the tsarist Russian regime for his democratic and national Ukrainian convictions. Died in Siberian exile.

20) *Borys Hrinchenko* (1863-1910) — famous Ukrainian writer, folklorist ethnographer, philologist, pedagogue and public figure.

21) *Oleksander Oles* (literary pseudonym of *Oleksander Kandyba*) (1878-1944) — Ukrainian poet who emigrated in 1919 and until his death lived in Austria and Czechoslovakia.

22) *Hryhoriy Kosynka* (1899-1934) — Ukrainian poet, arrested by Soviet secret police under false accusation of participation in "terrorist" anti-Soviet activities and shot after a secret trial. "Rehabilitated" after Stalin's death.

23) *Mykola Kulish* (1892-1942) — Ukrainian playwright, accused of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" in 1933 and spent many years in prisons and concentration camps where he died in 1942.

25) *Ostap Vyshnya* (literary pseudonym of Pavlo Hubenko) (1889-1956) — outstanding Ukrainian humorist. Accused of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" in the early 1930s and spent many years in prisons and forced labour camps. Released during World War II. Tried to prove his loyalty by writing pamphlets against "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists."

26) *Bohdan Ihor Antonych* (1910-1937) — Ukrainian poet from Western Ukraine. Until recently banned in the USSR because of his attempt to stand above politics.

27) *Symon Petlura* (1877-1926) — Head of the Directory and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1919-21. Assassinated in Paris by a Communist agent.

28) *Mykola Skrypnyk* (1872-1933) — a Ukrainian Communist leader, Lenin's friend, one of the leaders of the Communist fifth column in Ukraine against the Ukrainian National Republic (1917-1921); occupied leading CP and government posts in Ukraine, tried to carry out the "Ukrainization" policy in Ukraine, shot himself in 1933 when realised his failures and mistakes.

29) *Yuriy Kotsyubynskyi* (1895-1937) — a Ukrainian Communist leader, son of the famous Ukrainian writer Mykhaylo Kotsyubynskyi, sided with the Bolsheviks against the Ukrainian National Republic, later attempted to promote a policy of Ukrainization in Ukraine. Arrested on accusation of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" and shot.

30) *Opanas Zalyvakha* (1925 - ) — Ukrainian painter, arrested in 1965 and sentenced to 5 years imprisonment in severe regime hard labour camps for protests against the Russification policy in Ukraine.

31) *Kateryna Zarytska, Odarka Husyak and Halyna Didyk* — sentenced in 1947 and 1950 to 25 years of imprisonment each for their participation as Red Cross workers in the struggle of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army against the Soviet Russian occupation of Ukraine. Until recently they were imprisoned at the grim Vladimir prison near Moscow, but recently have been transferred to Mordovian camps.

---

## SOME UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS IN USSR

1. **Dr. Volodymyr Horbovyi** — b. Jan. 30, 1889, in Western Ukraine, then under Austro-Hungary, later under Poland; was never a Soviet citizen; lawyer. Arrested in Czecho-Slovakia in 1947, extradited to Poland and then to the USSR. Accused of being a Ukrainian nationalist, but an investigation lasting two years failed to discover any incriminating evidence. Sentenced on July 6, 1949, in his absence by a three-men Special Conference of State Security Ministry, on the basis of Art. 54-2, 54-11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR (high treason), to 25 years' imprisonment. After Stalin's death 25-year sentences have been abolished, Special Conferences have been condemned, foreign citizens have generally been released, but despite many appeals and protests of his innocence, Dr. Horbovyi is still kept in the Mordovian camps. Ought to be released in 1972. Mr. Gerald Brooke, the then imprisoned British lecturer, met him in Mordovian camps and speaks with highest admiration about him.

2. **Mykhailo Soroka** — a Ukrainian patriot, arrested in 1940, sentenced to 8 years in prison. After release in 1949 exiled to Siberia for the same "crime". Upon return to Lviv in 1951 he was vindicated for his 1940 sentence, but in 1952 arrested again on the grounds of belonging to subversive organisations in the camps and again sentenced to 25 years' imprisonment. Altogether he spent 7 years in Polish jails prior to 1939 and 27 years in Soviet Russian prisons. At present in camp No. 17 in Mordovia.

3. **Kateryna Zarytska** — b. 1914, wife of Mykhailo Soroka; an organiser of the Ukrainian Red Cross with the Ukrainian Insurgent Army which fought against the Germans and the Russians. Sentenced in 1947 to 25 years imprisonment which she spent mostly in the grim Vladimir prison near Moscow. Recently transferred to Mordovian camps.

4. **Odarka Husyak** — woman, b. 1924, arrested in 1950 and charged with being a courier of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists; sentenced to 25 years' imprisonment which she spent in Vladimir prison; now in Mordovia.

5. **Halyna Didyk** — woman, b. 1912, an organiser and worker of the Ukrainian Red Cross with the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. Sentenced in 1950 to 25 years' imprisonment. Kept in Vladimir prison, now in Mordovia.

6. **Svyatoslav Karavanskyi** — b. 1920 in Odessa; poet, linguist, journalist and translator. Arrested on Feb. 7, 1944 for belonging to

Ukrainian nationalist underground and sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment. Released in Dec. 1960 after more than 16 years. Re-arrested on Nov. 13, 1965 because of his written protest against Russification policy of the Soviet government in Ukraine, and sent to Mordovian camps to serve the remaining 9 years of his sentence. In 1969 transferred to Vladimir prison and put on trial on 23rd April, 1970 on charges of "anti-Soviet agitation" in prison. A new five-year sentence was added to his previous conviction. Altogether Karavanskyi's two sentences total 30 years. Karavanskyi has still eight and a half years to serve in prison.

7. **Mykhailo Masyutko** — b. 1918, poet, critic, teacher. First arrested in 1937 and sentenced to 5 years imprisonment. Released in 1940, served in the Red Army. Arrested again in 1965 in the Crimea and sentenced to 6 years' hard labour for Ukrainian "anti-Soviet propaganda". At present in Mordovia.

8. **Levko Lukyanenko** — an organiser of the underground Ukrainian Workers and Peasants' Union. Sentenced in 1961 to 15 years' hard labour in prison camps. At present in Mordovia.

9. **Ivan Kandyba** — b. 1930, lawyer. Sentenced in 1961 to 15 years hard labour in camps for attempting to organise the underground Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union. In Mordovia.

10. **Stepan Virun** — b. 1932, propagandist. Sentenced in 1961 to 11 years imprisonment in forced labour camps in connection with the foregoing case. In Mordovia.

11. **Oleksander Libovych** — b. 1935, agriculturist. Sentenced in 1961 to 10 years hard labour in connection with the foregoing case.

12. **Vasyl Lutskiv** — b. 1935, village club manager. Sentenced in 1961 to 10 years hard labour in connection with the same case.

13. **Volodymyr Hnot** — locksmith from Lviv. Sentenced in 1961 to death, later commuted to 15 years imprisonment, in connection with the underground "Ukrainian National Committee" case. Presently in Mordovia.

14. **Roman Hurnyi** — b. 1924, worker. Sentenced in December 1961 to be shot, later commuted to 15 years imprisonment, in the "Ukrainian National Committee" case. Presently in Mordovia.

15. **Hryhoriy Zel'man** (? Zelymash) — b. 1936, farmer. Sentenced in 1961 to 15 years imprisonment, "Ukrainian National Committee" case. Presently in Mordovia.

16. **Oleksiy Zel'man** (? Zelymash) — farmer, brother of Hryhoriy, sentenced in 1961 to 12 years imprisonment. Presently in Mordovia.

17. **Mykola Melekh** — b. 1924, a philologist, sentenced in the "Ukrainian National Committee" case in 1961 to 15 years' imprisonment. Presently in Mordovia.

18. **M. Kurylo** — sentenced in 1961 ("Ukrainian National Committee" case) to 12 years' imprisonment.

19. **Mykola Mashtalir** — b. 1925, sentenced in 1961 ("Ukrainian National Committee" case) to death, later sentence commuted to 15 years imprisonment. Presently in Mordovia.

20. **Stepan Soroka** — b. 1932, worker. Sentenced in 1961 ("Ukrainian National Committee" case) to 15 years' imprisonment. Presently in Mordovia.

21. **M. Pokora** — worker; sentenced in 1961 ("Ukrainian National Committee" case) to 12 years of imprisonment.

22. **Myroslav Iovchyk** — sentenced in 1961 ("Ukrainian National Committee" case) to 15 years imprisonment.

23. **Myn'ko** — sentenced in 1961 to 10 years imprisonment ("Ukrainian National Committee" case).

24. **O. Tyhlyvets'** — sentenced in the same case to 12 years of imprisonment.

25. **Mykola Melnychuk** — sentenced in the same case to 10 years of imprisonment.

26. **O. Khomiakievych** — sentenced in the same case to 12 years of imprisonment.

27. **Volodymyr Leonyuk** — b. 1932, Berestia region. Sentenced in 1951 to 25 and in 1960 to 12 years imprisonment. Presently in Camp 17, Mordovia.

28. **Mykhailo Horyn'** b. 1930, psychologist. Arrested in Aug. 1965 and sentenced on April 18, 1966, at a closed trial in Lviv to six years of hard labour for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation".

29. **Mykhailo Ozernyi** — b. 1929, teacher, translator. Arrested in Aug. 1965 and sentenced on Feb. 7, 1966, in Ivano-Frankivsk to six years' hard labour for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation".

30. **Anatol Shevchuk** — b. 1937, linotypist, writer, from Zhytomyr. Arrested in May 1966 and sentenced on Sept. 7, 1966 at a closed trial to 5 years' hard labour for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation". Presently in Mordovia.

31. **Zynoviy Krasivs'kyi** — b. 1928 teacher and writer. Sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment in 1967 at Ivano-Frankivsk in the "Ukrainian National Front" case.

32. **Dmytro Kvets'ko** — b. 1937, schoolmaster in Lviv. Sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment in the same case as above.

33. **Hryhoriy Prokopovych** — b. 1928, teacher in Lviv. Sentenced to 6 years' imprisonment. Same case as above.

34. **Ivan Hubka** — b. 1939, cultural worker from Morshyn Lviv region. Sentenced to six years imprisonment. Same case.

35. **Yaroslav Lesiv** — b. 1945, teacher in Kirovohrad region. Sentenced to six years imprisonment in the same case as above.

36. **Vasyl Kulynin** — b. 1943, worker from Stryi, Lviv region. Sentenced to six years' imprisonment. Same case as above.
37. **Mykhailo Dyak** — b. 1939, militia worker, Dolyna, Ivano-Frankivsk region. Sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment. Same case as above.
38. **Oleksander Nazarenko** — b. 1930, Kyiv University student. Arrested in June 1968 and sentenced to five years imprisonment for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation".
39. **Mykola Nykolayenko** — b. 1932 in Chernihiv region, worker. Sentenced in Chernihiv in 1969 to five years imprisonment for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation".
40. **Roman Hryn'** — b. 1946 in Lviv, student. Sentenced in 1970 by Uzhhorod region court to three years' imprisonment for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda".
41. **Mykola Kots** — b. 1930, in Volhynia, lecturer at Ternopil College of Agriculture. Sentenced in Oct. 1967 by Ternopil region court to seven years' imprisonment for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation".
42. **Fr. Danylo Bakhtalovskyi** — theology professor, abbot of monastery in Ivano-Frankivsk. Arrested in 1968 and sentenced by Ivano-Frankivsk court to three years' imprisonment for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda".
43. **Fr. Vasyl Velychkovskyi** — b. 1. 6. 1903 at Ivano-Frankivsk, became Redemptorist monk and priest in 1925, later was preacher in Volynia and Galicia, a parish priest. In 1942 became abbot of the Redemptorist monastery at Ternopil. After the forcible liquidation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite in 1946, was arrested and exiled to Siberia by the Russians. Released after Stalin's death. Arrested again on Jan. 27, 1969 and in Dec. 1969 sentenced to three years' imprisonment for "anti-Soviet" propaganda and agitation". It is rumoured that he was consecrated Archbishop of the underground Ukrainian Catholic Church.
44. **Fr. Denys Lukashevych** — Ukrainian Catholic priest from Soroky-Lvivski, Lviv region. Sentenced in 1949 to 25 years imprisonment for harbouring Ukrainian underground fighters. Camp 17 in Mordovia.
45. **Yaroslav Hasyuk** — b. 1937, Ivano-Frankivsk. Sentenced in Kyiv to 12 years imprisonment.
46. **Yevhen Hladkovskyi** — b. 1930, Lviv. Sentenced in 1953 to 25 years of imprisonment.
47. **Bohdan Hohus'** — from Ternopil region. Sentenced in 1962 to death, later sentence commuted to 15 years imprisonment for "Ukrainian nationalist anti-Soviet propaganda".



48. **Hryhoriy Kovalyshyn** — from Ternopil region. Sentenced in 1962 to 15 years imprisonment for "Ukrainian nationalist anti-Soviet propaganda".

49. **Hnat Husyk** — b. 1933, Lviv. Sentenced in 1961 to 15 years imprisonment.

50. **Hryhor Denyshchuk** (? Demchuk) — b. 1930, Rivne region. Sentenced in 1949 to 25 years imprisonment.

51. **Drop** — from Khodoriv, Lviv region. Sentenced in 1962 to 15 years imprisonment.

52. **Mykhailo Protsiv** — from Khodoriv. Sentenced in 1962 to 15 years imprisonment.

53. **Klymchak** — from Lviv region. Sentenced in 1962 to 12 years imprisonment.

54. **Khanas** — from Khodoriv. Sentenced in 1962 to 12 years imprisonment.

55. **Yosyp Nahrobnyi** — from Khodoriv. Sentenced in 1962 to 12 years imprisonment.

56. **Vasyl Levkovych** — member of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), commander of the "Buh" military district of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA). Arrested in 1946 or 1947, sentenced to 25 years imprisonment. Age about 50. Presently in Mordovia.

57. **Omelian Polyovyi** — b. 1913, Ternopil region. OUN member, political prisoner under Poland before 1939, officer in Ukrainian Legion (1941), commander of the "Lysonia" military district of UPA (Ternopil region). Arrested in 1945. Sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment. Was in concentration camps of Kolyma, Taishet, presently in Mordovia.

58. **Hryhoriy Pryshliak** — b. 1912, Lviv, old OUN member, Arrested in 1946. Active participant in the resistance movements within camps in late 1940s-1950s. Was in Taishet, Kazakhstan, now in Mordovia. 25-years term of imprisonment.

59. **Yevhen Pryshliak** — b. 1913, Lviv, OUN member. District leader of its security service. Arrested in 1952. Sentenced to 25 years imprisonment. Until 1962 held in prisons, later in Mordovia camps. Presently camp 17 in Mordovia.

60. **Vasyl Pirus** — b. 1921, Ternopil region; OUN member. Sentenced in 1946 to 25 years imprisonment. Was in Kolyma, Taishet, presently in Mordovia. (Camp 17).

61. **Mykola Levytskyi** — b. 1922, OUN member. Sent as OUN courier from abroad in the second half of the 1950s. Arrested and sentenced to 25 years' imprisonment in 1957. Presently in camp 17, in Mordovia.

62. **Viktor Solodkyi** — aged about 45, OUN member, arrested in 1948, sentence — 25 years. In the 1950s — one of the organisers of camp resistance movements. Was one of the initiators and leaders of the mass hunger strike in Taishet at the beginning of 1956 in which over 400 people took part, demanding revision of their sentences and improvement in conditions of detainment. As one of the organisers of the hunger strike, he was sentenced to another 25 year term of imprisonment. (At that time five people stood trial; three of them received 25-year terms each, and two — 10-year terms). Was in Taishet, in the prisons of Odessa, Izmail, Tobolsk. Presently in Mordovia.

63. **Vasyl Pidhorodetskyi** — b. 1925, OUN member, arrested 1948, sentenced to 25 years imprisonment. In 1956 received another 25 year sentence together with Solodkyi at al. for the organisation of the mass hunger strike in Taishet. Presently in Mordovia (Camp 19).

64. **Mykola Onyshkiv** — aged about 50, OUN underground member. Arrested in late 1940s, sentenced to 25 years imprisonment. Was in the camps of Kolyma, Taishet, presently in Mordovia.

65. **Hryhor Dubyna** — aged about 45, participants in the OUN movement; arrested towards the end of the 1940s and sentenced to 25 years imprisonment. Was in Taishet, presently in Mordovia.

66. **Stepan Pal'chak** — sentenced in 1961 to 10 years imprisonment only because he maintained contact with several members of the OUN movement who stayed in underground hiding in Ternopil region until 1961. Among them was his sister, Maria Pal'chak, who alone survived from the group, having been sentenced to death by shooting. The sentence was later commuted to 15 years imprisonment. Presently in Mordovia.

67. **Oleksander Chuhay** — aged about 45, member of OUN underground. Arrested in 1948 or 1949 and sentenced to 25 years imprisonment. Was in Taishet. Presently in Mordovia.

68. **Volodymyr Ostrovskyi** — aged over 35, arrested for the second time about 1958 some time after his release from previous imprisonment. Sentenced again to 15 years imprisonment.

69. **Dmytro Syniak** — district leader of OUN security service, from Hutsul area in the Carpathians. Arrested in 1946 (?), and sentenced to death; sentence later commuted to 25 years of imprisonment.

70. **Dmytro Verkholiak** — b. 1926, medical student; OUN underground member. Arrested in 1948, sentenced to death; sentence later commuted to 25 years imprisonment. Imprisoned in Mordovia.

71. **Mykola Romaniv** — a former communist who later joined the OUN underground movement, a peasant. Was district supply officer of the OUN in the Hutsul area of the Carpathians. Arrested about 1952, sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment. Presently in Mordovia.

72. **Hunda** — aged about 30; sentenced for “anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation” (according to others for “high treason”) in 1956 to a long term of imprisonment. Born in Hutsul area of Ukrainian Carpathians.

73. **Ivan Shevchenko** — aged about 60; sentenced for the second time in 1959, having spent some time out of prison, to 15 years of imprisonment for “nationalist agitation”.

74. **Mykhailo Lutsyk** — district leader of OUN underground youth movement, from Skole district, Lviv region. First arrested in 1945 or 1946, released in 1956. Again arrested in 1959 or 1960 and sentenced to 15 years imprisonment. Was in Vladimir prison, now in Mordovia.

75. **Ivan Il'chuk** b. 1925, — former member of the Ukrainian underground, Lutsk region, from Volynia. Arrested in 1948, sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment. Presently in Mordovia (Camp 17).

76. **Mykola Slobodianiuk** — b. about 1908, Zhytomyr region Sentenced in 1947 or 1948 to 25 years of imprisonment. Actively participated in OUN — organised camp resistance movement.

---

## EXAMPLES OF ADMINISTRATIVE PERSECUTION FOR CONVICTIONS

1. **Ivan Svitlychnyi** — expelled from the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR at the beginning of 1964 for making a speech at the soirée commemorating [the poet Vasyl] Symonenko which took place at the Kiev Medical College on December 20, 1963; on July 12, 1965 dismissed from his job as head of the editorial board of the department of language and dictionaries of the "Naukova dumka" (Scientific Thought) Publishing House at the demand of Academician Bilodid whom he criticised in the article "Harmony and Algebra" (*Dnipro*, No. 3, 1965); after spending eight months in prison — unemployed.
2. **Mykhailo Kosiv** — during the preliminary investigation dismissed from his job as head of the Section of Franko Studies at the University of L'viv; after spending five months in prison, was unemployed for six months; at present he teaches in a L'viv region school.
3. **Ivan Dzyuba** — dismissed from his job at the "Molod" (Youth) Publishing House in September 1965 after making a speech at the "Ukraina" Cinema on September 4, 1965, protesting against political arrests; at present — literary editor of the *Ukrains'kyi biokhimichnyi zhurnal* (Ukrainian Biochemical Journal).
4. **Yevhen Sverstyuk** — dismissed from his job at the Institute of Psychology on June 4, 1965, for making a "heretical" speech in front of Volhynia region teachers. At present he is secretary of the *Ukrains'kyi botanichnyi zhurnal* (Ukrainian Botanical Journal).
5. **Matviy Shestopal** — at the beginning of 1965 a fine was deducted from his salary by Party officials and he was expelled from a teaching post at the Kyiv university for "nationalism."
6. **Mykhailyna Kotsyubynska** — M.A. (Philology), senior scientific worker of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, expelled from the Party in April 1966 by the Kyiv city committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine for "ideological deviations" and for protesting against the arrests.
7. **Vyacheslav Chornovil** — in April 1965, at the signal from the KGB he was dismissed from his job as head of the ideological department of the newspaper of the Central Committee of the Komsomol of Ukraine, *Moloda Hvardiya* (The Young Guards), for making a speech at the "Ukraina" Cinema; for the same offence he was not accepted for postgraduate research studies at the Kyiv Teachers' College; on

May 5, 1966 "made redundant" from the editorial board of the newspaper *Druh chytacha* (Reader's Friend) for his refusal to testify at the closed trial in L'viv — at present *unemployed*.

8. **Vasyl' Stus** — expelled from the second year of postgraduate research course at the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR in September, 1965 for making a speech at the "Ukraïna" Cinema; a collection of his poems was struck off the list of the planned publications of the "Radyans'kyj pys'mennyk" (Soviet Writer) Publishing House. In June 1966 he was dismissed from his job as senior scientific worker of the State Historical Archives; in September 1966 dismissed from work at the construction of the Kyïv underground because he allegedly did not work according to his profession.

9. A group of journalists working with Kyïv newspapers, journals and radio (**Polkovenko, Toichkyn, Lihostov, Tvorynskyi** and others) — were dismissed from their jobs in the spring of 1965 and Party and Komsomol fines were deducted from their salaries — for making a statement of protest against the dismissal of M. Shestopal.

10. A group of students of the Faculty of Journalism of the Kyïv State University (**Vadym Mytsyk, Bohdan Uniyat, Yuriy Parkhomenko**, and others) — were expelled from the university, and some of them from the Party, in the spring of 1965, for staging a protest against the dismissal of M. Shestopal.

11. **Alla Hors'ka** and **Lyudmyla Semykina** — were expelled from the Union of Artists of the Ukrainian SSR in May 1964 for creating a stained glass window at the university which was not approved by the Party (today restored in membership).

12. **Yuriy Badzio** — dismissed from the post of junior scientific worker of the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR in the spring of 1965 for participating in organising a soiree commemorating Shevchenko at the Automatic Machine Tool Works; for the same offence as well as for being present at the "Ukraïna" Cinema on September 4, 1965 he was expelled from the party by the city committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine in April 1966.

13. **Mykhola Kholodnyi** — expelled from the fifth year course at the university for insubordination (speeches and poems of non-standard contents), spent a fortnight in prison on the grounds of a false charge of "making an attempt on the life of militia workers", expelled from Kyïv, and after temporarily working as watchman of a collective farm orchard — *unemployed*.

14. **Volodymyr Mishchenko** — dismissed from his job at the editorial office of the *Donbas* magazine; at the request of Donetsk prosecutor's office and the KGB a collection of his poems was taken off the printing presses because he allegedly read forbidden books.

15. **Rita Dovhan'** — was ordered to pay a Party fine and was forced in December, 1965 to resign from the editorial board of the newspaper *Druh chytacha* (Reader's Friend) — for her part in organising an evening of poetry at the Institute of Communications.

16. **Tetiana Tsymbal** — an artiste of the Ukrainian Concert Company, today a pensioner. Deprived of the right to appear on the stage... for making speeches from the stage.

17. **Antonina Matviyenko** — in February 1966 dismissed from her job as assistant lecturer at the University of Kyiv, deprived of the right to teach at the University of Kyiv by the decision of the Ivano-Frankivsk region court (she was a witness in Ozernyi's case), was rejected from teaching at the preparatory courses of the Kyiv Teachers' College (September, 1966) — at present *unemployed*.

18. **Yaroslav Dashkevych** — dismissed in April 1966 from the post of bibliographer at the Institute of Social Sciences (L'viv) for reading foreign publications and for publishing an article about the Polovtsi (Cuman) language in a foreign journal; at present — *unemployed*.

19. **Ivan Boychak** — dismissed from his job as head of the department of criticism of the journal *Dnipro* for publishing a number of articles, in particular by I. Svitlychnyi and I. Dzyuba.

20. **Pavlo Skochok** — dismissed in April 1966 from the editorial board of the newspaper *Radyans'ka Ukraïna* for criticising the line of the newspaper on a number of questions and for writing a statement to the Central Committee of the CP of Ukraine concerning the trial in Ivano-Frankivsk; at present — *unemployed*.

21. **Roman Kudlyk** — dismissed at the beginning of 1966 from the editorial board of the journal *Zhovten'* (L'viv) for asking a question about the arrests at a writers' meeting.

22. **Stefan Kozak** — expelled from the postgraduate course at the Kyiv State University and repatriated to Poland on suspicion of transmitting foreign publications.

23. **Volodymyr Danylenko** — "made redundant" in the spring of 1966 from the newspaper *Literaturna Ukraïna* for his independence of thought...

24. **Lidiya Mel'nyk** — 'made redundant' in the spring of 1966 from *Literaturna Ukraïna*.

25. **Lidiya Orel** — "made redundant" in the summer of 1965 from the film studio of the Kyiv State University for her presence at the debate on the questions of the national culture (April, 1965) which was dispersed, and for singing Ukrainian songs at the Shevchenko memorial on May 22.

26. **Ol'ha Borbot** — expelled in March 1966 from the fourth year course of the evening department of the Faculty of Philology for

asking the lecturer Kuznetsov a "heretical" question at the political economic seminar; the latter immediately reported it to the appropriate authorities; she was expelled from Kyiv.

27. **Hryhoriy Demyanchuk** — forced to pay a Party fine at the beginning of 1966 and dismissed from his job as head of the department of culture of the newspaper *Chervonyi prapor* (Rivne) for reading I. Dzyuba's speech at the soiree devoted to the memory of V. Symonenko; at present employed in the advertising department of the Regional Union of Consumer Cooperatives.

28. **Oleksandra Hromova** — "made redundant" in January 1966 from the Institute of the Advancement of Teachers for her acquaintanceship with the convicted persons.

29. **Henadiy Hrytsay** — literary critic (Moscow), dismissed from his job, and later expelled from the Party, for his acquaintanceship with Daniel, Sinyavsky, as well as with Svitlychnyi and other Ukrainian "rebels", at present — *unemployed*.

30. **Omelyan Mykhal'chuk** — expelled in the summer of 1965 from the fifth year course of the Kyiv Medical College for his refusal to take a military oath in Russian.

31. **Vadym Mytsyk** — in May 1966, at the demand from the Party committee, dismissed from his job at the Zhashkiv district newspaper in Cherkassy region. Earlier he was expelled from the university for making a speech in defence of Shestopal and for reading V. Symonenko's poems.

32. **Lyudmyla Sheremetyeva** — dismissed from the editorial board of the newspaper *Druh chytacha only* for her acquaintanceship with the "rebels."

33. **Vasyl' Mykhaulyuk** — dismissed from his job as chairman of a village Soviet in the autumn of 1965 for erecting a bust memorial of Shevchenko at the village of Sheshory, Kosiv district, Ivano-Frankivsk region.

34. **Ol'ha Kontsevykh** — was forced to resign from her job at the Zhytomyr Printing House. Her guilt was — making public the secret of the "namesday" album (see section 2) and her acquaintanceship with the "rebels."

35. **Lyubomyr Hrabovets'** — expelled from L'viv Conservatoire in autumn of 1965; an inter-college choir conducted by him performed in the Hutsul area, in the summer 1965, especially at the unveiling of the Shevchenko bust memorial in the village of Sheshory.

36. **Lyudmyla Tyshchenko** — dismissed in 1965 from her post as laboratory assistant of the Dictionary Department of the Institute of Philology of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR for her

refusal to collaborate with the KGB, dismissed from her teaching post at the preparatory course at the Kyiv Teachers' College (October 1966).

37. **Mykola Petrenko** — severely reprimanded for mentioning in one of the broadcasts of L'viv TV Studio the name of R. Kudlyk, who had earlier been punished for asking a question concerning the arrests, and a collection of his poems had been taken off the list of the planned publications of the *Kamenyar* (Stone-Cutter) Publishing House.

38. **Myroslava Zvarychevs'ka** — dismissed from work at the Regional Archives during the preliminary investigation. After coming out of prison — *unemployed*.

39. **Svitlana Popel'** — "failed to pass the competitive examinations", dismissed in June 1966 from the post of junior scientific worker of the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR for her acquaintanceship with I. Svitlychnyi.

40. **Ihor Sandurs'kyi** — dismissed in June 1966 from the post of lecturer in social sciences at the L'viv Agricultural College. At present — *unemployed*.

41. **Iryna Stakhiv** — dismissed from her job at the L'viv Ethnographical Museum in summer 1966 for her contacts with the convicted persons, at present — *unemployed*.

42. **Ol'ha Horyn'** — dismissed from her job at the L'viv House of Teachers for being the wife of the convicted M. Horyn'.

43. **Oleksander Serhiyenko** — student at the Kyiv Medical College, arrested at Ivan Franko jubilee commemorative evening, spent a fortnight in prison; groundlessly accused of "an attempt at the life of militia workers."

44. **Valeriy Nabok** — arrested on May 28, 1966 at the Ivan Franko jubilee commemorative evening, spent a fortnight at the Lukyanivka prison on groundless charge of "an attempt on the life of militia workers." During imprisonment expelled from the Party (in his absence, at the meeting of the Party bureau).

45. **Viktor Koval'chuk** — Kyiv river port worker, delegate to the last congress of the Komsomol of Ukraine, arrested on May 28, 1966 for poetry reading at the celebration of I. Franko jubilee, spent a fortnight at the Lukyanivka prison on a groundless charge of "an attempt on the life of militia workers."

46. **Ivan Ostafiychuk** — after completing in 1966 the L'viv Institute of Decorative and Applied Art remained as lecturer at the same Institute, because he was a talented artist. After reading the letter of the CC of the CP of Ukraine where his name was mentioned his appointment was cancelled and he was directed to go to the Donbas.



47. **Vadym Cherkas** — an artist, brother of the convicted M. Masutko. At a signal from the KGB he was dismissed from his lecturing post at the L'viv Institute of Decorative and Applied Art.

48. **Osyp Petrash** — literary critic, dismissed from lecturing at the Drohobych Teachers' College for his acquaintanceship with M. Horyn' — at present *unemployed*.

49. **Oleksander Kurinnyi** — poet, dismissed from his post of book-keeper of the collective farm at the village of Makarivka, Popil'nya district, Zhytomyr region, on a completely unfounded charge of "nationalism." At present — *unemployed*.

50. **Ivan Yushchuk** — "failed to pass a competitive examination" in June 1966 and dismissed from his job as junior scientific worker of the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSSR for contacts with the convicted persons, at present — *unemployed*.

51. **Mykhaylo Huts'** — "failed to pass the competitive examination" in June 1966 and was dismissed from his post of junior scientific worker of the Institute of Art Knowledge, Folklore and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR for contacts with the convicted persons, at present — *unemployed*.

52. **Yevhen Pronyuk** — transferred from the post of junior scientific worker of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR to a librarian's post — for contacts with the convicted persons.

53. **Lidiya Sverstyuk** — "failed to pass the competitive examination" and dismissed from teaching at the Kyiv Teachers' College in July 1966 for the convictions of her husband.

54. **Leonid Cherevatenko** — expelled from the fifth year course of the faculty of Philology of the Kyiv State University for his convictions, at present — *unemployed*.

55. **Borys Tymoshenko** — expelled from the fourth year course of the faculty of Philology of the Kyiv State University for his acquaintanceship with I. Svitlychnyi, at present — *unemployed*.

56. **Pen'kovs'kyi** — dismissed from his job as scientific co-worker of the Sector of State and Law of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR for his contacts with the convicted persons.

57. **Pavlo Chemerys** — dismissed from his job at the L'viv Institute of Printing Art for his contacts with the convicted persons.

58. **Mykhaylo Ivanyshyn** — after his release from Ivano-Frankivsk isolation prison of the KGB, was unemployed for a long time. In the autumn of 1966 dismissed from the post of teacher at one of the schools of Yavoriv district, L'viv region, at a demand from above, at present — *unemployed*.

This list was compiled as of 1st November, 1966 and is by far not complete.

---

## **LETTER OF PROTEST TO CAMP COMMANDANT**

To the Acting Commandant of Camp No. 17-A, Senior Lieutenant Kyshka, and the Commandant of Detachment No. 6, Senior Lieutenant Rubchynskyi.

From political prisoner M. M. Horyn.

### **P R O T E S T**

Political prisoners in the Mordovian camps have long since become aware of the fact that their stay in camps is determined not by legal norms, but by whims and fancies of the camp administration.

Sifted through the sieve of KGB wishes, only scraps from legal principles and international agreements and declarations on defense of human rights have entered into the camp instructions.

According to the criminal code, punishment by imprisonment does not foresee physical maltreatment or a threat to the health of the prisoner. But in the camps of Mordovia, prisoners are kept for months on the 10 "b" rations (1370 calories per day) in penal compounds and are completely deprived of walks in the fresh air, as is the case in Camp No. 385/11.

According to legal norms, it is forbidden to add to the prisoners' spiritual sufferings, but their term in camps has been turned into the process of continuous investigation with constant summoning of prisoners to the prisons of Saransk, as well as to Kyïv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Lviv or other cities of Ukraine.

At every turn, Soviet legality is being trampled with impunity and the prisoners' elementary rights are being cynically ignored.

On the day of my arrival in Camp No. 17 you assured me that all possibility of punishment of innocent prisoners is excluded, but in a week's time you have deprived Mykhailo Masyutko and Valentyn Moroz of a private visit, and have found a way to punish me.

These days, those close to you are spreading a rumour that materials are being compiled on the three of us in order to send us to jail. At the same time you are talking about humanity and justice! You are indignant at the repressions by the Greek authorities; you are sympathizing with Manoli Glezos. Hypocrites!

On June 17-19, 1967, an incident occurred in camp which showed that your misanthropy is extended not only to prisoners. His old mother came to see political prisoner Bohdan Hermanyuk, who is completing his tenth year of imprisonment in the Mordovian camps, only because he dared to hold other views as a student.

During an unceremonious search of her luggage she suffered a stenocardiac attack. You did not pay attention to the doctor's warnings, left the sick woman to sleep by herself in the reception room, and on the morning of June 19th threw her out into the street. In the street she had a new stenocardiac attack. A group of prisoners, who were going to work, resolutely protested and demanded that the guard administer first aid to the sick woman. The warder, who was called by the guard, promised to take care of the woman. But after the prisoners left, he pulled her roughly toward the watch tower. The exhausted woman fell in the sand. The warder left her in the sand, and himself disappeared in the watch tower.

And when the prisoners who watched this scene of mockery of human dignity protested, you, as the worthy pupils of your predecessors have reached a Solomon-like decision: to punish them. They punished not that heartless warder-robot, who has lost all human feeling and left the sick woman in the sand, but people who dared to raise a voice of protest against the infamous act of violence.

After this you became well-aware that you have lost the remnants of moral capital even among those prisoners who have become your collaborators and agents. And it was not by chance that on Wednesday, June 21st, you did not dare to hold your political classes.

The only thing that you are not afraid of is to be punished for your shameful act, for your crime, because you are well aware of the fact that this kind of misanthropic morality was adopted not only by you, that you are going to be supported by the prosecutor of Mordovia, Overkin, who has sanctioned the confinement of mentally ill people to the penal compound, and by KGB captain Krut, who is an expert at the fabrication of false statements.

You know that this incident is not going to bring about diplomatic problems between the governments of the Ukrainian Republic and the Russian Federation, that your names are not going to appear in the notes of protest. You know this very well.

But you must know that you will never be able to cleanse yourself of the shameful blot of criminals who exerted every effort to conceal the outrage toward the sick woman, that every honest man will show you his contempt and scorn for the unheard-of sacrilege, which is worthy perhaps only of the pupils of Yezhov and Beria.

And together with these people I am throwing into your eyes my own contempt and scorn.

June 23, 1967

## **LETTER OF PROTEST TO MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF UKRAINIAN SSR**

To the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ukr.SSR Bilokolos.

From political prisoner M. M. Horyn, sentenced to 6 years of imprisonment in the camps of severe regime, who is now at the halting place for convicts at the Vladimir prison.

### **S T A T E M E N T**

It is not by chance that I am writing to you in particular. Several thousand kilometres away from Ukraine, in the remote political camps of the Russian Federation, events are taking place which concern you directly, as Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian Republic, of the Ukrainian people.

On the day of victory over Fascist Germany J. Stalin raised a toast to the exceptional achievements of the Russian people in winning victory over the enemy. Thus a green light was given to those who have long propagated the idea of Russian messianism, to those who have preached Russian chauvinism.

With the impetus characteristic of Stalin he proclaimed whole nations anti-Soviet and deported them to Siberia. In several days the Crimea was cleansed of the Tatars; the Chechens, the Ingushes, Karachays and others were resettled.

At the end of the 50s and the beginning of the 60s the Russian chauvinists went further and began to give a theoretical base to their policy. As if to order, Agayevs, Desherievs and Kammaris began to write. First of all they began to elaborate upon the question of language policy. Language is the spiritual treasure house of a nation, the source of its strength and power. As a rule, national revival of a people began with a language renaissance. The perfecting of the language and its enrichment always gave reliable immunity against assimilation, while the interest in the native language and its cultivation raised the national consciousness. On the other hand, those who tried to assimilate a people, put into effect linguistic assimilation first of all. In Ukraine

the Ems ukase and the Valuyev circular are well-known, in Estonia the declaration by Count Rosen. Agayev is already propagating the idea that some languages have prospects while others do not. And when, for instance, the Ukrainian language is to be included in the number of those without prospects, then can one even dream of a better service to Russian chauvinism?

Anyone who is in favour of the expansion of linguistic development is very often proclaimed a nationalist. The new morality, according to which the renunciation of the native language and the change-over to the Russian language of communication is not something amoral, but to the contrary, it is a manifestation of international consciousness, worthy of imitation, is being cultivated in many ways. Thus the consciousness of peoples is being moulded and parallel to it factories and a considerable number of schools of higher learning are being Russified and the artificial intermixing of peoples is being accomplished. Who will believe that the Rozdol sulphur works needs manpower [from outside Ukraine]? But it is brought in. And side by side with the newly arriving Russians, Russian schools and theatres come into Ukraine, and the percentage of Russian population is assuming dangerous proportions, which in comparison with the pre-war time has increased in Ukraine more than two times.

Far more tragic is the situation of some three odd million Ukrainians who live on the territory of the Russian Federation. Having no schools with the native language of instruction, cultural and educational institutions and periodicals, and being deprived of information about the fate of their countrymen in the neighbouring regions, Ukrainians of Vorkuta, Chita, the Volga region, Kuban, Siberia and the Far East are doomed to total assimilation. Not so long ago, the Kuban Ukrainians were building a monument to the founder of the Kuban Cossacks, feeling their blood unity with Ukrainian people, while today the percentage of Ukrainians in Kuban is falling drastically. This is how the Ukrainian affairs are treated in one of the socialist states — the Russian Federation, which is building relations on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist nationality policy, is criticizing Chinese chauvinism with respect to the Uigurs, Mongols, Kazakhs and other nationalities and is proclaiming the most humane principles of equality of peoples.

And when the Ukrainian intelligentsia protested against the oppression by Russian chauvinism, in many cities of Ukraine the doors of investigating prisons of the KGB opened before them; closed trials were organized for them and they were accused of slandering Soviet reality and of propagating the ideas of nationalism. In defiance of the article of the Constitution about the freedom of speech and press, in defiance of the "Declaration of Human Rights" proclaimed by the UN and ratified by the USSR, which guarantees the rights to propagandize your views by whatever means, we were tried for

defending the legal rights of Ukraine, while among other things, the Constitution guarantees not only the equality of all the peoples of the USSR, but also their secession from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In the Mordovian camps of the Russian Federation besides Ukrainians, you will find Byelorussians, Moldavians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Circassians, Ingushes, Bashkirs, Tatars and others. In other words the Russian Federation has taken all political prisoners under its safe wing. And far from their native land violence and lawlessness are waiting for them. The stay in the camps for political prisoners has been transformed into the process of continuous investigation. In defiance of all laws, people are sent from camps to jails, where by way of psychological pressure they try to obtain what the investigation or the trial failed to obtain: self-flagellation, repentance, the admission of your own guilt.

On the basis of complaints confiscated from Mykhailo Masyutko, V. Moroz and L. Lukyanenko and a questionnaire of psychological research from me, a case about "systematic writing by us of nationalistic lectures and their circulation among prisoners" was fabricated. Of course, camp commandant Major Kasatkin, who signed the order, declared that he did not read them. Nevertheless such "blind" solution of the case did not stop them from confining us to the penal compound for 6 months. Furthermore on July 16th the same documents served as an accusation against us at the visiting assizes of the Dubova-Polyana district. Without any advance notice Mykhailo Masyutko, Valentyn Moroz and I were called out right from work and without any prior notice were taken to the office. Of course, all this was done with the aim to stun us by surprise.

I was tried first. When asked by the judge what were my claims to the court, I stated: I consider both the make up of the court as well as the procedure of the court hearing to be illegal. A representative of the administration: overseer of the regime, is sitting on the court; I, as a defendant, have not been notified in advance about the trial; I was not familiarized with the accusation or the request of camp administration, and as the result I cannot defend myself properly and cannot hire a lawyer. Therefore any kind of verdict by the court at all, is considered by me to be illegal in advance.

In the course of the court proceedings it became apparent that I was being accused of circulating nationalistic literature. But, as it turned out, neither the prosecutor, nor the judge, nor the representative of the administration, had seen these "nationalistic documents". The representative of the administration excused himself by saying that this happened in Camp No. 385/1, the prosecutor stated that he had heard from the prosecutor of Mordovia that these documents were nationalistic. For the second time I saw how they try "blindly". This did not prevent the judges from sentencing me to three years of imprisonment. But in camps for political prisoners, this is nothing sensational.

Upon demands from prisoner Masyutko (he was tried second) to acquaint him with the accusatory evidence, the prosecutor said that this is not a trial, but an ordinary change of regime. "Then — said Masyutko, — if this is not a trial, I don't want to hear the verdict." A female judge came to the aid of the prosecutor by declaring in Russian: "But this is a very real trial."

When the court was trying Valentyn Moroz, Masyutko and I were already sitting in the penal isolation ward, getting ready to be sent to prison. At that time one warder was passing the order of the camp commandant to another warder out loud, to prepare a place for Moroz in the isolation ward. Political prisoner Daniel called out for the whole isolation ward to hear: "Dear friends, what kind of a trial is it — Moroz had not been convicted yet, and a place is already being prepared for him in the isolation ward!"

And truly. What kind of a trial is it? It is a shameful mock trial, which is hard to be believed by a contemporary civilized man. This is the most brutal means of punishment of political prisoners, who stand up for their rights, their human dignity, law. This is a new manifestation of the intellect of the KGB agents. In connection with this I would like to ask you, Minister, several questions: are you considering raising the following questions before the government of the Russian Federation: 1) on the incident with citizeness Hermanyuk; 2) on the cruel treatment of Ukrainian political prisoners in the Mordovian camps; 3) on the cessation of assimilation of the Ukrainian population which is living on the territory of Russia, and the creation for it of normal conditions.

Are you considering doing this? And you should, if you are troubled by the fate of the Ukrainian people and if you are thinking about its future.

---

## KARAVANSKYI'S SENTENCE EXTENDED

S. I. Karavanskyi (a Ukrainian writer and translator) is a native of Odessa who was born in 1920. In 1944 he was sentenced to 25 years' imprisonment for taking part in an underground youth organisation (Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists) during the German and Rumanian occupation (the slogan of the organisation was "Down with the bloody terror of Hitler and Stalin!"). He survived the camps of Kolyma, Pechora, Taishet, and Mordovia. The amnesty of 1954 led to his term being reduced by half, but he was set free only in 1960, having thus served over sixteen years in prison, and spent about five years in captivity "for nothing."

In the camps Karavanskyi occupied himself intensively with literary self-education and wrote poetry. When he became free, he prepared for publication an extensive "Ukrainian Rhyming Dictionary", which was highly regarded by experts. He had verse and learned articles published on more than one occasion.

Observing a deep-rooted process of Russification in Ukrainian national culture, Karavanskyi considered it his duty to speak out against it, and wrote a series of articles on the subject. These articles led to summonses by the KGB and the Procuracy.

In 1965 he wrote a protest against the persecution of the Ukrainian intelligentsia and sent it to the heads of the Polish, Rumanian, Czechoslovak and Yugoslav Communist Parties, requesting them to discuss the problem. In October 1965 he was arrested and sentenced.

The motive given for this was that Karavanskyi was illegally set free, *as he had not served the sentence given him in 1944*, — although according to the law of 1959 the longest sentence possible is fifteen years. (As stated earlier, Karavanskyi himself had served nearly seventeen years in the camps).

In 1969, when 25 years had elapsed from the day of Karavanskyi's initial arrest, a lawyer who was invited to draw the attention of the Supreme Court to the illegality of Karavanskyi's further detention in prison refused to do this, referring to the "traditions of legal practice."

In the same year 1969, new criminal proceedings were instituted against Karavanskyi, then in Vladimir prison, under article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code (anti-Soviet agitation). This time the incriminating evidence was an article on the reconciliation of East and West and a history of the shooting of Polish officers in Katyn Forest



in 1940, which he had taken down from statements by persons who had been fellow prisoners with a certain Andreyev (now deceased) and a certain Menshankin, former Soviet citizens who had taken part in the shooting.

On 23 April 1970 a court sentenced Karavanskyi to five years' imprisonment. The judge was Kolosov and the Procurator Abramov.

Karavanskyi has nine and a half years to serve, his two sentences totalling 30 years.

Just before the latest trial, a letter in Karavanskyi's defence was sent to the President of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, comrade Lyashko, and the Procurator of Ukraine, comrade Glukhov. It was entitled "'Cell' case once again?" (i. e. cases, often involving stool-pidgeons, against people already in prison), and was signed by sixteen former political prisoners, amongst whom were V. Chornovil, V. Moroz and B. Horyn.

*(Chronicle of Current Events, No. 13, 28 April, 1970).*

## THREE YOUNG UKRAINIANS CONVICTED IN DNIPROPETROVSK

From 19 to 27 January [1970] in Dnipropetrovsk the trial took place of I. H. Sokulskyi, N. H. Kulchynskyi and V. V. Savchenko, accused under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (which corresponds to article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code).

The judge was Tubelts, the assessors were Krikunov and Hrynevych. The prosecutor was the deputy-procurator of the region, Zhupinsky. The defence lawyers were Romm and Sarry (Moscow) and Ezholy (Dnipropetrovsk).

The case was heard in closed session. Only the mothers of the accused, the correspondents of several Ukrainian newspapers, and officials of the KGB were present. Sentence was passed in open court. The accused were charged with:

1. the preparation and distribution of an "Appeal from the creative youth of Dnipropetrovsk."\* (Sokulskyi admitted authorship of the work. In this document, among other things, were discussed the dismissal from their work of persons devoted to Ukrainian culture, and facts about enforced Russification.)

2. the distribution of the document by V. Moroz, "Reportage from the Beria Game Reserve."

3. the distribution of the article by Academician Aganbegyan, "The Soviet Economy."

4. the copying of chapters from the book by Molnar "The Slovaks and the Ukrainians" (the books of this author have been published in the USSR, and the book in question has received positive reviews in the press).

5. keeping (at Sokulskyi's house) a letter addressed but not sent to the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party entitled "In the position of satraps of the Tsar."

6. (Sokulskyi only) his own verse.

7. verbal statements on the national question and on the military intervention in Czechoslovakia.

The procurator demanded: for Sokulskyi — six years' imprisonment; for Kulchynskyi — four years; for Savchenko — three years. (He was at liberty during the trial.)

The court passed the following sentences: on Sokulskyi — four and a half years' imprisonment under article 62 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR (strict-regime); on Kulchynskyi — two and a half years' imprisonment under article 187-1, which corresponds to article 190-1 of the Russian Code; on Savchenko — two years suspended sentence, with three years probation, under article 187-1.

The article under which Kulchynskyi and Savchenko were charged was altered in the course of the proceedings. The accused pleaded guilty within the terms of article 187-1 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR. Sokulskyi expressed his repentance.

*(Chronicle of Current Events, No. 12, 28th February, 1970).*

\* From 5 to 10 December [1970] the traditional hunger strike was held by a number of political prisoners in the Mordovian camps (Nos. 19, 3 and 17), by 27 people being held in Vladimir prison, and by Natalya Gorbanevskaya and Vladimir Gershuni in Butyrka prison.

*(Chronicle, No. 17)*

---

\*) See *The Ukrainian Review*, No. 3, 1969, pp. 46-52.

## TRIAL OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL FRONT

*Chronicle of Current Events*, No. 17, under the heading "Trials of Past Years", brings more details about one of the biggest trials in Ukraine in 1967, in which members of the underground organisation "Ukrainian National Front" were involved.

On June 8, 1966, the KGB of Ivano-Frankivsk region in West Ukraine arrested a Donetsk miner, Mykola Kachur, on the charge of spreading the illegal typewritten journal "Volya i Bat'kivshchyna" (Freedom and Country), organ of the Ukrainian National Front. In March 1967 the following people were arrested: *Dmytro Kvetsko* (b. 1935, graduate of the Faculty of History, University of Lviv, worked as teacher of history at a school); *Zynoviy Krasivs'kyi* (b. 1930, litterateur, author of the historical novel *Bayda* about the 16th C. Ukrainian Cossack leader Dmytro Vyshnevets'kyi. The novel was prepared for publication and edited by the writer M. Stel'makh, but was not printed owing to the author's arrest. In 1947, during mass deportations from Western Ukraine, Krasivs'kyi was deported together with his family, but he escaped while on the way to Siberia, was caught and spent five years in a concentration camp, later lived in Karaganda in Kazakhstan, where after a rockfall in a coal mine he became an invalid of the second category. Prior to his arrest he lived in Morshyn, (West Ukraine); *Mykhailo Dyak* (b. 1935, militia lieutenant); *Vasyl' Kulynin* (b. 1943, after serving in the army worked as turner at a factory in Stryi (West Ukraine); *Yaroslav Lesiv* (b. 1945, physical training teacher at a school in Kirovohrad region); *Hryhoriy Prokopovych*, history teacher; *Ivan Hubka*, an engineer from L'viv; *Myroslav Melen'*, a choirmaster from Morshyn. The three latter persons were 40 years old each. The four latter persons had previously stood trial for their participation in the national resistance.

The investigation against this group of members of the Ukrainian National Front was conducted by Lt.-Col. of the KGB in Ivano-Frankiv'sk, Dolgikh.

In September 1967, the L'viv regional court held a trial of Prokopovych, Hubka and Melen', sentencing the first two to six years imprisonment in concentration camps, and the latter one to five years. In October 1967, Ivano-Frankivsk regional court sentenced

Kachur to 5 years deportation to concentration camps. It appears that during the investigation Kachur broke down because "for assisting in the investigation" he was released before the completion of his term in 1969. All the accused were charged with spreading the journal "Volya i Bat'kivshchyna" and other material of the Ukrainian National Front.

In the second half of November, 1967, the visiting session of the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR presided by Stolyarchuk, held a trial of the leading group of "five" who were accused under Art. 56 (high treason) and Art. 64 (forming an illegal organisation). The prosecution was conducted by the deputy procurator of Ivano-Frankivs'k region, Chumak.

Defence lawyers called by the investigation differed little from the procurator. The accused were charged with: publishing the journal "Volya i Bat'kivshchyna" (which was published between 1964 and 1966, there appeared 15 issues, some issues were not submitted at the trial). A programme document "Demands of the UNF" was published in the first issue, and "Tactics of UNF" was published in the second issue — it was reprinted in the Ukrainian press in the West.

The chief publicist and theoretician of the journal was Kvetsko.

Apart from the journal, the Ukrainian National Front sent a "Memorandum of the UNF to the 23rd Congress of the CPSU" addressed to the leaders of the CPSU and the central press organs in 1966, as well as published "The Declaration of the UNF" in connection with the press conference in Kyiv given by the former member of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists, S. Dzhugalo (probably kidnapped by the KGB in Salzburg). During the trial mention was also made of the spreading of OUN brochures and leaflets from the period 1947-49 found in three chests by Krasivs'kyi in the Carpathians, about 7,000 copies in all. The most active distributor of the leaflets was apparently militia lieutenant Dyak.

The court's verdict was that the three accused were guilty and deserved "the highest measure of punishment", but taking into account various reasons, it sentenced Kvetsko to 15 years of deprivation of liberty (including five years in prison), Krasivs'kyi and Dyak to 12 years (including 5 years in prison and the rest in a concentration camp), and Kulynin and Lesiv to six years' imprisonment in concentration camp.

Kvetsko and Krasivs'kyi are at present held at the Vladimir prison; Dyak, Lesiv, Kulynin and Melen' — at Camp No. 19 of the Dubrovlag system of camps (in Mordovia); Prokopovych and Hubka at Camp No. 3 of the Dubrovlag.

---

## REPRISALS AGAINST MOROZ'S WIFE AND FRIENDS

The unofficial publication in Ukraine circulating privately, *Ukrains'kyi Visnyk* [Ukrainian Herald] No. 4 reports:

Reprisals are being applied against Raïsa Moroz, wife of the convicted Valentyn Moroz. For five years she has been satisfactorily working as German Lecturer at the Ivano-Frankivsk Medical College. After the trial of V. Moroz, Raïsa Moroz was given to understand that it was her last year at the College. In the spring (1971) her post is being advertised as vacant.

The family of Moroz were building a flat for themselves on a cooperative basis. By a decision of the general meeting of the cooperative they were permitted to have a three-room flat. They paid the necessary sum and moved into the flat. At present, upon an instruction from the KGB, they demand from R. Moroz to move into a one-room flat. The chairman of the cooperative does not hide that this is being done because R. Moroz's husband has been convicted for "politics".

\* \* \*

The previous issues (of *Ukrains'kyi visnyk*) reported about the search at the house of Fr. Vasyl Romaniuk, from the village of Kosmach, in Hutsul area, in the case of V. Moroz, on May 4, 1970. After the trial of V. Moroz, only a few religious books were returned to Romaniuk. The remainder were confiscated by the Ivano-Frankivsk KGB, as prohibited. Among the prohibited books are: a number of religious books, including some published towards the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th centuries, the dramatic poem *Boyarynia* [Boyar's Wife] (a photo-copy from a Soviet edition in the 1920s), the book by M. Vozniak, *Istoriya ukrains'koï literatury* (History of Ukrainian Literature), vol. 2, 16th-17th centuries, 1921, *Istoriya Ukraïny* [History of Ukraine] by M. Arkas, 1909 edition, *Nedilya* [Sunday] newspaper volume for the years 1934-36, the book *Vsesvitnia istoriya* [World History], calendars, Christmas carols, Lepkyi's poems, etc, personal correspondence, various notes, lecture notes of a religious character (V. Romaniuk is a student at the Moscow Theological Academy). To a question by V. Romaniuk: "Surely one cannot consider anti-Soviet the History of Ukraine by Arkas published in 1909 and passed even by tsarist censorship?" — KGB captain Pryhornytskyi replied: "Although it is not anti-Soviet in the direct sense, it can lead to anti-Soviet thinking".

Addressing a gathering of teachers at the town of Kosiv in Ivano-Frankivsk region, a CP lecturer described I. Dzyuba, I. Svitlychnyi and V. Chornovil as "schizophrenics". In his opinion, Gen. Hryhorenko [P. Grigorenko], the historian P. Yakir and Academician A. Sakharov, too, are also "mentally abnormal" people... He said about V. Moroz that the latter had managed to cause some trouble at Kosmach, but nevertheless he was made harmless in time.

#### KYIV

*Oleksander Serhiyenko*, drawing and painting master of the No. 97 school in Kyiv, has been unlawfully dismissed from his job. On the eve of the trial of Valentyn Moroz in Ivano-Frankivsk. O. Serhiyenko fell sick and did not come to work. A delegation of teachers appeared at his house on the same day. They did not believe that their colleague went to a polyclinic, and went to search for him there. After [Serhiyenko's] recovery from illness, the headmaster of the (Ukrainian) school called for Serhiyenko and enquired [in Russian]: "how far has it gone with him that he had to go to some sort of a trial". He explained the reason for the teachers' visit quite frankly: "Comrades [from the KGB — *Transl.*] took an interest in you, and the teachers' team had to convince themselves whether you were really sick". At first the headmaster decided, in order to "save Serhiyenko from harmful influence", to give him more work, by adding physics classes for him to do, but this did not succeed because Serhiyenko lacked the necessary education.

On 7th December, 1970, O. Serhiyenko made a speech at the funeral of Alla Hors'ka [a Ukrainian artist; see p. 65. She was murdered on November 28, 1970, in mysterious circumstances — *Transl.*]. Next day the headmaster suggested to Serhiyenko that he should "resign at his own request", because he was fed up with the fact that "comrades are constantly interested" in Serhiyenko, and he wanted to have peace and quiet at the school. Serhiyenko refused to hand in such a request.

On 27th December, in view of the fact that he had no classes that day and no other duties the next day, Serhiyenko went away to see his parents with the permission of the headmaster. When he returned to work he found an order about his dismissal waiting for him... as punishment for missing his work on 28th December. The headmaster "did not remember anything" about his permission. At present Oleksander Serhiyenko is out of work.

O. Serhiyenko's mother, *Oksana Meshko* (who spent 10 years in Stalinist labour camps, later rehabilitated), is also persecuted by the KGB. She is known from her public activities, protests against reprisals, in particular against the arrest of V. Moroz.

Of late O. Meshko noticed more and more frequently that she was under observation — in shops, cafés, in trolley-bus. Persons who followed her, especially tried to make themselves conspicuous. When, for instance, she stood in a queue, her "escort" several times impatiently looked through a window or doors.

When it transpired that O. Meshko did not show any symptoms of fear, actions against her changed somewhat.

After one of the rehearsals of the "Homin" Choir which works under the aegis of the Ukrainian Republic Choir Society at the "Kharchovyk" [Food Industry Worker] Club, O. Meshko was detained by a KGB worker and allegedly a worker of the district committee of the CP of Ukraine, and it was suggested to her to come for a talk to the club director. They dragged her almost with the use of violence to his office and began to interrogate her, what was she doing there, what was her job, where was she working, where did she live. Afterwards, the director of the club [a woman] explained [in Russian — Transl.] that she "did not like the behaviour" of O. Meshko who allegedly "lures members of other amateur teams to that "Homin" choir of hers", which, as a matter of fact, does not correspond to the truth.

The director told Leopold Yashchenko, choir conductor, that she would not in future admit O. Meshko to the club, because she was "a person with a hostile attitude". As a result O. Meshko was forced to quit the choir.

\* \* \*

The amateur choir "Homin" conductor — Leopold Yashchenko, M. A., expelled from the Institute of Art, Folklore and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR for signing a declaration of protest against violation of socialist legality (in 1968) enjoys wide popularity in Kyiv. The repertoire of the choir consists of old Ukrainian folk songs, mostly echoing ancient rituals, Choir members are factory workers, white-collar workers, undergraduates and postgraduate research students.

Since the time the choir was spontaneously formed, various and continuous obstacles were put before it (there were no premises available for rehearsals, it was forbidden to sing ancient spring songs in the streets, parks etc.).

When however, overcoming all difficulties, the choir found a firm ground under its feet, its members have been subject to individual persecution. Postgraduate research students are often carpeted at their faculties, and new singers are questioned about who persuaded them to join the choir, from whom did they learn about it. As a result some singers have quit the choir fearing unpleasantness at work or studies, some attend the rehearsals with anxiety.

\* \* \*

In October 1970, the critic and translator *Ivan Svitlychnyi* was summoned by the head of the district police HQ and was given an



ultimatum to find a job immediately, and threatened with punishment for "idleness".

As is known, I. Svitlychnyi completed postgraduate research studies at the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, and towards the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s often made appearance as literary critic. Reprisals against him began at the beginning of the 1960s (dismissal from work in the journal *Dnipro*, etc.). At the beginning of 1964 I. Svitlychnyi was dismissed from the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR for making a speech at the soirée devoted to the memory of V. Symonenko at the Kyiv Medical College on December 20, 1963. On July 12, 1965, he was sacked from the job of manager of the editorial board of language and dictionaries of the "Naukova dumka" [Scientific Thought] Publishing House at the instruction of Academician I. Bilodid, whose scientific incapability was revealed by I. Svitlychnyi in the article "Harmony and Algebra" (*Dnipro*, No. 3, 1965).

At the beginning of September 1965 I. Svitlychnyi was arrested together with a large group of Ukrainian intelligentsia. Released from investigation on April 30, 1966 as a result of active protests of the public in Ukraine and abroad. Since that time he could not find work in accordance with his profession, and occupied himself with literary work at home. In 1970 "The Songs" by Boranco, most of which were translated by I. Svitlychnyi, were published by "Dnipro" Publishing House.

I. Svitlychnyi was summoned for the second time with similar threats when V. Moroz was tried at Ivano-Frankivsk. I. Svitlychnyi proved that he had publishing contracts, that he received fees for publications and that he was not "idling" — and so he was left in peace for time being.

\* \* \*

The literary critic and publicist, Yevhen Sverstiuk, found himself in danger of dismissal in October 1970.

Yevhen Sverstiuk was sacked in 1965 from scientific work at the Institute of Pedagogy for a sharp speech he made at a gathering of teachers from Volynia. He found himself a job as responsible secretary of the *Ukrains'kyi botanichnyi zhurnal* [Ukrainian Botanical Journal] and has been working there for the last five years.

Yevhen Sverstiuk was told now that he was working not according to his qualifications and that he should look for another job. Several times time-limits have been set for him, and although Yevhen Sverstiuk has not yet been dismissed, such a threat hangs constantly over him.

No one has doubt that attempts at reprisal measures against Yevhen Sverstiuk and I. Svitlychnyi have been caused only by their public activities.

## THE TRAGIC DEATH OF ALLA HORS'KA

Alla Hors'ka, well-known Ukrainian paintress, died tragically on November 28, 1970. She was found murdered — strangled with a towel — at the house of her husband's parents near Kyiv where she was looking after her ill father-in-law. According to the latest information there are grounds to suspect that the murder was the work of the KGB for whom Alla Hors'ka was an inconvenient person. The KGB refused to give a permission for a public funeral, and those of her friends who dared to pay the last tribute to her were threatened with reprisals. Searches were carried out at their flats.

Alla Hors'ka, together with her husband, the well-known painter Viktor Zarets'kyi, were expelled from the Union of Artists of Ukraine for "ideological unreliability". Deprived of steady jobs because of it, they found only occasional jobs. Their flat in Repin Street in Kyiv became a sort of literary and artistic *salon* of the young Ukrainian intellectuals and was frequented by numerous representatives of artistic and literary youth. The poet Vasyl Symonenko who died in 1963 was often to be seen there. This circle of friends arranged the posthumous publication of his collections of works on the basis of "samvydav" (self-publication), and the project of erecting a monument to Symonenko from individual contributions was born there.

Alla Hors'ka was born on September 18, 1922 and was brought up in a Russified family in Kyiv. She finished the Kyiv Institute of Art and actively joined in the process of national rebirth which embraced the younger generations of the creative intellectuals of Kyiv at the beginning of the 1960s. She began to use Ukrainian in everyday conversation. In 1962 she became one of the organisers of the famous Club of Creative Youth (forcibly disbanded in 1964). She took part in the organisation of literary and artistic soirées, dissemination of "samvydav" (self-publication) works, collection of funds for mutual assistance, etc.

In 1964, together with the artists Lyudmyla Semykina, Panas Zalyvakha and Halyna Sevruck, Alla Hors'ka made the Shevchenko stained-glass window in the vestibule of the University of Kyiv building. The stained-glass window depicted an angry Shevchenko (the greatest Ukrainian 19th c. national poet) who with one hand embraced a wronged woman-Ukraine, and in another, raised hand held a book. There was an inscription on the stained glass (a quotation from Shevchenko) window: 'I shall glorify them, these mute slaves! I shall put WORD near them to guard them' (a photograph of the stained-glass window was printed in "The Ukrainian Calendar" for 1965 published by the Ukrainian Social and Cultural Society in Poland). The stained-glass window was brutally destroyed at the order of the CP committee of the University of Kyiv and the University authorities (at the instruction of the KGB) and Alla Hors'ka and Lyudmyla Semykina were expelled from the Union of Artists of Ukraine. They behaved with dignity during the consideration of their "case".

