

**THE  
TRUTH  
ABOUT  
A.B.N.**

*by*

**NIKO NAKASHIDZE**

**The Truth About A.B.N.**

*Lucius Muroby*

## CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Introduction . . . . .  | 5    |
| The Russian emigrants and Russian political organizations in exile . . . . .    | 9    |
| What is A.B.N.? . . . . .   | 14   |
| a) The history of the A.B.N.  |      |
| b) The political conception of the A.B.N.                                       |      |
| The historical and international legal basis of the A.B.N. principles . . . . . | 18   |
| 1. The Russian Tsarist empire   |      |
| 2. The Russian Communist imperium   |      |
| 3. The problem of the foreign peoples in the Soviet Union                       |      |
| The enemies of the A.B.N. and their propaganda campaign . . . . .               | 30   |
| Conclusion . . . . .  | 60   |

# **The Truth About A.B.N**

**An Answer to the Provocations of Moscow's  
Fifth Column in the West**

**by**

**NIKO NAKASHIDZE**

Published by the A. B. N. Press and Information Bureau

---

MUNICH 1960



## INTRODUCTION

Ever since the A.B.N. was first founded, the representatives of the Moscow government in the Western countries, their camouflaged centres, the Communist Party and the Russian emigrant organizations have been conducting a fierce fight against it.

They can really not be reproached for doing so, for the A.B.N. supports the principle that *the Soviet Union is a Russian totalitarian colonial imperium* which must be disintegrated and that the foreign countries conquered and ruled by this imperium must be liberated and the independent sovereign states of these peoples restored; and to this end the A.B.N. demands that a ruthless and relentless *fight must be waged against Russian imperialism*.

For there can be no peace in the world until this Russian imperium, which with its huge military strength is endeavouring to conquer the whole world, to subjugate it and enforce its Communist regime of dictatorship on it, has been destroyed.

It has long been an established fact that all Russians, both at home and abroad, are unanimously agreed that this peoples' prison — the Russian imperium — must be preserved. Hence there is so much concord and agreement between the Soviet Communist Russians at home and the nationalist and pseudo-democratic Russian emigrants in the fight against the A.B.N.

In the West the Russians are supported by native Communists, hirelings of Moscow, co-existentialists and Russophil circles of every political colour, as well as by all political nihilists.

By joint efforts they endeavour to paralyse the activity of the A.B.N. and to destroy this organization. They resort to every means in order to defame the A.B.N. and to put obstacles in its way.

In order to liquidate one's opponent it is nowadays customary to brand him as "Fascist," "Nazi" or "Anti-Semite."

In olden times an anecdote used to be told about a hare which fled from Russia because, according to a supreme decree, camels had to be shod there. When asked why he had run away, the hare replied: "You try to prove that you are a hare and not a camel!" — Such were conditions in Russia in former times and they are still the same! And now the civilized free world has also reached the same state.

Such, too, are the methods resorted to by the enemies of the A.B.N. We intentionally refer to them as "enemies", for they cannot be regarded as opponents. The ancient Romans already distinguished between the concepts "enemy" and "opponent". An opponent does not seek to destroy the life

of another person, but an enemy does, and such are the beings who are fighting the A.B.N.

They not only seek to destroy the A.B.N — this would not be particularly tragic — but they also aim to destroy our peoples, to degrade them completely to one and the same level and to assimilate them with the Russian element. It was the Assyrians who in the 8th century B. C. resettled the peoples, mixed them together and reduced them to one uniform level. Only their names have been recorded in the later history of the world.

Since then, this process has been repeated in the history of the world a second time, and it is now the Russians who are leading the ancient civilized peoples whom they have subjected towards their national ruin. And, incidentally, there are plenty of people in the civilized free world who support and further this crime! Others, on the other hand, regard this matter with complete indifference, as if it were no concern of theirs. And this is the world that calls itself Christian!

Some time ago, the enemies of the A.B.N. published a pamphlet in English, entitled "What Is A.B.N.", and circulated it all over the world. It was published by an organization which calls itself the "Ukrainian Liberation Movement", but which in reality consists of *genuine Russians* who pose as "Ukrainian Federalists".

This fictitious committee belongs to the notorious Russian chauvinistic reactionary organization NTS (Narodno-Trudovoy Soyuz = People and Labour Union), which has its seat in Frankfort on Main and which, practically at the same time as the said pamphlet was published, sent a strictly confidential circular letter to all the organizations friendly with the A.B.N. and also to other organizations, in which it attempted to portray the A.B.N. as a terrible bogey by producing proof entirely in keeping with the unscrupulousness of these Russian politicians.

Members of the peoples of Asia, to whom friendship is not an empty phrase but a virtue, brought this abusive pamphlet of the NTS to our notice.

The pro-Russians in England and France, on the other hand, hastened to spread these propaganda lies against the A.B.N. still further. Indeed, a certain Mr. H. Jaeger actually re-printed them in his publication "Bulletin on German Questions"<sup>1)</sup>. It is plain to us that this Mr. Jaeger is not an Englishman, for no Englishman would publish such accusations until he had convinced himself that they were true. In England defamation is regarded as the vilest and most despicable method of attack. We merely wish to point out this fact and are not interested in who Mr. Jaeger actually is. He has given sufficient proof of his human and moral quality by his action. This "Bulletin" was dispatched by the French information bureau of a certain Monsieur Jean Ruhland in Loroux-Bottereau (L.—I.).

---

<sup>1)</sup> Bulletin on German Questions, With Contemporary Archives, published by Gamma Publications Ltd., 15 Craven Street, London W. C. 2., Vol. X, No. 230, February 2, 1959.

He is not the first and only Frenchman to further Russian intrigues, for there is another French group active in this respect. A Russian by the name of *A. de Gourévitch* (what a peculiar combination the French designation of aristocracy "de" is with the Russian name "Gourévitch"!), who, incidentally, from the legal point of view is not entitled to bear this name, since in tsarist Russia there was no designation for the petty nobility and the fact that a person was of noble descent was only indicated in his matriculation certificate or in his official rank, runs a Russian "organization", which calls itself "Union pour la Défense des Peuples Opprimés", and edits a monthly journal entitled "Exil et Liberté". This organization has as its patrons certain French politicians who still have an old conception of the Russo-French alliance and who also contribute articles to the journal edited by Monsieur Gourévitch.

The above-mentioned journal recently also published an article against the A.B.N. written by Mr. Paul Monique, who based his arguments on the said pamphlet and used the lies and provocative statements contained in the latter as proof.

We shall deal with this "proof" and these "arguments" in detail further on and shall show how skilfully the Russian Soviet Fifth Column works in disseminating its vile propaganda lies and how easily many foreigners swallow its provocative statements. We sincerely regret that we are also obliged to attack the French pro-Russians who in their blind devotion to Russia have renounced the best French traditions and have so rashly abandoned the European tasks of France.





## I. THE RUSSIAN EMIGRANTS AND RUSSIAN POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS IN EXILE

When in October 1917, the Bolsheviks under the leadership of Lenin seized the power in Russia and the regime of dictatorship was set up, a dreadful wave of terrorism and civil war began to sweep the country. Thousands of persons were forced to leave their country and fled abroad.

Thus the Russians in exile constitute a political emigration, that is to say they are persons who were only driven out of their country as a result of the internal political upheaval or they were forced to flee because they opposed the ruling regime. At that time and also later, however, the non-Russian countries of the former tsarist empire still existed as independent states, but they were gradually seized by Soviet Russia one after another. And in contrast to the Russian emigration, the emigration of these non-Russian peoples ruled by Russia is a *national emigration*, for these peoples have either been forced to leave their native countries because the latter were occupied by a foreign power — namely, Russia, or else have been driven out of their countries by reprisals on the part of the foreign Russian rulers. For this reason, there is a big difference between these emigrations.

To the Russians who are fighting against the Communist regime, it is purely a question of regime, but to the emigrants of the peoples subjugated by Russia it is a national question, — namely, liberation from Russian rule and the restoration of their own national state existence.

Apart from political differences, all Russians are thus agreed on one point, — to work for and guarantee *the preservation of the Russian imperium*. And this was the reason why General Denikin and P. Milyukov during the last war exhorted the Russians in exile to fight on Stalin's side for Russia.

There have always been differences between the Russian and the other emigrants, and a fierce controversy was conducted in the press, for the Russians constantly supported the imperialistic idea, whilst the spokesmen of our peoples exposed the Russian aims to the world.

Since World War II, the Russian emigrants have increased in number and now include many new Soviet emigrants. The former emigrants have either died in the meantime, or have grown old and feeble. Russian political life in exile is now determined by *these new Soviet emigrants*.

And the latter have introduced the Soviet style and have imprinted it on the entire life of the Russian emigrants. Indeed, in the political life of the latter they play the leading role. They are individuals trained in the

Communist spirit; there are among them former Party functionaries, "politruks", commissars, and MVD officials, etc. As such, they are brutal as Bolsheviks, devoid of all moral principles, brazen, and obsessed by a pathological ambitiousness. They will stop at nothing to achieve their aims. What is more, they possess an extraordinary talent for adapting themselves to a given situation, and, accordingly, in the West they pose as democrats.

They hate the West and all that it stands for; they are obsessed by the Russian megalomania and are the most reactionary advocates of the Russian imperialistic idea. They despise and hate our peoples because they know only too well what the attitude and principles of the latter are. Such are the elements that are conducting a ruthless campaign against the A.B.N. and, in keeping with Bolshevik methods, are spreading lies and false allegations about this organization all over the world.

These Russian political organizations exist in various countries, — in the USA, France, England, Germany and elsewhere. In America these Russians have meanwhile been naturalized and, as Americans, are practising their Russian policy and are endeavouring to influence the public in this direction. But the true Americans are keen observers and practical-minded, and they have long since discovered that Bolshevism and the Soviet Union are not abstract ideas, but are expressed in a concrete form by human beings and that these human beings are Russians and the Soviet Union is *a Russian imperium*.

In France, as already pointed out, these Russian organizations are supported by those who believe that a Russo-French alliance would increase France's power and, in fact, help to make her a major power in Europe again. These persons cherish illusions as regards the future and fail to realize *the Russian danger* to Europe. And it is futile to try to convince them otherwise.

The most powerful Russian organization — the NTS — has its seat in Germany. This organization is supported financially by foreign circles. It has branches in various countries, is extremely active and has *huge funds* at its disposal, for it possesses a publishing firm and a printing works of its own and publishes newspapers, periodicals, books and pamphlets. The leading persons of this organization constantly travel about to all parts of the world, for they have no difficulty in obtaining entry permits, and hold conferences on a large scale.

The case of N. E. Khokhlov, an officer of the Soviet security police, MVD, who "made for the West", may serve as an example in this respect. This high-ranking functionary of the Soviet secret police is sent all over the world by so-called "democratic" managers and he holds lectures everywhere, even in Hollywood<sup>2)</sup>, in order to prove that the democratic influence of the West has allegedly penetrated far into the Soviet Union. What a disgusting comedy! And that is what one calls "psychological warfare". One deceives

---

<sup>2)</sup> NTS organ "Posev" of April 19, 1959, No. 16.

oneself and at the same time also deceives the millions of persons languishing behind the Iron Curtain who are waiting for the West to help them.

The NTS even had a broadcasting station of its own near Frankfort on Main, which was blown up under mysterious circumstances; and it was only then that the public learnt that this Russian emigrant organization had possessed its own broadcasting station in Germany, namely in a German state (Hessen) whose government is definitely social democratic<sup>3)</sup>. And then nothing more was said about the matter; and, indeed, it still remains a mystery. What would have happened if it had been the A.B.N. that had a broadcasting station of its own, in Bavaria for instance?! One only needs to recall how our emigrants in Bavaria were attacked when the former Slovak Minister M. Cernak was assassinated, and when a parcel, which had been sent from Frankfort on Main, exploded in the editorial office of the Ukrainian paper "Shlakh Peremohy"! When, some years ago, a secret A.B.N. broadcasting station which was anti-Communist was discovered in Belgium, the persons in charge of it were sentenced to imprisonment. *But apparently the NTS can do anything it likes.* Why? Because as a "democratic" organization it is under "democratic protection", whereas the A.B.N. is decried as "fascist" and "anti-Semitic". But none of the worthy democrats who offer their protection have ever taken the trouble to find out the source from which this defamation emanates. None of them have ever realized that it is the Soviet Russian camouflaged organizations, the NTS and its hirelings who invent and spread these lies about the A.B.N.

Hitherto we have refused to take any notice of these defamations, but now that even Western circles are contributing to them, we feel we can no longer keep silent and must give them a fitting answer. And this answer will show how amoral and degenerate our enemies are and how vile and infamous their allegations. In its foul fight against the A.B.N., the NTS has used as its vanguard its branch-organization, which calls itself the "Ukrainian Liberation Movement", and has published the pamphlet "What Is A.B.N." under the name of the latter. The "President" of the committee of this organization is allegedly a certain R. Yagotinsky.

It is an established fact that this organization, boastfully designated as "Movement", consists of a few questionable characters who are no more Ukrainian than the man in the moon is!

The real name of the "President" of this fictitious Ukrainian organization, R. Yagotinsky, is Ivan Emelyanovych CHEMERYYS. He formerly served in General Denikin's White Army and emigrated abroad with the latter. To begin with, he lived in Yugoslavia and later in France. Here he joined the so-called "Smena Vekhov" (= "change of marking-poles") group, which upheld the view that the Bolshevik government represented the people and as such was a national and legal government. He later returned to the Soviet

---

<sup>3)</sup> This broadcasting station still exists. At least, appeals are constantly published in the NTS organ "Posev" addressed to the Russian emigrants, in which the latter are asked to subscribe towards the erection of this station.

in the field of agitation and subversive activity. And these experts are to be found either *in the NTS or in Soviet departments*. And this scum reproaches us with being "Fascists", "Nazi collaborators" and "anti-Semites". We shall deal with these accusations in detail later on, but first we should like to mention some general facts.

The fact that some members of the Central Committee of the A.B.N. served in the German army and that others held responsible state positions in the countries which were allies of Germany during the last war, is not denied by the A.B.N. and will also be discussed in detail later on. But this does not make us "Nazis", just as the fact that the English, the Americans and the French were allied with Moscow during the war does not make them Bolsheviks.

At the same time it is also an established fact, however, that all the NTS leaders and the majority of its members served in the Vlasov Army (that is to say on the side of Hitler) and that many of them belonged to the Gestapo units. *The NTS programme at that time also contained various racial and anti-Jewish paragraphs*. But this fact is now concealed by these individuals and, as if nothing had happened, they behave as if they were democrats and social-minded politicians.

That many of us fought on the German side against Russian imperialism and Bolshevism, was in our national interests, just as it was in the interests of the Western powers — in their opinion — to ally themselves with Communist Russia against Hitler.

But whereas we did not in the least give in to the Germans as regards our national demands, the Western powers abandoned half Europe to the Russians.

Our countries were not occupied by Germany but by Russia, and for this reason the fact that some of us fought on the German side against Russia can be justified from the national, political and moral point of view.

## **II. WHAT IS A. B. N.?**

### **a) The History of the A.B.N.**

When the war between Germany and Russia broke out in 1941, it was obvious from the start that the non-Russian peoples incarcerated in the Soviet Union had no intention of fighting for Russia, a fact which was evident from the mass desertion of non-Russian soldiers of the Red Army to the German side. These peoples hoped to regain their independence through the defeat of Russia.

Our peoples were of the opinion that Germany would meet the wishes of these peoples incarcerated in the Soviet Union, as she had done after the first world war, and that, after the defeat of Russia, by restoring the state independence of these peoples and by free bilateral agreements and alliances

them together or uniting them. I. E. Chemerys is a morbidly arrogant man, devoid of all ability to act and think constructively. I. E. Chemerys is only a would-be literator and journalist, who causes the editors who have to edit his writings a lot of trouble. In the first place, he needs to learn a lot and to grow in his development in order to become equal to others."

In addition, P. Sencha-Zalessky also writes as follows to Chemerys-Yagotinsky himself, — incidentally, in Russian, since the "President of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement" *does not know Ukrainian*:

"You have quite obviously shown your complete inability to act constructively and to carry out work of any serious social value. I have reached the conclusion that productive collaboration with you is impossible if you do not recognize the incorrectness of your conduct in such a situation..."

"We are of the opinion — so the editor of the "Rusalka" concludes his leading article, after mentioning various other "characteristics" of a similar nature, — that these few quotations suffice as illustration and make it unnecessary for us to comment any further on the character of the said "President of the ULM". They have, furthermore, given us the right *to expose this wolf in sheep's clothing and to warn the entire Ukrainian people against him.*"

The same number of the "Rusalka" also contains various accusations brought against "President" Chemerys-Yagotinsky by a certain Nestor Halytsky. For instance, he asks the "President" (on page 10) for the reasons for his completely indifferent attitude with regard to two very peculiar facts: namely, (1) that there are members of the Executive Committee of the "ULM" who make no secret of the fact that they are thinking of returning to the U.S.S.R., and (2) that there are also other members of the same Executive Committee who, at anti-Communist meetings, "have voiced their protest against those who have opposed Red Bolshevism". — "And now, — so N. Halytsky continues, — we should like to tell the truth about how many persons still belong to the ranks of the "mass movement" ULM: Ivan Chemerys Yagotinsky as "President of the Executive Committee", Fedir Karpov-Romanovsky as "Vice-President of this Committee", Petro Sencha-Zalessky as "Secretary-General", and Leontiy Tymofeyevych Makhnushka as "acting commander of the Ukrainian Free Cossacks", — these are all the persons who at present belong to this 'mass movement'!"

This latter statement is likewise (on p. 10-11) corroborated by the "Executive Organ of the Galician-Carpathian-Ukrainian-Russian Union" which declares in all seriousness that there cannot be the least attempt at further collaboration with the ULM, "for the simple reason that there is no longer such a thing as the ULM and that one cannot collaborate with three self-elected impostors and illiterates."

It is hardly necessary to add anything to the above remarks, for it is surely obvious with which and through which political criminal elements the NTS operates.

It is likewise obvious that this pamphlet cannot have been composed by this semi-illiterate Chemerys Yagotinsky, but has been compiled by experts

in the field of agitation and subversive activity. And these experts are to be found either *in the NTS or in Soviet departments*. And this scum reproaches us with being "Fascists", "Nazi collaborators" and "anti-Semites". We shall deal with these accusations in detail later on, but first we should like to mention some general facts.

The fact that some members of the Central Committee of the A.B.N. served in the German army and that others held responsible state positions in the countries which were allies of Germany during the last war, is not denied by the A.B.N. and will also be discussed in detail later on. But this does not make us "Nazis"; just as the fact that the English, the Americans and the French were allied with Moscow during the war does not make them Bolsheviks.

At the same time it is also an established fact, however, that all the NTS leaders and the majority of its members served in the Vlasov Army (that is to say on the side of Hitler) and that many of them belonged to the Gestapo units. *The NTS programme at that time also contained various racial and anti-Jewish paragraphs*. But this fact is now concealed by these individuals and, as if nothing had happened, they behave as if they were democrats and social-minded politicians.

That many of us fought on the German side against Russian imperialism and Bolshevism, was in our national interests, just as it was in the interests of the Western powers — in their opinion — to ally themselves with Communist Russia against Hitler.

But whereas we did not in the least give in to the Germans as regards our national demands, the Western powers abandoned half Europe to the Russians.

Our countries were not occupied by Germany but by Russia, and for this reason the fact that some of us fought on the German side against Russia can be justified from the national, political and moral point of view.

## **II. WHAT IS A. B. N.?**

### **a) The History of the A.B.N.**

When the war between Germany and Russia broke out in 1941, it was obvious from the start that the non-Russian peoples incarcerated in the Soviet Union had no intention of fighting for Russia, a fact which was evident from the mass desertion of non-Russian soldiers of the Red Army to the German side. These peoples hoped to regain their independence through the defeat of Russia.

Our peoples were of the opinion that Germany would meet the wishes of these peoples incarcerated in the Soviet Union, as she had done after the first world war, and that, after the defeat of Russia, by restoring the state independence of these peoples and by free bilateral agreements and alliances

with them, would only seek to guarantee a normal political and economic position for herself.

But the government of the Third Reich, dazzled by unnatural and unreasonable doctrines and by its initial victories, had the intention of ruling these countries itself. The measures introduced by the Germans in the countries already occupied, as for instance the Baltic states, Ukraine and Byelorussia, clearly showed that the Reichs government did not even intend to introduce self-administration there, still less to restore the state independence of these countries.

The government formed by the President of the A.B.N., Jaroslaw Stetzko, after the proclamation of the restoration of the independence of the Ukrainian state, was arrested and the members of this government were deported to concentration camps. Many of the Ukrainian politicians and nationalists were arrested. And numerous Baltic statesmen and politicians were put into prison. This evoked bitter feelings amongst our peoples, a fact which had fateful results for the issue of the war. In their despair these peoples had no other choice but to take up arms and fight as partisans, namely on two fronts — against the Russians and against the Germans.

When it became obvious that Germany's defeat was inevitable and that the Russian Communist hordes could no longer be held up in their advance towards the West, it was evident that the liberation of our peoples would be postponed indefinitely. They were thus obliged to adapt themselves to a lengthy period of fighting and hence it became necessary to unite all the forces of the subjugated peoples in order to conduct a joint fight.

At the initiative of the Ukrainian nationalists, the first meeting of the representatives of these peoples, at which vital questions were discussed, agreements made and the essential tasks defined, was held in November 1943, somewhere in the forests of Volhynia, near Zhytomyr. In 1944 another conference was held in secret in Cracow. On this occasion all the subjugated peoples were represented and the political programme of the A.B.N. was already drawn up in detail.

Immediately after the war, the national revolutionary organizations of the countries newly occupied by Russia — Roumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Serbia, Croatia, Slovakia, Czechia, Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia, and Albania — joined the A.B.N. as members. The A.B.N. thus became an international union of the national revolutionary organizations of all the peoples subjugated by Russia and by Communism. These organizations were founded in their native countries and are represented by persons who have fought there for the freedom of their peoples. They are thus the lawful representatives and spokesmen of their peoples in the free world.

### **b) The Political Conception of the A.B.N.**

The political conception of the A.B.N. is based on ideas and principles which hold good and are recognized in the civilized world as the highest possessions and values of human life: freedom and justice for every individual,



and state independence for every people. These basic rights we demand and claim for our peoples, too. And those who refuse us these rights, deny the natural rights of mankind and show themselves to be advocates of brute violence.

The human rights promoted by Christianity from its earliest days and later achieved by political and social progress — the rights of equality, justice and freedom — hold good not only for people of a certain race or nationality, but for the whole of mankind.

And because the nation constitutes the natural community of man, these principles were extended to include the nations, too. For there can be no freedom of the individual, if the nation itself is not free. And there can be no justice and no equality, if these rights do not hold good for all nations.

These principles constitute the legal foundations of the civilized world and are expressed in the resolutions on human rights of June 14, 1952, by the UNO: — “All peoples and all nations shall have the right of self-determination, namely the right freely to determine their political, economic, social and cultural status” (UNO Bulletin, Vol. XIII of September 1, 1952, p. 250/253). Those who disregard these principles not only are no democrats, but also no persons of culture. They are barbarians and advocates of the political and social ideas of the darkest Middle Ages. And those who refuse to concede these rights to our peoples and nations show themselves to be advocates of the theory of the “superior peoples”, “inferior peoples” and the “under-dog”.

Such are the Russians and their friends in the Western countries, the intellectual cynics and nihilists, persons without faith and without moral principles. These persons are of the opinion that it does not matter if the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union are absorbed by the Russian element; what has the world to lose, so they argue, if such small peoples as the Estonians, Georgians and others cease to exist, for a new international “Russian Soviet people” will then come into existence.

It is these cynics and degenerate individuals who affirm that the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union are prospering and developing under the protection of Russia and that they have no desire to detach themselves from Russia. It is ridiculous to affirm that our peoples have no national claims and no aim to restore their independent states again and that they would be content to remain under alien Russian rule, though they know that even such countries as, for instance, Jordan, Iraq, Libya, Israel, Nigeria, Ghana, Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala and others, exist as sovereign states, that many peoples have in the meantime become free and have established states of their own — even those who formerly had no state of their own, that all the colonial empires have been disintegrated and only the Russian empire continues to exist, and that they alone are still under the despotic rule of the latter and are subjected to a brutal terrorist regime. Can anyone really believe in all seriousness that these ancient civilized peoples will be content to continue to remain under Russian rule?

To deny our peoples the life of their own, which it is their natural desire to live, would be to degrade them to the lowest level of civilization and to regard them as most primitive beings. But they are, thank goodness, not that, and in defiance of the NTS and its Western friends they continue to fight for their national freedom and to assert themselves spiritually and physically in an admirable way.

Russia is now the only colonial empire in the world. In this age of the liberation of peoples, of huge political upheavals, progress and achievement, Russia alone rules foreign countries and peoples and holds them subjugated under the brutal regime of dictatorship, under which they are deprived of even the most rudimentary human rights. And this peoples' prison — the Russian imperium, called the Soviet Union, is supported by the NTS and the pro-Russians in the West, and these are the persons who deny our peoples the right to a state existence of their own.

The political programme of the NTS was published in the NTS organ "Posev", of June 7, 1959, No. 23. With unrestrained cynicism the NTS here reveals its true character and its imperialistic aims. In order to give this programme an "objective" character, it stops at nothing. The author is described as a Georgian; actually this person does not exist at all. The programme states that the Russian imperium is to continue to exist in its present form as the Soviet Union. East Prussia will "probably" be returned to Germany. In the Baltic countries plebiscites can be held at the wish of the people, but in that case only the persons living there can take part in them (there is thus to be no repatriation of the expellees), and since the Russian population at present constitutes the majority in these countries, it is quite obvious in advance what the results of such plebiscites would be, — namely in favour of Russia. No doubt an astute idea! And the other peoples are to remain in the Russian imperium without being asked. And this organization is promoted and supported by Western circles as a Russian democratic movement!

Those persons, however, who advocate the idea of the preservation of the Russian imperium of violence and who regard violence as a right are individuals who are devoid of all religious and moral qualities and are only fit to be overseers in concentration camps, where they can give vent to their pathological disposition. They are political crooks, reactionaries and blasphemers.

We do not intend to argue with them, but wish to show the people in the West what type of person they are, whose and what cause they support, how mendacious and perfidious they are, and how the so-called pro-Russians in the West have abandoned their European attitude and have put themselves at the service of Russian imperialism which menaces the existence of their countries.

The disintegration of the imperium and colonial empire of Russia, the liberation of the peoples ruled by the latter, the restoration of their indepen-

dent states, that is to say the idea of national freedom, the recognition of the sovereign rights of all nations without exception and their equality of rights, the religious idea, the idea of human freedom and of the political equality of all human beings, of social justice, of the recognition of private property acquired by work, of the negation of the Communist Bolshevik doctrine and of the state system, — these are the ideas which the A.B.N. represents and for which it fights!

### **III. THE HISTORICAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEGAL BASIS OF THE A.B.N. PRINCIPLES**

The following historical survey and consideration from the aspect of international law is not given here in order to match ourselves against our Russian enemies, who are so obsessed by an imperialistic and messianist megalomania that they have failed to comprehend the development of historical events and have learnt no lesson from this, but for the benefit of the foreign pro-Russians and, in particular, the French and American pro-Russians, in order to show them how false and dangerous the course is that they have taken, how rash and unenlightened they are, how irresponsibly they are acting, on whose side they have placed themselves, how they are supporting the cause of violence and injustice and have thus abandoned all humanistic and democratic principles.

In former times France was regarded as the classical country of the ideas and ideals which were the driving force of the political and social progress of mankind and put their stamp on European civilization. It was the Frenchman E. Renan who first introduced the idea of the nation as a biological phenomenon of Nature, who determined the conception of the nation in political and sociological respect and defined the natural right of the nation accordingly.

The French were always on the side of those who were subjugated and deprived of their rights and constantly fought for their rights. But it now seems that many Frenchmen in this age of materialism and industrialization, not only in the economic but also in the spiritual sphere, have forgotten or abandoned the traditions of their country. Or are the Frenchmen who have taken over the patronage of the Russian organization — “Union pour la Défense des Peuples Opprimés”, who are active as contributors to the paper of the Russian chauvinist, Monsieur “de” Gourévitch, “Exil et Liberté”, and who are advocates of Russian imperialism, either unscrupulous and degenerate, or misguided and deceived by Moscow? Whichever is the case, they are merely damaging France’s prestige, for they cannot injure our national cause.

# 1. THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE AND ITS IMPERIALISTIC EXPANSION

## a) The Tsarist Empire

“Russia’s policy is unchangeable. Her methods, tactics and manoeuvres may change, but the lodestar of her policy, world dominion, is a fixed star”.

*Karl Marx, 1855.*

From the time of its foundation onwards, the Russian state, which at that time only included the provinces round Moscow, endeavoured to expand by annexing foreign territory. As far as the government of the state was concerned, the Muscovite tsars adopted the methods and the system of the Mongols, under whose rule they had been for a long time, — autocratic state power, despotism and complete subjugation of their subjects at home, and marauding raids into other countries.

It is appropriate at this point to mention a historical fact, namely how the Muscovite state came into being. At the time of the Mongol rule, the Muscovite principality was the smallest of all principalities and only comprised the small town of Moscow and the surrounding villages. By cunning the Muscovite Prince Ivan I (at the beginning of the 14th century) succeeded in winning the confidence of the Great Khan of the Mongols and was entrusted by the latter with the task of collecting tributes from other princes. To this end he was given full powers and he was authorized to punish the other princes, deprive them of their rights and depose them.

This was the beginning of the rise to power of the princes of Moscow and they gradually subjugated other principalities. In this way the Muscovite state came into being, and the methods and the system of government applied at that time have been preserved up to the present day.<sup>4)</sup>

When, in the 15th century, Moscow was proclaimed the “Third Rome”, the Muscovite tsardom claimed its priority over Europe, its mission as a “Christian” state and, accordingly, its priority over all Christian countries. The Russian idea of world conquest dates back to this era, and since then Russia has systematically and unchangeably pursued this policy.

The old Russian tsarist empire was thus founded on the conquest of foreign countries and the subjugation of foreign peoples. This Russian expansion and the conquest of foreign countries, which began in the 15th century, was only completed in the 1860’s — the Caucasus — and in the 1880’s — Turkestan. From here the Tsars tried to penetrate to the Far East and India and even as far as America (they actually succeeded in gaining a footing there, occupying Alaska and getting as far as California); they

---

<sup>4)</sup> Cf. “The History of the USSR” by Prof. A. V. Shestakov, published by permission of the all-Soviet Government Executive Committee, State Publishing Office for Education, Moscow 1952

then pressed on to the Balkan countries, in order to found their world imperium.

But in those days their advance was impeded everywhere, they were repulsed and their lust of conquest was checked. Yes, Russian expansion at that time was brought to a halt, but the Russian imperium of Lenin's day was later to achieve its aims!

All the non-Russian peoples who were ruled by the tsarist empire were originally independent nations and their states already existed many centuries before the Russian nation was ever formed and the Russian state of Moscow was founded. Of these peoples, the Finns, Esthonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, North Caucasians (Cherkessian people and related tribes), Georgians, Armenians, Azerbaijanians, Turkestanians, and Idel-Ural Tatars were never, either as regards their origin or their language, history and culture, related to the Russians.

But the Slav peoples — the Poles, Ukrainians, Byelorussians and Cossacks also belonged to the tsarist empire, and this question must be clarified at this point.

There are no differences of opinion as regards the Poles and they are not counted as belonging to the Russians; in fact, even the Russians themselves have given up all hope of ever classifying them as Russians. On the other hand, however, there are various opinions as regards the Ukrainians, Byelorussians and Cossacks, thanks to Russian sources and falsifications.

The opinion is often voiced in the West that they are merely some of the tribes out of which the Russian people have developed. This point of view is now being repeated by Monsieur "de" Gourévitch's paper, and, indeed, it is generally expressed by all Russians.

It is true that genetically the Slav peoples are related to the Russians, but, in the first place, their racial characteristics are entirely different, and, secondly, there is a clearly marked distinction between their history, culture, national character and mentality.

Genetically, the Germans and the Swedes, the Germans and the English, and the French, Italians and Spanish are related to each other, but of what consequence is this fact from the national and political aspect? It is also true that the founders of the Muscovite principality were descended from the same family as the Kyivan princes, but in the olden feudal times it frequently happened that some member or other of a princely family became a ruler in a foreign country or even founded a new state.

France and Germany originated out of the ancient kingdom of the Franks, William the Conqueror founded the English state, the Hohenstaufens ruled in Germany and Italy, the Habsburgs in Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Spain, the Bourbons in France and Spain, and the German dynasty of the house of Coburg ruled in numerous countries. But does this mean that all these countries are no longer independent nations and states? Is the genetic relationship between the peoples or the ruling dynasties which they have in common, proof of their national affinity?

And Holland, North America, the Central and South American countries, Canada, New Zealand, Australia and Austria are now sovereign states and peoples, even though they once originated from a certain independent nation and are still closely related to it, a fact which is not the case as regards the relation between the Ukrainians, Byelorussians and Cossacks and the Russians; does this not indicate that they are, after all, different peoples with different characteristics, that they have the right to a state existence of their own and that no one questions this right?

The Russians are the only ones who deny the peoples this right and are endeavouring to russify our peoples. And in this connection we should like to draw attention to a strange paradox. Although, according to the constitution of the Soviet Union, the countries subjugated by Moscow, are from the formal and legal point of view defined as sovereign states which, so it is alleged, have joined the Soviet Union "voluntarily", the Western democratic states cannot summon up courage to substantiate this fact and recognize these peoples as nations and states. Surely, a miserable failure on the part of the West!

Thus, not the origin and not the language of a people are decisive, but the consciousness of a spiritual and political affinity and of a common historical fate, and it is precisely this feeling which the Ukrainians, Byelorussians and Cossacks have never had towards the Russians.

Tsarist Russia used similar methods as regards the foreign peoples to those which are used today by the Communist rulers in the Kremlin and have been applied by them in the satellite countries. In the first place, an alliance or "protectorate" treaty was concluded with these countries and then, immediately afterwards, they were annexed. Such was the procedure applied in the case of the Baltic countries, Ukraine and Georgia. In 1654 a treaty of alliance was concluded with Ukraine, but its terms were not observed by Russia; in 1659 Ukraine under the leadership of Hetman I. Vyhovsky rose up against Russia and destroyed the Russian army at Konotop; Russia was obliged to give in, but nevertheless tried to evade her obligations. For this reason Ukraine, under the leadership of Hetman I. Mazepa, in 1709 went over to the side of Sweden in the Swedish-Russian war and together with Charles XII fought against Russia at the battle of Poltava. It was not until the second half of the 18th century that the autonomy of Ukraine was abolished by Catherine II.

Thus, the assertion that the Ukrainians are solely a tribe and not a people is a flagrant falsification of historical facts and a typical example of Russian insolence and shamelessness.

The methods resorted to by Russia in the case of Georgia were similar. In 1783, Georgia, harassed by Turkey and Persia, concluded a treaty with Russia and in 1801 was already annexed by the latter and its kingdom which had existed for centuries liquidated. In this way Russia constantly violated the treaties she made with other peoples. Such were her methods in former times and they are still the same today.

In the tsarist police state the foreign peoples were deprived of all their national, political and social rights and subjugated. But they never ceased to assert their national claims and demands and were accordingly revolutionary-minded. Hence, radical political trends were able to gain ground in these countries, and for this reason the socialist parties were strong there.

It was these peoples, too, who contributed a decisive share to the collapse of the tsarist empire during the first world war, namely in 1917. They thereupon immediately asserted their claims and demands, but the "democratic" government of the neurasthenic A. Kerensky refused to regulate relations between the states on a voluntary basis. In the autumn of the same year, the Bolshevik revolution broke out and the Russian empire collapsed.

### **b) The Russian Communist Imperium**

V. Lenin and his Bolshevik views and doctrine are deeply rooted in the Russian element and in the ethnic and historical factors of Russia.

The Bolshevik form of state with its dictatorship is nothing strange to the Russians. For over 250 years they were under Mongol rule and led the life of slaves. There followed the despotic age of the tsars, during which a terrible form of serfdom prevailed; under this system man was regarded merely as an object and was treated as an animal. The present-day kolkhozes had their precursors in the life of the Russians — namely in the form of communities, the so-called "Obshchina", — a communal cultivation of the land which belonged to the feudal lord (as it now does to the state); in many parts of Russia the "Obshchina" still existed up to the time of the revolution in 1917.

One only needs read the "Lettres sur la Russie" (Paris, 1843) by the French historian Marquis A. de Custine in order to ascertain what inhuman conditions prevailed in "Christian" Russia.

Nor is the terrorist system new. There were at all times special troops available for this purpose. During the reign of Ivan the Terrible, they were known as the "Opritchina" and were constantly in action, terrorizing, robbing and murdering the population. Peter I, called Peter the Great, had hundreds of persons publicly executed in Moscow.

Ivan the Terrible murdered his own son and Peter I had his only son executed. In a country in which one is allowed to murder one's own children for reasons of state, there are no moral limits and it is thus all the easier to murder foreign peoples. Such conditions as exist at present in Russia have thus always prevailed there, and the Russian people had no will of their own and submitted to their fate. The rulers of Russia disposed of the life and property of their subjects as they liked. As late as 1871, the French historian, Henri Martin, in his book "L'Europe aux Européens" demanded that a European federation should be formed against "l'association moskovite", — a "community which is personified by one individual who can arbitrarily dispose of all freedom, all property and every family".

Tsar Alexander II wished to introduce reforms into the country in order to bring about its cultural and economic rise; he abolished serfdom and intended reforming the state and bringing it up to the level of the European states, and, indeed, had already drafted a constitution when he was murdered by his own fellow-countrymen. His manifesto on the liberation of the people from serfdom began with the following words:

“Cross yourselves, Russian people of the orthodox faith, and ask God’s blessing for your free work . . .”

The Tsar had a false conception of his own people. The Russian people had no intention of crossing themselves, of attaining prosperity by free work and of gradually bringing their country up to the level of the civilized countries which had achieved political and social rights by cultural progress.

Fifty years after they had been liberated from serfdom, the Russian people rose up and destroyed everything; in their plebeian hatred they murdered all those who were not of their kind, went into slavery again of their own free will and dragged many other peoples and millions of persons down into slavery with them.

Bolshevism is of genuine Russian origin. It is a historically established fact that the advocates and executors of the Bolshevik revolution were the Russian people and that its leader, V. Lenin, was a genuine Russian.

In none of the non-Russian countries was Bolshevism able to gain ground. These countries severed their connection with Russia and restored their own states again, namely as democratic republics. It was only in Petrograd, Moscow and the genuinely Russian central regions that Bolshevism assumed power.

As proof of the fact that Bolshevism is of Russian origin and is in keeping with the Russian mentality and political attitude, we should like to quote various famous Russian personalities.

1) The religious thinker and philosopher, Nicholas Berdyaev, writes as follows in his book “The New Middle Ages”: — “Bolshevism is in keeping with the mentality of the Russian nation; it is merely an expression of the spiritual disunion of this nation, of its apostasy of faith, its religious crisis, and its extreme demoralization . . .” “Bolshevik ideas are completely in keeping with Russian nihilism”. — — “The Russian emigrants are not sufficiently aware of the fact that in the case of the Russian problem it is by no means a question of a small group of Bolsheviks who happen to be in power and who can be overthrown, but of a new and infinitely large class of persons who have now become the rulers of the country and cannot be easily overthrown. The Communist revolution has, above all, materialized out of Russian life.”

2) In his work “The Russian Counter-Revolution in the Years 1917/18” (Pt. 2, Book 4), General N. Golovin, formerly Professor at the Military Academy and later G.O.C.-in-C. of the tsarist army, writes: “When the Bolshevik revolution broke out, the peasants of the former central provinces of the Muscovite state became the most devoted slaves of Bolshevism”.



3) The well-known democratic woman-politician and publicist, Mrs. E. Kuskova, wrote in an article published in P. Milyukov's paper "Posledniya Novosti", of July 29, 1931, Paris: "There can be no controversy about the fact that the spirit of the dead Lenin hovers over our earth . . . not only has Russia, scratched by civilization, not put up any mass resistance against this spirit of destruction, but, on the contrary, has helped it in every way and this spirit is already deeply rooted".

4) The conservative paper "Vozrozhdenie", published in Paris, wrote on February 28, 1931: "Yes, we ourselves bear the full responsibility for Bolshevism, for we have called it into being; it was born in our midst, it is essentially a Russian phenomenon and of very old origin".

5) And writing in the same paper, the chief editor, J. Semeonov, affirmed in 1954: "We must admit that Bolshevism was forced on the foreign peoples of our empire by Moscow".

It is hardly necessary to add any further quotations!

This Bolshevist state is therefore the state of the Russians and the Soviet Union is a Russian imperium, in which the foreign peoples are forcibly incarcerated.

The non-Russian countries of the present Soviet Union were overpowered and conquered at different times by Russia's superior military strength (at that time the R. S. F. S. R. — Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic), as were later the satellite countries. And in this way the Russian Communist imperium, which rules the peoples by its ruthless terrorist regime, came into being.

It is a Russian continental peoples' imperium, artificially created and preserved by inconceivable violence, which in its ruthlessness can only be compared to the ancient empire of the Assyrians. And this is the peoples' prison which the pro-Russians in the West support and defend! And they even have the impudence to pose as genuine Europeans and champions of culture! Surely a case of complete moral and political degeneration!

Relying on their own strength, the peoples subjugated by Russia are carrying on a desperate fight for their national existence. The revolts which have constantly taken place in these countries have always been crushed in a most brutal manner. As a result of the mass resettlement of the people of these countries to far-distant regions of Siberia, the native population is being considerably decimated, and Russians are being sent to these countries to take their place. The subjugated peoples are living through the most tragic epoch in their history. But the Russian emigrants and their foreign friends have the impudence to affirm that these peoples feel themselves as one with Russia and are experiencing a national and cultural rise!

When and where has Russia ever displayed any tolerance and humanism? Not only did she subjugate the foreign peoples nationally and politically, but she also went to the length of depriving the Christian Church of the subjugated peoples of its rights and russifying it in the tsarist era, too, even

though she herself professed Christianity. Not even divine service was allowed to be held in the native language of these peoples.

The French friends of the Russians are undoubtedly aware of the manner in which the Russians treated the Polish people in 1831, 1862 and after World War II, and the Hungarians in 1848 and 1956. What, then, is the difference between the Russia of former times and the Russia of today? Indeed, what indication is there that Russia will mend her ways in future? Anyone who assumes such a thing, cannot be in his right mind!

So as not to be suspected of an "ultra-nationalist attitude" we should like to quote none other than Karl Marx. In August 1853, he wrote as follows in the "New York Tribune": "Counting on the cowardice and timorousness of the Western powers, Russia intimidates them and puts her demands as high as possible. There is no more striking feature in Russia's policy than its traditional conformity not only in its aims, but also in the manner in which it endeavours to achieve these aims . . . and it is this policy which is evidence of Russia's inner barbarity".

This was the case in former times; it is still the case today and will always remain so!

After World War II, Russia achieved the greatest expansion of her imperium, namely with the help of the Western powers. Surely a strange and unusual paradox in the history of the world! Her rule extends to a vast part of the earth.

Since 1940 Russia's booty has consisted of 18 countries with a total area of 3.2 million square kilometres and a total population of 107 million.

Writing in the "New York Tribune" in April 1853, Karl Marx affirmed: "Russia has declared herself in favour of peace and we have heard words from her mouth which express her peaceable feelings . . . . She is prepared to allow the other powers to occupy themselves with conferences, provided that these allow her to occupy the countries she desires in the meantime".

Surely nothing at all has changed since then!

### **c) The Problem of the Foreign Peoples in the Soviet Union**

The problem of the foreign peoples who have been forcibly incorporated in the Soviet Union constitutes an integral part of the entire world problem. There can be no partial solution of this problem. And for this reason it is closely bound up with the problem of the so-called satellites.

It is definitely senseless to imagine that Russia will renounce any of her possessions and will give up her positions. The sovereign states of the peoples whose countries were conquered by Russia and whose states were destroyed by her, which were restored after the collapse of the Russian empire in 1917 — Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Byelorussia, Ukraine, North Caucasus, Cossackia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Turkestan, etc. — were, with the exception of Finland and Poland, occupied again by Russia by military force at various times and were placed under Russian state

supremacy and subjugated by Russia. Poland, however, is a vassal state of Russia, and Finland is entirely in Russia's sphere of influence.

From the point of international law, some of the present non-Russian member-states of the Soviet Union were recognized as sovereign states *de jure* (Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Georgia) and the others *de facto* by various foreign states.

Russia forcibly occupied these countries and thus flagrantly violated international law. Nowadays, however, the occupation by force of a region or territory is regarded as a crime from the point of international law, and, indeed, the stipulations of the UNO are worded to this effect (Article 2, Clause 4). To acknowledge the right of possession of the Russians over the foreign peoples of the Soviet Union as a vested right, or to regard their problem as an internal state problem and affair of Russia, would thus be to deny all the recognized moral and legal principles of the civilized world. In accordance with these principles, the free world must on no account recognize the present state of affairs which has been created by force as a state of law, otherwise it would be renouncing its own fundamental legal principles, which constitute the essence of every civilized state.

“Ex injuria non oritur jus!”

In the West an exception is made in the case of the Baltic peoples; the occupation of their countries is not recognized and their liberation, like that of the so-called satellite countries, is demanded.

Such a difference in the attitude of the West towards the subjugated peoples clearly shows the former's spiritual and moral confusion. What crime have the other peoples committed, that one abandons them to the Russians. And what about the principle — equal rights for all individuals and all peoples? Or are these peoples on a lower cultural level than the others?

That the West discriminates between the subjugated peoples in such a manner, can only be described as scandalous and an evidence of cowardice in its attitude towards the Russians. And the sole reason for this is consideration on the part of the West for the Russians so as not to annoy them, since they are to be won over in the fight against Communism!

We shall refer to this unfounded hope on the part of certain Western circles later on. At this point we should like to examine the legal state and political position of the above-mentioned subjugated countries.

Like the Baltic countries, these countries were seized by Russia by military force and were deprived of their independence at various times. They have also been forcibly incorporated in the Soviet Union under the same circumstances. The time at which the different countries were occupied by the foreign state and foreign power is immaterial.

The claims and rights of a people subjugated by force to freedom and to the restoration of its sovereign state *cannot be barred by the statute of limitations*. This would be contrary to all legal, ethical and democratic

principles, and from the legal and ethical point of view would be sheer nonsense.

From the point of international law, these states are in the same position as Holland, Norway and Belgium, etc., were under German occupation and as Poland, Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria now are under Soviet Russian rule, that is to say in complete vassalage to Russia.

The sole question at issue is therefore the liberation of these countries from foreign, i.e. Russian occupation and from compulsory membership in the Soviet Union.

The demand for the liberation from Russian occupation or vassalage only for the countries which were occupied by Russia after 1939, and the recognition of the right of restoration of independent states only for these peoples legally and ethically nullifies the justification of this demand even in the case of these peoples and deprives it of all purport and meaning.

For either right and wrong hold good for the state of affairs prior to and after 1939 and every act of violence is condemned, whether it occurred prior to or after 1939, or there are no universally valid legal and moral principles at all. And those who do not think and act according to these principles are in no way different from the Communists and their way of thinking, which is identical with that of the Soviet Bolshevist mentality.

The Western pro-Russians have overlooked an important historical fact from the point of international law, namely that Ukraine and Byelorussia are today members of the UNO with equal rights and thus members whose state existence of their own has already been internationally recognized, whether the pro-Russians like it or not.

## **2. THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST IMPERIUM AND ITS CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES**

There are at present two worlds which differ from each other not only as regards their political, social and economic structure and form, but also from the ideological and philosophical point of view. On the one hand, there is the Western world with its progressive achievements and its moral principles, — on the other hand, the Communist world, which is dominated by the vast imperium of the Russians and its military power and which has a burning desire to destroy and conquer this Western world.

As a result of this partition of the world, it is inevitable that these two separate worlds should clash.

Coexistence is limited by time and is transitory; and to believe in its permanency, is to deceive oneself!

Since the Western politicians expect this clash to occur, they try to please the Russians and win them over for this fight by leaving it to them to rule the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union and promising them

the preservation of their imperium. Such an attitude is an entirely unfounded speculation and originates solely from the imagination of illusionists who fail to recognize the real situation.

The fact that the Russians will not take sides with the West is due to their national consciousness and to their national interests. The Russian of today is no longer what he formerly was, — illiterate and devoid of all national and political thought. It is true that he has remained a horde being, but he can now read and write and in some cases is even educated; he thinks politically and is nationally conscious. He has become a being with Russian national ideas and consciousness, and, as a result of the huge expansion of power of his country, he is obsessed by the idea of Russia's superiority and by megalomania.

Lenin was well aware of the important part which national consciousness plays in the life of a people. He wrote as follows about the Decabrist<sup>5)</sup>:

"Is the feeling of national pride strange to us, the conscious Velikorussian<sup>6)</sup> proletarians? Of course not! We love our language and our native country . . . It is particularly painful to us to see and feel how our beautiful native country is exposed to atrocities and suffering and to the contempt of the tsarist hangmen, of the aristocracy and the capitalists. We are proud of the fact that these methods of violence evoked resistance in our midst, amongst the Velikorussians and that this circle called the Radichtchev, the Decabrist movement, the revolutionaries of the 70's, into being" (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 85).

How proud Lenin was of the Russian element! In his sentiments and feelings he was not an internationalist, but a genuine Russian.

This national thought and the consciousness of the superiority of the Russians are being instilled into Russian youth in the Soviet Union. In this connection we should like to quote some passages from the text-book for schools by A. Pankratova, "The Great Russian People" (State Publishing Office for Political Literature", 2nd Edition, Moscow 1952): on page 3, — "The Great Russian people are the foremost people in the brotherly family of peoples of the Soviet Union". And on page 5 of the said book: "The workers of all the nations who inhabit the Soviet Union regard the Russian people as their elder brother and loyal friend, who inspires them to illustrious deeds in the name of their native country and leads the country to the victory of Communism". And elsewhere: "The great ideas of Leninism, whose home is Russia, are capturing the consciousness of the millions of people in the whole world more and more".

---

5) The liberal constitutional movement at the beginning of the 19th century, whose revolt was ruthlessly crushed by Tsar Nicholas I in 1825.

6) That is to say "Great Russian", the name by which the ethnically genuine Russians call themselves.

7) The word "Great Russian" is not used in the ethnical sense here to designate the Muscovite people, but as a political conception, "Great Russia" like "Great Germany", for instance "Velkiy russkiy narod" — "The great Russian people".

This Bolshevist Communist imperium, called the Soviet Union, is the imperium of the Russians; it is here that the Russians are the lords and rulers! And they know only too well that the collapse of Bolshevism and of the Soviet regime means the collapse of this Russian imperium, its final disintegration and the liberation of all the peoples subjugated and ruled by them. And it is precisely for this reason that the Russians will never take sides with the West. They are also aware of the fact that this collapse may well be followed by foreign occupation, though possibly only temporarily, and they know from their own experience the meaning of foreign occupation, for they themselves constitute such forces in numerous countries.

There is also another important factor which produces the negative attitude to the West. The Russians are governed by a plebeian hatred of the Western cultured and civilized people and, indeed, have an inferiority complex towards them. For this reason they do not like them and are proud of ruling such a large part of the world and of intimidating the Western world by their power.

And in this Bolshevist state the Russians do not in any way feel that they are suppressed, for they have from the outset been used to living not as free citizens, but as subjugated subjects. Of all this the Moscow rulers are well aware, and for this reason they can proceed with such assurance. Personal struggles to achieve power in the Kremlin will never lead to a political crisis in the state, for the Russian people guarantee the further preservation of this state and will serve anyone who assumes power.

Such are the Russians who are stationed in all the non-Russian countries of the Soviet Union as occupation troops and keep these peoples under military control.

The men in power in Moscow make out that their imperium is an internationalist, proletarian, Communist one, in which the peoples are united "of their own free will". And in this respect they are supported by Russian emigrants and pro-Russians in the West. For the present rulers of Russia do not pursue an internationalist but a Russian nationalist policy.

It has always been Russia's aim to secure the Baltic Sea for herself, to destroy Germany as a major power, to penetrate far into the West, to obtain access to the Mediterranean and, to this end, to gain a firm footing in the Balkans; and, in addition, to eject the Western major powers from the Far East and from Southeast Asia, etc. And Russia has, in fact, succeeded in doing all these things. And those who think that Russia might recede a single pace, merely reveal their own ignorance and are not only naive, but also foolish!

The Bolshevist Communist system is merely the political form of *the Russian national state*, which has subjugated countless peoples.

For the benefit of the French contributors to the Russian nationalist paper of M. "de" Gourévitch, "Exil et Liberté", which is published in French, we should like to quote their fellow-countryman, the Abbé de Pradt, Napoleon's ambassador to Poland, who in 1823 wrote as follows: "On the

other side of the Vistula a curtain has been lowered, behind which it is extremely difficult to ascertain exactly what is going on within the Russian empire. In a country in which it is the aim and purpose of the state constitution to conceal everything from the people . . . Since the days of Peter I, the policy of Russia has never ceased to be a policy of conquest. Indeed, one might even say that for a whole century the government of Russia has been dominated by one and the same man, by one and the same idea, — that of systematic expansion.”

For their further information these French contributors to “*Exil et Liberté*” should also read the book “*La France devant l’Europe*” (1871) by another fellow-countryman of theirs, the historian Jules Michelet. We can but ask them — what has changed in Russia since those days? Nothing at all!

#### **IV. THE ENEMIES OF THE A.B.N. AND THEIR PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN**

Immediately after the A.B.N. commenced its activity the Russian emigrants, irrespective of their political views, realized that they were now confronted by a serious opponent who would become extremely dangerous for the national cause of the Russians in the West.

Accordingly, they started a fierce joint fight against the A.B.N. They tried to influence public opinion by introducing their theory that in the first place the fight must be conducted against Communism and all else must be set aside for the time being and its solution left to the future. By means of this manoeuvre they intended to conceal and suppress the problem of the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union who had been conquered and subjugated by Russia.

A.B.N., however, succeeded in enlightening the public on the fact that Communism and Bolshevism are supported and represented by the Russian people and that the imperium of the Russians is their major power which threatens the world; furthermore, that this Russian imperium forcibly subjugates the peoples. A.B.N. likewise pointed out that the foremost task is to destroy this Russian imperialism, to disintegrate the Russian imperium and to liberate the subjugated peoples.

The more the A.B.N. managed to assert itself, the more fiercely did its enemies seek to combat it by means of lies, provocation and libellous denunciation. Naturally, the Russian Communist Soviet organizations in the West also fought the A.B.N. through their agents because they were well aware of its strength and also of its influence in the home countries.

The Russians are supported in their subversive activity in the West by the native Communists there, by co-existentialists of every trend and by pro-Russians of every kind. By every means available they seek to undermine the A.B.N. and paralyse its activity.

The successes achieved by the A.B.N. on the international level, its alliances with the international anti-Communist organizations of the world, and the fact that its political ideas have been adopted at all the congresses of these organizations have incensed its enemies still more and have prompted them to intensify their fight.

Some time ago, a fierce propaganda campaign was started against the A.B.N.

The vile pamphlet in English "What Is ABN", published by a questionable and shady Russian individual, R. Yagotinsky, alias I. Chemerys<sup>9)</sup>, allegedly appeared in Stuttgart. The lies contained in this pamphlet were then reprinted by a certain Mr. H. Jaeger, London, and also by the Russian paper in French "Exil et Liberté" and were supplied with commentaries. At the same time, the Soviet press attacked the President of the A.B.N., Jaroslaw Stetzko, and a propaganda committee for the emigrants in the Soviet Zone of Germany issued leaflets directed against the Secretary-General of the A.B.N., Prince Niko Nakashidze. A striking conformity between the campaigns of the A.B.N. enemies on this side of and behind the Iron Curtain! And no comment is needed!

This propaganda campaign on the part of the enemies of the A.B.N. is based solely on lies and defamations; as witnesses they are now using the organizations of former Soviet Communist collaborators, and as documentary proof the publications of this rabble.

In this connection we should like to draw attention to a peculiar fact which is characteristic of allegedly democratic circles in the West. Whereas the Western super-democrats condemn nationalism in any form as reprehensible and brand all nationalists who merely demand freedom for their peoples as anti-democrats, the Communist collaborators and former founders of Communist controlled popular fronts and members of Communist governments, such as the Bulgarian, Georgi Dimitroff, and the Hungarian, Ferencz Nagy, etc., *who were responsible for the murder of thousands of innocent persons* and latter fled when it was their turn to be the victims of the usual political purges, enjoy the sympathy and full confidence of these "democratic" circles and are designated as exponents of democracy.

A ruthless attack is waged against the nationalists, but every Communist renegade (and it is questionable whether such an individual really is a genuine renegade) and even high-ranking functionaries of the Communist security police are received with open arms and extolled as democratic fighters.

As proof of this fact here are the names of some Russian renegades, who were received with open arms and were acclaimed as sincere advocates of democracy, and who belonged to those Russian circles that defame the A.B.N. in such a vile manner and who have in the meantime returned to the Soviet Union:

- 1) Airman Anatolj Borsov, who in 1948 flew to the West (from the USA).

---

<sup>9)</sup> We have already described this obviously suspicious person earlier on.



- 2) Boris Olchansky, first lieutenant, who in 1948 chose to settle in the West (from the USA).
- 3) The crew of the tanker "Tuapse", who in 1955 remained on the island of Formosa (from the USA) in spite of the fact that they received financial support.
- 4) Fedor Podgorny, journalist (from Munich).
- 5) Boris Vinogradov, a member of the staff of "Radio Liberation".
- 6) Michael Bibikov, the owner of the Russian printing firm in Munich which printed anti-Semitic publications.
- 7) Ivan Ovtchinikov, who played an important part in Russian emigrant circles in Munich and received financial support.

We could add to this list ad infinitum, but the above names suffice for our purpose. It is thus obvious that these Russian circles are teeming with agitators!

In the West dictatorships are on the whole assessed in different ways, according to taste; some are condemned, others are regarded in a positive light. Hitler and Mussolini were criminals; Stalin is now regarded as bad, though he was once fondly called "Old Joe"; Trotsky, on the other hand, who ranked next to Lenin, is looked upon as good; and Khrushchov and Co. as even better; Franco's authoritarian regime is condemned, but Tito's dictatorship is praised. But no one troubles to consider what Europe's position would be if the Communists were in power in Spain!

How "liberal and democratic" minded Dictator Tito, who is favoured by the Western ultra-democrats, is, can be clearly seen from the fact that he gave his consent to the intervention and invasion of the Soviet Russian troops in Hungary during the national revolution there. (In this connection, see the informative and authentic article by the well-known English publicist, Richard Lowenthal, in the periodical "Der Monat", No. 121, October, 1958.)

The Munich paper "Münchener Merkur" of June 6/7, 1959, published a detailed report on the military collaboration between Moscow and Tito. It was stated that rocket bases had been set up in Yugoslavia and the names of the places were even given. Special training courses for commanding officers are being held by Soviet generals, and the names of the instructors and participators in these courses were given in the said report. It was pointed out that 200 Yugoslav cadets had attended training courses in Moscow. And in spite of all this, certain circles in the free world still continue to believe that Tito is a good Communist and dictator and that he is "Western-minded"!

And people with political views and moral principles such as these have the audacity to pose as protectors of democracy!

All these circles are controlled very skilfully and cunningly by Moscow. Their purpose is to divert the attention of the public from the Communist danger in their own country by means of a lot of propaganda about the allegedly reviving "fascist danger" and by defaming the nationalists. Demonstrations against armament are held in the Western countries, but Russia

continues to arm herself and her vassal states uninterruptedly and constitutes a huge military power.

Public opinion in the West overlooks the grave danger to the free world, a danger which is aggravated still more by the fact that Russia has millions of supporters in the Western countries, who are not only Communists, politically and ideologically, and, as such, Party comrades and allies of the men in power in Moscow, but also soldiers of Moscow, who will fight on the side of the latter as partisans in their own country, in order to abandon their countries and peoples to the Russians and let them be subjugated by the latter in the interests of the "liberation of the proletariat" and the setting up of the Communist state.

And the circles in the West that are fighting the A.B.N. are Moscow's Fifth Column and they have received instructions to pave the way in their countries for the advance of Russian Communism and thus of Russian imperialism, too.

#### **a) The Propaganda Methods of the Enemies of the A.B.N.**

Their methods are the old-established ones of all agitators and informers, — namely, lies, defamations, misrepresentation of facts, distortion of the truth, malicious abuse and agitation.

In order to defame one's political opponent and put him out of action it is nowadays customary to designate him as "fascist" or "Nazi". These are "modern" expressions coined by the Soviets and also used by the super-democrats. The members of the A.B.N. are also accused of being "fascist".

And, incidentally, Western statesmen and politicians are also designated in this way by the Soviets. On one occasion United Press (UP) reported that the Moscow radio had launched a fierce attack against Pope Pius XII, in which it had affirmed that His Holiness "was allied with the warmongers of Wall Street"; and, further, that the Pope had supported Hitler before the latter came into power and he was now supporting "American industry and its efforts to set up a fascist Germany again". (The "Süddeutsche Zeitung" of August 4, 1954, No. 177, p. 2, Munich.)

We are somewhat surprised at being described as "fascist". For we could not and cannot be "fascist and Nazis", for the simple reason that our peoples were not counted as ranking amongst the "superior peoples" and were looked upon as "inferior beings" by the theoreticians of the racial doctrine of the Third Reich, and the peoples of the Caucasus were even declared to be beings of the inferior "Near East" race.

The other reason is that ever since the origin of our peoples, the political and social structure of their life, their way of living, their character, mentality and traditions have always been democratic. It is true that feudalism prevailed in our countries, but not serfdom; this was only introduced into our countries by the Russians; tyrants, despots and dictators have never ruled

in our countries. Totalitarian political views are thus completely alien to us, for we derive our views from the life and history of our peoples and we are firmly bound up with the traditions of our peoples.

The fact that our views differ from those of the Western super-democrats does not by any means imply that we are not democrats. On the contrary, we advocate the realization of democratic principles for our peoples and demand the right to freedom for them as nations and individuals. Is our fight for the human rights of our peoples "fascist", or is it a fight for the highest ideals, principles and achievements of democracy? After the restoration of the independence of our states, they were democratic republics with a constitution which was based on progressive political and social principles. They were destroyed by Russia and their people were turned into kolkhoz slaves and factory robots and were deprived of all human rights.

The second serious accusation which the said agitators bring up against the A. B. N. is that of anti-Semitism. In this connection they cite as witness the director of the "American Jewish Committee" in Europe, Z. Shuster, who, in Bonn, in June 1954, gave the press a report on anti-democratic and anti-Semitic emigrant organizations, in which the A.B.N. was also mentioned.

We thereupon — in August 1954 — replied to Z. Shuster in detail in an open letter and refuted his defamatory statements. We sent this open letter to the entire press, to the competent authorities and political organizations concerned. We refuted his accusations so thoroughly and exposed him, and our answer was so effective that Z. Shuster was left speechless. Those who are now defaming the A.B.N. know all this, but nevertheless they continue to use the same methods and quote Z. Shuster.

Let us now examine the charge of "anti-Semitism" against us.

#### **b) On "Anti-Semitism"**

First of all, let us consider the conception "anti-Semitism" and its definition. The conception "anti-Semitism" is not in keeping with its meaning in the sense in which it is used, but is distorted. For what is meant is an *anti-Jewish* attitude, and this does not mean that the person in question is opposed to Semitic peoples in general. It is, for instance, an established fact that the Semitic Arabs are the greatest enemies of the Jews. What is therefore meant is not "anti-Semitism", but *anti-Judaism*. We should like to stress this point.

It is true that there are anti-Jews and persons who hate the Jews, *but we do not belong to these categories*. By this we do not mean to say that we love the Jews and admire them more than anyone else. One cannot expect a person to love and admire everyone. It suffices for him to be tolerant and humane and to respect every person as an individual.

Anything concerning the Jews can be interpreted as "anti-Jewish" if one is malicious.

In the old tsarist days a Jewish anecdote used to be told which originated from the Jews themselves, and the Jews of Odessa were known for making the best jokes about their own race.

A Jew who was travelling on a train and found that he had forgotten his toilet-bag asked a fellow-traveller to lend him his. The latter did so, but the Jew noticed that there was no toothbrush in the toilet-bag. When he asked for it, his fellow-traveller refused to lend it to him. Thereupon the Jew retorted: "Oh, so you're a bad anti-Semite!" — This is the nonsense that can result from an exaggerated and tendentious interpretation, which can make anything appear ridiculous.

In this respect we should like to cite some examples. In the Western press it is stressed in particular that Stalin and Beria were Georgians. But if the Georgians point out that Trotsky, Zinovyev, Radek, Kaganovich, Kamenev, Litvinov, Uritsky, Sverdlov and many others were Jews, then they are sure to be decried as anti-Jews.

When a number of Jewish doctors were arrested in Moscow and when 11 Jews were amongst the Party functionaries who were shot in Prague in 1952, the world press protested indignantly, but we have never heard of any occasion on which the Jews have protested against the massacre of thousands of our people. Is it anti-Semitism on our part if we point out this fact?

A reactionary chauvinistic Russian paper "Novoe Russkoe Slovo" ("The New Russian Word"), which appears in New York, publishes vile articles attacking our peoples. The chief editor of this paper is a Jew called Weinbaum. And if one replies to his vile attacks in a fitting manner, he promptly cries: "Help! Anti-Semites!" Is it anti-Semitism if one gives a person like Weinbaum a piece of one's mind?

Some time ago an American film was shown in Munich, in which the leading part was played by the Russian Yul Brynner. It featured the Hungarian national revolution. The Soviet Russian officers were depicted as good persons who know how to behave in society. Even the soldiers of the Red Army were well-mannered and greeted a foreign woman and shook hands with her quite in the manner of the young Prussian aristocrats trained in Potsdam. The only nasty fellow in the whole film was a Georgian — an MVD officer, who guzzled his food like a pig. This film was directed by a Jew, Anatol Litvak. But if we had shot a film like this and had depicted a Jew as an MVD officer, then we should most certainly have been ruthlessly attacked as anti-Semites. Is that not correct?

In the 1920's there was a young writer who published sensational books, which were allegedly true life reports and were based on historical facts. He used the pen-name of *Essad-Bey*, but actually he was called *Leo Nussimbaum* and was a Russian Jew. He also wrote a book entitled "Oil and Blood in the Caucasus", which was a particularly vile piece of work. The foul manner in which he attacked and defamed the Azerbaijanians and Georgians is indescribable. Indeed, he did not even spare the womenfolk of

these peoples. But no one protested, and the entire press was most enthusiastic about this book. What would have happened had a Caucasian written a book like this about the Jews? The entire press would have screamed hysterically: "Anti-Semite! Anti-Semite!" Is that not so? Incidentally, Nussimbaum had lived in Baku, where his father had a business, and he knew how kind people had been to them and how comfortably they had lived. These defamations were his way of expressing his gratitude!

A book has recently appeared in the Federal Republic of Germany entitled "The Return of the Dead". The author is Dr. Joseph Scholmer, a former Communist, who was deported to Russia and returned to Germany some years later after having been interned in a concentration camp. In this book he imputes horrible vices to the Georgians and defames them in a vile way. But the press has not protested at all and no criticism of this defamation of an entire people has been voiced. What would have happened if the Jews had been defamed in such a way?

A popular encyclopedia, similar to the French Larousse and the German Brockhaus, entitled "The Basic Everyday Encyclopedia", is published in New York. In this work, which has been compiled by scholars, there is no mention whatever of Georgia or the Georgian people. In fact, the geographical position of Georgia is not even given. Since even primitive tribes are mentioned in this encyclopedia, we can but ask — is the omission of the ancient historical and Christian people of Georgia intentional or merely an oversight? What would have happened if we had published an encyclopedia and failed to mention Israel and the Jews in it?

And if we censure and condemn such vileness and maliciousness, what has it to do with "anti-democratism" or "anti-Semitism"!

And is it anti-Semitism if we raise the question as to why the right of our peoples to the restoration of their national independent states is not proclaimed by the Western powers and is not regarded as a problem that must be solved; and why the state of Israel was set up on territory which the Jews left centuries ago, whereas our peoples have always remained on their native soil and have sacrificed themselves for it; and why our peoples should apparently be regarded as having less historical, political, ethical, cultural and economic rights to set up a state of their own again.

And is it anti-Semitism if we point out that most Jews, when they were citizens of other countries, were radical leftists and definitely pacifists, but since they have been living in Israel have developed into radical nationalists and have become quite "conservative" in their views and even belligerent. We, however, are looked at askance for being nationalists and for demanding the liberation of our peoples from Russian tyranny and from the Communist terrorist regime.

The Jews themselves know only too well that our peoples have never been and are not anti-Semitic.

Ukrainian Jews also fought in the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which was formed by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN)

and which is accused of anti-Semitism by the said pamphlet of lies; many Jewish doctors served in the UPA and many Jews were saved by it.

The Bulgarian delegation represented in the A.B.N., the Bulgarian National Front, published in its organ a declaration by the Bulgarian Jews now living in Israel, to the effect that it was thanks to the policy of the Bulgarian national government under King Boris that the Jews in Bulgaria were not extradited to the Gestapo and murdered. ("National Bulgaria", No. 1/2 January/February 1954, Munich.) This policy was executed by the constitutional Bulgarian governments and not by the Communist collaborators, Dimitroff and his clique of the radical leftist "popular front", as affirmed in the said pamphlet.

It was the Georgian delegates of the A.B.N. and their friends who saved their Jewish fellow-countrymen from persecution with the support of their German friends. Not a single one of these Jews was killed or arrested. And not only Jewish fellow-countrymen were saved by the Georgians, but also many foreign Jews, too, who were given Georgian identity papers.

The French contributors to the paper "Exil et Liberté" should make enquiries in this respect in the community of the Georgian Jews in Paris. The Georgian delegation represented in the A.B.N. can also produce a letter by the Head Rabbi in Paris as proof of this fact. How many Jews have the editor of the said paper, Monsieur "de" Gourévitch, and his Russian friends saved? The allegation that we are "anti-Semites" is thus not only a vile lie, but also ridiculous.

Anti-Semitism prevailed only in Russia and it was only in that country that atrocious and ruthless anti-Jewish riots, Russian "pogroms", were systematically organized.

Anti-Jewish feeling was fanned by official departments and the primitive superstition prevalent among the Russian people was fostered.

As proof of this fact let us hear what the Russians themselves have to say on this subject; at least, no one can reproach them with showing anti-Russian tendencies, or of being friends of the A.B.N.!

There appeared in the emigrant Russian monarchist journal "Znamia Rossii" ("The Flag of Russia") a leading article by the editor, N. N. Chukhnov, entitled "Jewish Anecdote". In this scurrilous and cynical article, the author affirms as follows: "One must assume that the majority of the so-called Jewish anecdotes have been invented by the Jews themselves, just as the much-discussed pogroms in Russia were frequently provoked by the Jewish revolutionary circles who received substantial sums of dollars — as "compensation" — for every eiderdown that was slit; but, as a rule, the eiderdown was not replaced and the money went into the fund for the fight against the monarchist autocracy."

But the pro-Russians in the West and the American Jewish Committee "overlook" such anti-Jewish atrocities on the part of the Russians!

The well-known Russian writer, *Nikolay Zbigulev*, has now, however, expressed his opinion on this subject and in an article published in the Russian paper "Russkaya Mysl" ("The Russian Thought"), of April 28, 1959, No. 1361, Paris, replies to N. N. Chukhnov's article as follows: "But how would Mr. Chukhnov describe the 'much-discussed' pogroms in Kishinev, Bjelostok, Odessa, Voronezh and other towns? Also as anecdotes? The Jewish children whose skulls were smashed on the pavement, the pregnant women and the aged who were murdered with stakes, — — are these also anecdotes? What, then, does Mr. Chukhnov call reality? Because of the many years that have elapsed in the meantime, Mr. Chukhnov has probably forgotten the scenes of the Jewish pogroms, how they began and how they ended. I should like to remind him of the following scenes: on a certain day, processions, which consisted mainly of members of the "Union of the Russian People" ("Black Gang"), assembled in the streets. As a rule, the procession was headed by businessmen who carried a picture of the Tsar; behind them came the clergy, and at the rear of the procession the "public". Singing hymns the procession moved through the streets. Suddenly a shot was fired from a balcony or from some other spot. Thereupon, a cry of despair was immediately heard, — 'They are shooting at the Tsar!' The members of the procession disappeared and in their stead a dreadful mob of drunkards and rabble appeared on the scene. Shouting 'Down with the Jews! Save Russia!' this mob, armed with knuckledusters and wooden cudgels, raided the houses and shops in the Jewish quarter of the town and the pogrom began.

Woe to any Jew who got involved in these riotous scenes. Neither the old nor the young were spared. At the end of the pogrom the police appeared on the scene to restore order.

I am not relating all this from hearsay, but as a living witness of those days which were a disgrace to Russia, as a member of the workers' brigade!"

Such is the description given by a well-known Russian of these terrible and atrocious incidents! And the Russians of the NTS have the audacity to cast the blame for these incidents on to others.

We should like to add some further points in this respect and corroborate them with facts.

It was the father of one of the leaders of the NTS, Prime Minister A. Stolypin, who restricted the rights of the Jews, even admission to educational institutions, to a minimum. The greatest enemies of the Jews, who were well-known for their persecution of the latter, were the Minister of the Interior Durnovo and the Governors of Petersburg and Odessa, General Trepov and General Tolmachov. It was the Minister of Justice, Shcheglovitov, who issued orders that the dreadful Beylis trial of Jewish ritual murder was to be held and his henchmen, the chiefs of the political police, who carried out this trial.

In tsarist Russia there were two big anti-Semitic organizations — "Soyuz Russkogo Naroda" ("Union of Russian People") and "Dvuglavnyi Orel" ("Double Eagle") — which were officially supported by the government.

The leaders of the former were permanent deputies of the Russian Duma, — the notorious Purishkevich, Markov II and Zamyslovski; the leader of the latter organization was Dr. Dubrovin, an influential man, and it was he who was responsible for the murder of the Jewish deputy of the Russian Duma, Herzenstein, and the Jewish publicist, Jollas. These dreadful murders were concealed by the police, but the press exposed the real murderer; but nothing was, however, done in the matter.

We could enumerate numerous other facts in this respect, but the above cases no doubt suffice for the present.

It is to be hoped that the Western supporters of the NTS will realize how false the cause is which they are promoting. Should Communism be overthrown in Russia, she will not become democratic, as the pro-Russians naively believe, but ultra-reactionary and ultra-nationalist, as is already the case today, and the Jews will be even worse off. And not merely the Jews, but everyone who is non-Russian.

And if Z. Shuster, Weinbaum and the Russian agitators do not cease to spread propaganda lies about us, we shall not keep silent any longer, but shall likewise attack them ruthlessly, even at the risk of being called “anti-Semites”. The Jews demand tolerance for themselves and should, therefore, also practise tolerance towards others themselves. They should not claim the right to a national state existence of their own for themselves alone, but should allow our peoples this right, too, and should also support this principle.

### **c) The Agitators’ “Concrete Accusations” against the A.B.N.**

R. Yagotinsky & Co. are not content with attacking the A. B. N. in general, but even go to the length of bringing up “concrete accusations” against the members of the A.B.N. and presenting them as “facts”.

They quote various other persons and allegedly “national” papers published by different exile organizations, but, of course, they conceal the fact that these persons are former members of Communist governments, high-ranking Communist functionaries and Communist adherents, who now pose as ultra-democrats. Anyone who has once been a Communist functionary has a moral attitude accordingly, and though his political views may change (whether they have really changed, is very questionable), his moral, or, rather, immoral principles by no means change. And their press is equally immoral!

The entire Soviet press and, in particular, the paper devoted to propaganda amongst the emigrants, which is published in the East sector of Berlin by the Soviet committee “For Repatriation to the Native Country”, as well as the press of the satellite countries and all the Soviet and Communist broadcasting stations constantly carry on a violent attack against the members of the A.B.N., whom they describe as traitors and agents in “American service”.



The Russian agitators in exile, however, denounce us here as “fascists” and “Nazis”. Anyone who does not see through this cunning and skilful game, is stupid and, in fact, beyond help.

The enemies of the A. B. N. are trained agitators; they have had plenty of practical experience of how to “liquidate” persons and they are completely uninhibited. They will stop at nothing to achieve their purpose.

We shall examine their “accusations” point for point below and shall prove how false and completely unfounded they are. We intend to expose these political gangsters and deal them a destructive blow.

They endeavour to stir up the Americans against the A.B.N. by affirming that this organization is anti-American. In this connection they quote A. B. N. publications and the various press organs of the members of the A. B. N. In doing so, they omit sentences from the articles which they quote and distort and falsify the ideas expressed in the latter.

*The A. B. N. cannot be anti-American for the simple reason that America is the only major power that is in a position to oppose the Russians and because the free world cannot defend itself without America and would be lost without America. In addition, the American people are not burdened by any past; they are unbiassed and have no political and legal misgivings about recognizing the right of a nation to independence. We have frequently stressed the fact that America has never been a colonial major power and that she has allowed many small states that are her neighbours to lead their own life unmolested and has never made any attempt to subjugate them. On the contrary, she has done a great deal to further the economic development and civilization of these countries. How, then, could we be anti-American?*

In the articles which we have published we have only endeavoured to enlighten the Americans as to the history, culture and political rights of our peoples and to show the true nature of the relations which exist between our peoples and the Russian people. In doing so, we have naturally demanded the recognition of the right of our peoples, too, to an independent state, — a right which has been recognized in the case of the Baltic states. Is all this anti-American? Naturally, we have sharply criticized individual politicians — the pro-Russians — and also the unfortunate policy of pro-Russian American circles, but this by no means implies that we are anti-American. Only Yagotinsky and his like would ever think of reproaching the A.B.N. with such a thing. We are not anti-American precisely because we know that it is the Russians who are the enemies of America and who hate the Americans!

In the meantime, however, the USA has officially recognized the right of our peoples to the restoration of their independent states and has thus corroborated the fact that the demands of the A. B. N. are right and just.

On July 6, 1959, the US Senate passed a resolution on the establishment of a “Captive Nations Week” which had been introduced by Senator P. H. Douglas on June 22, 1959, and supported by 18 Senators. On July 9, 1959,

this resolution was also passed by the US House of Representatives and was subsequently unanimously adopted by a proclamation by President Eisenhower.

In this resolution the competent government authorities of the USA for the first time officially contested the Russian Bolshevist rule over all non-Russian countries and peoples both outside and within the frontiers of the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and recognized the right of these peoples to freedom and independence as legitimate. And, what is more, the liberation of all these forcibly subjugated and enslaved peoples was declared to be an aim which must be pursued and which is of vital importance for the security of the United States, too.

As victims of the “imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian Communism” — as is explicitly stated in the said resolution — and incarcerated today in a “vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world”, the following countries are mentioned: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Esthonia, Byelorussia, Roumania, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, etc.

The US Congress, basing its arguments on the following points, namely that

- 1) “it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive;
- 2) “the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace;
- 3) “it is fitting that we (the Americans) clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence”,

requested the President of the United States to proclaim a “Captive Nations Week”, to be observed every year in the month of July, and to invite the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

True, this resolution is of an ideological nature, but it is nevertheless a declaration which concedes the legal and ethical principles that hold good in the civilized world to our peoples, too. This resolution is a manifestation of the spirit of the American people, who, in keeping with their national traditions, hereby show that they regard not political expediency but the eternal values of right and of moral principles as being of decisive importance.

The said agitators have no doubt failed to realize this historical revolutionary fact, otherwise they would not write such nonsense!

The conception which the US Congress and the President of the USA have now officially adopted as their own is wholly identical with the fundamental idea which we of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, as the united spokesmen of the entire subjugated world in the East, first propagated and have always championed.

It is extremely gratifying to us that, in spite of the global agitatory campaign organized against us, the purpose of which was to hush up the claim of our peoples to national freedom and to preserve the integrity of the Russian imperium at least within the frontiers of the U.S.S.R., the truth has nevertheless asserted itself in this resolution by the US Congress and has triumphed over the quarantine imposed on us.

This resolution is directed exclusively against Russian imperialism and is a direct demand to disintegrate the Russian colonial imperium, known as the U.S.S.R., and to restore the independent states of the nations forcibly incarcerated in this Union.

And this is one reason more why we are not anti-American!

Incidentally, we should here like to point out that the said agitator Yagotinsky was not in a position to read our articles, let alone understand them, since he cannot speak any foreign language and, moreover, as even his friends, whom we have mentioned above, affirm, is quite uneducated. And it is, furthermore, obvious that the pamphlet against the A.B.N. which has been published by him was not written by him. It was, in fact, compiled by a committee which received its instructions from persons authorized by Moscow. In order to prove our "anti-democratic" political tendency, they affirm that the A.B.N. has convened no congress since 1953, that no meetings of the Central Committee are held, that democratic elements have resigned from the A.B.N. and that "reactionary and pro-Nazi elements" have remained in it.

It is really touching how concerned these political gangsters are about the prestige of the A.B.N.! Even a Russian saying affirms: "Lie, but do so in moderation!"

The congress of the A.B.N., which is referred to, was held from March 27 — 29th, 1954, and all the national delegations were represented at it; representatives of the foreign press attended the opening of the congress and it terminated with a press conference. At this congress all the executive organs of the A.B.N. were elected. (For detailed reports on this congress see the German and English editions of the "ABN Correspondence" of 1954.) The fact that no congress has been convened since then, has nothing to do with democratic principles, but is solely due to financial reasons. We receive no financial support from anyone; the A.B.N. is entirely dependent on the contributions given by our fellow-countrymen; the A.B.N. is not in the employ of any foreign organization, nor does it carry on espionage activity for any foreign service.

The members of the A.B.N. are not only political friends, but they are also connected by personal friendship and enjoy each other's confidence.

They can all rely on each other and each can act for the other. They consider the nature of their joint cause more important and decisive than any formalities.

Meetings of the Central Committee of the A.B.N. are held frequently, as can be ascertained from the minutes of these meetings. In any case, however, this is a matter which concerns only the members, and, like any other organization, the A.B.N. is not obliged to account for such meetings to outsiders.

No "democratic" elements have resigned from the A.B.N.; certain intriguers were excluded from the organization, — namely, a Cossack called Glazkov and a Byelorussian; the former because he had a very shady past, as was learnt from a reliable source, and was carrying on a subversive policy in the A.B.N., and the latter because he was also a member of another organization opposed to the A.B.N. and was conspiring with Glazkov against the A.B.N. And these impostors are supposed to have been sincere "democrats"! These same defamations and a report on the downfall of the A.B.N. were at the time also published by the organ of the Czech Communist Party, "Rude Pravo", on February 19, 1954. This association of ideas speaks for itself!

Only the Czech federalists left the A.B.N. of their own accord and without any disagreement, because they wanted to be entirely independent. But our relations with them have remained correct, and their representative at that time, Prof. Dr. Rudolf Wierer, has now returned to the A.B.N. again. Thus, the lies told by our enemies about us are refuted!

The French pro-Russians reproach the members of the A.B.N. with hating the Russians. The A.B.N. has never denied this fact. We hate the Russians just as the French, the Belgians, the Dutch and the Norwegians, etc., hated the Germans during the occupation, and we shall go on hating them as long as they rule our countries and this state of affairs continues to exist, and we shall fight them as unrelentingly and as ruthlessly as the French and the other peoples fought against the Germans. What others can do, we, too, can do!

As regards the allegation concerning "Nazi", "fascist" and "reactionary" elements in the A.B.N., it is already hackneyed and is no longer in the least effective. But as "proof" of this senseless allegation, our enemies affirm that it was for this reason that the A.B.N. was prohibited in France.

They tell lies in a most shameless manner. In this connection we should like to quote a notification, dated October 11, 1954, from the 3rd Bureau of the Direction Générale de la Sûreté Nationale, which states that the activity of the A.B.N. has been prohibited on the strength of the decree of April 12, 1939, as amended by the decree of September 1, 1939. According to this decree, an organization can be prohibited if its activity is directed against an *allied state*. And because the activity of the A. B. N. is directed against Soviet Russia and Communism, Monsieur Mendès-France and his pro-Communist Minister of the Interior, Mitterand, and his Cabinet, to

whom Soviet Russia was still an ally, regarded the fight against Communism as "undemocratic".

It is an established fact, however, that it was not the A.B.N. but the French people who overthrew Monsieur Mendès-France and his Cabinet and thus cast them into oblivion for good!

Another argument which is advanced by these agitators is the fact that some members of the A.B.N. were refused entry permits for the USA. It is true that such applications were at first turned down, but when the American authorities ascertained that the information which had been supplied to them about A.B.N. members was nothing but malicious defamation, they immediately lifted the ban. Jaroslaw Stetzko spent six months in the USA and testified at length before official sessions of the Foreign Affairs and other Executive Committees (Un-American Activities Committee) of the US Congress in Washington, at the special invitation of these Committees. Prof. Dr. Ferdinand Durcansky has spent a long time in the USA; General F. Farkas de Kisbarnak has already visited the USA twice and has now received an entry permit again; and the Vice-President of the A.B.N., Christo Stateff, frequently travels to the USA. There is thus not a vestige of truth in the argument advanced by the alleged champions of democracy.

But the agitators in this case are probably laughing in their sleeve, for they will no doubt have already received their reward for their traitorous service!

#### **d) Personal Accusations against the A.B.N. Members**

##### **1) Ukrainian Delegation**

The said agitators harbour particularly bitter feelings against the Ukrainian representatives in the A.B.N. They affirm that the latter play the leading part in this organization, and their pamphlet and the paper published by Monsieur "de" Gourévitch contain some abusive attacks on the President of the A.B.N., Jaroslaw Stetzko, the former Prime Minister of Ukraine. No delegation plays a leading part in the A.B.N., for they are all united in one common aim, — to liberate their countries ruled by Russia and to destroy the Communist regime.

We are united by our common ideas and by the conscious feeling that the aim which we have set ourselves can be achieved by our joint fight. The common fate which all our peoples share has united us. And our union is based on common national and political principles and on human feelings. We are all inspired by our ideals and it is in a spirit of comradeship and concord that we fight for our cause.

Each one of us is aware of our position; we know, each of us individually, that we represent our people and that we must fulfil our task in a worthy manner. And because of our national pride none of us would allow ourselves to be led and influenced by someone else.

But such an attitude is entirely incomprehensible to such degenerate individuals as Yagotinsky & Co. and their wire-pullers, because they are completely lacking in moral principles, dignity and pride.

They have the audacity to describe J. Stetzko as a "Nazi collaborator", although they know perfectly well that he was interned in a German concentration camp for about four years because he refused to make a compromise with the Hitler government. In fact, the French Minister Delbos was a prisoner in the same concentration camp with him, and the French co-workers of Monsieur "de" Gourévitch can obtain information on this point if they wish.

The fact that J. Stetzko attended the Congress of the European Centre for Documentation and Information in Escorial (Spain) is regarded as a crime on his part. But the French Prime Minister M. Debré and various other well-known French politicians and members of parliament also attended this congress.

On this point, however, the agitators have tripped up, for when they wrote this, Debré was not yet Prime Minister, and they had no idea that de Gaulle would come into power! But these gangsters are not content with merely spreading lies; they are now trying to accuse S. Bandera, J. Stetzko and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists of murder and are affirming that these persons in 1949 murdered Professor V. Petrov. What vile minds these agitators must have! And what foolish minds, too! Naturally, as is their custom, they count on the naivety and ignorance of the average reader, for it has long since been proved that this "murdered" Professor Petrov returned to the Soviet Union a long time ago and is carrying out archaeological excavations there and publishing scientific treatises. And the first person to ascertain this fact was none other than the former Soviet scholar, Professor M. Müller, who now holds a post at the American Institute for the Research of the History and Culture of the U.S.S.R. in Munich. Surely there could be no better proof of how mendacious, vile and degenerate the enemies of the A.B.N. are! Is it worth taking any notice at all of their "accusations"? Of course not, but we are forced to do so in order that the public should realize what subversive forces are at work in the West and the cunning manner in which they proceed.

It is significant that the attacks are launched simultaneously from this side of and behind the Iron Curtain. Immediately after the pamphlet in question appeared, J. Stetzko was violently attacked by Lubomyr Dmyterko at the Congress of Soviet Ukrainian Writers in Kyiv, in March, 1959, because of the lecture he had held in the USA; this fact was reported on by the Communist organ "Radjanska Ukrayina". It is perfectly obvious where the employers of the enemies of the A.B.N. are to be found and for whom they are conducting this agitatory campaign.

The Ukrainian Nationalists and their leaders, S. Bandera and J. Stetzko, are constantly being attacked in the Soviet Union, which only goes to show how popular they are amongst the people, otherwise no mention would be

made of them at all. At the 1957 Congress of Writers, Kozachenko and Smolych attacked them ("Literaturna Hazeta", of January 22, 1957). Subsequently, the writer Bratun attacked them in the "Literaturna Hazeta" of March 15, 1957, and the paper "Radianska Ukrayina" of February 27, 1957, published agitational articles against them. And as early as February 1955, the Prime Minister of the Ukrainian S.S.R., Kalchenko, attacked the Bandera Nationalists. And at about the same time, the state publishing office of Ukraine published a poem by the "poet" Mykola Sheremet, in which the head of the state of Independent Ukraine, Petlura (murdered by Soviet agents in Paris in 1926), the Nationalist leader, Konovalts (murdered by Soviet agents in Rotterdam in 1938), Bandera and their supporters were defamed and abused. This same type of agitation is also carried on by the enemies of the A.B.N. in the West.

These agitators lie in such a shameless and such a senseless manner that one is bound to come to the conclusion that they are mentally deranged. How else can one explain their allegations that the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists consists exclusively of Ukrainians who come from Galicia, which formerly belonged to the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and that the Ukrainians who come from East Ukraine, which formerly belonged to Russia, are members of another organization, — the National Rada? In the first place, what does it matter if the members of some national organization come from this or that part or province of the country?

And, secondly, the allegations made by the Russian agitators in this respect are nothing but lies, for in both the organizations which they mention, the members come from every part of Ukraine. And, thirdly, there is *no difference at all* between these organizations as regards the liberation of Ukraine from Russian rule and the restoration of the independent sovereign state of Ukraine. All the Ukrainian organizations demand and fight for these rights. And in this respect they are all united, and as far as this question is concerned they are all unyielding and uncompromising. This fact is known to everyone in the West and the Russian agitators' attempt to mislead the latter in this respect is thus futile.

As regards the Ukrainian Hetman Union, it consists of conservative nationalists, whose monarchist principles are derived from historical traditions and are purely ideological in character. Hetman P. Skoropadsky, who died many years ago, received his pension (not honorarium) not from Hitler's government, but from the Reichs government under the Reichs President at that time, the Social Democrat F. Ebert, and he received it as the head of the Ukrainian state during 1918, when Ukraine was an ally of Germany. This was merely a form of honour conferred on Germany's former ally in the fight against Russia. Incidentally, the Polish General Anders also receives a pension from the British government. Indeed, this is a tradition amongst civilized peoples, and no decent person would ever think of reproaching anyone with this fact. But the said agitators have no idea at all of decency. They are gangsters and their views are in keeping with their character.

## 2) Hungarian Delegation

General F. Farkas de Kisbarnak is reproached with having co-operated with the pro-Nazi government. He did not co-operate with nor was he a member of this government, but was an officer and a soldier and as such he served his native country. He was never a "Nazi and fascist", for the simple reason that he was trained in a different spirit and in other traditions. He merely did his duty as a soldier. According to the views of the agitators, General Farkas de Kisbarnak should no doubt have deserted or organized the Communist revolt and should have delivered up his people to the Russian Communists, that is to say, should have committed high treason; because he and his comrades did not do so, they are now called "war criminals"!

The fact that the Russians hold such views is not surprising, but what are their friends in the Western countries thinking of to repeat such nonsense! And this in spite of the fact that they have in the meantime seen what has happened to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain and have witnessed the dreadful tragedies in Hungary and Poland!

General Farkas and his comrades fought to the bitter end because they knew what fate would befall their people once the Russian Communist hordes overran their country; they rightly foresaw all that would happen in such a case.

It is an established fact that the Russians on this side of and beyond the Iron Curtain are unanimously agreed and united in their aim to subjugate all Western countries to Russia, but the fact that they are supported in their insidious fight against the freedom fighters of the subjugated peoples by certain circles in the West is not only disgusting, but also evidence that these elements are the hirelings of the Russians and are preparing the downfall of their own people.

General Farkas and all the Hungarians who fought for their country and are united as members of the Veterans' Union are decried as public enemies, but Ferencz Nagy and his clique, the former members of the Communist government and the Party functionaries who were responsible for the murder of their own fellow-countrymen, are described as "friends of the people" and "sincere democrats".

And in this connection we should like to point out that the Budapest broadcasting station and the Communist papers there constantly brought up the same accusations against the Hungarian members of the A.B.N. as do the Russian agitators Yagotinsky & Co. and the pro-Soviet circles in the West. One does not need to be particularly clear-sighted to realize that they are working hand in hand.

The said agitators affirm in their pamphlet that the Hungarian Liberation Movement only constitutes a small group and consists of 200 members, who were formerly officers of Horthy, and that the majority of Hungarians in the free world belong to the so-called "Hungarian Democratic Central



Committee". This assertion, like all others, is a downright lie. The majority of Hungarians belong to the Hungarian Liberation Movement and to the patriotic organizations which co-operate with it. On two occasions in the history of Hungary, Russia ruthlessly crushed the liberation movement of the Hungarians, but the latter have always borne in mind the course which their great compatriot, State Administrator L. *Kossuth*, the leader of the fight for freedom in 1848, showed them.

A hundred years ago, as an exile in Turin, he wrote that Russia constituted a despotic power and that it could only be preserved by expansions of power; for this reason, he added, Russia would constantly subjugate other countries. Russia, he said, was the only country which did not include the word "enough" in its vocabulary, since she was constantly endeavouring to expand. This imperialistic danger, so he pointed out, could not be met and warded off with diplomatic negotiations, for the Russians would always go two steps forward, but would only go one step backward, so that they would in every case gain one step and this was, in fact, sanctioned by the Western powers. "The Russian power knows no freedom. Everything in Europe that is bad has originated from Russian absolutism. My poor native country has also become a victim of this rapacious moloch". And he added: "As Lord Clarendon said in 1852, there is only one method by means of which Europe can attain security and peace, — one ought to cut the Russian claws in such a way that they will never grow again, — otherwise Russia will steal even more."

The great men of Europe already recognized the Russian danger much earlier and rightly foresaw all that would happen. But were their warnings heeded? Does anyone nowadays realize this fact and act accordingly? The West cherishes illusions and goes on waiting for a miracle to happen, and many persons actually believe that this miracle will be brought about by the East. Surely this is evidence of a lack of intelligence and insight. The misfortune of the West lies in the fact that no country there has ever produced a great statesman. The talent in this field is only mediocre!

### 3) Slovak Delegation

The Western supporters of the artificially created state of Czecho-Slovakia, the Czechs of Masaryk's and Benes' stamp and the former Communist Party functionaries regard it as a crime on the part of the Slovaks that the Slovak independent state came into being during the Hitler era. Surely no person in his sane mind would reproach a people of such a thing!

Why should the circumstances under which a people proclaim and execute their national will constitute a crime? Surely it can be neither a sin nor a crime for a people to use a given situation to advantage in order to realize their national aim. Masaryk and Benes did not keep to the Pittsburgh agreement, but deceived the Slovak people and did not even concede them self-administration. And now they longed for opportunity of retaliation for

the injustice which had been done them came, and the Slovaks detached themselves from Czechia.

Practically all the states which were formerly ruled by colonial powers originated in this way.

The fact that Slovakia came into being as an independent state after the Germans entered Prague is regarded as a crime from the "democratic" point of view, but is the fact that Poland, Hungary, Roumania, Bulgaria, Albania and the same Slovakia and Czechia were abandoned to the Russians, in keeping with democratic justice? Was the fact that these ancient Christian peoples were treated so harshly and inhumanly, proof of an anti-Nazi attitude? In their anti-Nazi hatred some persons in the West have become anti-human, and the Communists and the Russians continue to kindle this hatred against a Nazism which no longer exists, play off people against each other and persecute and hunt down human beings.

In their attacks on the Slovak members of the A.B.N., the agitators quote the statements made by the representative of the American Jewish Committee in Europa, Z. Shuster, on June 3, 1954, in Bonn.

As already mentioned above, we gave Mr. Shuster a fitting answer at the time. Of course, the Russian agitators have not taken our answer in this respect into account at all.

This Jewish Committee, so it is affirmed, is the oldest Jewish organization in the USA to "combat bigotry and intolerance and to further human rights". But the statement which it issued on the aforesaid occasion was a perfect example of the worst form of bigotry and intolerance, and was *not a furtherance but a mockery* of human rights. And in our answer we ruthlessly exposed this fact. The sentences passed by a Communist court — the execution of Monseigneur Dr. Tiso and the death sentence passed on Professor Dr. F. Durcansky — were used as an argument against these persons by the said agitators. The fact that they regarded the sentences passed by the Communist court as humane and democratic, shows their moral worth. So the persons sentenced were "Nazis", were they! Truly, a moral lapse! Professor Durcansky was removed from office in Slovakia at the instructions of Ribbentrop because he protested against German intervention in the internal affairs of Slovakia and opposed the German demands that measures should be adopted against the Jews, etc.

The said agitators know all this, but they have received instructions from their employer to discredit all opponents and liquidate them by every means available. The Russians say of someone who is given to lying: "He lies to order", — and this saying certainly applies to these individuals.

And now they are trying to disparage the Slovak organization "Slovak Liberation Committee" led by Prof. Dr. F. Durcansky, by affirming that it is the smallest Slovak organization; the majority of the Slovak emigrants, so they allege, are opposed to the severance of Slovakia from Czechia. Actually, however, all the Slovak organizations have united, and Professor Durcansky himself attended the congresses of the Slovaks in Canada and

in the USA and was given a tremendous reception. On this occasion the Slovaks resolved to continue the fight for the restoration of the independent Slovak state as intensively as has hitherto been the case, and Professor Durcansky was elected president of the executive organ of all the United Organizations.

#### 4) Bulgarian Delegation

Since they have no arguments or other means by which to defame the representatives of the Bulgarian National Front in the A.B.N., the agitators who have compiled the pamphlet in question resort to arbitrary defamations derived from the shady source of Dr. Georgi Dimitroff's Bulgarian Exile Committee. Anyone who knows anything at all about politics, however, will also know by this time that this so-called "national committee" consists solely of questionable elements of a *radical leftist splinter group* of the Bulgarian agrarian party, who as early as 1925 joined with the Communists in forming a *common "united front" of conspiracy* and, owing to their inability to assert themselves by constitutional and democratic means, were only able to conduct their political fight by means of assassinations and with the aid of armed partisan gangs.

The notorious attempt at mass murder in the Sofia Cathedral, "Sveta Nedelja", in 1925, the attempt to murder the popular Bulgarian King Boris on a lonely mountain pass and various other attempts to stir up a revolt, *which were always financed and organized by Moscow*, were the work of this same "united front" between the Communists and the small leftist agrarian party group, which was known by the name of "Pladne Party".

The president of its exile committee, Dr. Georgi Dimitroff, who in his native country is known as an unscrupulous political adventurer, after the Communists took over power was *secretary-general of the so-called "Patriotic Front"*, on which the Communist government relied. In this capacity Dimitroff for a whole year concealed the dreadful atrocities of the Communist terrorist regime, and hence is responsible for the murder of *thousands of innocent Bulgarian patriots who were either shot or tortured to death*.

Zenko Bareff, whom the defamer Yagotinsky quotes as an authority and whose letter is reproduced in the pamphlet in question as "authentic proof", in order to defame the Bulgarian member of our Central Committee, Dr. Dimiter Waltscheff, former leader of the national liberals, as well as Bareff's brother are close Party comrades of Dr. Georgi Dimitroff; they were his accomplices in Bulgaria and likewise have the murder of some of the most loyal Bulgarian patriots after the Communist revolt on their conscience. The fact that such elements attack the leading Bulgarian representatives in the A.B.N. — former Minister of State Christo Stateff and former Secretary of State Dr. Dimiter Waltscheff, both of whom in the past were the political leaders of democratic parties which were loyal to the constitution, is actually

the best testimonial that our Bulgarian comrades could wish for. And in reply to the statement of the members of the above-mentioned notorious Bulgarian Exile Committee to the effect that neither in Bulgaria nor here have they ever wanted to co-operate with our Bulgarian friends, the latter can but point out that this would in any case not have been possible, for the simple reason that every Bulgarian patriot and sincere democrat both in Bulgaria and here in exile regards the elements of this *Communist leftist agrarian trend* as being utterly *beyond the pale from the political and social point of view*.

When Christo Stateff was Minister of State and Dr. Waltscheff Secretary of State there were neither concentration camps nor chambers of torture in Bulgaria; but these were introduced as from September 9, 1944, when the preponderantly Communist government coalition of the "Patriotic Front", which Dr. Dimitroff helped to found, usurped state power with the aid of Soviet bayonets. Prior to this date, people in Bulgaria were not tortured, shot and interned en masse; but it was precisely during the early period of Communist power, when Dimitroff as the secretary-general of the government coalition represented this power and his "Pladne Party" was *the partner of the Communist government*, that this was the case.

Our Bulgarian fellow-fighters of the "National Front" were always loyal to the democratic constitution and served their country and their king to the best of their ability. They were well aware of the danger which threatened Bulgaria from Russia and of the fate which would befall their people with the invasion of the Russian hordes and the setting up of a Communist regime.

The fact that Bulgaria during World War II was oriented to the Axis Powers was, as far as our Bulgarian comrades were concerned, not a question of a certain philosophy of life as a whole or of a subjective national bias in favour of one or other of the belligerent camps, but an *urgent and real political necessity*, dictated by the vital interests of their country. As the object of Russia's obvious expansion and annexation intentions, Bulgaria during World War II had no other alternative but to place herself under the protection of the opposite camp in order to evade the deadly Soviet Russian danger. Dr. Dimitroff and his likes of the so-called "Patriotic Front", on the other hand, since *they had always been fanatical advocates of pro-Russian feeling and of the pro-Russian orientation of Bulgaria*, had no scruples whatever in acting as the henchmen of Moscow in World War II and wantonly plunging their country into slavery and misery. Later, when with their help the Communists had consolidated their position and became the sole rulers and subsequently threw out their coalition partners, including Dr. Dimitroff, and made them the object of Communist terrorism, the latter fled to the West; and now they have the audacity to pose here as "democrats" and "freedom fighters".

In the opinion of the sorely tried Bulgarian people, however, they are to blame for the present tragedy of Bulgaria and their names will go down in the history of the country as having been cursed by the Bulgarian people.

There is still another point which we should like to stress. Many prominent functionaries of Dimitroff's Exile Committee, as, for instance, the organization secretary of the sub-committee for Germany, Milorad Mladennoff, the secretary of the committee in Austria, Peter Trifunoff, the chief editor of the organ published in Munich, "Free and Independent Bulgaria", Zwetan Peneff, and various others have in the meantime returned to Bulgaria and have placed their services at the disposal of the regime for the purpose of disseminating anti-Western propaganda and defaming the national fight for freedom in exile. Here in the West this is done by Dimitroff's committee and his supporters by means of defamatory denunciation and pamphlets directed against the Bulgarian National Front and its representatives. Indeed, there exists complete solidarity between the Communist regime in Sofia and the exile staff of Dr. Dimitroff in the West as regards their joint fight against the Bulgarian nationalists and champions of true democracy and of the genuine freedom idea.

Such are the "crown witnesses" of the defamer Yagotinsky against our Bulgarian fellow-fighters.

### 5) Georgian National Organization

The Russian agitators affirm that the majority of Georgian nationalists are represented in the "Paris Bloc" (this is the name given to the union of the political exile organizations of the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, which co-operate with the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism). Only the Georgian socialists are represented in the so-called "Paris Bloc". And these, too, are in favour of the idea of the unconditional liberation of Georgia from Russian occupation and the restoration of an independent Georgian state. (See in this connection the book by the leading Georgian social democrat and former Minister of Economy and Finance of the Georgian Republic, *K. Kandelaki*, — "The Georgian Question Before The Free World" (Acts — Documents — Evidence), Paris, 1953, published by the Georgian National Council, in which the social democrats play the leading part.) In this respect, therefore, there is no difference between us.

The relations which exist between the members of the Georgian National Organization and the above-mentioned organization are friendly, and the former have never been attacked in the Georgian press.

Yes, it is true that Prince Niko Nakashidze served in the German army, and the Americans, the British and others know only too well that he did so because he wanted to fight against Russia and Communism for the liberation of his native country, and Germany at that time was not the power which was in occupation in Georgia, — it was Russia. Prince Niko Nakashidze has never been a socialist, — he has always been a nationalist. And yet he has many personal friends amongst the social democrats. The Russians reproach him with publishing articles in "Nation Europa". Incidentally, the American General Bonner Fellers, chief of McArthur's staff, and

other foreigners have also written articles which were published in "Nation Europa". Are these persons "Nazis", too? Prince Niko Nakashidze wrote about the subjugated peoples and Russia and his article was a historical and political treatise. And he will continue to write for all publications which print his articles without altering or falsifying them! Prince Niko Nakashidze has never contributed articles to the periodical "La Nation Géorgienne" which is published in Paris. And if he had done, it would have been no crime, for he agrees with the ideas expressed by this periodical.

The editor, W. Tsitsishvili has spent practically all his life in France and has French nationality; his wife is French and so, too, are his children and grandchildren. By his activity he is fulfilling his duty towards his native country — Georgia — and towards the country in which he has made his home, — France. And the French understand his sentiments perfectly well, for they themselves know what it means to have one's own country occupied by foreigners, and they also know how terrible the Communist regime is which the Russians have forcibly inflicted on Georgia.

**6) What these Russian agitators write about the other national member-delegations of the A.B.N. is likewise so senseless and ridiculous that it is not worth discussing.**

We should, however, like to quote a few examples to illustrate the infamous character of these agitators.

In order to attack the Turkestanian National Unity Committee, they wrote exactly the same as the Soviet press did some time ago when attacking the member of the Turkestanian delegation of the A.B.N., Dr. B. Hayit. The Soviet papers, "Literaturnaja Gazeta" of September 27, 1958, the "Pravda Vostoka" of September 30, 1958, and various other papers launched a violent attack against him. A pamphlet by Aykarli appeared in Tashkent in 1957 and a year ago a play "History Begins To Talk" was given there, in which the National Turkestanian Unity Committee and its President, Veli Kajum-Khan, were depicted and defamed in the customary Communist manner. In addition, they are constantly being attacked in the Communist press and the broadcast programmes in Turkestan. Soviet Russian agents in the Near East even went so far as to carry out an attempt to assassinate Veli Kajum-Khan.

All this goes to show how harmoniously the Russians and the Communists work hand in hand.

The Lithuanian delegate in the A.B.N, J. Gytis, is accused of the "crime" of having fought against Bolshevik tyranny during World War II. According to the said agitators, everyone who fights against the Russian Bolsheviks is a "Nazi".

In reply to the various lies disseminated by these agitators, we should like to make the following comments:

- 1) The head of the Czech organization in the A.B.N. is the well-known General L. Prchala, who fought against Germany and emphatically opposed Benes' policy, namely that of an alliance with Moscow.
- 2) There has never been a concentration camp in Latvia and democratic politicians have never been interned in that country. The former Minister of State A. Berzins was interned in a German concentration camp for over three years.
- 3) The Esthonian delegate in the A.B.N., Dr. O. Loorits, was likewise interned in a German concentration camp for over three and a half years.
- 4) The Byelorussian Central Council (Rada) was not a German invention, but a direct product of the struggle of the Byelorussian people for the liberation of their country from occupants and mainly from the Russians and the Poles.

This struggle according to circumstances assumed various forms. At the head of this movement in 1918 was the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, which proclaimed Byelorussia as an independent state. One of the most active members of this Council and Minister of Education in the second Byelorussian Government was Professor R. Ostrowski, who has been the President of the Byelorussian Central Council from December 21st, 1943, but not from 1941, onwards.

To settle the question of the national representation of Byelorussia, the Byelorussian Central Council on June 27, 1944, convened the Second All-Byelorussian Congress in Minsk. 1,039 delegates from all parts of the country, representing all classes of the people, took part in this congress. With patriotic fervour, the congress reaffirmed the act proclaiming the state independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic on March 25, 1918, annulled all international treaties for the division and annexation of Byelorussia, and re-established a national representation of Byelorussia and the Byelorussian people in the form of the Byelorussian Central Council (Rada).

And it was unanimously resolved that the Byelorussian Central Rada, with its President Radoslaw Ostrowski at its head, was the only legal representative of the Byelorussian people and their country.

If the above-mentioned activity dictated by Byelorussian reasons of state is regarded as criminal collaboration, the question must be raised, — was not the "Peace" of Munich on October 1, 1938, criminal collaboration? Secondly, was not the Soviet-German plot of 1939 against Poland criminal collaboration? And, thirdly, was not co-operation with the same Soviet Union, which is guilty of Katyn, Vinnytsia and countless other atrocities, also criminal collaboration?

Incidentally, the leading members of the NTS, *G. Okolovich* and *Ivan I. Vinogradov*, from 1942 to 1943 held important posts in Smolensk. The former was head of the transport department of the town of Smolensk and

the latter was head of the roadways department of the Smolensk district. Thus, they were also "Nazi collaborators". But why is this not regarded as a "crime" in their case? Because they are members of the NTS and as such are under the protection of the "ultra-democrats"!

5) The Serbian, Armenian and Cossack organizations are described as insignificant organizations by the agitators. What do they mean by "insignificant"? Are they referring to the number of members? It is not the number of members, but the ideas and the persons of an organization that are important and decisive. And the ideas of these organizations are the ideas which today stir peoples, and the men of these organizations are old and deserving fighters who come from the ranks of the people at home, not from those in exile.

6) The defamatory statements which the agitators make about Croatia and A. Pavelic have been copied from the Communist press of Tito's country. And because we congratulated A. Pavelic on having escaped being murdered by a Communist agent, this is quoted as proof of our "fascist" attitude. Apparently these individuals regard everything that is against Communism as "fascist", and anyone who advocates and fights for the liberation of his country is designated as "reactionary" and "chauvinistic".

Clear-thinking circles are gradually beginning to realize the truth and to see through the game that is being played. They are no longer allowing themselves to be misled by agitational propaganda, since they now recognize the true position. In this connection we should like to cite the following case.

The Supreme Court in Los Angeles (USA) recently passed final judgement in the case of Dr. Andrija Artukovic, the former Minister of the Interior of the Independent State of Croatia, by refusing to extradite him to the Belgrade Communist government, as requested by the latter eight years ago.

This judgement is all the more significant and favourable for the national Croat cause as the judge did not confine his decision to ascertaining the innocence of one individual alone, but based his arguments on both the legal and political point of view and emphasized the right of the people of Croatia to freedom and to an independent state of their own. In particular, he stressed the established facts in this connection, namely that Croatia was in 1919 forcibly incorporated in the so-called state of Yugoslavia and that, without a plebiscite and without their consent, the Croats and the Slovenes were placed under the rule of the Belgrade government.

It was further ascertained that this government was one of despotism and violence, that a Serbian deputy murdered the leader of the Croat people, Dr. Stepan Radic, in the Belgrade parliament, and that the Serbian King Alexander suspended the constitution and thus prohibited all political activity on the part of the Croats. Thereupon, the Croat organization USTASHA very rightly began to wage a liberation struggle and on April 10, 1941, restored the independent state of Croatia. This organization, since it defended the state, thus had the right to intern all persons who either engaged in



subversive activity against the state or were a danger to it. Incidentally, other states have also acted in the same way, and, as the judge in Los Angeles stressed, the government of North America also interned thousands of Japanese — men, women and children — because they were a danger to North America.

The court in Los Angeles has thus passed exactly the opposite judgement to that which Belgrade demanded, which was that the independent state of Croatia and also the USTASHA organization should be condemned and declared illegal.

The Belgrade government and some of the witnesses produced by the representatives of this government wanted to hold the head of the state, Dr. Ante Pavelic, responsible for all that was done in the independent state of Croatia by the police authorities, since it was alleged that both the regular police as well as the USTASHA police were under his and no one else's sole control, and thus not under the control of the Minister of the Interior.

But this demand was likewise turned down by the judgement of the court, which recognized all the action taken by the head of the independent state of Croatia, Dr. Ante Pavelic, as entirely lawful.

#### **d) The Foreign Friends of the A.B.N.**

The fact that the A.B.N., in spite of the fierce fight which is waged against it by its enemies, has succeeded in gaining friends, influential political circles and personalities in the Western countries as its allies greatly disturbs the Russians. The ideas and principles of the A.B.N. have thus proved stronger than the financial means, the connections and unlimited possibilities of its enemies.

The said enemies of the A.B.N. mention all these persons by name in order to put them in a bad light, too, for morally supporting or co-operating with such a "reprehensible" organization as the A.B.N. By defaming the A.B.N. and its members, however, they wish to warn and admonish these persons. As if the latter did not know what the A.B.N. is and who its members are! And what annoys the Russians so much in this respect is the fact that one does not believe them. They rightly see in this fact a grave danger for Russia, — for the simple reason that these influential circles are anti-Russian and support the idea of the disintegration of the Russian imperium. And they also know that they have little chance of impressing these circles with such cheap methods, — even if they decry them as "fascist". Secondly, these circles consist of persons of experience who are well informed on the history of the world, on international problems and the political situation in general and who are not likely to be deceived by falsified facts.

The "Scottish League for European Freedom", which for many years has been in close contact with the A.B.N., numbers amongst its members such

notable personalities as Field Marshal Lord Ironside (meanwhile deceased), former Chief of the Imperial General Staff, the Earl of Mansfield, Gordon Duncan, Prof. A. Dewar Gibbs, Sir M. Barsley Harvey, K.C.M.G., Lt. Col. Sir Th. Moore, C.B.E., M. P., Sir J. H. F. McEwen, and Col. D. Moncrieff, who are all well informed on world politics and are not likely to allow themselves to be influenced by the Russians, still less by the political impostors in exile.

And the fact that the famous Major-General J. F. C. Fuller contributes articles to the "ABN Correspondence" and that the late Lord R. Vansittart, that great statesman and diplomat who for many years played a leading part in Britain's foreign affairs and who was a big Nazi-hater and a most loyal friend of the A.B.N., was in close contact with the A.B.N., is not based solely on sympathy with our peoples, but on a knowledge of conditions and on the conviction that the problems in question can only be solved by following the course indicated by the A.B.N. But, in the first place, what was and is decisive is the fact that such a policy is in keeping with Britain's interests.

Thus, all the efforts and attempts on the part of the Russians are futile. Their defamations and false allegations will avail them nothing, for it rests with the policy of the West to destroy the Russian imperium! And, in any case, no one is in a position to stop the urge of the subjugated peoples for national freedom.

From Europe to Mongolia, from Tibet and the Far East, the peoples are stirring; and the foundations of the Russian citadel are already badly shaken; there are huge fissures in its walls, and soon it will collapse; and the free states of the subjugated peoples will be built up on its ruins! The Russian imperium is inevitably moving towards its downfall.

The enemies of the A.B.N. even go so far as to make out that such organizations as the Catholic Eichendorff Guild and the Dutch "Activeringswerk Geestelyke Weebaarheid", which are on friendly terms with the A.B.N. and which surely cannot be called "fascist and Nazi", are to be regarded with suspicion since they support the A.B.N. principles and advocate the liberation of the subjugated peoples from Russian rule and the setting up of a new order in East Europe on this basis.

The Russian agitators must be out of their minds, otherwise they would realize that freedom and the right of self-determination have been proclaimed and recognized by the civilized world for all peoples and are in keeping with Christian and democratic principles.

But the Russians alone deny and oppose this truth.

What apparently infuriates the Russians more than anything is the agreement and alliance of the A.B.N. with the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League and with the Inter-American Confederation for Defense of the Continent, an organization in which all the countries of Central and South America are represented. They know the significance of the fact that these two organizations approve of the principles of the A.B.N. and are

jointly demanding the disintegration of the Russian imperium. And they also realize how powerful this world-embracing anti-Communist front is and that the ideas of the A.B.N. are surely and steadily asserting themselves and that the public of the West is gradually gaining in insight and is seeing through and rightly assessing current events and problems.

The Russians cannot save their cause by trying to defame the A.B.N. For the question at issue is not whether the A.B.N. is "reactionary" and "undemocratic", or good or bad, but whether the peoples subjugated by Russia and the human beings enslaved by the Communist regime of terrorism have the right to freedom; and whether the only colonial empire in the world — the Russian peoples' prison — is to continue to exist! This question is of decisive importance; and those who refuse to recognize the right of the subjugated peoples to freedom and the human rights of every individual and who support the preservation of the Russian imperium with its terrible Communist regime, are neither democrats nor Christians, nor, in fact, human beings, but beasts.

For this reason all civilized human beings in the West should support the ideas of the A.B.N.; if they refuse to recognize the right to freedom of our peoples, then they are either pathological cases or they are inhuman and monsters!

The successes achieved by the A.B.N. have alarmed the Russians to such an extent that they admit in despair: "There can be no doubt about the fact that if the proposed congress (reference is made to the anti-Communist World Congress of the anti-Communist organizations of Asia, America and Europe, etc.) is held, the A.B.N. will succeed in convincing those who take part in it that the 'flickering flame of freedom' is being nurtured behind the Iron Curtain exclusively by the A.B.N."

There is obviously something wrong with the minds of the Russian agitators! The A.B.N. no longer needs to convince these organizations and their members for they all have already recognized and endorsed the principles of the A.B.N., the disintegration of the Russian imperium and the restoration of the national independence of all peoples in their ethnographical territory, and have signified their willingness to carry on a joint fight against Russian imperialism and Communism.

Indeed, how could it be otherwise, for all these delegates represent ancient freedom-loving civilized peoples, whose national traditions are derived from their profoundly religious character. They feel it is their duty and an inner voice prompts them to fight for right and justice and for the freedom of mankind. Many of them have in the past been forced to endure foreign rule and they know that nations and individuals can only be happy if they enjoy freedom. They are willing to concede this right to our peoples, and no one will ever succeed in dissuading them from their attitude.

In their pamphlet the Russian agitators try to accuse us of having no confidence in the UNO. How they have come to this assumption is their

secret, or else it is a figment of their vile minds. We have always regarded the Organization of the United Nations as a powerful international institution, and for this reason we have demanded again and again that it should have the executive power to protect the peoples and states against the arbitrariness of Soviet Russia and its vassal states. If the UNO had applied such power during the revolution in Hungary or during the revolt in Tibet, the peoples of these countries would have been saved. But, unfortunately, this was not the case. We have also demanded the exclusion of Soviet Russia and its satellites from the UNO, since they violate the clauses contained in the UNO statutes regarding the rights of peoples and individuals, refuse to recognize these rights and constantly violate and subjugate peoples and individuals. Perhaps it was our demand that Soviet Russia be excluded from the UNO that has angered the NTS clique?

We do not wish to regard the UNO as a welfare organization which only propagates humanistic ideas, but as an organ of the civilized world and of civilized states which is in a position to restore order according to its principles, to assert its will, to help the subjugated peoples in their striving for freedom and to bring about the restoration of the rights of peoples and individuals in the Communist dictatorship states.

Those who condemn and oppose "Nazi" and "fascist" dictatorship, but recognize and tolerate Communist dictatorship, are negating all the religious, political and moral principles of civilization. "Sacro egoismo" will ruin the democratic world, just as was the case in the fascist states!

## CONCLUSION

Next to the ancient empire of the Assyrians, the Russian imperium is the most brutal colonial imperium in the world, in which the peoples are languishing and the individual is deprived of all human rights.

To destroy this Russian despotic imperium, to liberate the subjugated peoples and to give back enslaved beings their freedom again and ensure that they may lead a free life, is the aim of the A.B.N. Is this a "fascist" attitude, or is it a fight for the highest ideals, ideas, principles, rights and achievements of democracy? Or is it "extremist nationalism"? Is it a crime on our part to demand for our peoples, too, the right to a state existence of their own and to fight against alien Russian rule and against the Communist regime? If it were so, what, then, would democracy be? Perhaps the co-existentialists would care to explain this point! We are genuine and sincere democrats, who fight against dictatorship and its terrorist regime, against the subjugation of peoples and against the violation of the individual.

In one respect, however, we differ very considerably from those "ultra-democrats" who give evidence of their "democratic" attitude by joining forces with the Russians and the Communists, by rendering them every possible cultural, political and economic service, and by propagating the "peaceful and friendly co-existence" of these two worlds and acting accordingly.

Precisely because we are democrats, we are also the uncompromising enemies of these pro-Soviet elements; for it is these alleged "democrats" who in practice recognize the Communist dictatorship and its brutal despotic regime and undermine the existence of the free world by their preposterous activity. We also include amongst these political defeatists those persons who collaborated with the Soviet and Communist rulers and later fled from the "Communist Paradise" for purely personal reasons because they were beaten in the struggle for power, and are now designated by some political circles in the West as "advocates of democracy".

This rabble is only interested in defaming the A.B.N. and damaging its prestige in the world. For they know only too well how powerful an organization the A.B.N. is and how dangerous it is to them.

The Western pro-Russians are still seeing "Nazis" and "Gestapo", but they fail to see the millions of Communists and Soviet MVD agents in their own country! Some day they will have an unpleasant surprise. Either they do not want to realize, or else they are too naive to realize that the camouflaged Soviet organizations and native Communists have received strict orders to subvert all national political organizations, to undermine them

completely and put them out of action, to stir up hatred amongst all the peoples in the West and start a war amongst them.

The ruthless and criminal manner in which the Soviet Russians and their Fifth Column in the West fight the supporters of the national fight for liberation can be seen from the recent murder of the well-known Ukrainian national politician and champion of freedom, *Stepan Bandera*, by the MVD.

The statements made by the co-existentialist press in the West in connection with this crime are clear proof of the extent to which political and moral subversion and decay have progressed here.

It is, incidentally, significant that the Soviet and, indeed, the entire Communist press thrusts the blame for this crime on the Germans, but neither the German press nor any German official authorities have attempted to refute this insidious accusation.

The disintegration of the Russian imperium and the annihilation of Communism is a demand which is in keeping with the present times and with history. The peoples ruled by Russia also have the right to live in freedom as nations and individuals. This is, indeed, the commandment of justice and of humanity.

Those who advocate the preservation of the despotic Russian imperium and who refuse to recognize the right of the peoples subjugated by Russia to an independent national life of their own, are advocating dictatorship and despotism and cannot, therefore, be regarded as civilized beings and as democrats.

On the eve of the Crimean War in 1853, Karl Marx wrote: "The idea of the superiority of Russian policy owes its strength to the ignorance and timorousness of the Western nations."

In a clash with the Communist world, the West can only gain a victory if it supports the national fight of the subjugated peoples in every possible way and proclaims a programme for the disintegration of the Russian imperium and the restoration of the national states.

The resolution of the US Congress of July, 1959, on the introduction of a "Captive Nations Week" proves that the true nature of the Bolshevik world danger has been recognized and that the course to eliminate this danger has now been realized by the leading American world power. The revolutionary factor in this case is that *it is not solely a question of slavery in the East or, primarily, of Communism as an ideology or a state political system, but, above all, of the forcible subjugation of the peoples under alien rule.*

For it is Russian imperialism that, by means of Communist doctrines and dogmas about monolithic leadership, today already triumphs over half of Europe, after having, in its Bolshevik form, ruthlessly crushed by military

force and subjugated scores of foreign peoples within the Soviet state after the first world war and outside the Soviet state, too, after World War II.

To realize this fact is to open up in a decisive way means and ways of combatting the acute Bolshevist world danger. And to crush this danger it does not suffice alone to further the resistance of the individual against the Communist system of terrorism forced upon him, but, in the first place, it is imperative that national liberation revolutions should be kindled amongst all the enslaved peoples in the Russian Bolshevist sphere of influence.

Only by joining forces with these peoples can the West defeat the Communist major power — Russia — and save the civilized world from destruction.

As long as the Russian Communist imperium continues to exist, the world will constantly be in danger. It is a grave error to believe that two such different worlds can exist peacefully side by side for any length of time. Sooner or later, the explosion will occur, for the Russian Bolshevist rulers in Moscow will never abandon their plan to conquer and rule the whole world. And it is precisely for this reason that the Russian peoples' prison and the Russian despotic imperium must be destroyed!

