



SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY, INC
НАУКОВЕ ТОВАРИСТВО ІМ. ШЕВЧЕНКА В ЗДА
302-304 WEST 13TH STREET, NEW YORK 14, N.Y.

PAPERS ДОПОВІДІ

Ч.
№ 16

Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, Ph. D.

Marquette University

DISCRIMINATION AND BIAS IN TWO UNESCO PUBLICATIONS



Проф. д-р Роман Смаль-Стоцький

Маркет університет

ДИСКРИМІНАЦІЯ ТА УПЕРЕДЖЕННЯ У ДВОХ
ПУБЛІКАЦІЯХ ЮНЕСКО



Shevchenko Scientific Society

New York, N. Y.

1961

Поручили для публікації 15. червня 1961 року
проф. д-р Кость Кисілевський, дійсний член НТШ
проф. д-р Василь Стецюк, дійсний член НТШ

Редактор

проф. д-р Василь Стецюк

Технічний редактор

інж. Роман Кобринський

This paper may be reproduced,
provided the source is cited.

**
*

Reprinted from *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. XVII,
No. 1. Spring, 1961 and No. 2, Summer, 1961

**
*

Ціна \$ 0.70

DISCRIMINATION AND BIAS IN TWO UNESCO PUBLICATIONS

By ROMAN SMAL-STOCKI

I

This article is the response to a duty which the writer feels, as an American scholar, to evaluate two important publications of the United Nations Educational, Social, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The basis of this evaluation is Public Law 565, adopted by the 79th U.S. Congress, which authorized this country's acceptance of membership in this organization. The Law states that this organization was established in order:

... to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations throughout education, science, and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law, and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed *for the peoples of the world without distinction of race, sex, language, or religion*, by the Charter of the United Nations.*

The first publication to be considered is *The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education* in the *Monographs on Fundamental Education* series, Second Printing, Paris, UNESCO, February, 1958.

The work includes an Introduction followed by "A Continental Survey of Vernacular Languages and Their Use in Education" (Chapter I).

The meaning of a *vernacular language*, according to the definition given on page 46, Chapter II, of the Report of the UNESCO Meeting of Specialists held in 1951 in Paris, is:

A language which is the mother tongue of a group which is socially or politically dominated by another group speaking a different language. We do not consider the language of a minority in one country as a vernacular if it is an official language in another country.

There is an interesting editorial footnote to the definition:

UNESCO recognizes that, while this definition holds in the generality of cases, for it to be universally applied and comply with the conditions governing individual particular cases, variations in emphasis and wording would be necessary.

It is important also to take the other definitions of terms into consideration:

* Here and in all subsequent quotations italics are added.

Mother or native tongue: The language which a person acquires in early years and which normally becomes his natural instrument of thought and communication.

National language: A language used in the business of government—legislative, executive, and judicial.

Pidgin: A language which has arisen as the result of contact between peoples of different language, usually formed from a mixing of the languages.

It is clear from the definitions of these terms that the *political* qualifications of the nations speaking the pertinent languages are involved. Thus for a language to qualify as “vernacular” it must be spoken by a nationality which is in fact *not* a nation which constitutes its own independent political, social, and cultural entity; it means that this language is not used as the official language in the business of government—legislative, executive, or judicial. In short, the qualifications of a language as “vernacular” is the *official recognition by UNESCO of the colonial status of a nation.*

Discussed in Chapter I, which is interesting and detailed, are the following topics: Africa with its 369 languages; the imperialist language policies of the English, the French, and the Belgians towards the vernacular languages of the natives; the American continents with their hundreds of indigenous languages. Other areas considered are Asia and the Pacific with their problems of India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, Philippines, Turkey, Iran, Nepal, China, Japan, the Arab-speaking world, Israel, and, finally, “Europe Including the USSR.” The information about the USSR and the Slavic world which appears on pages 41-43 of the UNESCO publication leans heavily on E. Koutaissof’s *Literacy and the Place of Russian in the Non-Slavic Republics of the USSR:*

Europe is a cross-roads of languages and cultures. . . the number of ways of speaking in the whole of Europe and the Soviet Union is therefore enormous. Of the main languages mentioned, only 26 (including as one unit Czech and Slovak, and the Serbo-Croat and Slovene) are official languages; the rest are *vernaculars*. Some of these vernaculars are *dialects of main languages* as Alsatian, spoken in France, which is a dialect of German, as Letzenburguer of Luxembourg and Frisian of Holland and Germany. Macedo-Rumanian, spoken in Greece, is a variant of Rumanian; Walloon of Belgium may be taken as a French dialect; Judeo-Spanish is a variant of Castilian; the language of the Faroe Islands is very close to Icelandic; Galician of Spain is similar to Portuguese; Ruthenian and White Russian speakers can understand Great Russian.

Main languages which are real vernaculars in Europe, not including the Soviet Union, though some of them are also spoken in the Union, are: Armenian, spoken in Bulgaria, Turkey, and the USSR; Basque, spoken in Spain and France; Lapp, spoken in Finland, Norway, Sweden, and the USSR; Catalan, spoken in Spain, France, and in Italian Sardinia; Lusatian-Serb or Wend, spoken in Germany; Maltese, spoken in Malta (under British administration); Manx, spoken in the Isle of Man; Provencal, spoken in France; Welsh, spoken in the United Kingdom; Gaelic, spoken in the United Kingdom; Lithuanian, spoken in Poland, Germany, and the USSR; Karaitic, spoken in Poland; Romany or Gypsy, spoken in varied forms almost everywhere.

In the Soviet Union about one hundred different main languages are spoken; these include six Slavic (Great Russian, Polish); 11 Finnish; 43 Cau-

casian (Georgian is the most important); 27 Turco-Tatar; four Mongol; four Iranian-Manchurian (Turco-Tatar, Mongol, and Manchurian are classed as Altaic by some authorities), and some Paleoasiatic and Samoyede minor languages. "Soviet educational policy," an authority writes, "has aimed at providing education in the *vernacular*; languages that had no written form have been endowed with scientifically devised alphabets and grammars, a work of great magnitude which is still proceeding, for obviously the earlier grammars were at first approximations. These languages, whose alphabets were difficult and ill-adapted, were made to replace them by simpler Latin and later by the Russian script, which made the art of reading and writing more accessible to the masses. In time, the need for a unifying language led to the introduction of *compulsory Russian and the concomitant use of the Russian alphabet for most vernaculars*. With the extension of compulsory attendance from four to seven or eight years, and the provision of boarding schools for pupils from outlying villages, the standards for proficiency in Russian are likely to improve. This will help solve the problem of more advanced education among minor linguistic groups.

So far there have been no attempts at devising a simplified form of pidgin-Russian. *The aim seems to be a bilingual population proud of its own national achievements, yet enjoying access to the wider world through Russian.*

In this connection it should be borne in mind that even great Russian writers have not scorned the work of translating from other languages, the modern Soviet writers consider it part of their vocation. As a consequence, usually good translations of both major European works and popular native songs and epics are available in Russian. A Chukchi may read the *Manas* and a Karelian the works of Rustavelli in Russian. This is admittedly not the best way of knowing the poetry of other nations but it broadens the range of reading of the multilingual population of the USSR and enables small linguistic groups to participate in the intellectual life of a much larger community.¹

II

On this presentation of the language problems of the USSR and its sphere of influence we offer the following remarks:

(1) The information about the Soviet Union is, in comparison with the abundance of data on the other countries, superficial and misleading. Responsible along with UNESCO for this are the United States delegate to UNESCO, Dr. M. Swadesh of Columbia University, and the U.S. Department of State. The USSR joined UNESCO in 1954 and therefore shares responsibility for the second printing of this work.

(2) From the linguistic point of view it is inadmissible to mix state units with existing languages and to treat "as one unit" Czech and Slovak, because the linguistic fact is that in existence are *two* separate units, Czech and Slovak. It is also inadmissible to establish as one unit Serbo-Croat and Slovene because, again, there exist at least two units, Serbo-Croat and Slovene. (In our opinion it is better to operate with three units because of the developed differences between Croat and Serb. In fact, however, in Yugoslavia there is

¹ E. Koutaïssouf, *Literacy and the Place of Russian in the Non-Slavic Republics of the USSR*. Regional paper on vernacular languages, No. 21, Paris, 1951. M. S.

yet a fourth unit, Macedonian, which was completely disregarded in the UNESCO publication.)

(3) Only the twenty-six main languages in Europe and USSR are declared as "official languages"; the rest are "vernaculars." "Some of these vernaculars are *dialects* of main languages," or "variants." Here, among mention of Alsatian, Letzenburguer, Frisian, Walloon, etc., is also to be found: "Ruthenian and White Russian speakers can understand Great Russian."

The inclusion of "Ruthenian and White Russian" in this paragraph discussing the dialects or variants of main languages and the statement, "Ruthenian and White Russian speakers can understand Great Russian," induce the false idea in the reader that "Ruthenian and White Russian" are in the same linguistic relation to Great Russian as the enumerated "dialects or variants to their main languages." This is contrary to linguistic fact and is simply Russian imperialist propaganda.

(4) We object to the term "Ruthenian." This medieval term is justified for the proper era and area (as "Bohemian," "Hungarian," etc.), but for scholarly publications of our time the correct contemporary usage is called for, i.e., Czech, Magyar, etc., as are also to be found in the UNESCO publication. Consequently, the term "Ruthenian" here is misleading and inaccurate; Ukrainian should be used instead. This term is known to the editors, for we find in Appendix I, page 142, under the "Tentative Classification of the Languages Spoken in the World Today," "Ruthenian (or Ukrainian), (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania)."

(5) We object also to the confusing term "White Russian," which customarily is used as a political term antithetically to "Red Russian."

(6) The languages of these two Slavic nations legitimately merit in UNESCO publications the application of proper scientific terminology because their states, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelo-Russian Socialist Republic, are charter members of the United Nations. Consequently, for these languages only the terms "Ukrainian" and "Byelo-Russian" should be used in the official publications of the United Nations.

These two republics, it is to be recalled, have been members of UNESCO since May 12, 1954.

(7) The information about the territories where these languages are spoken is wholly nonsensical and contrary to fact: "Ruthenian (or Ukrainian), (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania)."

Equally nonsensical is it to insist, as is done on page 142, that "Russian" is spoken in "Rumania, Bulgaria, Finland."

The fact is that just as there exists a Bulgarian, Czech and Slovak Polish, Serbo-Croat, and Slovene linguistic and ethnographic territory (see page 142), there also exists Ukrainian and a Byelo-Russian linguistic and ethnographic territory in the mentioned republics of these nations. But to mention only "Ruthenian and White Russian minorities" and not to mention the proper Ukrainian and Byelo-Russian linguistic territories is confusing.

(8) The term "Russian," which is used without explanation, alternating with "Great Russian," is confusing in its linguistic use; therefore, we prefer the term "Muscovite," because the "Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic," which uses this term "Russian" in its *political* meaning, is a multinational and multilingual state encompassing the rest of the old Czarist Russian empire, the national and linguistic nucleus of which is the *Muscovite* nation and its language.

(9) Taking into consideration the definition above of the term "vernacular," which states that "we do not consider the language of a minority in a country as a vernacular if it is an official language in another country," we object to the degradation in this UNESCO publication of the Ukrainian and Byelo-Russian languages to vernaculars because they are official languages in their own republics, which, as pointed out above, are charter members of the United Nations, and because, according to the Constitutions of these republics not only their state laws, but according to the Constitution of the USSR, all federal laws must be upheld and published in the *official languages* of the two mentioned Slavic Union Republics. Article 40 of the Union Constitution orders:

Laws passed by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR are published in the *languages of the Union Republics* over the signatures of the President and Secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

(10) A strange and unscientific argument was employed by the authors in order to degrade these two Slavic languages to "vernaculars": "Ruthenian and White Russian speakers can understand Great Russian." This point of "understanding" demands a scientific qualification "partly"; besides, it is not a one-way argument, but logically also applies in the other direction, to wit, "partly" Great Russian speakers understand Ruthenian and White Russian. But surely this does not degrade "Great Russian" to a vernacular of the official languages of the Ukrainian or Byelo-Russian Republics. In addition, the authors should know that the "Ruthenian and White Russian speakers" understand Polish far more easily. Do not the

Slovaks and Czechs, on the one hand, and the Poles and Ukrainians, on the other, understand themselves partly mutually? And likewise the Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, and Macedonians?

This "understanding" argument betrays linguistic and historical dilettantism and even Russian imperialistic bias, none of which belongs in scholarly publications aspiring to scientific objectivity.

(11) The following excerpt is obscure:

Main languages which are real vernaculars in Europe, not including the Soviet Union, though some of them are also spoken in the Union, are: Armenian, spoken in Bulgaria, Turkey and the USSR... Lithuanian, spoken in Poland, Germany and the USSR...

and together with Basque, Lapp, Catalan, Lusatian-Serb or Wend, Gaelic, etc., they are finally classed in the same group as "Roman or Gypsy, spoken in varied forms almost everywhere" (page 42). Where is simple logic? The editors cited their definition of vernacular and expressly stated that "we do not consider the languages of a minority in one country as vernacular if it is an official language in another." But they do just that by classifying Armenian, the official language of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, as spoken in Bulgaria, Turkey, and even in the Soviet Union, to which the republic belongs, as a "real vernacular." The same treatment is accorded Lithuanian, the official language of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, as spoken in Poland, Germany, and even in the Soviet Union.²

These three nations—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—have a record of heroic resistance to the dictatorship of Russian Communism, which by breaking all principles of justice and international law abolished in these countries all human rights and fundamental freedoms. Our government does not recognize their occupation and integration into the Soviet Union; but just now, when these nations are fighting for their very existence, UNESCO erases Estonian and Latvian from the European family of existing national and official languages while Lithuanian is classified as a "real vernacular" on a level with the Gypsy language.

III

In the Soviet Union, the reader is informed, about one hundred different main languages are spoken. These include six Slavic languages, but only two are given between parentheses (Great Russian, Polish). The languages of the two other Slavic republics of the Soviet Union were not regarded as important enough to cite, although

² "Gaelic, spoken in the United Kingdom," is also falsely degraded to a vernacular because it is the official language of the Irish Republic.

Polish was included by some strange logic of the UNESCO linguists. Then follows the long quotation from the work by E. Koutaissof, an individual cited by UNESCO as "an authority on Soviet educational policy." Mr. Koutaissof makes the following points on "Soviet educational policy":

- a) that it has aimed at providing education in the vernacular;
- b) that languages which had no written form have been endowed with scientifically devised alphabets and grammars;
- c) that difficult and ill-adapted alphabets of languages were replaced by similar Latin and the latter by the Russian script which made the art of reading and writing more accessible to the masses;
- d) that the need for a unifying language led to the introduction of compulsory Russian and the concomitant use of the Russian alphabet for most vernaculars;
- e) that so far there have been no attempts at devising a simplified form of pidgin-Russian;
- f) that the aim of the Soviet policy seems to be a bilingual population proud of its own national achievements yet enjoying access to the wider world through Russian; and for that purpose even great Russian writers have translated major European works and popular native songs and epics into Russian.

On these points on "Soviet educational policy" which are accepted and publicized by UNESCO as *objective truth*, we should like to make the following comments:

(1) It is wholly untenable on the part of UNESCO to accept as gospel the Russian Communist point of view about the "place of Russian in the Non-Slavic Republics of the USSR." American scholars of the Soviet language and educational policy are not provided with an equal opportunity to present their point of view. But above all it is unobjective to disregard the opinions on these problems of the free scholars of those nationalities now in exile. UNESCO presents only one side of the coin—the Communist one. The reverse side is ignored. Is the free world yet to be a free market of ideas?

It is a fact established by an immense amount of material and authoritative statements of the Russian Communist Party itself that philology, linguistics and education are subordinated to the dictatorship of the Communist Party for the realization of its program. Therefore, to publish such information on Soviet educational policy and its attitude toward the non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union without critical remarks and factual background information is a flagrant abuse of the UNESCO forum.

This disregard for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of these non-Russian nations is the more unfortunate in that it is

displayed by a U.N. organization. Moreover, it appears in a publication whose expenses are paid for by the free world, especially the United States.

(2) As background information for the understanding of the Russian Communist policy regarding education and non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union, one must keep in mind its guiding principles and dialectical method of thinking and acting.

The aim, as formulated by Stalin at the Sixteenth Congress of the All-Union Party (1930) regarding languages, is:

The flourishing of national culture and languages during the period of the dictatorship in a single country is *permitted*, but with the purpose of preparing conditions for the dying out and amalgamation of these cultures and languages into a single culture and common language when socialism achieves victory in the whole world.³

The historic mission of "Russian, as formulated by D. Zaslavsky, is:⁴

The Russian language has become the *world language*. . . The succession of languages runs through the ages. Latin was the language of the ancient world, French, of the feudal epoch; English, of capitalism; Russian is the world language of socialism. French is the fancy language of courtiers, and English is the jargon of traders. They were the tongues of ruling classes and of snobbish intellectuals. The English language corrupted people in foreign lands. *Russian is the first language of internationalism*. No one can call himself a scholar if he does not know Russian. Russians unquestionably occupy first place in the social sciences. All future progress in these sciences has been determined by the genius of Lenin and Stalin.

For the realization of these aims, the Russian Communist dictatorship used the so-called Soviet Linguistic Theory of N. Ya. Marr, who, after 1920, elaborated it on the basis "of the tenets of dialectical and historical materialism."⁵ (The theory was revoked by Stalin himself in June, 1950.⁶)

The main principles of Marr's theory are: (a) all things in society—the political, judicial, philosophical, religious, and artistic—are superstructures resting on an economic basis; consequently, language also is a superstructure; (b) as everything in society has class characteristics, there do not exist national languages but only class languages; (c) the historical and economic process moves inevitably toward the establishment of the one and indivisible proletarian republic the world over, and Lenin postulated for this era the emerging of one Soviet nation, with one Soviet culture and one

³ We underscore the point that languages have no rights as such in the Soviet Union but only "permission" from the Russian Communist Party.

⁴ *Literaturnaia Gazeta*, February, 1949.

⁵ See Roman Smal-Stocki, *The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union*, pp. 79-92.

⁶ See Roman Smal-Stocki, "Reasons for the Revocation of Marr's Linguistic Theory by Stalin, June, 1951," *Proceedings of the Shevchenko Scientific Society*, Vol. I, Philosophical Section, New York - Paris, 1955, pp. 5-22.

language. The task of Soviet linguistics is to realize the first phase of this process and to speed up through enforced use of Russian the unification process of languages in the Soviet Union, and (d) all Indo-European linguistics, with their conception of an Indo-European family of languages and its original proto-language, is "bourgeois nonsense"; instead, all languages of the world developed from four original elements—SAL, BER, YON and ROSH—from which all words of all languages stem.

Marr, convinced that there exists in the whole world a "single glottologic-language-forming process," classified languages according to stage-theory in four groups based on the level of the economic development of the peoples. At the very top appear the Semitic and Indo-European languages. Next appear three groups of languages "frozen" at a given stage—economically, socially, linguistically—which represent obsolete language systems because their stagnation is final. To these groups belong also the Finno-Ugric, Turkic, and Mongolian languages. Into the most primitive group at the very bottom, Marr placed Chinese and the living Middle and Far African languages. (The main reason for Stalin's revocation of Marr's theory was the Communist conquest of China.)

Marr's Soviet Linguistic Theory underlaid the linguistic, nationality, and educational policy of the whole Stalin period up to 1950, and it clarifies the statement of Stalin at the Sixteenth Congress in 1930, on the "flourishing of national culture and languages during the period of the dictatorship." But Stalin simultaneously advanced an important condition for this "flourishing," namely, in the non-Russian languages everything has to be of "Socialist content" and must be expressed only in "national language form." Its practical consequences soon became apparent: "Socialist content" could best be expressed by introducing only Russian words and phrases into the non-Russian languages, that is, by *Russifying them*.

At the same time the Russian classic language and literature, developed by the Russian nobility and bourgeoisie, were proclaimed by the Russian Communists as the "proud heritage of the Russian proletariat." Russian was proclaimed as "classless," "all-national," as the "language of the great Lenin and the Communist revolution" and of the "big brother." Therefore, this language has to be preserved in absolute purity as a holy language. The application of Marr's Theory after 1928 signified an enforced Russification of all non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union.

Russian Communism thus established not only a Russian political and economic dictatorship, but a linguistic one as well. All non-

Russian languages and nations lost the freedom to express their peculiarities in orthography, terminology, vocabulary, phraseology, and syntactical constructions. The aim of Soviet policy clearly was the creation of a "Soviet nation" with a Russian culture and language.

This aim has been partially realized by applying genocide, by liquidating leading linguists, writers, even Communist leaders of the non-Russian nations and nationalities, by a systematic Russification of the universities and the education of the non-Russian nations and by colonizing their territories with Russians and accusing all opponents of this Russian imperialism of "bourgeois nationalism."

The present Khrushchev era is characterized by the same dialectical thesis-antithesis. In slogans of "flourishing national cultures and languages" for the non-Russian nations and nationalities, on the one hand, and "eternal friendship among the Soviet family of progressive peoples," on the other, we note a deepening Russification of the schools of the non-Russian nations. Soviet educational standards compel the teaching of Russian fifteen hours weekly in non-Russian schools, whereas only eight and one-half hours are given over to native language instruction. This is in accord with established Soviet goals for the "synthesis" of all nations into "one Russian Soviet nation," which will be the "vanguard of humanity" and give the world "Russian as the international language." This cultural world imperialism is pursued by all means, including the so-called "cultural exchanges."

This privileged and master position of the Russian language in the Soviet Union is established by the Russian Communist Party in direct violation of Article 13 of the Soviet Constitution:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a federal state, formed on the basis of a voluntary union of *equal* Soviet Republics...

and also of Article 123:

Equality of rights of citizens of the USSR, irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, governmental, cultural, political, and other public activity, is an indefeasible law.

Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or, conversely, the establishment of any direct or indirect privileges for citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law.

The Soviet Constitution is thus mere window-dressing.

For forty years the non-Russian nations and nationalities have been resisting Russian cultural imperialism and its linguistic dictatorship. This fight is one of the facets of so-called "National Communism" among the non-Russian Communists, who demanded for all languages in the Soviet Union equal rights with the Russian lan-

guage. They demanded the right for the writers, poets, and scholars of all nations and nationalities of the USSR to develop and to cultivate their languages in order to make language an instrument of perfect understanding among the individuals using it toward popular education in democracy and humanism. They demanded full liberty of languages as realized in Switzerland, the United States, Canada, or the British Commonwealth. The non-Russian linguists and philologists especially demanded the right of "language self-determination" for all non-Russian nations, including the right—without interference from Russian Communists—to establish the orthographic, grammatical, and terminological norms of the languages and to conduct free objective research in the field of linguistics and philology.

This background information is essential for the understanding of the language problems of the non-Russian nations and nationalities which are inseparably merged with the basic ideas and purposes of the United Nations Charter, namely:

...to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of *equal* rights and self-determination of peoples—and to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, *language*, or religion. . .

Without this information the American reader in the free world would get a completely false idea from the UNESCO publication about the plight of the non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union; he would be prone to accept the baseless thesis as truth that the Russian dictatorship has left free at least one field, that of language and linguistics, for the non-Russian nations, nationalities, and peoples.

(3) Against this background of the non-Russian languages problem in the Soviet Union, we now turn to an evaluation of the information about the Soviet Union, point for point:

With reference to point (a): Soviet educational policy has not "aimed at providing education in the vernacular." First, the Soviet educational policy is aimed not at all at education, in the sense that we understand education, but at Russian Communist indoctrination with the final goal of propagandizing the world revolution. Second, it is wrong to classify the official languages of the non-Slavic Union Republics or even the languages of the autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics as vernaculars. Third, the Russian Communist Party is everywhere providing not education in the vernacular, but *Russification* of the vernaculars by making their natural development practically impossible.

On point (b): It is true that some languages which had no written form have been endowed with alphabets and grammars, but it is also true that this was done to facilitate the Russification of these languages and peoples by imposing on them the Cyrillic script, used in Russian.

On point (c): It is untrue that difficult and ill-adapted alphabets were replaced by simpler Latin and later by the Russian script in order to make the art of reading and that of writing accessible to the masses. The fact is that in order to separate the Moslem nations from the alphabets of their cultural Islamic heritage and to facilitate atheist propaganda and Russification, first the Russians used the slogan: "The Latin alphabet is the beginning of the revolution and of progress." This reform cut off the literate native masses from the art of reading and writing. Becoming aware that the Moslem nations of the Soviet Union acquired through this reform a common Latin script with Turkey and that by this script their opposition to Russification became stronger, the Russian Communist Party then ordered the Cyrillic script to be used in the languages of all the non-Russian nations (with the exception of the Georgian and Armenian) together with the Soviet Linguistic Theory of Marr. Even upon Rumanian in the Moldavian Soviet Republic was the Cyrillic script impressed, and the Rumanian nation was split.

It is unscientific in a UNESCO publication to use for the Cyrillic script the term "Russian"; moreover, it demonstrates the Russian Communist imperialist bias. This script in scientific literature is called Cyrillic after its supposed creator, the Slavic apostle of Christianity, St. Cyril. This script is used by the Bulgarians, Serbs, Macedonians, Ukrainians, Byelo-Russians, Cossacks, and Russians. To introduce the term "Russian script" in a UNESCO publication, a political term which is preferred by Russian Communism and imperialistic Pan-Russianism and atheism, is strikingly unfair to all the other Slavic nations and their languages.

On point (d): It was not the need for a unifying language which led to the introduction of compulsory Russian and the concomitant use of the Russian alphabet for most vernaculars in the Soviet Union, but the interest of Russian cultural imperialism and Russian Communist world revolution, the first stage of which was and is the attempted Russification of the non-Russian languages in the USSR and the creation of a Russian speaking "Soviet nation."

On point (e): The statement that so far there have been no attempts at devising a simplified form of "pidgin-Russian" is only partly true. As a matter of fact, the Russian language is proclaimed

as a kind of "holy language" of the Russian Communist secular faith, and the Russian Communists prefer full Russification of the non-Russians to simplified forms of pidgin-Russian.

But we must remark that the term "pidgin" is not used here in the proper meaning of the definition. Pidgin is a language which has arisen as the result of contact between peoples of different language; it is usually formed from a mixing of the languages, and that presupposes a natural process, as in the rise of pidgin-English. But pidgin-Russian was created by Communist terror, compulsion, mass exiles, and by the artificial methods of Marr's linguistic theory. Therefore, among pidgin-languages it merits a special term: *Russian terror-pidgin*. (It was a special phenomenon in the concentration camps.) The Russian Communist Party became disinterested in the creation of pidgin-Russian because the Marr method stimulated anti-Russian nationalism among the non-Russian nations, and "National Communism" rose among the non-Russian Communists. Also the enforcement of Russian in the captive countries of Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia had the same results. The Russian language, despite its great literature, is presently hated among non-Russian nations as the language of Russian Communist dictatorship⁷ and Pan-Russian chauvinism and Messianism.

On point (f): The statement that "the aim of the Soviet policy seems to be a bilingual population proud of its own national achievements, yet enjoying access to the wider world through Russian" is simply contrary to fact and to the statements of Lenin, Stalin, and even present-day Communist leaders. Everything "national" in regard to the non-Russian nations is denounced as "bourgeois nationalism and counter-revolution" by today's Russian Communist imperialists. The classic authors of the literatures of the non-Russian nations, (for instance: Shevchenko, Franko, and Lesya Ukrainka of Ukraine) are published in purged and falsified editions while the Russian classic authors remain untouched. Consequently, the non-Russian nationalities have no access to their own national achievements or any feats of heroism to take pride in. In any event, any display of their national pride constitutes "bourgeois nationalism."

In the same way the ascribing to Russian writers of a sense of devotion to the non-Russian nations and nationalities which moti-

⁷ See the experiences of an American speaking Russian in Poland in the article, "I'm Suspected," in *Talmanac Goes to Poland and Czecho-Slovakia*. Talman Federal Savings and Loan Association. Chicago, Ill., p. 1. One Pole warned another: "This man says he is American but he speaks Russian. Be careful."

vates them to supply translations so that all may participate in the intellectual life of the larger community is only partly true, and the examples are badly selected. A "Karelian," which means a "Finn," can read Rustavelli in Finnish, yet a Chukchi fears to read the heroic poem "Manas" since it was denounced as "nationalist Kirghiz" by the Russians and since the purging of many Kirghiz scholars by special "decree" because they were "proud of their national achievements."⁸

IV

Chapter II is dedicated to the report of the UNESCO meeting of specialists in 1951. This discussion completely ignored the language problems in the Soviet Union, their history and experiences since 1920.

To be sure, many of the suggestions and recommendations of this report are valuable, but these will never be seriously considered by the Russian Communist dictatorship. It is worthwhile for linguists to compare the suggestions and recommendations on "The Choice of Writing Systems" and "Questions of Vocabulary and Structure" with the real situation enforced on the non-Russian nations by the Russian Communists. The statement of Professor Sauvegeot on pages 72-74 is excellent, a point which especially must be applied to all non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union:

If Finnish had not adapted itself through centuries to the successive needs with which it was confronted, the Finnish people would today speak only Swedish, and would thereby have lost all the treasures which they have inherited from their ancestors and which they have succeeded in handing down to the present generation. Many other examples of the same type could be quoted, showing that, for a people desirous of preserving their heritage, no price could be too high in an effort to adapt their language to the needs which circumstances impose upon them. Success in this is essential if we wish to preserve, for the future of mankind, that diversity of civilizations which enriches all, and modern linguistics vastly facilitates it.

Here is the great tragedy of present times—that the Russian Communist dictatorship attempts to do just the opposite. It attempts to impose on the non-Russian languages and nations the fate of the Karelian part of the Finnish language whose speaking population the Russians hope to completely Russify and absorb in the next decade, as they have already done with the Jews. Their Karelo-Finnish Union Republic already is abolished.

Chapter III includes some case histories. Only one of them has any connection with present-day Russian Communism, namely, the Finno-Ugrian Experiment, reported by Professor Sauvegeot. We are

⁸ See Roman Smal-Stocki, *The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union*, pp. 290-293; *Vestnik Akademii Nauk SSSR*, No. 12, 1950.

happy to see that the Estonian language, missing in Appendix I in the "Tentative Classification of the Languages Spoken in the World Today," appears here. But the article is purely historical, and the author does not mention what happened to the Karelo-Finnish language in the Soviet Union, or to Estonian and Magyar, after World War II under Russian Communism. Also the Ingrians, an example of Soviet genocide, are in this connection not mentioned at all.

Only in one case did we find an important principle applied for the solution of language problems. On page 99 in a discussion on Bahasa Indonesia:

This is not democratic in the modern sense, and does not appeal to the generation which has coined the slogan, "One country, one people, and one language."

Thus there is a double moral standard in the UNESCO publication, one, the democratic principle, for the countries of the free world and the languages of the colonial peoples liberated by the free world, another for the languages of the nations and nationalities which fell victim to Russian Soviet imperialism.

In summation, the information on the Soviet Union and its sphere of influence is unobjective and inaccurate. It creates a false impression about the language problems of the Soviet Union by silencing the attitude of the Russian Communist Party toward the non-Russian languages. Lastly, it was allowed to be written with pro-Soviet Russian imperialist bias.

V

The second publication to be discussed is: *Contributions a l'histoire Russe — Studies on Russian History — Contribuciones a la Historia Rusa, Cahier d'Histoire Mondiale, Numero Special, 1958; Editions de la Baconniere, Neuchatel; published under the financial assistance of UNESCO.*

It consists of a preface of A. A. Zvorikine, Vice-President of the *Commission internationale pour une histoire du developpement scientifique et cultural de l'humanite*, and three chapters with articles dedicated to (1) prehistory, (2) the Middle Ages and the XVIth century, and (3) the period from the XVIIIth to the XXth century, written by representative Soviet scholars of good standing in the Russian Communist Party.

The following matters cannot but provoke strong criticism in the free world:

(1) *Terminology*. In English, French, and Spanish the volume uses in the title the terms: Russian, Russe, and Rusa. Just what do these terms mean in this UNESCO publication?

From Zvorikine's preface (p. 13) the reader learns that Georgia, Uzbekistan, Eastern Siberia, North Caucasus, Ukraine, Crimea, Armenia, and Central Asia (p. 14) since the paleolithic and mesolithic ages are "Russian" and the histories of all the colonies of the old Czarist Russian Empire from the dawn of man up to the present are "Russian history." Zvorikine does use objectively and systematically in his preface the terms "Soviet Union" or USSR but in the title the Russian imperialistic bias comes to full expression, "Soviet Union" being equated with "Russia."

Is this terminology of the title objective and scientific or is it Russian imperialist propaganda?

Would UNESCO write in this fashion in the case of the countries and peoples of the former European colonies in Asia or Africa, including, for instance, India or Egypt since ancient ages in the history of Great Britain, or Morocco and Tunis in French history? Why must "Russian *Lebensraum*" be respected by UNESCO in such a way and why must it be propagated by such terminology throughout the free world?

The term "Russie-Russia" has a second meaning in chapter I in the article of I. U. Boudovnitz. Here it is used for the Kievan Rus-Ukraine in spite of the fact that even Soviet Academician A. D. Grekov, in his English works published in Moscow, insists for this state and era on the use of the term "Kiev Rus" (*The Culture of Kiev Rus*, Moscow, 1947) as well as in his German translations on the term "Rus" (*Die Bauern in der Rus, Geschichte der Kultur der Alten Rus*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1959).

The term "Russie-Russia" has a third meaning in Chapter II, denoting Moscovia-Muscovy—which is also used in the present Soviet terminology in Russian.

To top off this terminological confusion the term "Russie-Russia" is used in the third Chapter. Czar Peter I changed the name of the Muscovite Czarism to "Russian Empire"; from that time on this term for the state is fully justified. The ruling Muscovite nation and empire changed its nationality term gradually to "Russian" and now also terms as "Russian" its language, culture, and history. This term is an expression of the Russian imperialism and colonialism of the Russian Petrine empire. It has created constant confusion between "Russian" equalling citizenship or, better, "subjectship," and "Russian" equalling the language, culture, and history of the imperial Muscovites. Consequently, at the present time these two meanings should also always be terminologically separated in the interest of an objective presentation of East European history.

What is behind these terminological tricks of the Soviet "savants"? It is this. By the introduction of a common term "Russie-Russia" for all the periods of East European and partly even Asiatic history from the paleolithic up to the present Soviet Union, the Russian Communists attempt to create, in the free world, the impression of a "continuity of Russia" for the defense of the integrity and indivisibility of "Russia" behind which lurks the old Russian-Muscovite imperialism and colonialism.

In order to provide a firm basis for the evaluation of the present problem of the term "Russia" being equated with the term "Soviet Union," we submit the scholarly opinion of a distinguished American geographer, Professor Eugene Van Cleef, Ohio State University, who in his article "Russia or USSR?"⁹ writes:

It may be well enough for the "man on the street" to use the term "Russia" when he means the USSR, but when a geographer does so the sin seems unpardonable. . .

Today, officially speaking, the USSR consists of. . . so-called "Republics" one of which is commonly named "Russia" or technically, Russian Federated Socialist Republic. Presumably, the government of the Soviet Union has a right to organize itself into such political units as pleases itself. Because it has decreed to employ as the name for one of its divisions, a name which once upon a time referred to the whole nation is no justifiable ground for continuing to use Russia in its wrong sense—certainly not among an intellectual folk.

There are those who contend that "Russia" is more convenient to say than "USSR," much less the protracted expression "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." And there are those who argue that inasmuch as the RSFSR contains the seat of the national government and is the largest in area and population of the republics it is legitimate to say "Russia" when we mean USSR. Again, we may hear it said, "Everybody knows what we mean when we say Russia, so why bother with saying USSR?"

Of course it is the privilege of any person to use any nomenclature which pleases his fancy, provided he announces in advance what his intentions are. If he declares, "I am now going to discuss matters pertaining to the USSR, but I shall use the word Russia in its stead," he is on safe ground. . .

These contentions, justifications, whims and other bases for deviating from the standard or the official nomenclature may satisfy millions of persons and, arguing "common usage" to be the criterion for the accepted meaning of a word, these persons are sincere in their continued erroneous ways. . .

Even if we were to grant as sound all these mis-uses by the masses, we as geographers can hardly tolerate an identical attitude among ourselves. Nor can we excuse our own error, when we commit it, on the ground of wishing not to give an impression of superior knowledge by being correct. If there be geographers who dissent, then we can only say they do a disservice to our science.

After World War I, many nations sought to gain official recognition by other nations, of the native names of their cities. For example Norway announced the abandonment of Christiania and its replacement by Oslo. Interestingly enough, the world promptly acceded to the request, and few if any of the younger generation are aware of the change. On the other hand "Eire" or "Ireland" asked that "Dublin" give way to "Baile Atha Cliath." But altho modern atlases show this name, hardly a person outside "Eire" uses that form—the probable reason is clear enough. The correct pronunciation of the

⁹ *The Journal of Geography*, Vol. 54, November, 1955, pp. 413-415.

native name is almost impossible by those unfamiliar with the Celtic language. Even so, this type of substitution for the correct name is of a different order from that of Russia for the USSR. The two forms are synonymous. They do not have different official meanings. A part is not substituted for the whole as in the case of Russia for the USSR. . .

The United States Board of Geographic Names "in editing materials for accuracy and consistency of geographic names . . . permits the abbreviation 'USSR' and the term 'Soviet Union' for the present-day entity, but limits the use of 'Russia' to references to pre-Soviet Russia." Again, "We recommend 'Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic,' or the abbreviations 'RSFSR' for the largest of the Soviet republics." So states the Executive Secretary of the Board. This recognition by the Board ought to serve as a sufficiently authoritative basis for anyone to employ the term "Russia" correctly and without embarrassment. Certainly for the geographer there is no alternative; nor need he be apologetic for being correct.

(2) *Scholarly objectivity.* In order to evaluate the articles from the scholarly point of view one must consider facts of Soviet life under Communist dictatorship. Having sketched the plight of linguistics under Russian Communist dictatorship, we now present the situation of all liberal arts and sciences under the Soviet regime.

It is a matter of fact, unquestioned by the Communists themselves:

(a) that since the establishment of the Russian Communist dictatorship in Petrograd, its later expansion into the Soviet Union and, after World War II, over the new colonies, academic freedom has been abolished in all the captive nations. The inalienable rights of all scholars in the fields of liberal arts and sciences were destroyed with irreparable damage to these disciplines, to the culture of all the captive nations inside and outside the Soviet Union, and to the whole of mankind.

(b) that all liberal arts and sciences in the Soviet Union and its sphere of domination are subordinated to the Marxist-Leninist dictatorship of the Russian Communist Party, which has converted them into tools of the Russian cultural imperialism. This is also especially true of the sciences, which have become one of the most efficacious tools of Communist world revolution.

(c) that the Soviet police state created a Soviet police liberal arts and sciences and also a Soviet police literature, according to Marxist-Leninist Party dogmas and the established directives of the Russian Communist Party. Thus in fact from the very top, from the Soviet Academy of Sciences and its system of academies over the Universities and its institutions to the lower levels of education, all research and education is directed by the Communist Party according to Marxism-Leninism in a constant cold war inside and outside the Soviet Union against any freedom of thought. All liberal arts and sciences are subordinated to rigid conformism following the Party line, and only the Party can change, through new

directives, the opinions of scholars and professors, who, having no tenure, are completely at the mercy of the Party. Scholars cannot collaborate (in the meaning of the free world); one can only collaborate with the Russian Communist Party, which terrorizes them. Soviet scholars are merely the loudspeakers of the Russian Communist Party—not the representatives of free and objective research of the nations, nationalities, and peoples of the Soviet Union.

In the present era of Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism since the end of World War I, the Communist Party continues the policy of the old Czarist Russian government, especially with regard to the liberal arts. The old White Russian Czarism systematically persecuted all liberal arts of the non-Russian nations, especially history, philology, and linguistics. The far-reaching persecution of all free research was accompanied by the creation of pseudo-scientific imperialist conceptions in history, philology, and linguistics, imposed by the Czarist government upon schools and teaching in the empire. The most important pseudo-scientific conceptions of Russian imperialism were:

(a) the official scheme of "Russian history," which negated the existence of separate Ukrainian and Byelo-Ruthenian (Byelo-Russian) historical streams. The Kievan Rus-Ukraine and all its cultural achievements simply disappeared in the maw of "Russian" history.

(b) the conception of the so-called "Proto-Russian parent language" in Slavic philology, which gave Russian chauvinist politicians the terms "Russia and Russians" in order to deprive the Ukrainian and Byelo-Ruthenian languages of their rank as independent Slavic languages and to degrade them to "dialects of Russian," unfit for use in public life or for instruction. Thus Russian was forced upon Ukraine and Byelo-Russia as the literary language (by *Ukase* of the Czar Ukrainian has been forbidden since the year 1876). These dogmas of "unity in history and language" of the Ukrainians and Byelo-Ruthenians with the Russians became the cornerstone of Russian imperialist propaganda to preserve the "integrity and indivisibility of the Russian Empire."¹⁰

After the expansion of the Russian Communist dictatorship by aggressive wars and subversion into the former colonial territories of Czarist Russia, territories which made legitimate use of the right of self-determination and during the revolution proclaimed their independence (Idel-Ural Tartars, Ukraine, Kuban Cossacks, Byelo-

¹⁰ In 1906 some objective Russian academicians, among them the leading Russian linguists—F. E. Korsh, F. F. Fortunatov, A. A. Shachmatov—defended the independence and equality of the Ukrainian language in a "considered opinion" of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.

Ruthenia, Don Cossacks, North Caucasians, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Siberia, Turkestan—only Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania preserved their freedom) the Russian Communist dictatorship at the end of the NEP period (1928) reestablished the old Czarist pseudo-scientific conceptions as dogmas. In philology the conception of the “Proto-Russian unity of the Byelo-Ruthenian, Russian, and Ukrainian languages” (amongst which Russian is not equal with the others, but rules as the “language of the older brother” and the “holy language” of the Communist revolution) was revived and Marr’s “theory” was used, as discussed, for the forced Russification of all non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union. M. N. Pokrovsky’s official Marxist history¹¹ condemning Russian imperialism and colonialism was banned. The old Czarist official Russian scheme of history was reintroduced, and under the editorship of Mrs. A. M. Pankratova, the history of the Soviet Union and of all non-Russian nations was rewritten, according to the conception that Russian imperialism was the “lesser evil,” “progressive,” and “beneficial” to the economic, political, and cultural development of all non-Russian nations. A glorification of Ivan the Terrible and of Peter I is a peculiarity of the new Communist evaluation of Muscovite and Russian history, which also expanded the idea of the “integrity and indivisibility of Russia equal the Soviet Union” into the paleolithic age.

According to M. A. Zinoviev:¹² “History is a powerful weapon of communist education and it must wholly serve the cause of the struggle for Communism,” and so the history of the Soviet Union for the last few decades is a history which is continuously being rewritten. This fact is proven by a large literature (example, C. E. Black, *Rewriting Russian History*, Frederick A. Praeger, 1956, New York). The history of Slavic philology and linguistics in the Soviet Union has also a large literature (see the writer’s work, *The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union*, Bruce Co., 1952, Milwaukee, Wisc., pp. 93-259) and the work (in Ukrainian) of Panteleimon Kovaliv, *Principles of Formation of the Ukrainian Language in Comparison with Other Eastern Slavic Languages*, Memoirs of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Vol. CLXVIII, New York, 1958). How the Russian Communist Party eliminated free creativeness and thought in the literatures of the nations under its dictatorship is well represented in the work of Avrahm Yarmolinsky, *Literature under*

¹¹ M. N. Pokrovsky, *Brief History of Russia*, Vol. I, II, Marxist Library, Works of Marxism-Leninism, New York, 1933, International Publishers.

¹² M. A. Zinoviev, *Soviet Methods of Teaching History*, Washington, 1952.

Communism, Russian and East European Institute, Indiana University, 1957, Bloomington, Ind.

To recapitulate, all the articles of the mentioned book published under UNESCO auspices reflect Russian Communist Party dogmas and directives. No credit attaches to UNESCO for its endorsement and financial support of this work of Communist propaganda. Briefly, in "Russian history" mention is made of all paleoanthropological finds on the territory of the USSR and Siberia; the study of the Urartu civilization in the Caucasus of such great importance for Armenia and Georgia; the Rus-Ukrainian written monuments of the XI century; an article minimizing the influence of the Mongols on the Muscovite civilization (in order to counteract the school of thought that Russia-Muscovy, in spite of her Byzantine Orthodox religion, belongs not to the Byzantine civilization but to the Turanian); the great cultural achievements of Armenia and Georgia before the Mongol invasion; the first printed books of all Slavic nations. Then all articles are restricted to the Russian-Muscovite aspect of the history: the political and social Russian literature of the XVI century (attempting to make the tyranny of Ivan the Terrible a European phenomenon of the Renaissance); the Russian-Muscovite inventors of the XVIII and XIX centuries; the evolution of the Russian theater, 1800-1860; the development of Russian plastic arts in the XIX century; Russian music in the XIX century. Hence these articles tend to leave the reader with the impression that not one of the Russian-conquered colonial nations, nationalities, and peoples, who in previous chapters were included in this "Russian history," also had its own development in literature, the theater, the plastic arts and music.

The book ends with an article on the Marxian philosophy of G. V. Plekhanov and with a eulogy for Lenin the philosopher, which reaches the level of a typical Communist *agitka*.

VI

In light of the above, we hold that both UNESCO publications are unobjective and are permeated with the dogma of the Russian Communist Party. An abuse of the objectives of UNESCO and a waste of the money of the American taxpayer, they comprise at the same time a direct aid in the present cold war of ideas to the Russian pseudo-scientific infiltration in the free world.

Not to be overlooked is the effect on the American scholar, who, grounded in the idea of free scholarship from birth, labors under the delusion that in collaborating with a Soviet scholar he is

advancing the objective search for truth. In actuality, he collaborates with the Russian Communist Party, the fountainhead of all the "scientific" opinions of its UNESCO delegates.

Hence such collaboration as in these UNESCO publications comprises a direct violation of the spirit of the UNESCO Constitution.

The attention of our Government is called to the fact that it would be illogical and without legal foundation to justify the content of these UNESCO publications by point 3 of Article I of the UNESCO Constitution which says:

With a view to preserving the independence, integrity, and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the States members of this Organization, the Organization is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their domestic jurisdiction.

We do not hereby propose any intervention in Soviet domestic affairs; but we do demand as an American scholar and citizen that UNESCO publications must comply with its Constitution and that they be the expressions of an "unrestricted pursuit of objective truth" and of a "free exchange of ideas and knowledge," rather than a vehicle for Russian Communist propaganda.

The truth is that the Russian Communist dictatorship, as a signer of the U.N. Charter, has violated its pledges regarding the non-Russian languages, nations, and nationalities, even with respect to two U.N. members, Ukraine and Byelo-Russia, as are implicit in Article 55:

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

(c) *universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedom for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.*

By collaborating with the Russian Communist dictatorship, as it has in these ill-conceived UNESCO publications, the United States is depriving the United Nations and herself as well of political and moral prestige among all the non-Russian victims of the Soviet Union. The publications comprise a blatant disregard and contempt of their human rights, their fundamental freedoms and their right to self-determination.

This collaboration manifests the double standard of morals of the U.S. which, on the one hand, condemns the Dominican and Cuban dictators, but on the other collaborates in UNESCO with the delegates of the Russian Communist Party, the most tyrannical regime history has ever known.

Finally, this collaboration with Soviet scholars is based on a naive belief in "peaceful coexistence" with and a "gradual liberaliza-

tion" of Russian Communism, a dangerous obsession of some State Department officials who did not even wait for the Soviet "Trojan Horse," but voluntarily opened wide the gates of UNESCO to it (at American expense), anticipating the "liberal Khrushchev era."¹³ Zvorikine is properly appreciative of this (p. 13) :

Le consentement donne par la redaction des Cahiers a la publication de ce numero special temoigne que le principe de la collaboration amicable des savants de divers pays se realise dans notre travail en commun.

(3) On behalf of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, an American learned association, we protest against these publications and request our Department of State:

(a) to influence UNESCO in the name of fair play to grant equal rights to American scholars whose opinions do not conform with Russian Communist Party lines in a similar "*numero special*" publication under the auspices of UNESCO and with its financial assistance.

(b) to insure that this UNESCO publication receives the same treatment in Soviet Union libraries as the mentioned UNESCO publication got in the free world. Only then will a basis have been established for a scholarly discussion and exchange of ideas.

(c) to insist that the American delegation to UNESCO be supplemented by American scholars-specialists in the field of liberal arts and sciences of the non-Russian nations, nationalities and peoples inside the Soviet Union and within the sphere of influence of Russian Communism.

¹³ For the whole Soviet Union all scholarly activities are now regulated by the Resolutions of the XXI Congress of the Communist Party, which are enforced on all Academies of Sciences of all Union Republics of the non-Russian nations. In liberal arts the aims are: "increasing the struggle against bourgeois ideology, especially against bourgeois nationalism and revisionism. . . an integral part of the propaganda of Marxist-Leninist ideas must be an aggressive criticism of the reactionary bourgeois ideology, especially contemporary revisionism, bourgeois nationalism and cosmopolitanism." To these directives are subordinated history, linguistics, philosophy, literature, law, social sciences, and ethnography. Cf. *Dopovidi Akademii Nauk USSR*, copy 6, 1960, p. 848-849.

Printed in U.S.A.

Svoboda — 81-83 Grand Street, Jersey City 3, N. J.

PUBLISHED BY THE SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY

In the Ukrainian language:

- Hrycak Paul:** The Duchy of Halych-Volhynia, 1957
Zajcev Paul: The Life of Taras Shevchenko, 1955
West Ukraine under the Bolsheviks 1939-41, edited by M. Rudnycka,
1957
Anthology of Ukrainian Short Stories, 1955
Lepkyj Bohdan: Mazepa. A novel, 1955
Malaniuk Eugene: Poems, 1954
Broken Strings. Anthology of Poems, 1955
Sichynsky Volodymyr: History of Ukrainian Art, 1956. Vol. I. II.
Franko Ivan: Selected Works, 1956
Yanovskyj Yuriij: The Shipmaster. A novel, 1954
Ohloblyn Olexander: Hetman Ivan Mazepa and His Era, 1960
Kniashynskyj Antin: The Spirit of the Nation, 1959
Paneyko Alexander: Ukrainian Stenography, 1961
Zarsky Edward: Geography of Ukraine (Maps), 1961
Bulletin of the Committee on Terminology, Vol. I. 1958
Bulletin of the Library Committee, Vol. I. 1959
Memoirs of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Collected Papers of
the Philological Section, 1953. Vol. 161, 1954. Vol. 162, 1956.
Vol. 165, 1957. Vol. 166, 1959. Vol. 168, 1961. Vol. 171, 1961.
Vol. 172.

In the English language:

- Proceedings of the Historical-Philosophical Section, 1951. Vol. I.
Proceedings of the Philological Section, 1952. Vol. I, 1955. Vol. II.
Proceedings of the Mathematical-Physical-Medical Section, 1953.
Vol. I, 1954. Vol. II, 1955. Vol. III, 1956-58. Vol. IV.

ISSUES OF "PAPERS" PUBLISHED

1. **Bohachevsky Daniel, J. U. Dr.:** Problems of Ukrainian Learning Abroad. (In Ukrainian)
Lew Vasyl, Ph. D., Prof.: Folklore in the Almanac "Rusalka Dnistrova" (In Ukrainian). (1958)
2. **Ostapiak Mykola, Prof.:** Isolating the Virus of Asian Influenza from Samples of Gargling the Throat and Autopsy Material (In Ukrainian). (1958)
3. **Smal-Stocki, Ph. D., Prof.:** The Impact of the "Sputnik" on the English Language of the U.S.A. (1958)
4. **Bohachevsky Daniel, J. U. Dr.:** The Ideological Fundamentals of "The November Awakening" (In Ukrainian). (1959)
5. **Jaszczun Vasyl, Ph. D.:** Religious and Moral-Ethical Tenets of Taras Shevchenko (In Ukrainian). (1959)
6. **Smal-Stocki Roman, Ph. D., Prof.:** J.S.C. De Radius, an Unknown Forerunner of Comparative Slavic Literature. (1959)
7. **Nazarko Ireneus, OSBM, Ph. D.:** Metropolitan Julian Sas-Kullovsky (1826—1900). (1959)
8. **Smal-Stocki Roman, Ph. D., Prof.:** Shevchenko and the Jews. (1959)
9. **Mackiw Theodore, Ph. D., Prof.:** Mazepa (1632—1709) in Contemporary German Sources. (1959)
10. **Vytanovych Illja, Ph. D., Prof.:** Social and Economic Tendencies in State Policies of Ivan Mazepa (In Ukrainian). (1959)
11. **Luciw Luke, Ph. D.:** Academician Prof. Stephen Smal-Stockyj (In Ukrainian).
Wozniak Michael, Acad., Prof.: Stephen Smal-Stockyj and Franko (In Ukrainian). (1959)
12. **Manning Clarence A., Ph. D., Prof.:** The Role of Mazepa in Eastern Europe. (1960)
13. **Kamenetsky Ihor, Ph. D.:** Origins of the New British Imperialism. (1960)
14. **Krawciw Bohdan:** Fedkovych in the Latest Literary Publications (In Ukrainian). (1961)
15. **Pavlovych Petro:** The Shevchenko Heritage and M. Kotsiubynsky (In Ukrainian). (1961)