

The Ukrainian Quarterly

Vol. XXXI, No. 1

A JOURNAL OF EAST EUROPEAN AND ASIAN AFFAIRS

Featuring In This Issue:

THE U.N., PALESTINE AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS
Editorial

THE INSTITUTIONAL MOULD OF COMECON
By Lev E. Dobriansky

DETENTE, THE OCTOBER 1973 WAR AND THE PALESTINIAN PROBLEM
By Joseph H. Dunner

ARCHBISHOP BUCHKO—"ARCH-SHEPHERD OF REFUGEES"
By Walter Dushnyck

*PROBLEMS OF THE NON-RUSSIAN PEOPLES AS EXEMPLIFIED
BY RECENT UKRAINIAN PUBLICATIONS*
By Dan B. Chopyk

The Ukrainian Quarterly

A JOURNAL OF EAST EUROPEAN AND ASIAN AFFAIRS

SPRING, 1975

VOLUME XXXI—No. 1

\$2.50 COPY



All articles published in this journal and signed by the authors do not necessarily reflect the views of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

**EDITORIAL BOARD FOR THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA:**

Chairman of the Board: Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky

Editor: Dr. Walter Dushnyck

Members: Anthony Dragan, Walter Dushnyck and Matthew Stachiw

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD:

<i>Prof. Adolfo Munoz Alonso</i>	<i>University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain</i>
<i>Prof. Austin J. App</i>	<i>LaSalle College (Ret.), Philadelphia, Pa.</i>
<i>Prof. James D. Atkinson</i>	<i>Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.</i>
<i>Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren</i>	<i>LeMoyne College, Syracuse, N.Y.</i>
<i>Prof. Raffaele Ciasca</i>	<i>University of Rome, Rome, Italy</i>
<i>Prof. Jose Fernandes Silva Dias</i>	<i>University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal</i>
<i>Prof. Kurt Glaser</i>	<i>Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Ill.</i>
<i>Prof. Jerzy Hauptmann</i>	<i>Park College, Parkville, Missouri</i>
<i>Prof. Stephan M. Horak</i>	<i>Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Ill.</i>
<i>Prof. Sechin Jugchid</i>	<i>Director, Institute of China Border Area Studies, Taipei</i>
<i>Prof. Jan Karski</i>	<i>Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.</i>
<i>Prof. Watson Kirkconnell</i>	<i>Acadia University (Ret.), Wolfville, N.S., Canada</i>
<i>Prof. Jun-Yop Kim</i>	<i>Korea University, Seoul, Korea</i>
<i>Prof. Yintang Koo</i>	<i>Taiwan University, Taipei, China</i>
<i>Prof. Peter Lefins</i>	<i>University of Maryland, College Park, Md.</i>
<i>Prof. Kenneth C. Lottich</i>	<i>Montana State University (Ret.), Missoula, Montana</i>
<i>Prof. Michael S. Pap</i>	<i>John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio</i>
<i>Prof. Florent P.J. Peeters</i>	<i>State University, Ghent, Belgium</i>
<i>Prof. Stefan T. Possony</i>	<i>Hoover Institution, Stanford, California</i>
<i>Prof. Joseph S. Roucek</i>	<i>Queensborough Community College, Bayside, N.Y.</i>
<i>Prof. Georg Stadtmueller</i>	<i>University of Munich, Munich, Germany</i>
<i>Prof. Peter G. Stercho</i>	<i>Drexel University, Philadelphia, Pa.</i>
<i>Prof. Franco Valsecchi</i>	<i>University of Rome, Rome, Italy</i>
<i>Prof. Paul Yuzyk, Canadian Senator</i>	<i>University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada</i>

Subscription: Yearly \$9.00; Single Copy \$2.50

Checks payable to: UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.

Editorial and Managing Office: THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

302-304 West 13th Street, New York, N.Y. 10014

Tel.: (212) 924-5617

C O N T E N T S

The U.N., Palestine and the Captive Nations	5
<i>Editorial</i>	5
The Institutional Mould of COMECON	13
<i>By Lev E. Dobriansky</i>	13
Detente, the October 1973 War and the Palestinian Problem	27
<i>By Joseph Dunner</i>	27
Archbishop Buchko—"Arch-Shepherd of Ukrainian Refugees"	32
<i>By Walter Dushnyck</i>	32
Problems of the Non-Russian Peoples As Exemplified by Recent Ukrainian Publications	44
<i>By Dan B. Chopyk</i>	44
BOOK REVIEWS:	
Valentyn Moroz. <i>Suchasnist Publishers</i>	
Report From the Beria Reserve. Ed. John Kolasky	60
<i>Walter Dushnyck</i>	60
Sakharov Speaks. By Andrei D. Sakharov	61
<i>Lev E. Dobriansky</i>	61
Russian Imperialism. Ed. Taras Hunczak	64
<i>Aleksander Sokolyszyn</i>	64
Charles A. Lindbergh and the Battle Against American Intervention in World War II. By Wayne S. Cole	66
<i>Henry C. Wolfe</i>	66
The Cold War Beings: Soviet-American Conflict Over Eastern Europe.	68
<i>By Lynn Etheridge Davis</i>	68
<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	68
The Myth of Liberation: East-Central Europe in U.S. Diplomacy and Politics Since 1941. By Bennett Kovrig	69
<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	69
Soviet Naval Power Challenge for the 1970's. By Norman Polmar	70
<i>Anthony T. Bouscaren</i>	70
Marie of Romania. By Terence Elsberry	71
<i>George I. Duca</i>	71
Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution. By Anthony C. Sutton	72
<i>Tommy W. Rogers</i>	72
PERTINENT DOCUMENTS:	
I. 50th Anniversary of the "Association for the Liberation of Ukraine" and 45th Anniversary of the Trial of Its Leaders	
<i>75</i>	75
II. Telegram to the National Council of Churches in the U.S.	
<i>79</i>	79
III. Soviet Revisionist Policy Stubbornly Resisted in Ukraine	
<i>80</i>	80
UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PERIODICALS	
<i>83</i>	83
CHRONICLE OF CURRENT EVENTS:	
I. Ukrainian Life in the United States	
<i>91</i>	91
II. Ukrainians in the Diaspora	
<i>109</i>	109
III. In Captive Ukraine	
<i>113</i>	113

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

DAN B. CHOPYK, Ph.D., was educated in Ukraine, Germany, England and the United States; he is an Associate Professor of Languages at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City; a member of various American and Ukrainian professional organizations, an active participant in local and national professional meetings and author of frequent articles on Soviet and Ukrainian folklore, language, literature and methodology.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, Professor of Economics at Georgetown University; in October, 1972, he was elected President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America for his eighth consecutive term; Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC) and first vice president of the American Council for World Freedom (ACWF), both in Washington, D.C.; in July, 1974, he was appointed by President Nixon to the National Commission for the Observance of World Population Year.

JOSEPH H. DUNNER, M.A., Ph.D.; Professor Emeritus of Political Science and International Law at Yeshiva University; taught at Harvard University, Grinnell College, and the University of Freiburg (as Fulbright Professor). During the Second World War he served as Chief of the Intelligence Department of the U.S. Office of War Information in London and Head of the Press Section of Psychological Warfare, attached to the U.S. Third Army. He is the author of numerous articles, pamphlets and books as well as the editor of the *Dictionary of Political Science* and the *Handbook of World History*. He is a member of the Board of Directors of the Institute for Mediterranean Affairs, the American Friends of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and the American Council for World Freedom.

WALTER DUSHNYCK, Ph.D., member of the Executive Board of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA) and editor of this review since 1957; a member of the Board of Directors of the American Council for World Freedom (ACWF) in Washington, D.C.; a lifelong student of Soviet and East European affairs, he is the author of a number of books, pamphlets and brochures dealing with the USSR and Eastern Europe.

THE U.N., PALESTINE AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Editorial

For the first time in the thirty-year-old history of the United Nations the United States is beginning to confront the fact that the world organization is not what it has purported to be, and Washington is said to have begun a high-level review of its policies toward the U.N. and its affiliated agencies.

With hindsight, of course, the U.S. move can be said to be a quarter of a century late, because from its very inception the U.N. has served either as a propaganda forum for the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist puppets or it has simply favored decisions and resolutions benefiting the USSR and its Communist allies.

The decisive step undertaken by Washington was precipitated by a series of U.N. decisions that were clearly one-sided and directed against the United States and its European allies. These include the recognition of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the exclusion of South Africa from the U.N. General Assembly session, the expulsion of Israel from UNESCO, and the curbing of Israel's right to speak on the Palestine question and other problems, which were decided upon by the nations of the "Third World" and their Communist supporters.¹ Last but not least is UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim's decision to allow the "Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam" [PRG], that is, the Viet Cong, to open a U.N. liaison office in Geneva.²

In critically assessing U.N. activities we cannot and must not overlook the many things that the international organization has accomplished for humanity. It has dealt effectively with such problems as the right of self-determination, prevention of discrimination, war crimes and crimes against humanity, including genocide; slavery, servitude, forced labor, nationality, statelessness, asylum and refugees; freedom of information, freedom of association, political

¹ "Dissatisfied U.S. Reviewing Policies Toward U.N." by Kathleen Teltsch, *The New York Times*, January 27, 1975.

² "Kissinger Raps U.N. Over Viet Cong," by Michael J. Berlin, *New York Post*, January 17, 1975.

rights of women, marriage, family and childhood and youth; social welfare, progress and development, and so forth.³

But on a higher political plane U.N. accomplishments have been all but meager. It has survived for almost three decades, but the latest strains in the U.N. may well indicate the same end as had its predecessor, the League of Nations.

The League of Nations was established in 1920 for the definite and laudable purpose of preventing future wars, but after a few attempts to bring peace to the world, its impotence became apparent. In 1932, when Japan invaded Manchuria, the League took no effective action, nor could it do anything when Italy sacked Ethiopia in 1935. Again, when Germany swallowed Austria and Czechoslovakia, and later attacked Poland, thereby beginning World War II, the League looked on helplessly. And even though the League expelled the USSR in 1939, it could muster no effective power in aid of small Finland when it was attacked by the Soviet Union. By 1939 the League had lost whatever little prestige it once had, and then disappeared, almost unmourned.

At the end of World War II, all the bloodied nations were weary of war, and the world's eldest statesmen worked feverishly to create a new "instrument and guardian of peace." The United Nations thereupon was born.

Alas, from the very inception of this new international body, it was more a sounding board for Communist propaganda than a serious instrument of solving the monumental problems of the world. True, in 1950, when North Korea invaded South Korea, the U.N., over the strenuous objections of the USSR and its Communist satellite states, succeeded in sending a token force to Korea. And when the U.N. forces, with American superior numerical strength and war equipment, were about to deliver the final blow to the Communist aggressors, some of the Western powers, selfish and shortsighted in their desire to trade with Red China, prevailed upon the United States to dismiss its best military leader, General Douglas MacArthur. The U.S. proceeded to agree to a "peace" in Korea, which continues to this day to be a potential source of war.

The U.N. proved unable to prevent the Arab-Israeli wars in 1948, 1956, 1967 and 1973. It was impotent to forestall the Soviet crushing of the Hungarian revolt in 1956 and the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. Nor was it capable of meaningful action in strife-torn Vietnam or in the Congo.

³ *Human Rights: A Compilation of International Instruments of the United Nations* [United Nations, New York, 1973], p. III.

The more recent war in Cyprus in 1974 demonstrated the now woeful inadequacy of the U.N. Three years earlier, in 1971, the U.N., now wholly dominated by the Soviet bloc and the "Third World" countries, had unabashedly expelled the Republic of China from its membership, despite the fact that that country (Nationalist China) was a legitimate charter member of the U.N.

Late in 1974, the U.N. General Assembly suspended South Africa from the General Assembly for the rest of the year. But at the same time, as if to add insult to injury, the U.N. took an unprecedented step by inviting the leader of a non-nation, Yassir Arafat, to address the General Assembly, thereby giving recognition if not sanction to a revolutionary movement, whatever its claims to legitimacy.

Today the U.N. is more divided and disunited than ever. The real voting power of the 138-nation body rests in the hands of the "Third World" nations. Many fear that tiny Israel may be expelled because most of the U.N. members are openly pro-Arab and many are pro-Soviet and anti-American.

The U.S. may grumble and complain, but there is little it can do short of withdrawing from the U.N. While possessing only one vote, it continues to shoulder twenty-five percent of the U.N.'s costs.

EMERGENCE OF THE PALESTINIAN PROBLEM

Historically speaking, Palestine is a holy land for Jews, Christians and Moslems alike. It has been successively ruled since Biblical times by Hebrews, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Moslems, Egyptians, Crusaders and Mameluks and by the Ottoman Turks, who took over in 1516 and were ousted by the British in World War I.⁴

The more than three million Palestinians are dispersed across the Middle East, with a large population under Israeli rule. It is estimated that 300,000 Palestinians live in Israel, where they are Israeli citizens; 700,000 live in the occupied West Bank and 300,000 in the occupied Gaza Strip. About a million live in Jordan under the rule of King Hussein, and about 700,000 in Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and Kuwait. Small groups are to be found in Europe and the United States.

Palestinians have fled their homes in two vast waves—the first as a result of the Middle East war in 1948-49 and the second because of the war of 1967. Hundreds of thousands of them live pitifully in

⁴ "Palestine at a Glance," *The New York Times*, November 16, 1974.

refugee camps—many since 1948—supported by the U.N. in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

The principal Jewish colonization of Palestine occurred in the XXth century, with the Zionist movement beginning its efforts in 1906. In February, 1917, before it conquered Palestine, Britain issued the "Balfour Declaration," asserting that the territory should become the Jewish national state but promising that the rights of non-Jewish Palestinians would be taken into account. In 1939, when Palestine's population consisted of about 900,000 Moslems, 400,000 Jews and 100,000 Christians, most of them Arabs, Britain issued a "White Paper" that envisioned the establishment of an independent, predominantly Arab country, with Jewish immigration restricted.⁶

After World War II the British refused Jewish demands for an increase in immigration, and a wave of illegal immigration began. There were bloody clashes between Arabs and Jews before the war of 1948, as the Arabs saw the proportion of Jews increasing.

On May 14, 1948, Palestine ceased to exist as a political entity. On that day, the British, who had controlled Palestine under a League of Nations mandate since 1920, withdrew, and the State of Israel was proclaimed in an irregularly-shaped part of the territory. Of the remaining parts, which were to have formed an independent state under the U.N. partition plans of 1947, the West Bank was annexed by Jordan and the Gaza Strip fell under Egypt's control. In the six-day war of 1967 Israel occupied both areas, along with the Sinai Peninsula, which was Egyptian territory, and the Golan Heights, belonging to Syria.

Today the Palestine Liberation Organization, recognized by Arab leaders as the "sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people," says its long-range goal is to reconstitute Palestine as an independent country of Moslems, Christians and Jews. Israel, naturally, is opposed, on the ground that such a move would mean its destruction.

Arafat's visit to the U.N., where he was treated like a head of state, was his second international triumph, the first being his appearance at the Arab summit conference in Rabat, Morocco, where the leaders of Arab League countries recognized the PLO as "the sole representative of the Palestinian people."

In a letter to Jordanian students in Baghdad a few weeks before his arrival at the U.N., Arafat wrote:

⁶ *Ibid.*

Jordan is ours-- Palestine is ours—and we shall build our national entity on the whole of this land after having freed it of both the Zionist presence [Israel] and the reactionary-traitor presence [Jordan's King Hussein]...⁸

High U.S. officials share the view of the Israelis that an independent Palestinian state, as envisioned by the PLO, in the territory of the West Bank of the Jordan River that Israel took from Jordan in 1967 (after Jordan had occupied it in 1948), would pose a mortal threat to both Israel and Jordan. Many American officials believe that the PLO has become such an important political force that Israel may be compelled to deal with the guerrilla organization sometime in the future. With the prevailing mood among the U.N. members there is no secret whom the U.N. General Assembly will support.

But Arafat's PLO and its tactics aside, there is no escaping the fact that the Western nations, particularly Britain, are directly responsible for the suffering and misery of the Palestinian people, in that they failed to settle the Palestinian problem at the time the State of Israel was established.

THE U.N. IGNORES THE CAPTIVE NATIONS IN THE USSR

From the very inception of the U.N. this international organization has been a forum for Soviet Russian invective against the West in general and against the U.S. in particular. After Stalin's demise and with the advent to power of Khrushchev, the U.N. devoted much time and effort to the de-colonization of the world, that is, the breaking-up of the Western colonial systems, a process begun immediately after the end of World War II.

Between 1945 and 1960 some 38 nations won their freedom from Western European countries, whereas Soviet Russia extended its police-state control over more than 25 countries. Except where its own colonies are concerned, the Kremlin has been an ardent proponent of the "liberation" of the colonial countries.

At the XVth session of the U.N. General Assembly, held in the fall of 1960, the issue of colonialism took much of the U.N.'s time.

When on September 23, 1960, Khrushchev proposed discussing the issue of colonialism and, in fact, advocated the immediate granting of independence to all colonial trusteeships and non-self governing areas of the world, the West collectively had a unique opportunity to wrest the initiative from the Kremlin and to put it itself on the

⁸ "Arafat's Proposal Amounts to 'Stamp Out Israel,'" by Stan Carter, *N.Y. Daily News*, November 15, 1974.

defensive. It could have demanded the breaking-up of the Russian empire, only half of whose population are ethnic Russians. But it did not.

Some voices were heard, however. Speaking at the same U.N. General Assembly on September 26, 1960, Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker of Canada, in rebutting Khrushchev's statements on the colonial attitudes of the West, stated:

Mr. Khrushchev in his speech advocated a declaration at this session for the complete and final elimination of colonial regimes...

He has spoken of colonial bondage, exploitation and foreign yokes. These views, uttered by the master of the major colonial power in the world today, followed the admission of fourteen new member nations to the United Nations...

Since the last war seventeen colonial areas and territories, comprising more than 40,000,000 people, have been brought to complete freedom by France. In the same period some fourteen colonies and territories, comprising 500,000,000 people, have achieved complete freedom within the Commonwealth. Taken together, some 600,000,000 people in more than thirty countries, most of them now represented in this Assembly, have attained their freedom with the approval, encouragement and guidance of the United Kingdom and France alone, and I could go on to name others.

These facts of history invite comparison with the period of Soviet domination over peoples and territories, sometimes gained in the name of liberation, but always accompanied by loss of personal and political freedom.

The General Assembly is still concerned with the aftermath of the Hungarian uprising of 1956. How are we to reconcile that tragedy with Mr. Khrushchev's confident assertion of a few days ago in this Assembly:

"It will always be the Soviet stand*** that countries should establish systems*** of their own free will and choosing..."

What of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia? What of freedom-loving Ukrainians and other Eastern European peoples? (Italics ours—Ed.).

Mr. Khrushchev said at the same time:

"The very course of historical development at present poses the question of complete and final elimination of the colonial regimes*** immediately and unconditionally..."

There must be no double standard in international affairs...⁷

Prime Minister Diefenbaker's fearless words evoked a savage reaction on the part of the Soviet press, and in Europe. The Swiss daily, *Die Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (November 20, 1960), widely-read journal of public opinion in Europe, immediately grasped the significance of the Soviet reaction. It pointed out that the Soviet experts and specialists had been greatly alarmed by the Diefenbaker thrust, seeing it as the beginning of a large concerted Western assault

⁷ " 'What of Freedom-loving Ukrainians?,' Canadian PM Asks," *The Ukrainian Bulletin*, Nos. 19-20, October 1-15, 1960, New York, N.Y.

against Soviet Russian colonialism. This, of course, proved to be boundless. With the exceptions of the British Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Ormsby Gore, and Ambassador Tingfu F. Tsiang of the Republic of China, both of whom followed the example of the Canadian Prime Minister, no other Western representative, including that of the United States, dared to follow suit. (As good as Mr. Gore's statement was, he stressed only *six* countries, with a population of 100 million, omitting Ukraine, Byelorussia, Armenia, Georgia and Turkestan, the most important peripheral colonial countries of Communist Russia).

On October 4, 1960, Nicholas V. Podgorny assailed Prime Minister Diefenbaker for his criticism of Soviet Russian colonialism in the non-Russian countries of the USSR, hotly protesting that "Ukraine was free and independent."

Interestingly enough, Mr. Podgorny delivered his address in *Ukrainian*. The reason for this was given much later by Khrushchev, who stated:

...As a matter of principle, I felt it was important that each people in the Soviet community of nations should speak with its own voice. But more important, I counted on these speeches having a political effect in the United States and Canada by striking a sympathetic chord among the hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians and tens of thousands of Byelorussians who live in North America...⁸

A year earlier, in July 1959, the U.S. had the wisdom and the faith in its own principles to enact Captive Nations Week Resolution, now Public Law 86-90. The resolution did not mince words. It said that the "enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence." It named 22 nations that Communist Russia holds in bondage, some of them nations Americans never thought of as independent entities because they had been conquered by the Russian Czars, the earlier tenants of the Kremlin.

But neither the U.S. government nor our progressive and enlightened press has ever considered the resolution as a powerful weapon to be used against the Kremlin and in the advancement of freedom.

Finally, in connection with the aforementioned expulsion of Israel from UNESCO, a number of American intellectuals began to scrutinize this U.N. agency. As laudable a move as it was, it, too, came

⁸ *Khrushchev Remembers: The Last Testament*. Translated and Edited by Strobe Talbott. With a Foreword by Edward Crankshaw and Introduction by Jerrold L. Schechter. Little, Brown & Co., 1974, p. 475.

rather late. Ukrainians and others have been keenly concerned about this U.N. body, which long has been a mere propaganda vehicle of the Kremlin.

THE PALESTINIAN LESSON

The recognition, at least *de facto*, of the PLO, sets an important precedent for a number of the captive nations to take their cases to the U.N. There are the exile governments of the so-called nine satellite countries, whose legitimate governments were taken over by the Communists with the approval and active support of the Kremlin. There exists the Ukrainian government-in-exile in Munich, Germany; there are similar exile governments representing Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Turkestan. There also are powerful liberation movements of Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Byelorussians and other non-Russian nations in the USSR.

Why not recognize them and give them a voice in the U.N., as that body has done in the case of Mr. Arafat's organization?

THE INSTITUTIONAL MOULD OF COMECON

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

COMECON or CEMA—the communist Council for Economic Mutual Assistance—is an instrumentality of Moscow that has received generally little recognition in the West and yet is the arena of all the fundamental politico-economic forces at work in Eastern Europe. Because of these basic forces, COMECON will doubtlessly increase in importance and significance as concern Moscow's hold over the area, the integrationist drive, the greater interaction of non-Russian interests both within and outside the USSR, and the prospect of a more assertive economic nationalism on this internal and external non-Russian dimension. The construction of pipelines from Ukraine to Hungary, the location of joint ventures in various parts of the USSR and expanded trade between the "satellites" and the affected republics in the USSR cannot but form a material base for the interplay of these fundamental forces. In the realm of real possibility, it is even conceivable that with a mutual dismantling of the Warsaw Pact and NATO, the institutional mould of COMECON could accommodate a central unified command.¹ Insight into this and the other possibilities can only be gained from an evolutionary analysis of the origins and development of COMECON. The general survey undertaken here provides a necessary, concise background toward this end.

THE STALIN PERIOD, '49-'53

In what may properly be called the Stalin period from 1949 to 1953 the first phase in the origination and development of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance took place. By way of short background and starting with a basic point of historico-political fact, one of the immediate consequences of World War II which fundamentally helped to shape the postwar environment in Europe was the penetration of Soviet military power into Central Europe. The employment of that military presence served Moscow's political and economic ends

¹ See Henry Wilcox Schaefer, *Comecon and the Politics of Integration*. London, 1974.

that were aimed far beyond the defeat of Nazi Germany. Stalin explicitly indicated this to Djilas in April 1945: "This war is not as in the past; whoever occupies a territory also imposes on it his own social system. Everyone imposes his own system as far as his army can reach. It cannot be otherwise."² While in various causal ways this paramount historico-political fact laid the groundwork for COMECON and other East European institutions, and in a real sense the essence of the Brezhnev Doctrine and other phenomena in more recent times, it was evident that the Western allies had no intention of removing the Soviet military presence from Central Europe by force. In 1945, at Yalta, President Roosevelt had even declared that American troops would not be in Europe for more than two years after the war.³ For Stalin this tip-off seemed sufficient to indicate Western acquiescence to the USSR's control of Eastern Europe. Apart from current revisionist theories of the period, the thrusts of Russian expansionism posed a challenge that led in its wake to the development of the Truman Doctrine, later the Marshall Plan and the policy of containment. In short, the United States declared its intention to thwart any further expansion of Moscow's influence in Europe and elsewhere. Basically, the lines drawn by our action in what has continued to be the paramount politico-economic struggle to this day, and will continue to be for many years to come, merely constituted a formal affirmation of an empirical and ideologic division of the world that has found expression economically in two broad markets, the mixed capitalist and so-called socialist markets.

Several salient circumstances and factors surround the founding of COMECON and its early development. As is known to students and specialists in the field, this instrumentality for Soviet economic control over Eastern Europe was established in Moscow in January, 1949. Its founding members were the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Romania. Albania, now inactive, joined within a month, and the Democratic Republic of Germany (East Germany) joined in 1950. In subsequent years, Yugoslavia and the People's Republic of China assumed an observer status in 1956, followed by North Korea in 1957, Mongolia in 1958, North Vietnam in that same year, and Cuba in 1962.⁴ Of these, only the Peoples Republic of Mongolia became a full member of COMECON in 1962; and Cuba in 1972. Lately, Iraq has expressed an interest in joining COME-

² Milovan Djilas. *Conversations With Stalin*. New York, 1962, p. 114.

³ Herbert Feis. *Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin*, Princeton, 1957, p. 531.

⁴ Michael Kaser. *COMECON: Integration Problems of the Planned Economies*, 2nd ed., London, 1967, p. 68.

CON.⁵ It is generally agreed that COMECON was organized as the communist response to the Marshall Plan, reflecting Moscow's decision to bind the Communist countries economically as well as politically. The Poles and Czechs sought Marshall Plan aid, and the Council was Stalin's answer to Marshall aid. But one can critically expand this view to embrace other aspects of the situation prevailing at the end of the 40's. In a real sense, COMECON was also a creature of the Cold War as it began to be applied to Moscow's former allies.

By all evidence, it is erroneous to view the formation of COMECON as a vehicle for the imposition of an economic master plan for Eastern Europe. The intent was expressed in Soviet circles at the time and is somewhat approximated in current Soviet thinking on integration, but in practice and by show of events it was not prevalent in this early phase. On the contrary, the very opposite was the case. If in any area a master plan was in vogue, it was in armaments production for the supposed safeguard and security of the new Communist bloc. For that matter, in planning terms, COMECON produced no equivalent to the Marshall Plan for the economic restoration of Eastern Europe. Indeed, as concerns any planned integration or unification of the economies to Central Europe, the role of COMECON was minor and inconsequential for many years to come. Although a formal intergovernmental organization of states, COMECON possessed no formal constitution or charter until 1960. This fact in itself suggests the inchoate character of the organization and its activity for a decade of its existence. The founding of COMECON was actually based on an agreed-upon communique which, among other things, embraced the concept of national sovereignty in its declaration.

Highlights indicating the loose nature of the organization in this and succeeding phases entail conferences, structure and Soviet concern. Regarding the frequency of conferences, few were actually convened from 1950 to 1956, and at that on an ad hoc basis in the absence of a charter. On structure, the only formal body of COMECON was, until 1954, the conference of member states or the Session of the Council. Also significant is the fact that in this Stalin phase for the years 1950-1953 nothing appeared in the USSR press about the organization. Another dominant trend in this Stalin period was the development of each East European country along the lines of the Soviet model. This meant rigid national planning, emphasis on the

⁵ Henry Shapiro. "COMECON Membership Eyed", UPI, Moscow, September 25, 1972.

development of heavy industry, and a residual importance of foreign trade in overall national growth of the respective country. Parallelism rather than integration was fostered. In essence, the development of autarchy within the national economies was stressed as a basic commitment to the full and balanced development of the national economies. The climate was one of economic autarchy. Factually and theoretically, the drive for economic integration in the 60's and 70's finds little source of inspiration and authority during the Stalin period. There is credible ground to hold that Stalin distrusted the intentions of the satellite governments, and feared that their economic buttressing might lead to the formation of an anti-Soviet bloc, economically independent of the USSR. The policy pursued in practice discouraged bringing the member countries closer to each other, but encouraged their individual economic dependence on the USSR.⁶

Finally, bilateralism was the keynote of intra-bloc trade activity during this early period; significantly, as it is to a marked degree today. Multilateral consultation was at a minimum, and little was discussed about multilateral clearing. Only two outstanding trilateral arrangements were consummated during this first phase, in June 1949 involving Finland, Poland and the USSR and the last, Czechoslovakia and Finland. It appears that whatever coordination occurred between and among the member states was structured to the advantage of Moscow.⁷ In addition, a matter of importance a decade and more later, the general autarchical development precluded any serious consideration of long-run programming among the COMECON members. Also, the few commissions that were established, largely to determine procedures for technical and scientific cooperation, were done so on the bilateral basis, as, for examples, Hungary with the USSR and Czechoslovakia in 1949. It took another five years before the solid beginnings of an infrastructure were in the making.

THE NEW COURSE, '53-'55

Brief and ephemeral as it was, the second distinctive phase in the development of COMECON represented a radical shift in the trend and activity of the organization. Generally referred to as "the New Course," it also reflected the change in economic thinking and priority emphasis in the USSR. Actually, it was only after Stalin's death that

⁶ See for thesis Heinz Kohler. *Economic Integration in the Soviet Bloc*, New York, 1965.

⁷ Norman J.G. Pounds. "Fissures in the Eastern European Bloc." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, July 1967, pp. 42-44.

the USSR began to recognize the potential economic and political values inherent in COMECON. With the "New Course" introduced under Malenkov, the idea of economic specialization among the countries of the Soviet bloc began to gain currency in the USSR, a sort of reversion to the original but blunted vision of a Voznesensky. The "New Course" was highlighted in large degree by an imitation of the short-lived changes in the USSR, with the satellite regimes adopting the principle of collective leadership, promises to improve the standard of living, the intent to abolish economic autarchy and so forth.⁸ The effects of these changes on COMECON were numerous and accelerative. Organizational meetings were now held with greater regularity. The infrastructural pattern of the organization was bolstered with the creation of a series of permanent commissions, staffed by their individual secretariats and respective headquarters established in the member states. This spirit of change was abetted in 1954 with the significant dismantling of the network of Soviet-owned companies in member countries.

As a matter of fact, in 1954 several other salient changes occurred to shape the future course of COMECON and its extensive deliberations and actions. For one, it was then that the decision was first made to coordinate the five year plans of the member states.⁹ Bilateralism continued, of course, to be the rule, but this recurrent tendency toward multiculturalism, no matter how modest, was more in conformity with the criteria of an integrated "socialist market." Discussions among COMECON members veered more and more toward the fostering of national specialization according to cost advantages and the progressive elimination of uneconomic duplication of effort. The idea of an international division of labor within the bloc began to take firm root, at least in the area of theoretical discussion. Projecting this development two years hence, it is significant that at the COMECON meeting in East Berlin in 1956 proposals submitted by the USSR for industrial specialization and coordination were adopted.

Whatever the reasons, and they are many, the fact is that the USSR manifested little vision and foresight during these early years in not pursuing integrationist policies both for economic efficiency and firm but flexible political domination, a politico-economic end that is to absorb its energies both in the 60's and 70's when circumstances were and are substantially different in Eastern Europe. By the end of 1955 the "New Course" had in a way run its course. As one writer

⁸ Basil Dmytryshyn. *USSR: A Concise History*, New York, 1965, p. 289.

⁹ *Economic Developments In Countries of Eastern Europe*. U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, USGPO, 1970, p. 533.

stresses it, this was because of a return to the priority of heavy industrial development and despite a higher concern for agricultural investment and incentives than prevailed in the Stalin period.¹⁰

INFRASTRUCTURAL ACTIVITY, '55-'61

The third phase of COMECON development may properly be classified as one of intensified infrastructural activity during the selected years of 1955-61. This doesn't mean, of course, that this type of activity wasn't extended and broadened in the full decade ahead. In fact it was and with considerable refinement. The essential point here is that in sharp contrast to the preceding phases this one is punctuated by this form of activity to warrant a selective designation in the genetic growth of the organization and its practical efforts. The vibrancy and vigor of COMECON activity in this third phase cannot be too strongly emphasized. The period is impregnated with ideas and intentions that for discussion and application carry over into the 60's and down to the present date. For instance, technical cooperation and exchange for the purpose of overall productivity increases were even extended beyond the COMECON area. The organization's delegates first went to Geneva in October 1955 to establish contact with the Economic Commission for Europe in order to advance this goal beyond the limits of the area's capabilities.

Despite certain basic systemic difficulties, the spirit and tone of the period are accurately conveyed by terms such as collaboration, coordination and specialization. Problems of pricing, economic planning, differential economic growth, and national economic determination pervaded the period and those after, but nonetheless the spirit toward some form of integration was dominantly present. Overtly, the application of the specialization principle would furnish an operational infrastructure in conformity with the purpose of COMECON aimed at greater integration. However, the application has not been without almost insurmountable difficulties, particularly when the inter-product type of specialization is invoked. Intra-product specialization does not involve the allocation of whole branches of production to a given country and thus permits, for example, both the USSR and Romania to produce types of oil drilling equipment or small rolling mill equipment to Poland and East Germany. On the other hand, for purposes of full-fledged specialization, the inter-product type of specialized effort would involve such an allocation for optimal efficiency and advantage. At least in theory the USSR was not receptive to this

¹⁰ Kaser, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

idea until 1962 and in practice, as we shall see, the idea has not made any headway down to the present date. The reasons for this include the absence of any absolute advantage for most commodities among the member countries, the difficulties in determining costs underlying relative advantage to both the productive expander and contractor, and the resistances of both the less developed members to specialize in raw material production at the cost of further industrialization and the developed to curtail current outputs.

In addition to specialization, collaboration and cooperation were also reflected in a great deal of activity during this period. In 1955 a proliferation of ad hoc committees of the Delegates Meeting, which was established in 1954 as a standing body, developed and set a precedent for what may be called administrative economics in the years to come. In 1956 the operational base of the organization was significantly broadened with the establishment of twelve standing commissions, covering branches such as agriculture, coal, chemicals and so forth and headquartered with secretariats in respective member capitals, such as agriculture in Sofia, coal in Warsaw and the like. Projecting this trend of infrastructural activity further, the organization obtained a formal Charter in 1959 and adopted it the following year. In 1960 the application of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes was undertaken by COMECON. There has also been the creation of a common rail transport system, involving a freight car pool; an electric power grid joining most of the COMECON countries; the Druzhba pipeline of oil and its products from the USSR into the separate member areas and, to extend this further, the so-called Bank of the Socialist Countries and, some ten years later, the International Investment Bank. In 1962, finally, an Executive Committee was created in COMECON.

By 1960 a formal constitution was adopted in COMECON. In reality it added little new to the functions of the organization, but over ten years after the group's founding it nevertheless provided a legal framework for COMECON and furnished it with the institutional marks of prestige and validity. The organization now assumed a *de jure* international form, though the greater part of its manpower remained *de facto* in terms of national delegations. Among the significant articles of the Charter, Article IV protects the principle of the sovereignty of member countries; Article V describes the principal organs of the body, such as the Council of the Session, the Conference of the Representatives of the Countries of the Council, which resides permanently in Moscow and is administratively responsible for COMECON operations, and the Standing Commissions

and the Secretariat; and Article VI defines the Council of the Session, the main organ of COMECON.

A method of COMECON operation which has gained wide vogue and currency in the 70's and has served as a means of avoiding the disputes of the 60's is that of joint investment projects. Earlier, Poland and East Germany entered into the first joint investment project in 1957, directing foreign capital into a specific venture and paying off capital and interest from eventual output. Sixteen years later the two still are joint venturing in building a textile plant in Zawiercie, Poland, which, rather exaggeratedly, they view as an "impressive example of the integration of Communist economies."¹¹ Multilateral investments had been made previously in the COMECON area, such as a cellulose plant in Romania, launched in 1956 and financed jointly by Czechoslovakia, Poland and East Germany, but the credit extended was on a government-to-government basis and the loan was not strictly attached to the given project. The variations in arrangements are several and can be discussed at length.

What is called "the pricing problem" in COMECON applies not only to this phase in the organization's development but to the preceding and succeeding ones as well; in fact, to this day there are several aspects to this problem. Systematically, one is that if prices fail to reflect profit opportunity on a national level, they can hardly be employed as indicators of opportunity costs and rational investment choices for Eastern Europe as a whole. Indeed, one could go on further to maintain that ultimately the success or failure of COMECON integration is a political question, and as of now the answer can only be given in the negative. Prices, as market reflectors of broader objective conditions, are pertinent to these questions, as well as to the one of increased dependency of the members on the USSR for raw materials and the constant conflict between them on the valuation of these materials. Implicit in this problem also is the heavy weight of the uncertainties of Soviet economic performance and goals, which affect the whole issue of COMECON integration.

In considering the other aspects of this pricing problem it should be reiterated in terms of a basic framework of reference that since none of the COMECON countries has as yet arrived at a realistic assessment of the real production costs in its industries, the difficulty in establishing a realistic price base for trade and exchange is ever-present. On the whole, it is no exaggeration to hold, even in view of

¹¹ Dan Morgan, "East Germans, Poles Try Economic Integration," *Washington Post Foreign Service*, April 20, 1973.

the disparate reforms of the past eight years, that prices still are basically determined politically and bargaining concerning the terms of trade between members still is largely conducted in a political frame of reference, particularly in the context of primary and advanced products.

In this phase and beyond it was also generally recognized that the system of pricing was artificial and wholly out of line with world prices for comparable products. To correct this inequity, efforts were made to establish a less artificial pricing system based on an average of world market prices. Up to 1966 the world price base of 1957 served as a guide in trade among bloc members. The drawbacks of this arrangement should be obvious, especially with the passage of each year. In conclusion, the price distortions in intra-bloc trade further reinforce bilateralism, and the combined irrationalities in both the domestic and foreign trade spheres explain the failure of COMECON to establish convertibility.¹² Disequilibrium between primary products and manufactures tend to impede multilateral balancing of accounts, where a ruble-surplused Czechoslovakia may want to purchase goods from a ruble-deficit Romania, but the latter finds it more advantageous to sell to the USSR to settle accounts.

SUPRA-NATIONAL PLANNING DISPUTE, '62-'64

The fourth distinctive phase in the development of COMECON is roughly the period of the supra-national planning dispute from 1962 to 1964. A strong move for integration of the bloc and an equally formidable resistance to the move are the dominant features of this period. As to integration in its genuine and even classical sense, it was pointed out earlier that the opportune time was at the very foundation of the organization when brute Russian power was supreme, ideological conformity with Moscow was pristine pure, and the annexed economies were imitating the Soviet model. Roughly 13 years later the idea of integration receives its first major assertion in COMECON.

In his search for reinforced solidarity, Khrushchev in the autumn of 1962 proposed a "unified planning organ empowered to draw up common plans and decide organizational matters."¹³ What, in effect, Khrushchev endeavored to introduce was bloc-wide economic planning by converting COMECON into a supra-national planning agency for

¹² Joseph G. Whelan. *Comecon and Soviet Economic Integration of Eastern Europe*. Library of Congress, April 9, 1969, pp. 10-11.

¹³ *Komunist*, Moscow, No. 12, 1962.

the area. The Khrushchev plan, drawing on original Polish ideas and the evolution of the supra-national EEC, was presented at a COMECON meeting in June, 1962. It proposed the coordination of national plans into an overall master plan, aimed at the maximization of production at least cost in a planned environment where each country would specialize in fields determined by its natural endowment and current productive capacities.

In reality, the proposal and its engendered ideas as presented by Khrushchev were not new. If Khrushchev employed old ideas to cope with a new situation confronting the USSR, his endeavor certainly produced a new situation in COMECON with impact on the organization's efforts toward integration. That impact, created by the stern opposition of Romania to the supra-national planning authority, continues to be felt today. There is a sort of irony in these situations since ten years earlier Moscow upheld autarchy and now was emphasizing integration on the basis of an international socialist division of labor, while in the earlier period the satellite economies were by and large amenable to the latter and now for some, like Romania and Poland, in varying degree found the model of autarchic economic development as an effective safeguard of their national state structures. In short, the economic policy shifts were a response in large measure to political shifts, and countries like Romania and Poland don't relish complete economic submission to the USSR.

Expressing its opposition to the Khrushchev plan, Romania, which would not be deprived of developing a diversified industrial economy, announced its plans in 1962 to establish an extensive steel industry and, in effect, challenged the principle that bloc interests should prevail over national interests. In essence, the Romania revolt signalized a voluntarism that had been implicit in COMECON operations since its founding, namely an acceptance of as much integration by any member as it considered necessary for its own national interests. The polemics on the issue flowed over into the July '63 conference. Thus, almost a year before the Romanian Declaration was released, compromises on the basic issue were suggested. One that was accepted at the '63 meeting was the principle of "the paramountcy of the interested party as the working principle of COMECON."¹⁴ Definitely discarding Khrushchev's plans for a central planning body, the '63 conference arrived at another compromise by creating a Bureau of the Executive and the Conference of Commission Chairmen

¹⁴ Hertha W. Heiss, "The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance—Developments Since the Mid-60's." *Economic Developments in Countries of Eastern Europe*, Joint Economic Committee, 1970, pp. 529-530.

for new forms of more centralized consultation and to supplement bilateral negotiations at an increasingly departmental level.

The general pragmatic solution arrived at was seen even more concretely in 1964. Romania's Declaration in April restated Bucharest's opposition to "the idea of a single planning body for Comecon" which it saw as having "the most serious economic and political implications."¹⁵ In fact, Romania expressed a readiness to withdraw from COMECON. However, the declaration allowed for countries to pursue "forms of cooperation different from those unanimously agreed upon within CMEA." In the spirit of sovereignty, this was a question of concern exclusively for those countries. This part of the declaration was essentially in accord with the COMECON agreement of February, 1964 on cooperation.

From all this it should be evident that Moscow's plan for economic integration failed. As concerns the problem of integration, which remains very much a problem today, the consequences of these crises in COMECON were far-flung. For one, taking advantage of the Sino-Russian rift, Romania pursued its independent course with great vigor and intensified its ties with the West.¹⁶ Also, the principal method of integration has become the coordination of the five year plans chiefly through bilateral agreements between the members. Moreover, as indicated at the COMECON conference on the equalization of economic levels in Prague in May 1964, pressures for specialization have produced the dilemma of advanced members seeking assurances of markets and materials which other members are disinclined to offer, especially in view of the alternatives presented in the West. Other considerations regarding integration are the productivity gap between members, the basic principles on participatory development, investment returns, and bilateral contacts, not to mention the related pricing problem mentioned previously.

THE POLITICO-ECONOMIC STRUGGLE, '65

Against the concise and structured perspectival background portrayed in the preceding sections, the events and developments in COMECON from 1965 to the present form an intelligible pattern of diverse activity that justifies characterizing this phase as one of politico-economic struggle. The period is replete with characteristic concerns about economic reform, further specialization and coordina-

¹⁵ *Scintela*, Bucharest, April 26, 1964.

¹⁶ Stephen Fisher-Galati, "Rumania and the Sino-Soviet Conflict" *Eastern Europe in Transition*, 1966.

tion, multicultural dealings and clearings, prices, currency convertibility, added infrastructure, outmoded technology and scientific and technical advancement, basic resource development, trade with the West and other Free World interests, renewed pressure for integration, a revised attitude toward the EEC, and, doubtlessly, more political friction and crisis.

Unlike the EEC, COMECON has up to now failed to develop one huge market with a better distribution of resources within it and continues to be hampered by arbitrary price systems and bilateral deals. It will also be observed that now with most changes in COMECON, basic initiation comes from the largest market and producer, the USSR. A sounder price system and more enterprise efficiency in the USSR, which still have not been attained in the Soviet reform, cannot but convey a salutary effect on the bloc. Past and present experience shows Soviet interest bent on securing better terms of trade and having the members pay more for the capital cost of extracting primary products in the USSR. Considering all this and as essential evidence will show, a further decentralization in the member countries would pose a striking contradiction to the recent and current Soviet pressure for economic integration within the bloc, if by this Moscow envisions a supra-national planning agency subordinating the planning efforts and decentralizing moves of the members. Should this contradiction evolve substantially, it would be difficult to envisage any development of significance in the future of COMECON. And yet, at the present time, this point is at the crux of the bloc's dilemma. Failure to resolve this problem, which is thoroughly politico-economic in character, and to execute necessary reforms in COMECON itself would justify the observation made that it would simply remain as an "organ for the dissemination of information and preparation of valuable analyses, monographic studies and programs for its members."¹⁷ The title of the commentary is suggestive of the nature of COMECON so far—a vicious cycle.

Again placed in perspective, the three years that followed the crisis in COMECON were conspicuously marked by domestic economic reform. From Moscow to Budapest the keynote was greater efficiency and productivity through decentralized planning. The bloc countries were mainly absorbed in these reform measures; even the USSR, after the ouster of Khrushchev in 1964, hailed the urgent need for such reform and permitted a measure of consumer-orientation of its industries and Libermann applications concerning more rational opera-

¹⁷ "Comecon: The Vicious Cycle." *The Economist*, London, August 19, 1967.

tions in the economy. While preoccupied with these domestic concerns, on the international scale all members, including the USSR, seemed resigned to the compromises worked out the previous year with regard to the struggle between supra-national authority and national interest. Meanwhile, as all of this was transpiring with the obvious risks involved as regards the solidarity of the bloc, COMECON continued to move forward on the planes of more discussion and negotiation for increased specialization, scientific and technological cooperation, and infra-structural improvements. These years of accentuated reform also were highlighted for the continuation of activity in joint ventures, labor exchange innovations and efforts in the formation of additional international branch associations.

Once again a politico-economic crisis arose to place in jeopardy the gains of economic reform in most bloc countries and to accelerate the revival of Russian-advanced integration in COMECON. The crisis centered on Czechoslovakia. This discussion on the Soviet brand of integration, implying supra-national authority, began on a broad scale in 1968. One Soviet specialist on COMECON underscored the need for greater integration of the bloc;¹⁸ others gave their versions of integration along lines of international enterprise associations and joint ventures in the USSR. With the aim of blunting this momentum, in August, both before and after the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Romanian leader Ceausescu sharply restated his country's position in opposing any transformation of "CEMA into a superstate body, transition to a single plan and other similar proposals." Concretely, the net result of all this and more was once more the avoidance of a collision between Romania, and surprisingly in some degree East Germany, and the rest of the membership, the more intense pursuit of bilateral consultations between the members and the USSR, and a cycled reversion at subsequent COMECON meetings from 1969 to the present to respect for the national sovereignty principle and bloc coordination through means other than supra-nationality. In effect the status quo reaffirmed in 1969 on the subject of integration hasn't alterably changed to the present.

Any careful examination of the date for these recent years discloses a jig-saw of conflicting views shifting positions, and an undercurrent of maneuvers for the most advantageous national position. For example, Romania, which has taken about 40 percent of its imports from non-communist countries as against 20 percent for Czechoslovakia and Hungary, has firmly maintained the national sover-

¹⁸ Dr. O. Bogomolov, *Pravda*, January 13, 1968.

eignty principle. Czechoslovakia and East Germany have favored cooperation within COMECON on a planning level but have been inclined to cultivate integrating forces through enterprises, cooperatives and joint ventures more or less independent of their governments. Poland also has inclined toward this, but Bulgaria has supported the USSR for tighter integration.

Moscow's approach toward politico-economic consolidation of the bloc has been far more subtle than Khrushchev's blunt plan of integration. Also, the new discussed plan for 1985 appears to rest on a broad base of agreement involving the main contenders in the integration issue, namely the USSR, Romania and the GDR. Further, the program is also based on a tactful recognition of the national sovereignty principle, thus accommodating Romania in particular, and on an agreed view toward COMECON as "a loosely-knit organization of national states."¹⁰

What conclusions are to be drawn from this general survey? Based on its fundamental political domination of the bloc, the USSR will continue to employ COMECON as an instrumentality for further consolidation of the bloc and the generation of "integrating" forces within it, despite the perpetuation of a whole array of economic irrationalities. Supra-national authority of the Khrushchevian type won't be needed to cope with centrifugal forces of nationalism; instead, deepened dependence of the member economies on that of the USSR will be achieved through raw material needs, joint ventures, extra-COMECON organs, and a controlled flexibility with regard to both domestic economic reforms in the member economies and trade with the West. Toward consolidation, the 15-20 Year Program will doubtlessly realize many successes in plan coordination and scientific-technical advances attuned to increased productivity. Bilateralism in intra-bloc trade, further intra-product specialization, currency inconvertibility, arbitrary pricing, and socialist-type planning, modeled by the GDR, will continue to feature the region for the foreseeable future. The implications of all this for the points raised at the start should be obvious.

¹⁰ "Trends in the USSR and Eastern Europe." Paper, U.S. Contribution to NATO Experts Meeting Group, U.S. Department of State, October 1971.

DETENTE, THE OCTOBER 1973 WAR AND THE PALESTINIAN PROBLEM

By JOSEPH DUNNER

Illusions, like prejudices, die hard. When in February 1945 I warned Robert E. Sherwood, the Director of the U.S. Office of War Information (in which I headed the Intelligence Department for Europe), that the Yalta Agreement would lead to the Communization of large parts of Europe and that a United Nations Organization with the Soviet Union as one of its leading member states was bound to turn into a frankenstein monster for the Western democracies, I was laughed out of court and threatened with demotion. Harry Hopkins, Franklin Delano Roosevelt's chief adviser at Yalta, believed (or professed to believe) that the wartime alliance between the U.S. and the USSR would lead to a permanent peacetime alliance. The leadership of the U.S. Office of War Information, on Roosevelt's explicit orders, had to convince a skeptical American public that the Soviet regime had turned into a peaceful, albeit somewhat radical, democracy interested solely in borders which could be defended against "another German aggression." Disregarding the facts that the Soviets, via the Communist Party of Germany, had systematically worked to bring the Nazis to power in order to undermine the Weimar Republic, and disregarding the further fact that the Soviets had concluded a Treaty of Non-Aggression and Friendship with the Hitler regime in August 1939, thereby giving the Nazis the green light for their invasion of Poland and Eastern Europe, Hopkins during the Yalta Conference prevailed upon Roosevelt to override Churchill's objections and to accede to all the major demands of the Soviets.

Confronted with ever increasing manifestations of Communist aggression and imperialism, the Truman Administration organized the airlift for Berlin, proclaimed the Truman Doctrine for the defense of Greece and Turkey and, finally, helped to create NATO. Yet Truman, having inherited the Roosevelt policy of appeasing the Soviets, did not go beyond the policy of "containment," which allowed Mao and his "Jeffersonian agrarian reformers" to occupy the Chinese mainland and, in alliance with the USSR, to drag the U.S.A. into the

Korean War. Needless to say, the defensive American strategy in Korea served the Communists as a most outstanding object lesson, for it assured them that America, weakened by its own defeatists, pacifists and Communist fellow-travellers, had lost the stamina to achieve victory over Communism and could, therefore, be expected to refrain from fighting the Communist-instigated "wars of national liberation" on the soil of the aggressors.

Hypothetical history is frequently the preoccupation of people who after the event know everthing better. Yet even at the time it was obvious that if Eisenhower had given but minimal support to the Polish anti-Communists in 1956 and the Hungarian revolutionaries in 1956, the Iron Curtain might have been rolled back. Similarly, had the U.S., instead of joining the Soviets in their support of Nasser, helped the British, French and Israelis to demolish Nasser's dream of empire in 1956, the Arabs—leftist radicals and religious conservatives both—would never have dared to threaten the Western nations with an oil embargo. Nor would Nikita Khrushchev have had the impertinence to provoke the Cuban missile crisis and tell Americans, "History is on our side, we shall bury you."

If the Communist aim to conquer the globe and enslave world humanity needed further demonstration, the war in Indochina and the "October War" in the Middle East should have taught the still free parts of the world that there can be no "peaceful coexistence," no "genuine detente," so long as the Leninist conspiracy is not liquidated in Russia, which to this day remains the chief political center of international Communism.

In this respect a small monograph, *The Soviet Union and the October 1973 Middle East War: The Implication for Detente*, authored by Foy D. Kohler, Leon Goure and Mose L. Harvey and published by the Center for Advanced International Studies of the University of Miami in Florida, might be an eye-opener for those who under the influence of Communist psychological warfare and the pseudo-liberal apologists for Communism in the Western world persist in clinging to the hope that somehow—miraculously—ever greater concessions in disarmament agreements, trade and so-called cultural exchanges on the part of the U.S. and its NATO partners will induce the Communists to become morally responsible partners in world politics. For the three authors, professors of international politics, have done an excellent job in collecting, chiefly from Soviet sources themselves, all the pertinent facts, showing conclusively that it was the Soviet Union which wanted the October war and which armed Egypt and Syria for that war. But just as the Indochinese war, complicated as

it is by local ethnic and religious conflicts, is aimed at the heart of America, the leading power of the free world, the Soviets used the deep-seated conflict between Israel and the Arabs to apply a major stranglehold on the industries of the U.S. and the West European countries. Professors Kohler, Goure and Harvey rightly stress that the target of Soviet policy in the Middle East is not primarily Israel, but the U.S. and its allies. "The Soviet Union," they write, "makes it unmistakably clear that it regards oil as an instrument of the 'anti-imperialist' struggle against the West, and at the same time as the vehicle by which various countries in the Middle East and elsewhere can be pressured to become involved in that struggle and thereby escape Western domination and come under Soviet influence. This is why the struggle over oil should be waged irrespective of any solution of the Arab-Israeli problem, because the objective is to erode and eventually eliminate U.S. influence and presence in the Middle East."

Whether the Nixon-Kissinger Administration understood the true objective of the October War I do not know. It acted with some dispatch in the airlifting of badly needed supplies which, incidentally, would not have reached Israel in time had Portugal followed the example of our other European allies and prevented the refueling of the American transport planes. One thing we do know. The Administration did not explain to the American people that it was the Soviet Union which prepared, down to the smallest military details, the attack on Israel and coerced not only Algeria's Boumedienne but even "America's friend," King Faisal of Saudi Arabia, into organizing the oil embargo and joining the Syrians, Egyptians and Iraqi in the actual fighting. When the Israelis, recovering by October 13 from the initial shock of the surprise attack on Yom Kippur, the highest Jewish holiday, began to repel the Arab forces, the Soviets not only airlifted additional war materiel, particularly SCUD missiles and tanks, to both Egypt and Syria, but also threatened to land their own troops in the region.

From my point of view, the October War was ended too soon. On October 13 the U.S. asked the U.N. Security Council for a cease-fire resolution. The USSR rejected it. But when it became clear that the Arab armies were defeated, that the Egyptian third army corps was about to surrender, Brezhnev demanded that Kissinger come to Moscow to discuss a truce. In Kissinger's position we would not have gone to Moscow but informed the Soviets that the U.S. was too busy with problems not only of the Middle East but also of Indochina, Cuba and Berlin. Four more days and the October War would have

ended with the complete defeat of the Russians and their pawns in the Middle East.

Why did the government of the United States fail to disclose the reasons for the October War? Why did Dr. Kissinger coerce the Israeli military leadership into accepting a cease-fire when the Israeli tanks were rolling toward Cairo and Damascus? The answer is that Nixon and Kissinger had based their foreign policy on detente, i.e., the same wishful thinking which allowed the Soviets to annex half of Europe in the days of Roosevelt and Truman. That the Russians in spite of detente attacked the United States in and via the Middle East was too embarrassing a fact to communicate to the American people who, after all, had been indoctrinated in the belief that Nixon and his Secretary of State had finally achieved what no Administration was able to achieve before—the transformation of a rather skillful, rather rational clique of world conquerors into persons who would act in accordance with Kant's categorical imperative. For the sake of detente with the USSR, the Israelis were told to release the Egyptian third army corps and to stop all military action. Dependent as they were and are on American fighter planes, tanks and money, they had no choice but to obey.

All this does not mean that the Israelis could or should disregard the legitimate needs of those Palestinian Arabs who were uprooted by the war of 1948-49 which followed the partition of Palestine in November 1947 and the proclamation of a Jewish statehood on May 14, 1948. As a lifelong Zionist, I had some share in the building of the Jewish state, and to this day I am prepared to defend its *raison d'être*. In nineteen hundred years of dispersion the Jews experienced again and again the fact that a defenseless minority will always be an ideal scapegoat in times of political, psychological and economic crisis. Having been attached to what was once Israel and Judea, it was only natural that the politically conscious elements among the Jews hoped to restore some day a Jewish national and religious center in the land of Israel's prophets. Until 1947 this restoration was accomplished without any disadvantage to the Palestine Arab population which, as I know from personal experience, had left the large parts of Palestine uninhabited and uncultivated. Had the Arabs, who have vast lands and several religious and political centers at their disposal, accepted the right of the Jews to build the State of Israel within the confines of the 1947 partition resolution of the U.N., there would have been no Palestine Arab refugee problem. Nor would there have been the mass exodus of the Jews from Iraq, Syria, Yemen and the North African, Arabized countries. There would still have

been a sizeable Arab minority in the small Jewish state as there would have remained sizeable Jewish minorities in various Arab-Moslem states. Under conditions of peace and cooperation this would have been salutary since it would have caused the Arab Moslems to learn to treat the Jews in their midst as equals rather than as national and religious outcasts—which was the fate of the Jews in every independent Arab polity since the days of Mohammed.

As is well known, unfortunately, in 1948 the Arab states did not acquiesce to the restoration of a national and cultural center of the Jews, and the war of 1948-49 poisoned the relations between the Jewish settlers in Israel and the Arabs for decades to come. That in spite of this predicament the Israelis must respect the national and religious aspirations of the Palestine Arabs, those outside the State of Israel and those who live within the confines of the State of Israel, I, for one, have stated in my writings some twenty years ago, long before there was a Palestine Liberation Organization.

From the viewpoint of international morality, which has a curious way of asserting itself in history, the United States would be well advised not to sacrifice Israel to Arab intimidation and the agitation of the U.S. oil lobby. But from the same viewpoint, neither the United States nor Israel can neglect the needs and rights of those Arabs who were born on the soil of Palestine and wish to live on it. Back in 1947 the U.N. had resolved that the Palestine Arabs should form a state of their own in the area in which they formed the majority. At that time neither Egypt nor Transjordan was willing to allow such a state to be built. Now that the Palestine Arabs seem to have achieved a political manhood which they could not muster in 1947, a Palestine Arab state might well come into being. Such a Palestine Arab state, which would mean the submergence of the Jews of Israel in a "secular" greater Palestine (in which they would again be a defenseless, ethnic and religious minority) will, however, be opposed by the Soviet Union. The Russians are as little interested in the genuine cultural aspirations of the Arabs and the Jews as they are in the cultural aspirations of the Ukrainians or any other people within the Soviet empire. In other words, their actual aim is the destruction of national cultures and religious commitments. If the Soviets have their say, the Middle East will be thrown into permanent turmoil and permanent war—testing over and over the willingness of the free world to fight for its survival or to accept the Orwellian nightmare of 1984.

ARCHBISHOP BUCHKO—"ARCH-SHEPHERD OF UKRAINIAN REFUGEES"

By WALTER DUSHNYCK

The Most Reverend Ivan Buchko, former Apostolic Visitator for Ukrainian Catholics in Western Europe, and a towering figure in the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Ukrainian community throughout the free world, died on September 22, 1974 in Rome, Italy, at the age of 83. A great churchman, educator, missionary, citizen and patriot, he played a vital role in Ukrainian life in Western Ukraine and among the Ukrainians dispersed in the diaspora for more than half a century.

A THORNY ROAD

Archbishop Buchko was born on October 1, 1891 in the village of Hermaniv (now Tarasivka) near Lviv. His father, Hryhory, was a sexton in the local Ukrainian parish, while his mother, Agripina, was widely known for her piety and devotion to the church. In many respects his career as a future church leader was carved in his teen years, and it was only natural that he pursued his calling, being deeply imbued with religious belief and dedication to serve his fellow countrymen and humanity at large.

He was ordained into the priesthood in Rome on February 21, 1915 after terminating his theological studies in the Eternal City. The act of ordination was performed by the Bulgarian Bishop Lazar Mladenov. For the next fourteen years he served in various parishes in the Lviv Eparchy of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine.

His reward was swift and well deserved. On September 16, 1929 he was consecrated a bishop of the Ukrainian Catholic Church; the act of consecration took place in Rome and was performed by Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, assisted by two Ukrainian bishops from Western Ukraine: Josaphat Kotsylovsky of Peremyshl and Gregory Khomyshyn of Stanyslaviv (now Ivano-Frankivsk), as well as other Ukrainian prelates gathered in Rome at that time. He assumed the titular name of Bishop of Cadi.

On April 27, 1953 he became an archbishop (titular Archbishop of Levecadia), and from 1939 to 1971 he served as Apostolic Visitator for Ukrainian Catholics, first in South America, and then in Western Europe. He was also made an Assistant to the Papal Throne, a Domestic Prelate of His Holiness and a Roman Count; he was also Consultor to the Sacred Congregation of Oriental Churches. But for Ukrainians he was known affectionately for over three decades as the "Arch-Shepherd of Refugees" for the great services he rendered to thousands of Ukrainian refugees and displaced persons and other victims of total war who found themselves in West Germany and Austria after the end of World War II.

For a whole decade (1929-1939), after his consecration, Bishop Buchko had plunged into his pastoral activities and soon emerged as a great prelate and patriot. He organized pilgrimages of Ukrainian Catholics to Rome and Lourdes, thus providing an opportunity for many lay leaders and youth to see and meet Catholics of Western Europe.

As Auxiliary Bishop to Metropolitan Sheptytsky, he became Secretary of the Ukrainian Catholic Episcopate and Head of the Commission charged with the correction and editing of liturgical books. He was then one of the twelve Ukrainian Catholic bishops in the world, and entrusted with the work of bringing liturgical books up to official standards. After six years of the Commission's work, the books were checked and approved by a commission of cardinals in Rome.

During the Polish "pacification" of Western Ukraine in 1930, Bishop Buchko visited the stricken villages, gathered photographs, wrote affidavits for beaten villagers and brought words of solace and encouragement to the suffering and the persecuted, upon whom the Polish cavalry and gendarmerie had descended without warning and without cause to beat, pillage, rape and burn. In response to the activities of the Ukrainian underground organizations, such as the Ukrainian Military Organization (UVO) and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), the Pilsudski regime replied by applying "collective responsibility," burning Ukrainian national homes, closing popular *Prosvita* reading clubs, destroying and closing Ukrainian cooperatives, financial institutions and social-cultural societies, and beating, torturing and arresting Ukrainians. Bishop Buchko condemned the terrorism as a method of political warfare and saw a great injustice to the people of his country. He appealed to the Polish government and the Polish Roman Catholic episcopate, the Vatican and the League of Nations. He accused the Pilsudski regime of vio-

lating its own constitution and the treaty safeguarding the rights of national minorities which the Polish government assumed under the League of Nations mandate.

In 1933 Bishop Buchko organized a huge Ukrainian Catholic rally of Ukrainian youth in Lviv, "Ukrainian Youth—in Homage to Christ," in which some 120,000 youth took part. It was a powerful manifestation of the strength and organization of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. He was also the initiator and later rector of the Minor Theological Seminary in Lviv, which produced hundreds of priests and other professional laymen.

AMERICAN INTERLUDE

In 1939, just as war clouds were gathering over Europe, Metropolitan Sheptytsky sent Bishop Buchko to South America, as Apostolic Visitator, to visit the Ukrainian Catholic communities in Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay. For eight months he toured these countries, and everywhere thousands of Ukrainians turned out to greet him as one of the most illustrious personages ever to visit them.

At that time there were some 150,000 Ukrainians in Brazil, 200,000 in Argentina, 20,000 in Paraguay and 10,000 in Uruguay. Most of them were working on farms or colonies, but a number of them were also employed in oil fields and industry. They had their Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox churches, schools and organizations, as emigrants have in all of the diaspora countries.

At that time in Brazil, Getulio Vargas headed a semi-dictatorial regime in Rio de Janeiro. With the rise of Nazism in Europe the Germans in South America—as in North America—began showing considerable sympathies for Nazi policies of conquest and aggression. In Brazil the German emigrants were well organized politically and economically. In certain states, such as Santa Catarina and Parana, they had elected an impressive number of members to state legislatures who in turn began efforts to introduce the German language in some state offices as the official language. This, understandably, aroused the Brazilian people and their government to no mean degree, and the Vargas government reacted swiftly by banning the use of all foreign languages in public offices, schools and even in churches.

Whether Bishop Buchko knew of this restriction or not is unknown, but in this connection an incident occurred which marred his stay in Brazil. On October 29, 1939 in Curitiba, State of Parana, the Bishop was interrupted by Brazilian police during a sermon, and a scuffle broke out in church. The Brazilians demanded that he speak

in Portuguese although he had permission from the Foreign Office to speak in Ukrainian. He was detained for a few hours, and upon his release he left the country under protest. Subsequently, the Brazilian government apologized, the Brazilian Army promised him protection, and he returned to Brazil for two more months.

In South America Bishop Buchko was impressed by the hard-working, sturdy and loyal Ukrainian immigrants, most of whom lived on farms in colonies and took little part in politics, keeping out of the strife that seemed to be characteristic of South American countries.

On April 29, 1940, Bishop Buchko arrived in New York from South America aboard the "S.S. Uruguay" to continue his missionary work and visitation in Ukrainian Catholic parishes in the United States. He went to Philadelphia to visit his old friend, the Most Reverend Constantine Bohachevsky, head of the Ukrainian Catholic Diocese. As newly-appointed interim Auxiliary Bishop, he celebrated his first liturgy on May 5 in the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception in Philadelphia, and on May 12 in St. George's Ukrainian Catholic Church in New York City. Thousands attended both services and heard him pray for the deliverance of the Ukrainian people from foreign enslavement.

From May, 1940 to October, 1941, Bishop Buchko served as pastor of St. George's Ukrainian Catholic parish in New York. One of his outstanding accomplishments was the founding of St. George's Catholic school, which exists to this very day. While in the United States, Bishop Buchko visited numerous Ukrainian parishes, conducted missionary services, delivered highly inspirational sermons and built up the strength and belief of the faithful.

INTERVIEW AND ATTACK

Bishop Buchko's stay in the United States coincided with a wave of pro-Soviet sentiments and insidious campaigns against all anti-Communist organizations and leaders.

A smear campaign was also waged against those Americans who opposed America's entry into World War II, even though they were patriotic and dedicated citizens. In his book on the late Gen. Charles A. Lindbergh, Wayne S. Cole writes that the administration of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt "used a tactic of identifying isolationists with Nazism..."*

* *Charles A. Lindbergh and the Battle Against American Intervention in World War II.* By Wayne S. Cole. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974.

The attacks against Ukrainian organizations and their leaders in the United States were mounted by a Ukrainian Communist newspaper and some pro-Communist American organs, on the simple assumption that since Ukrainians were combatting the Soviet Union and Poland, they must be "pro-Nazi," an absurdity invented by those powers which tried to perpetuate their domination over Ukraine.

In contrast to American isolationists and especially the "America First Committee" led by Col. Lindbergh, Ukrainians did not support nor advocate American isolationism. On the contrary, they wholeheartedly supported U.S. war efforts and sent scores of thousands of their sons and daughters into the U.S. Armed Forces; they bought millions of dollars worth of U.S. War Bonds, worked in defense plants and factories and helped immensely in the American victory over its enemies.

But, nevertheless, attacks on Ukrainians continued throughout the war, although on a tapering scale.

Bishop Buchko was also attacked by the same elements, and through their "transmission belts" of information, as well as by some known American broadcasters, as, for instance, the late Walter Winchell, who assailed him as a "pro-Nazi Bishop," and so forth.

The basis of these attacks was Bishop Buchko's interview which appeared in the July-August 1940 issue of *The Trident*, under the editorship of this writer and Roman Lapica, and published by the Organization for the Rebirth of Ukraine.**

The 15-page interview covered the Bishop's biography, his work in Ukraine and his experiences in South America. It touched on such subjects as Poland, Communist Russia, Nazi Germany, peace in Europe, prospects for Ukrainian independence, Ukrainian nationalism, Col. Andrew Melnyk, Metropolitan Sheptytsky and South America. Nothing was said in it which would indicate any sympathy for Germany; on the contrary, he condemned the Nazi philosophy:

On Germany: The Germans have always considered themselves to be a people chosen by God, a *Herrenvolk*, destined to rule over other people. Who knows whether the Germans would have recovered so swiftly after the war [WW I] without such a belief... In general they are not so able, but they are well disciplined and know how to obey. This is the secret of Hitler's success... For this reason it is doubtful whether Hitler would have succeeded in any other country as well as he has in Germany...

** "An Interview with Bishop Buchko," by Roman Lapica, *The Trident*, Vol. IV, No. 6, July-August, 1940, New York.

On Communist Russia: Bolshevism is unnatural and therefore it cannot last... The enslavement of the human spirit, the regimentation of all thinking, the destruction of individuality—all these characteristics of Bolshevism are anathema to the Ukrainians... Bolshevism is similar in these respects to Fascism and Nazism... Stalin is a Nietzschean superman, immune to pain, suffering and the fate of millions. He has an abnormal gift for putting into practice the theories that the intellect of Lenin created...

On Poland: Poland's most disastrous mistake was its failure to win the sympathies of the great Ukrainian minority of 7,000,000 people, who inhabited one-third of the state. The Polish policy toward them was to minimize their importance, and every means of the government machinery was devoted to eliminate them from government positions... Because of this constant strife with non-Poles, Poland could not hold out long against Germany. Being one-third foreign, with 7,000,000 Ukrainians, 3,000,000 Jews, 2,500,000 White Russians, 1,000,000 Germans and 500,000 Lithuanians, the state could not hope to resist long without their support... By its unjust treatment of minorities, it (Poland) gave Hitler and Stalin an excuse to invade the country. Hitler came to "free" the Germans, and Stalin to "free" the Ukrainians...

On Ukrainian Independence: Ukraine must become independent. It has to become free because it is too rich, too large and too dangerous to the future peace of Europe so long as it remains under foreign domination...

On Ukrainian Nationalism: Ukrainian nationalists are the flower of the Ukrainian nation. Without a doubt the strongest national political force among the Ukrainian people is the Ukrainian nationalist movement. It has captivated the entire youth without exception. It has disciplined them, given them something to fight for and made them dream of a better day. It has united them in protest against occupation. By its very name, it is not and never has been Nazi, Fascist or anything else that is foreign to the mentality of the Ukrainian people and harmful to their cause...

On Metropolitan Sheptytsky: He carried out the high ideals of his priesthood at every step and engaged in every field of human endeavor. He brought about the reform of the Ukrainian seminaries according to the West European model. He collected thousands of examples of Ukrainian culture and art. He founded one of the finest museums in Europe. A patriot and a philanthropist, he donated his entire income of one million *zlotys* a year to the poor, to the education of youth, to the construction of schools, hospitals and churches and

to Ukrainian organizations. Most important of his ideas was to unite the Eastern rite churches to Rome... His dream was and is the union of all Ukrainians in one church under a free flag...

NEVER SAW UKRAINE AGAIN

In October, 1941 Bishop Buchko was recalled to Rome. Before boarding a Spanish ship destined for Genoa, Italy, he took leave from the United States forever. Those who came to wish him *bon voyage* were Ukrainian American leaders with whom he was closely associated here: the late Dr. Luke Myshuha, Dmytro Halychyn, Michael Hayvoronsky, Stephen Shumeyko, Rev. Lev Chapelsky, and Nicholas Murashko—and Eugene Lachowitch, Prof. Nicholas D. Chubaty, Mrs. Stephania Halychyn and Walter Dushnyck. He was saddened at reports of the persecution of Ukrainians by the Nazi occupation authorities and said that he would never be allowed to enter Ukraine, as indeed he was not.

During the entire war period, Bishop Buchko spent in Rome. It is understood that he tried to get permission to visit Ukraine, but neither the Vatican diplomatic passport nor the fact that he was residing in Italy, an ally of Nazi Germany, helped him to secure the necessary clearance from the Nazi government. Bishop Buchko was not a *persona grata* with the Nazi regime, which feared his presence in Ukraine and his close association with Metropolitan Sheptytsky and the entire Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy as well as his influence upon the Ukrainian population of Western Ukraine.

This development contributed greatly to the fact that Bishop Buchko remained alive to the ripe age of 83. For had he been allowed to return to Ukraine and remain there, he certainly would not have survived the Soviet Russian assault upon the Ukrainian Catholic Church after the end of World War II.

The widespread persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church began with the arrival of the Soviet troops in Western Ukraine in 1944, especially after the death on November 1, 1944 of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky (reported poisoned by the Soviet secret police).

He was succeeded by Bishop Joseph Slipyj, Rector of the Theological Seminary in Lviv, who was secretly made Metropolitan, and empowered to direct the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the most difficult times of its history.

Immediately after the death of Metropolitan Sheptytsky the Soviet government addressed itself to the Ukrainian Catholic hier-

archy and ordered it to break away from Rome and recognize the Patriarchate of Moscow.***

When the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy refused to comply with this order, the Russian reaction was, as always, harsh and cruel. In April, 1945, the NKVD arrested all Ukrainian Catholic bishops and scores of priests, monks, nuns and lay leaders; at least 800 persons connected with the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine were arrested. Patriarch Alexei of Moscow appointed Bishop Makarius as head of the Orthodox Church in Western Ukraine. The metropolitanate of Galicia-Lviv and the territory were incorporated into the Kiev metropolitanate. Moscow selected three apostate priests, Rev. Dr. Gabriel Kostelnyk, Rev. Dr. M. Melnyk and Rev. A. Pelvetsky to form a "Committee of Initiative" to implement a "union" of the Ukrainian Catholic Church with the Russian Orthodox Church.

On March 8-10, 1946 a spurious *sobor* was held in Lviv, attended by 216 terrorized priests and 19 lay delegates, all of whom were guarded by the NKVD. The *sobor* decided to "liquidate the decisions of the Council of Brest of 1596" and to "return to the Holy Orthodox Church..." It must be stated that out of some 2,000 Ukrainian Catholic priests in Western Ukraine only 216 priests participated in the gathering, and most of them were coerced by the NKVD.

Parallel to the official liquidation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine, the Soviet government in Kiev held a secret trial of all Ukrainian Catholic bishops, who were charged with "high treason" and "collaboration" with the Germans.

As a result of the trial, the following sentences were imposed:

Metropolitan Joseph Slipyj—condemned to hard labor and sent to a concentration camp in Vorkuta. He is the only survivor of the entire hierarchy. Released in February, 1963 upon direct intervention by President John F. Kennedy, he was made Archbishop-Major of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and a cardinal; he resides presently in the Vatican;

Bishop Mykola Charnetsky, Apostolic Visitator for Ukrainian Catholics in Volhynia, Kholm, Pidliasia and Polisia—life imprisonment (eventually released, he died in Lviv in 1958);

Bishop Nykyta Budka, Auxiliary of the Lviv Archeparchy, condemned to life imprisonment, although he was a Canadian citizen (he died in prison in 1949);

*** *L'Ukraine dans le Cadre de l'East European* (Ukraine in the Framework of East Europe). L. Leskovytch, "La situation religieuse en Ukraine," Paris-Louvain, 1957, p. 115 and ff.

Bishop Ivan Latyshevsky, condemned to hard labor in Siberia (he died in 1958);

Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn of Stanislaviv, after torture during questioning, died in prison on January 17, 1947;

Bishop Gregory Lakota, Auxiliary of the Peremyshl Eparchy, was arrested and tortured by the Polish Communist police in Rzeszów, and handed over to the NKVD. He died in Kiev on September 21, 1947 after questioning by NKVD inquisitors.

Bishop Paul Goydych, Apostolic Delegate in Slovakia, was imprisoned on January 15, 1951 and died in a Czech prison in 1960;

Bishop Theodore Romzha, his successor; in October, 1947, his horsedrawn cart was rammed by a Soviet armored car and he was badly wounded and beaten by the crew; he died on October 31, 1947 in a hospital, apparently from poisoning;

Bishop Vasyl Hopko of Priashiv was arrested in 1946 by the Czech Communist police and kept in prison for seventeen years. Released in 1963, a sick and aging man, he has been deprived of all power and authority, although during the Dubcek regime he was very active in the effort to restore the Eastern Rite Catholic Church in Slovakia; he still lives in Priashiv;

Msgr. Augustine Voloshyn, President of Carpatho-Ukraine, arrested by the NKVD in 1945, died or was murdered in a Soviet concentration camp;

Msgr. Peter Werhun, Apostolic Delegate for Ukrainian Catholics in Germany, was arrested by the NKVD in Berlin in 1945 and sent to a concentration camp in the USSR, where he perished;

Archbishop Vasyl Welychkovsky of the "Silent" (underground) Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine, was arrested by the KGB on January 27, 1969 in Lviv and sentenced to three years at hard labor for "religious activities." Released in 1972, he was allowed to come to Rome and then went to Canada, where he died in 1974.

During the secret trial of the Ukrainian hierarchy in 1945, the name of Archbishop Buchko was frequently referred to by the Communist "judges," who labeled him a "Vatican agent," "an ally of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists," and a "traitor" to the Ukrainian people.****

He was spared the fate of all other Ukrainian Catholic bishops because of the anti-Ukrainian policy and stupidities of the Nazi occupation authorities of Ukraine who barred his return to Ukraine.

**** *Diannya Soboru Hreko-Katolytskoi Tserkvy u Lvovi* (Proceedings of the Greek-Catholic Church in Lviv), 1946.

"ARCH-SHEPHERD OF REFUGEES"

During the last three decades Archbishop Buchko lived and worked exclusively for the welfare of Ukrainian refugees and displaced persons dispersed throughout the world.

In the years immediately following the end of World War II, he visited camps of displaced persons in Germany and Austria, hailed by Ukrainian and non-Ukrainians alike as a "defender and protector" of political refugees. His sermons were imbued with the spirit of Christian love, tolerance and brotherhood, and he defended all refugees regardless of their religion, national origin or political convictions.

He worked closely with such known Ukrainian leaders in DP camps as the late Vasyl Mudry, Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki and Rev. Stepan Reshytylo, and those still living—Gen. Paul Shandruk, Archbishop Mstyslav Skrypnyk of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Julian Revay, and others, who were providing him with memoranda and petitions in defense of political refugees.

In the Vatican Archbishop Buchko worked closely with the late Eugene Cardinal Tisserant and the late Pope Pius XII, who also became staunch defenders of political refugees and displaced persons. It was due greatly to his efforts that the Allies suspended the forcible "repatriation" of refugees to the USSR and Communist-dominated countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

Through Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, who was acquainted from prewar times with the American General Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, member of the GHQ of the American forces in Europe, in charge of displaced persons in the U.S. Zones of Germany and Austria, both Archbishop Buchko and Cardinal Tisserant succeeded in convincing General Dwight D. Eisenhower, as well as the British and French supreme commanders that hundreds of thousands of refugees from the USSR and Eastern Europe were not "war criminals" nor "traitors" to their countries, but victims of Nazi and Communist tyrannies and persecution.

Archbishop Buchko was primarily responsible for saving the 11,000-man Ukrainian Division (First Ukrainian Division of the Ukrainian National Army), which the Soviet government tried to "repatriate" as "war criminals" to the USSR.

The Ukrainian Division was organized by the German High Command in the summer of 1943 with an explicit understanding that the division would be used on the Eastern Front against the Soviet forces exclusively, and not against the Allies in the west. In the summer of 1944 the Division, 30,000 strong and commanded by the German

General F. Freitag, was thrown against the heavy Soviet armored units at the City of Brody in Western Ukraine, and was decimated, being deprived of heavy weapons and armor. Subsequently, the division was reorganized and re-manned and sent to Slovakia and Austria for training. In the beginning of 1945 the Germans recognized (too late) the Ukrainian National Committee as the nucleus of a Ukrainian government, which took over the command of the Ukrainian division, renamed the First Ukrainian Division of the Ukrainian National Army under the command of General Paul Shandruk, a Ukrainian.

In April, 1945 the Division, with neutral and Allied intermediaries, surrendered to the British forces in Austria, over loud protests of the Soviet command which wanted to deal with the Ukrainian Division in the same way it had dealt with the Russian army of General A. Vlasov and the Cossack Corps, both of which were massacred or exiled to slave camps in the USSR.

The Ukrainian Division was brought to a camp at Rimini in Italy, and subsequently to Great Britain, where it was demobilized and granted political asylum. Most of the 11,000-man unit has dispersed throughout the world, but a majority remained in the United Kingdom, being integrated gainfully in to the British economy.

In this process Bishop played a vital and important part, but only future historians can determine all of Archbishop Buchko efforts in this case.

Archbishop Buchko devoted also much of his time and effort and provided funds to various Ukrainian scholarly institutions and to Ukrainian youth. He financed the purchase of a building for the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Sarcelles, outside Paris, France; he was a Curator-Patron of the Ukrainian Free University in Munich which bestowed upon him a degree of doctor *honoris causa*. He trained scores of Ukrainian Catholic priests in the Ukrainian Catholic Papal College in Rome. He made arrangements with the Catholic hierarchies of Belgium, Spain and Holland for the education of Ukrainian students at the University of Utrecht and others (in Holland).

In 1952 he was a host in Rome to the delegation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America—Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, the late Dmytro Halychyn, Atty. Stephen Jarema and Walter Dushnyck—which was sent to Europe in connection with efforts of the American Committee to unite exiled Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian groups in a joint anti-Communist radio broadcasting project. He was keenly interested in the development of the Ukrainian community in the United States and elsewhere.

In 1962 Archbishop Buchko strongly protested against the presence of observers from the Russian Orthodox Church at the Ecumenical Council, stating that it was inconceivable to honor this church which actively cooperated in the destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church by the Soviet regime.

The real greatness of Archbishop Buchko is attested to in his last will (written on February 18, 1973), revealed by the Most Reverend Myroslav Marusyn, newly-appointed Ukrainian Catholic Bishop, and successor to him as Apostolic Visitator for Ukrainian Catholics in Western Europe:

On my grave let stand a wooden cross bearing a Ukrainian inscription: "*Here rests a Ukrainian Catholic Bishop Ivan Buchko who asks good people their gracious mention in holy prayers.*"

I beg not to have eulogies-panegyrics at my funeral, and if a short mention should appear in the press, it should not reveal anything from my life except the dates of my birth and my death and the following statement, which I always repeated and repeat now at the hour of death: "*I solemnly declare before the Almighty and before the world that my last will is to die in the holy Catholic faith, in full devotion and obedience to every Holy Father the Pope of Rome, whom I consider to be my Supreme Protector and Infallible Teacher of the whole Church of Christ, a true successor of St. Peter the Apostle and a true Viceroy of Jesus Christ on earth.*"

Archbishop Buchko was buried in a crypt in the St. Sophia Ukrainian Catholic Cathedral in Rome.

PROBLEMS OF THE NON-RUSSIAN PEOPLES AS EXEMPLIFIED BY RECENT UKRAINIAN PUBLICATIONS*

By DAN B. CHOPYK

In 1972 official circles in the Soviet Union organized festive celebrations commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the U.S.S.R., a component idea of which was to secure equal rights and opportunities for the non-Russian nationalities in order to develop their native economies and cultures. A preamble to the formation of the federation was the March 1921 Resolution of the Xth Congress of the Russian Communist Party. It said, "The Great Russian Communists, who work on the peripheries and who grew up in the conditions of existence of (their) 'national state' and who have not suffered any national oppression, very often diminish the importance of national considerations in the party and Soviet work, or, worse, pay no attention to them whatsoever... This position leads to deviation from communism into the direction of imperialism, colonialism, great Russian chauvinism."¹

The formation of the Union and of its Constitution was accomplished and ratified in January of 1924, but the national problems, which this union was supposed to have solved, persisted. Consequently, the XIIth Congress of the All-Union Communist Party which took place after the Union was formed had to issue a reprimand stating that "the Union of the Republics is looked at by a large part of the Soviet officials in the center and in the provinces (i.e., in the peripheries) *not* as a union of equal national states..."²

The demand for equal national rights continues up to the present day. The national struggle currently takes the shape of resistance against Russification, which is cloaked in vestments of creating a "new Soviet man" who would feel, think, act and speak Russian. Large

* Recent Ukrainian publications are understood here to be materials published in Soviet Ukraine during the six years from 1968 to 1973 (inclusive).

¹ USSR, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, *Obrazovanie S.S.R.* [Education — The USSR] (Moscow-Leningrad: 1949), p. 224.

² *Ibid.* p. 367.

numbers of representatives from non-Russian nationalities are incarcerated or spend time in hard-labor camps for participating in this struggle. We are all familiar with the many dissident voices that have been heard in the West via clandestine publications. Last year Nobel Prize-winning writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn, himself once an inmate of the Soviet concentration camps, appealed to the Soviet leaders in a 15,000-word letter³ to dismantle the Soviet Union, to abandon the Kremlin's control over the non-Russian republics and to create a Russian national state which would embrace only Russian ethnographic territory, confining the Kremlin's political control to it alone. The Russians, thereby being freed from the suppressive struggle with the national minorities, could concentrate, with financial help from the West, on the development of the "Northeast," the vast forested and sparsely inhabited reaches of northern Russia and Siberia. Otherwise, Amalrik's prediction for 1984⁴ might well become a reality.

Nothing would suit the non-Russian nationalities better than Solzhenitsyn's solution, but so long as it is not adopted, their demand for self-expression spreads over ever-widening areas of their cultural life. In Ukraine this struggle is observed as strongest in the humanities. It concentrates on problems of history, religion, folklore, music, political science, art, literature, language, etc. Many examples illustrating the situation in each of these areas of Soviet Ukrainian life speak for themselves.

History. In 1965, the year the Soviet bulldozers started an intensive reconstruction of the cities in the U.S.S.R., many ancient Russian cultural monuments were threatened with destruction. The Russian people at large reacted spontaneously, forming a six-million-strong Society for the Preservation of National Monuments. This Society, now co-opted by the Comsomol and other government agencies in the RSFSR, pursues various legal activities: it raises money for restoration work of old churches and monasteries; it inspires children to seek out historical ruins and to write on legends and other folklore materials, and it sends students to help professionals in the reconstruction work.

Ukrainians, on the other hands, have not been allowed to organize into such societies. To fill the need, writers have spoken out for the people. The first eloquent voice was that of Oles Honchar, the former president of the Ukrainian Writers' Association, who, in his work

³ *The New York Times*, September 5, 1973.

⁴ Andrei Amalrik, *Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970).

The Cathedral,⁵ published in 1968, brought forth strong arguments supporting the preservation of the Ukrainian-Kozak heritage. *The Cathedral* has been declared a non-book, and is banned in libraries and bookstores, as is its discussion on the part of critics (as is evident from M. Malynovska's work *Oles Honchar*,⁶ published in Kiev in 1970). Moreover, Honchar himself, since the appearance of this book, has lost his position as the president of the Ukrainian Writers' Association. The young Ukrainian literary critic, Eugene Sverstyuk, who defended Oles Honchar in his work *Cathedral in Scaffolding*, is now under arrest.

Another writer, Valentyn Moroz, wrote an essay, "A Chronicle of Resistance,"⁷ in which he strongly defended the right of the town of Kosmach in Western Ukraine to repossess its famous Iconostasis, which was built during the time of the West Ukrainian rebel-hero Dovbush (XVIIIth Century). It was recently stolen by an obscure film director who still has not returned it to Kosmach, despite the legitimate demands of the local populace. Valentyn Moroz, who was on a hunger strike from July 1 to November 22, 1974, is kept in the notorious Vladimir Prison.

To be published, literary works about Ukrainian history must be innocuous enough to be approved. In 1972, Ivan Bilyk, a Ukrainian author known mainly for his translations, published a novel called *The Sword of Areus*⁸ (St. George's Sword). It dwells philosophically upon the freedoms and greatness of the primeval Ukrainian state, the advent of Christianity and the democratic social system which knew neither masters nor slaves. The life there was free. This book, too, is proscribed. The party critics see in *St. George's Sword* the legendary symbol of strength of the separatist Kievan princes. Inimical to Soviet educational purposes is the portrayal of the superiority and uniqueness of these princes, since "the idea of exclusiveness of the Ukrainian nation is foreign to the people."⁹ Yet a copy of the book was worn out in one year from being read and passed hand-to-hand before it found its way to the West in 1973.

⁵ Oles Honchar, *Sobor* [The Cathedral], in *Radyansky Pysmennyk* [Soviet Writer] (Kiev: 1968).

⁶ Margarita Malynovska, *Oles Honchar* (Kiev: Dnipro Publishers, 1970).

⁷ Valentyn Moroz, "A Chronicle of Resistance in Ukraine," in *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, XXVII, No. 1 (Spring, 1971), 13-37. The article was translated by Zirka Hayuk and published by the Smoloskyp Press Service in Baltimore, Md.

⁸ Ivan Bilyk, *Mech Areja* [The Sword of Areus], in *Radyansky Pysmennyk* [Soviet Writer] (Kiev: 1972).

⁹ 'Ohlyadach,' 'Idelnist i pafos tvorchosti' [Identity and Pathos of Creativity], in *Literaturna Ukraina* [Literary Ukraine], April 25, 1973.

Religion: Religion in the Soviet Union is another area of social life which tends to escape the Party's control. Since ridicule no longer works for the Soviet propagandists, they have resorted to scientific methods, to polling, like the Gallup poll in the United States. In 1972 appeared "On the Questions of Scientific Atheism," in which Soviet sociologists published their findings concerning the influence of the father on the religious convictions and practices of his whole family. Grouping the fathers into three categories—believers, wavering, and indifferent or nonbelievers—the Soviet researchers came up with the following data:¹⁰

% of the members of his family:	Father: Believer	Father: Wavering	Father: Indifferent, nonbeliever
Are religious	68.4%	47.4%	22.2%
Have icons at home	59.3	36.8	11.1
Attend church	42.6	39.3	7.4
Celebrate festivities	81.5	71.0	42.0
Take part in church life (births, weddings, deaths)	80.0	33.3	22.2
Give religious education to the children	50.0	33.3	5.0

In Ukraine, where family religious life is very strong, especially in Western Ukraine, the propagandists, being aware of these findings, have considerably increased their antireligious writings in publications most popular with men. To illustrate how important the religious-national problem is in Soviet Ukraine, Father Dr. Hryniokh¹¹ examined current Ukrainian periodicals for two equal periods of time (1969-70 and 1971-72) and came up with the following statistics:

In the period 1969/70, Ukraine periodicals published 235 antireligious articles.

In the period 1971/72, Ukraine periodicals published 470 antireligious articles.

Thus antireligious propaganda exactly doubled in the periods compared.

¹⁰ *Voprosy nauchnogo ateizma* [On the Questions of Scientific Atheism], A Symposium, Moscow, 1972.

¹¹ Father Dr. I. Hryniokh, "Molod mizh Marksom i Khrystom" [Youth Between Marx and Christ], in *Ukrainsky Samostiynyk* [Ukrainian Independent], Sep. of the USSR, rev. ed. (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1972), p. 38.

Folklore: Folklore and, especially, calendar festivities, which in the past centered on family affairs, are now being brought to the stage and to spectator viewing, where under the fanfare of sound and light the reeducational speeches may be presented. "The new ritual festivities have as their purpose the task to speed up the process of the formation of the 'new Soviet man'."¹²

Soviet Party workers responsible for the ideological education of the masses connect folklore directly with religion. The Ukrainian newspaper *Soviet Ukraine* editorialized that a "rejection of religion is a complicated process which requires common efforts of the workers and society at large and of personal interests of propagandists in matters of believers' religion..."¹³

Pointed out was that the more the religious person lives by the principles of his or her religion, the greater the difficulties awaiting the propagandists-atheists in their task to turn such people away from religion. Such persons are attracted to religion not only by its moral stands, but also by the religious *rituals*. It is necessary, therefore, advises *Soviet Ukraine*, to develop new Soviet ceremonies such as weddings, burials, calendar celebrations which could effectively compete and replace religious ceremonies.

In essence, the new customs and ceremonies are not meant to be applied to family circles, but to staged performances, resembling American football halftimes. They are mass performances, but the general public is only viewing and listening. Soviet propaganda officials utilize such spectacles for presenting speeches which extol the joys of Soviet life, express gratitude to the Communist Party and reaffirm allegiance to the Soviet system. One can find a good example of such festivities in a recently published book by a group of authors, *Festivities and Customs of Soviet Ukraine*.¹⁴ An example of a dedicative speech presented at a group Spring festivity will sufficiently illustrate our contention:

¹² "Potribno i dali posyliuvaty naukovo-ateistychne vykhovannia trudashchychka, bilshe vahy prydilliaty vprovadzhenniu novych radyanskykh obriadiv..." [It is Necessary to Further Strengthen the Scientific-Atheistic Education of the Working People, to Lend More Weight to the Introduction of New Soviet Rituals...]. A Report on the XXIV Congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU), in *Komunist Ukrayiny* [Communist of Ukraine] (No. 3, 1971), p. 39.

¹³ *Radyanska Ukraina*, July 20, 1973.

¹⁴ Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, *Sviata ta obriadny Radyanskoj Ukrayiny* [Festivities and Customs of Soviet Ukraine], in *Naukova Dumka* [Scientific Thought] (Kiev: 1971), pp. 175-178.

My dear fans! I brought you happiness, joyful work, soaring song, bright flowers, and true love. Without beautiful songs there cannot be much joy in work, without joyous work there is no happiness in life, without flowers true love won't bloom either. So cherish all I give you. Do not fold your hands and do not spare your strength in work in the fields, sow them with healthy seeds, weed them out and the fields will reward you with happiness. I wish you success in your inspired work. With your work as with your song now, you will bring glory to our dear Communist Party which has shown us the road to true Spring—to Communism!¹⁵

Such dedication is repeated again in the usually expected reply-promise, as, for example:

...May you always bring for the Soviet people happiness, peace, joyous songs, flowers and love! And every year we will repay you with our devoted love and with our inspired work in the name of our bright future—Communism!¹⁶

Though speeches at such festive occasions tend to be ignored by the audience, their strength lies, like commercials, in repetition. Some Soviet citizens consider such attempts *deplorable*.

Valentyn Moroz, the Ukrainian dissident writer, has given a critical evaluation of the Soviet attempt to introduce substitutive new customs in place of the old ones. His evaluation deserves quoting:

...Lately there has been an attempt to "create" new traditions and combinations which become more ridiculous as time goes by: "Building of Happiness," "the Holiday of Workers' Spring..."

The "creation" of traditions is just as ridiculous as the promotion of "cultural revolution." Culture represents a centuries-old maturation, which is impossible to speed up. Any kind of revolutionary interference is destructive. You cannot create traditions. They are created by themselves through the centuries. You can call everyone to a clubhouse and announce some idiotic holiday of Pigtenders, or Milkmaids, instead of Easter, but it will never become an observed holiday. This will create merely another *kolhosp* [collective farm] meeting with another booze party to follow. In order to have a holiday, you must have an atmosphere of some spiritual meaning, and this takes time to create.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 177.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

The atmosphere of Christmas or of Easter in a Ukrainian village has been mutilated and destroyed. It is even hard to remember what Christmas was like:

The creator of History—the folk—
are playing dominoes until sunrise.

(M. Kholodny)

Now they want to fill the vacuum with general necessities:

Christmas, christmas, christmas song,
the cows have calved
they have calved on the farm
and the calves have been born.

We will take care of these calves
to the farmer they're his wealth,
to the *kolhosp* it brings new revenue
to the people it brings meat and butter too.

(*Shchedrivky*, 1968)

This truly cattle folklore, this cow-like image is seen everywhere. All you have to do is look at the grotesque presentations of amateur singing or drama clubs wearing Ukrainian costumes...¹⁷

Music: Music is closely connected with folk customs and celebrations, though foreign influences, including modern ones, have always been readily adapted in Ukraine. All this was deplored recently at the Sixth Composers' Congress of Ukraine, which held its sessions in Kiev from the 28th to the 30th of January, 1974. In the activity report to this Congress it was declared that there are too many works with false pathos and sweet sentimentality and which copied popular western models. This would not do. The musicologists and critics were reminded that it is their duty to actively oppose all infiltration attempts from bourgeois influences in the arts. Soviet Ukrainian composers must express in their music the spirit of "union with the music of fraternal union Republics so as to go forward in the common stream of intimacy and bilateral enrichment."¹⁸ Bilateral here, of course, means primarily the influence which comes from and through

¹⁷ Moroz, "A Chronicle of Resistance in Ukraine," pp. 32-33.

¹⁸ *Radyanska Ukraina*, January 30, 1974.

the Russian models in arts and music, while bourgeois influence refers to Ukrainian national models which have no counterparts in Russian repertoires.

Art: Art like music and literature may be employed for educational purposes. The *peredvizhniki* artists used art in Russia in the latter half of the XIXth century to stir up social consciousness among the Russian people. Similarly, Ukrainian artists recently seem to have bestirred students of the Kiev State University. As a pretext, the artists, Alla Horska and friends, used an opportunity to portray the Ukrainian national poet Taras Shevchenko, the patron of the Kiev State University, in stained glass fashion on the vestibule window of the University building. The *vitrage*, as the stained glass windows are called in Ukraine, depicted an angry Shevchenko glaring through iron bars. One arm comforted a distraught woman—Ukraine; the other held a book high over his head. From it, Shevchenko's "Imitation of Psalm 11," appeared the words: "I shall exalt those humble slaves who are speechless and in their defense I will put a word..."¹⁹ These words express the poet's mission and concern for his people, who, like he himself, were serfs. Many feel that the lot of the people is not much different now in Ukraine. At least Soviet officialdom seemed to react that way. They destroyed Alla Horska's artwork as a degenerate formalist opus unfit for Shevchenko and, after a trial, expelled Alla from the Artists Association of Ukraine. A few years later (February 28, 1970), Alla Horska was killed under questionable circumstances in the environs of Kiev. She was 41.

Political Science Ukrainians have had their own view of the function of the Union of the Republics which was formed after the fall of the Russian empire. Ukraine, like Poland and the Baltic States, declared its independence (January 22, 1918) and was recognized by the Lenin government as a separate and independent state. After two years of survival, internal strife and Communist subversion (indispensably helped by Moscow) overthrew the Socialist government in Ukraine, and the Communists took over. The latter decided to form a union of equal states with Russia proper. The federation treaty between Russia, Ukraine, Byelorussia and the Federation of Caucasian Republics was signed on December 29, 1922. During the year 1923 discussions were held in the Central Executive Committee of the Union as to the character of the Union. The Ukrainians insisted on federation, but Stalin proposed a resolution which was passed declaring that "the Russian SFSR, Ukrainian SSR... are joining into one union state."

¹⁹ Taras Shevchenko, *Kobzar* (Kiev: Dnipro Publishers, 1969), pp. 575-576.

A Soviet Constitution specialist, S. Ronin, dealing with the period of the formation of the USSR, has this to say about the Ukrainian position: "The national deviationists, the Ukrainians first of all, stood fiercely against Stalin's formulation..."²⁰ The Ukrainian opposition to the *total Union* persisted and is evident now. "Moscow," reported Michael Parks from Moscow in *The Baltimore Sun*, "is especially sensitive to the situation in Ukraine. This sensitivity has been recently heightened by several anti-Russian demonstrations in Ukrainian cities in recent years and by a growing volume of underground literature..."²¹

The Kremlin's attempts to curb the growing nationalism in Ukraine were partially foiled in recent years by Petro Shelest when he was first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine. He succeeded in building the republic party into a well-organized machine that responded to Kiev rather than to Moscow. This, in turn, allowed him to oppose the central Moscow leadership on foreign policy and other issues. He was duly ousted from Ukraine's party leadership and later from the Politburo in the Kremlin, but before that was done, he succeeded in publishing a book called, *Ukraine, Thou Art Ours, Soviet.*²²

A glowing review of this book was published in the July 1971 issue of *Vitchyzna* (Fatherland). Subsequently, however, a reappraisal of this book appeared in the journal, *The Communist of Ukraine*. This review was adversely critical.²³

In the meantime, the official stand against nationalism in Ukraine has assumed emergency proportions. Consider, for example, some from the list of major publications scheduled for 1974 publication:

1. Bukovich, D.M., *The Web of Deceit*, wherein the author accuses the Ukrainian Catholic (Uniate) Church of fostering denationalization and preaching bourgeois nationalism and fascism among Transcarpathian Ukrainians;
2. Varvartsev, M.M., *Bourgeois Nationalist Propaganda in the Service of Anti-Communism*;

²⁰ S. Ronin, *K istorii konstitutsii S.S.S.R. 1924 godu* [On the History of the Constitution of the USSR of 1924] (Moscow: 1953), p. 106.

²¹ *The Baltimore Sun*, September 18, 1973.

²² Peter Shelest, *Ukraino nasha radyanska* [Ukraine, Thou Art Ours, Soviet] (Kiev: 1971).

²³ *Komunist Ukrayiny*, No. 4, April, 1973.

3. Vozniak, N.V., *Their True Face*, wherein documents will be presented uncovering the clandestine activity of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism and Zionism;
4. Zamlynskyi, V.O., *Branded by the Scorn of the People*, which uncovers the crimes of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists during World War II;
5. Zasanskyi, V.V., *Critique of Bourgeois Nationalist Concepts of Economic Development of Soviet Ukraine*, devoted to repudiation of the works of Ukrainian economists in the West showing Moscow's colonial policies in Ukraine;
6. Ihnatchenko, H.T., *Peking Stakes in Ukrainian Bourgeois Nationalists*, uncovering arrangements for patronage of some groups of Ukrainian nationalists by the Mao regime of Red China;
7. *Ideo-centered Critique of Religion and Religious Modernism*;
8. Kolembetova, V.G., *Way of Life and Religious Superstitions*, aims to speak against the church and Ukrainian nationalism;
9. Kolyar, M.F., *Historical Traditions of Ukrainian People and Their Emigre Falsifiers*, is against Ukrainian historians in the West and their interpretations of the Kievan Rus and Kozakdom periods;
10. Nahorna, L.O., *Against Present Bourgeois Falsifications of the National Program and Policy of the CPSU*;
11. Pavlenko, M.I., *The Enemies of Peace in Europe* are the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist groups which now allegedly constitute a handy tool in the hands of imperialists used for subversive activity against peace;
12. *The Yaroslav Galan Post* (collected articles) uncovering the criminal activity of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists;
13. *Against Anti-Communism and Bourgeois Nationalism*, which uncovers infiltrating methods of contemporary anti-Communism and its branches, Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism and international Zionism;
14. Sotnikov, V.V., Veres, H.V., *Together They Create Black Deeds*, where documents will purportedly show the cooperation of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists and Zionists at work on a platform of fierce anti-Communism;
15. Tkachenko, V.M., *Ukrainian Bourgeois Nationalist Emigration and the American Far-Right*;
16. Shpak, S.P., *Contemporary Falsifiers of the Spiritual Heritage of Taras G. Shevchenko*;

17. *Cursed by the People*, prose and poetry collection speaking against Ukrainian nationalism, etc.

As the materials brought out so far in this paper indicate, attempted solutions to these problems are not just, not fair, and quite illegal, because they all fall in the area of non-Union competencies and thus are only of direct national republic concern.

Language: Art. 40 of the USSR Constitution recognizes indirectly the national, i.e., native, ethnic languages of the Union Republics, by stating: "Laws passed by the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet shall be published in the languages of the union republics..."²⁴ yet together with the attempt to create a "new Soviet man," there proceeds apace a concerted effort to make the Russian language mandatory in republic offices and institutions of higher learning. New regulations are being introduced in various union republics which make fluent Russian a requirement for high school graduation, for employment in many jobs and for almost every promotion.

To make the use of the Russian language legal in the Ukrainian republic, some of its proponents, like Academician I.K. Bilodid of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, declare the Russian language "*the second native language*"²⁵ of the peoples of the Soviet Union. This way they seek to accord it a status equal to that of the native *languages* in daily use among the ethnic non-Russian peoples. Bilodid, moreover, goes even further. In his article "Language and Ideological Struggle" in *Movoznavstvo*, he chastises the purist defenders of the Ukrainian language, calling their efforts "attempts to direct its development along the path of separateness from the Russian language..."²⁶ The only way for the Ukrainian language to progressively develop is "in close ties with the development of the Russian language by utilizing [also] values of other languages."²⁷ Academician Bilodid charts the following road along which the national language development should progress:

In practice of the Soviet socialist life, a harmonious bilingualism has developed, i.e., the free and parallel use of the national native language and the language of international

²⁴ USSR, *The Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics* (As amended and supplemented at the Second Session of the Eighth Supreme Soviet of the USSR), rev. ed. (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1972), p. 36.

²⁵ I.K. Bilodid, "Language and Ideological Struggle," in *Movoznavstvo* [Linguistics] (No. 5, 1973) 8.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

communications—the Russian language—whereby the character of this bilingualism secures the utilization of both languages in all spheres of life—national, political, business, science, education, culture and folklore. These positions concerning the development of national languages, including the role of the Russian language as the language of intranational communications, are reflected in the program of the C.P.S.U. as the realization of the Leninist national policy.²⁸

Literature: Literature has always been a vehicle through which popular consciousness and public opinion is molded in a totalitarian society. Literature has many sides, the thrust of which often changes direction. Soviet officials, aware of this nature of literature, endeavor to map out their course of counteraction in advance. Often they see the development of independent and critical stands on the part of their creative people as "dupism" caused by Western influences. They try to convince their society that this is so. In a recently published booklet, *Scientific Exchange and Ideological Subversion*,²⁹ they quote an article from the West German journal *Aussenpolitik* [Foreign Policy] which deals with the ideological and psychological struggle between East and West. The excerpt presents the Western position as follows:

While using all means of contemporary propaganda and refined devices of psychological struggle, it is necessary to implant our morals and ideology in the common consciousness of the population of the Communist bloc country. [While] utilizing national differences, religious superstitions, human weaknesses, envy, female vanity, drive to comfort, it is also necessary to foster indifference to the aims set by the leadership of the Communist state. Economic, moral and other troubles must be ruthlessly dragged out for public viewing so as to stir the population into conducting passive resistance (slowing down production and sabotage). If the State should take any steps against such deviates, it is necessary then to give the widest publicity to these measures, branding them as unjust, so as to arouse compassion on the one hand, and, on the other, to increase dissatisfaction with the Communist system.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

²⁹ USSR, *Nauchnyi obmen i ideologicheskaiia diversia* [Scientific Exchange and Ideological Subversion] (Leningrad: 1972).

With dissent thus made tantamount to treason, anyone who is desirous of change, constructive as well as destructive, runs the risk of being caught up in the net of dupes, criminal infiltrators and subversives whose activity invokes the judgment of martial law. Ukrainian writers are therefore very cautious. They state their intentions clearly in their works, such as young Ukrainian poet Mykola Vinhranovsky, who wrote:

I feel no evil against any people.
 'against any people in the world I feel no evil.
 Why then does it become more difficult for me
 To live in this world in spiritual plurality?³⁰

Another Ukrainian writer, Oles Honchar, was less fortunate than Vinhranovsky, who so far has been accused of no deviations. In his major novel *Sobor* [The Cathedral], Honchar attempted to do two things: to bring to light the pitiful characters (Loboda) in Soviet Ukraine who were produced by the despotic regime during the period of "Stalin's Cult of Personality" and to present a model of a new man (named Nicholas Bahlay) for the Ukrainian nation to emulate. In official eyes, Honchar failed on both counts. That he should be deemed to have failed in his critical evaluation of the past, that is understandable. But his alleged failure in presenting a new Soviet man is hard to comprehend, for that new man, Nicholas Bahlay, seems to reflect the ideals the Soviet "new society" desires.

Here is a sketch of Nicholas Bahlay:

He was born to a foundry worker. All his ancestors have chosen this profession since the inception of Kozakdom. Nicholas' father died a hero's death at the front almost exactly at the same time that Nicholas himself was born. An orphan from birth, Nicholas went to work early, worked hard, and complained little. He learned his family trade rather early in life from his uncle, but decided to go further. Evenings, after work, Nicholas attended engineering school where he excelled without neglecting social obligations. He participated in the work of various committees and joined the Young Communist League, the youth organization of the party.

In his pursuit Nicholas was absorbed by the future. His primary interest was ecology: clean air, clean water and unhampered vegetation, so that humanity "could live without stench in plenty of fresh

³⁰ Mykola Vinhranovsky, *Poezii* [Poetry] (Kiev: Dnipro Publishers, 1971), p. 126.

air."³¹ The miserable war years had taught Nicholas to respect people, life and nature. Now he dedicated himself to the people, his only concern to do something before the spring flowering of his energies fell off without, God forbid, conceiving fruit. Nicholas' religion was to serve people, conducting his affairs in such a way "that he could stand in the face of the Universe and inwardly feel that he, a man, be indeed the crown of nature."³² Looking at the ancient Kozak cathedral, Nicholas makes an observation that captures his own views and aspirations: "Past generations succeeded in crowning themselves with this *symphony of plastics* molded into the shape of this beautiful cathedral. And by what, pray tell," he rhetorically asks, "will the future generations remember us?"³³ Nicholas is not naive in his views of the past. He knows well that life away from the cathedrals was hard and brutal. But it always has been that way. It is that way to-day. One has to fight for humaneness and human considerations. Nicholas fights. He does it with his relatives when they are wrong, he restrains acquaintances, and he chastises party officials.

Nicholas doesn't hide his resentment of his nephew's wife, Vera, pointing out to her that she has no right "to pull free people by the ear, even when she is on official duty in the park."³⁴ He makes fun of and stings his acquaintance, party official Volodka Loboda, who uses his official position to persuade young Yelka to marry him. Nicholas also condemns the fish inspectors who, having received their positions due to party connections, take advantage of a retired fisherman by frequenting his home in order to savor the best part of his catch. Nicholas lashes them mercilessly for their drone-like existence, but keeps himself away from officialdom and does not strive for an office himself. He is deeply absorbed by his *purification* project, to which he also devotes his free hours at home. His quiet, persistent and unpretentious devotion to work does not go without notice. People respect Nicholas for it, showing him their deference that he is on the right path to "his own cathedral." Nicholas, of course is unaware of it.

The reader, however, is left with no doubt that Nicholas will succeed, that this man, independent, not only unguided by the party but even rather critical of it, by his own devotion, honesty and persistent work, will create a monument which future generations will remember him by. The vaunted guiding role of the party is nowhere to be seen

³¹ Oles Honchar, *Sobor*, p. 23.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 19.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

in Nicholas' endeavor and this is the fact that officialdom cannot stomach.

Officials always have to justify their parasitic existence by latching themselves on to every achievement, claiming it for themselves or making it look at least as if it came about due to their inspiration. Honchar, however, neglected to give the party leadership this satisfaction in his *Sobor*. Hence its quick demise, illustrated even in the work of such a prominent Soviet Ukrainian literary critic as Margarita Malinovska. In her biographical work, *Oles' Honchar*,⁵⁵ published in Kiev in 1970 to commemorate the author's 50th birthday (in 1968), M. Malinovska critically and favorably examined all of Honchar's creative works, including all his novels up to 1970. However, *Sobor*, which appeared in 1968, was accorded not a single word. Yet references to this work were to be found regularly in the Soviet, foreign and Ukrainian press of the time!

It seems that Soviet bureaucracy will permit literature which is critical of the Stalinist period, even of party activities of that time, but it dares not let the future be menaced by the individualism of a Nicholas. It would be self-defeating for the party to show that an independent, self-made man of the people, working directly for the people, might, in spite of the party but by the people, triumph. Hence, *Sobor*, offering such a hero, was burned and later banned in Kiev.

There is a sequel. Despite the fact that Oles Honchar himself, though demoted, was left unmolested, his pupil, young literary critic, Eugene Sverstyuk, was not. His critical essay on Honchar's *Cathedral*, called *The Cathedral in Scaffolding*,⁵⁶ caused his arrest and, in April of 1973, his sentencing to seven years in prison and five years in exile. Sverstyuk's defense speech in court is worth quoting (in excerpts):

For over a year the investigators tried to find evidence of my secret and hostile activity. Finding none they decided to consider my literary work as hostile, and covered it with shadows of criminality... I cannot accept any criminal accusations for my rudimentary literary contacts, for the fact that I showed my article before or after sending it for publication in a journal. How could I have known that four or five years later this article would be classified as anti-Soviet?... I had the rare fortune to be associated with and to work with people of exceptional talent

⁵⁵ Margarita Malinovska, *Oles' Honchar*, p. 126.

⁵⁶ Evhen Sverstyuk, *Sobor v ryshtovani* [The Cathedral in Scaffolding] (Munich: 1970).

and nobility, people the likes of whom I only read about in books. It is a priceless boon to live by high cultural and social interests, ignoring personal ones. It is good fortune to learn the rigor and weight of great words like truth, honor, duty, words which constitute the moral and ethical foundation, the essence of my values. Honor, which is paid for by blood; dignity, which is the prerequisite of life; truth, to which one goes with the fearlessness of the researcher—without any guarantee of return. I grew up with these notions, intent upon living up to them, trying to break away from the closed circle of empty words... Of course, when at the beginning of the 60's we supported with youth's enthusiasm and directness the popular slogans of personal responsibility for everything happening around us, the slogans of bravery and of action in literary and social life—it never crossed my mind that ten years later I would have to talk about all this in court... In my conscience and before the law I feel no guilt. Whether I was able to live up to the demands of time, to the level of duty—let first the people's court judge that and afterwards the court of history...⁵⁷

Nicholas Bahlay was also in this court. He was sentenced to seven years in prison and five years in exile.

The recent publications from Soviet Ukraine are reflecting the trends and struggles of other non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. The drive of Soviet leadership to produce "the new Soviet man" has frightened many Soviet nationalities mainly by its unrelenting pressure of Russification, by which Russian culture projects itself as superior and all other purely national cultures, languages and social peculiarities as inferior. It is baffling that the Soviet ideological leadership, in putting Russian achievements as models to follow and to look up to, should not realize that *looking up to someone* implies *looking down at someone*, thus providing grounds for dissatisfaction, frustration, and hostility. The inception of the Soviet Union originated, we are told, to solve deep-seated national problems, yet to this day they have not been solved.

⁵⁷ *Homin' Ukrainsky* [Echo of Ukraine] (Toronto), March 9, 1974, p. 2.

BOOK REVIEWS

VALENTYN MOROZ: ESSEYI, LYSTY I DOKUMENTY (Valentyn Moroz: Essays, Letters and Documents). *Suchasnist* Publishers, Munich, 1975, pp. 286 (Ukrainian).

REPORT FROM THE BERIA RESERVE: The Protest Writings of Valentyn Moroz. Edited and Translated by John Kolasky. Foreword by Alexander Sergeyovich Yesenin-Volpin and Translator's Note. Cataract Press, Chicago, Ill., 1974, pp. 162.

The plight of Valentyn Moroz, the Ukrainian historian, and his inhuman and barbaric treatment by Soviet prison authorities have echoed throughout the world and made him a veritable *cause celebre*. Moroz was arrested for the first time in 1965 and sentenced to four years at hard labor. Released in the fall of 1969, he was rearrested in June 1970 and sentenced in November of the same year to fourteen years.

On July 1, 1975 Moroz began his hunger strike and said he would refuse food unless he were transferred to a regular concentration camp and treated according to provisions of the Soviet constitution. On November 22, 1974 Moroz ended his hunger strike after the Soviet authorities promised to improve his prison conditions. He is still reported to be at Vladimir Prison, the notorious Russian dungeon dating back to Czarist times, where he was beaten, tortured and stabbed during his incarceration there.

Recently Soviet dissident sources in Moscow revealed that Moroz was thrown into a punitive cell, where shivering and sleepless, he spent two weeks—January 3 to January 19. No reason for this punishment or "crime" of Moroz was reported publicly, and even his family does not know why he was punished so cruelly in solitary confinement.

Moroz became first known through the publication of *The Chornovil Papers*, dealing with the secret trials of 20 Ukrainian intellectuals, among whom was Valentyn Moroz. During the great turmoil in Ukraine in 1969-1972, Moroz's writings, especially his essays and petitions became widely known outside Ukraine, thus spurring international protest movements on his behalf. Prominent intellectuals and statesmen of many countries, and a number of U.S. legislators and public figures voiced their protest and appealed to the Soviet government for Moroz's release.

The State Department's Public Affairs *Bulletin* in its January 10, 1975 issue, re-stated its principled position in condemning the "persecution of minorities and the suppression of fundamental human freedoms" and said in reference to Ukraine:

"The arrests of dissident figures in the Ukraine appear to be directed against advocates of an enhanced Ukrainian national identity. We have been aware of the tragic situation of such well-known Ukrainians as Valentyn Moroz and Leonid

Plyushch and others for some time and have condemned their arrests as violations of the principles outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights..."

The works of Valentyn Moroz have appeared, thus far, in three separate collections. The first of them, entitled *Boomerang* (reviewed in the Autumn 1974 issue of *The Ukrainian Quarterly*), was published by the Smoloskyp Publishers in Baltimore, Md. in 1974. Two other collections under review are *Report from the Beria Reserve*, published by Cataract Press in Chicago, Ill. in 1974 and the second collection, published by *Suchasnist* Publishers in Munich, Germany, in 1975. The latter work is in Ukrainian.

Both collections are almost identical in content except the Ukrainian version contains a series of Moroz's poetry, a cycle called "Prelude," and a short poem, "From Prison Poetry." Likewise, the Ukrainian edition includes a biographical list of persons mentioned by Moroz, as well as remarks and explanations on problems discussed or referred to in the text.

Included in both collections are such known Moroz's essays, as a "Report from the Beria Reserve," "Moses and Dathan," "Chronicle of Resistance," "In the Midst of the Snows," "The First Day" and "Instead of a Final Statement."

An important section in both collections consists of Moroz's communications and petitions to the highest organs of the Ukrainian SSR: to the first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine, Petro Shelest; two petitions to the Attorney General of the Ukrainian SSR, and Chairman of the KGB of the Council of Ministers, and another to the Association of Jurists of the Ukrainian SSR. There also are other letters and reports by members of Moroz's family, his friends and also by other concerned citizens of Ukraine.

The collection, *Report from the Beria Reserve*, also contains a Foreword and a Translator's Note by two men of note, namely, Alexander S. Yesenin-Volpin, son of the famous Russian poet, who was confined five times in psychiatric wards and is an active member in Sakharov's Human Rights Committee, and John Kolasky, a Canadian educator and the author of *Education in Soviet Ukraine* and *Two Years in Soviet Ukraine*, which he wrote after his expulsion from Ukraine in 1965. Their interpretations as well as their views on the case of Moroz provide additional strength to the book.

Both collections are first-hand testimony to the lawlessness and unbridled stupidity of the Soviet regime in Ukraine.

New York, N.Y.

WALTER DUSHNYCK

SAKHAROV SPEAKS. By Andrei D. Sakharov. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1974, pp. 245.

In many respects this is a remarkable and stimulating work. It is a compilation of statements, memoranda, interviews, and declarations by the towering Russian physicist and human rights advocate, but it is really more. The work reveals the profound moral and intellectual depths and insights of a truly great man. In every sense it causes the reader to pause and reflect over the various penetrating passages that fill this work. The depicted life and career of Sakharov are in themselves absorbing and stimulating, and reflect the greatness of the person. The use of the terms great and greatness here are used advisedly and for the best, simple expression of one, who with courage, humanism and open candor, speaks, and speaks forcefully.

The book contains a highly informative foreword written by Harrison E. Salisbury, who neatly edited the work. A fairly lengthy introduction is provided by the author himself. Following these are sections on "Progress, Coexistence, and Intellectual Freedom, June 1968" and "Manifesto II, March 1970" which first appeared in the book *Progress, Coexistence, and Intellectual Freedom*. The rest of the work consists of memoranda, a statement on "Let Soviet Citizens Emigrate," interviews with Swedish, Lebanese and western correspondents, including one with Mikhail P. Malyarov, the first Deputy Soviet Prosecutor, a letter to the Congress of the United States, and a sundry of statements dealing essentially with the human rights issue. It may seem that the assortment put together by the editor lends itself to discordant reading, but in fact after one section is read, the reader's interest is so well stimulated that he can't wait to plunge into the next offering, and a basic continuity is sensed as concern the author's thoughts, feelings and attitudes.

As shown in vivid terms by the editor, Sakharov's career has been a most fascinating one. The author himself supplements the description to some extent. Born in 1921 in Moscow, the author came from a cultured family, his father having been a teacher of physics. By the early 40's, the author gained the reputation of being the most brilliant student known to the Moscow faculty. His degree was awarded in the field of cosmic-ray theory at the renowned Lebedev Institute of Physics of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Thereafter his career was highlighted by the presentation of advanced scientific papers, work with Tamm on developing the principles of the H-bomb, and, at the age of 32, election in 1953 as a full member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences with a Doctor of Science. Awards and emoluments flowed, including the Stalin Prize, three Orders of Socialist Labor, an outstanding remuneration of 2,000 rubles per month, and a host of privileges. All this is mentioned here because by 1958 Sakharov turned to the philosophical and political implications of his work and was ready to sacrifice much of these and other comforts to pursue what he deemed was right, truthful and personally compelling.

Increasingly his name became associated with Grigorenko, Valery Chalidze, Solzhenitsyn and countless others who formed what has come to be known as "the Soviet dissidents," seeking greater freedom of expression, respect for human rights and democratization in the Soviet Union. The broad humanism of the author is reflected in every section of the work. In his introduction he pointedly refers to the religious and national movements that have been and are being suppressed in the Soviet Union. With deep compassion for those involved, he observes that "The religious and national movements are the broadest and most conscious" (p. 43). To speak out on this and related subjects, he joined with Chalidze and Tverdokhlebov to found the Human Rights Committee.

The threat of nuclear war is of prime concern to the author. In the section on "Dangers" he is quite explicit on this and his advocacy of real coexistence and gradual disarmament. His argumentation is persuasive and convincing. However, the imputation of the United States perhaps considering a "preventive aggression" is subject to fair criticism. Mutual deterrence is the main ground of his argument, leading into the necessity for a genuine detente which he argues for later. An engaging statement in this portion of his work goes as follows, "A thermonuclear war cannot be considered a continuation of politics by other means (according to the formula of Clausewitz). It would be a means of universal suicide"

(p. 65). The variables involved in all this are really too immense for anyone to predict or forecast.

Sakharov's observations on Vietnam and the Middle East, international tensions and new principles, and hunger and population also indicate the stature and intellectuality of the man. One does not have to agree with them, and the reviewer for one would criticize at length some of his views regarding the anti-Communist struggle in Vietnam. Nonetheless, who would reject outright his observation that "International affairs must be completely permeated with scientific methodology and a democratic spirit, with a fearless weighing of all facts, views and theories, with maximum publicity of ultimate and intermediate goals, and with a consistency of principles" (p. 69)? On hunger, population and the fulfillment of the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" as a way of reducing international tensions his views are well grounded, although, here too, some may question the weights he assigns to birth rate restrictions and socioeconomic development.

Significant in this work are Sakharov's many observations with respect to the so-called nationalities problem in the Soviet Union. In discussing, for instance, the restriction of the civil rights of the Crimean Tartars, who lost heavy numbers of people under Stalin's rule, he has this to say: "Nationality problems will continue to be a reason for unrest and dissatisfaction unless all departures from Leninist principles are acknowledged and analyzed and firm steps are taken to correct mistakes" (p. 95). His reference to Leninist principles assumes those on self-determination and secession that Lenin professed but evidently reneged on in his actual treatment of the oppressed nationalities. With this understanding, Sakharov is on safe ground, and his stated views later more than confirm this.

His discussion of interrelations with the national republics more than amply shows his liberal disposition and sound thought. As he cogently points out, the USSR Constitution proclaims the right of union republics to secede. With some qualification, he believes that the number of republics seeking or tending toward secession is, "to all appearances," very small. Moreover, he further states that "there can be no doubt that any republic that secedes from the USSR for one reason or another by peaceful, constitutional means would maintain intact its ties with the socialist commonwealth of nations" (p. 149). This view obviously raises many questions that he does not consider here. The assumption is that sufficient democratization will have taken place in the USSR to permit this act of secession. Would it necessarily follow that Ukraine or Lithuania, for example, would want to remain socialist?

The author shows also a considerable awareness of what is going on in the various non-Russian republics. He observes, "The wave of political arrests in the first few months of 1972 is particularly alarming. Numerous arrests took place in the Ukraine" (p. 156). The force of nationalism is well recognized, too. Concerning nationalistic tendencies, he states, "Whether they are positive or not is very hard to determine in individual cases. In some cases—for example, in the Ukraine—they have become very strongly interwoven with democratic forces" (p. 172). Moreover the author's concern for Leonid Plyushch, who was arrested in January of 1972, is most notable. In a communication to U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim, Sakharov writes, "At the present time we are especially alarmed about the fate of the Kiev mathematician Leonid Plyushch" (p. 242). He relates the kangaroo type of trial held in this case, the victim's dispatch to a special

psychiatric hospital, and how his wife has been prohibited from visiting him. Elsewhere he mentions the case of Valentyn Moroz.

One of the most illuminating parts of the book is the letter to the U.S. Congress regarding the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Throughout the work the author advocates across-the-board emigration rights, not only for Jews but also Russians, Ukrainians, Germans and others. In this letter he pinpoints the entire issue and sees it as a crucial one for his general stand on genuine detente, convergence, peaceful coexistence and democratization in the USSR. Without question, this and other subjects make this work a refreshing source of humanistic ideas and thoughts.

Georgetown University

LEV E. DOBRLANSKY

RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM: From Ivan the Great to the Revolution. Edited by Taras Hunczak. With an Introduction by Hans Kohn. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, N.J., 1974, pp. 396, maps and bibliographical references.

After Prof. T. Hunczak's Foreword and Hans Kohn's Introduction, Henry R. Huttenbach dwells on the origin of Russian imperialism. On pp. 167-197, a chapter dealing with "The Ukraine and Muscovite Expansion," includes an old map of Ukraine by Hornemann. In the book Prof. Hunczak has a chapter on Pan-Slavism and Pan-Russianism, Marie Hatton writes on Russia and the Baltics, Walter Leitsch on Russo-Polish confrontation; Troian Stolaniovich on Russian domination in the Balkans; Firuz Kazemzadeh on Russian penetration of the Caucasus; Geoffrey Wheeler on Russian conquest and colonization of Central Asia, and Sung-Hwan Chang on Russian designs on the Far East. The book also has notes, an index, and information about the authors. The editor, Prof. Hunczak, in his Foreword cites Karl Marx's view, which states that Russia's policy is essentially changeless, changing only in methods and tactics, its main goal always being world domination. Russian expansion made for a Russian imperial colossus under the czars and today a world menace under the Communist rule.

The book covers Russian political expansionist policy from the Mongol period to the Bolshevik Revolution only. The editor has selected a group of specialists dealing with all aspects of this problem, making it a most valuable source in a time of detente, Soviet coexistence and appeasement policy on the part of the U.S. government rather than one supporting the liberation of all the captive nations in the world. Each chapter is backed by an exhausting selected bibliography at the end of the book.

Despite the detente, the Soviet Russian policy has indeed proved to be unchanging, the slogan of world domination still persisting: this should be kept in mind by all political and international scholars, diplomats and politicians.

Prof. Huttenbach's chapter about "The Ukraine and Muscovite Expansion" has, as mentioned, a rare map of Ukraine by Johann Baptist Homann of Nuremberg printed in 1716, and a bibliography of 62 selected items. Prof. Huttenbach, who teaches Russian history at the City College of the City University of New York, shows himself to be an objective researcher and scholar. The chapter starts with a discussion of the relationship of Ukraine to Czarist Russia and to Soviet Russia in general, emphasizing the strong independence desire of the Ukrainians, including kinsmen abroad. Those in the USSR compose the largest national entity

in this last existing colonial empire. He points out that many histories of Ukraine have been written from different aspects. The Russian version has tried to harmonize all contradictions between itself and the national independent stand of Ukrainian patriots and scholars. The author states that the Soviet tactics of absorbing Ukraine into Muscovite and Russian imperial history has its origin in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries. In this period, according to Prof. Huttenbach, a single civilization (un-named) embraced the Dnieper and upper Volga valleys.

It is known that the Kievan Rus' state had its origins in the Trypillian civilization and in the political organization of the people known as the Antes. The Kievan Rus' state was exposed to the invasions of the Mongol nomads from the East and the North. This state was invaded by the Pecheneg and Polovtsi tribes. In the XIIIth century this Mongol invasion virtually destroyed the Kievan Rus' cultural and political heritage, stopping its evolution until the XVth century. The Ukrainian cultural and political center moved westward to the Halych-Volhynian Principality, which at that time was under Lithuanian protection. In 1480, Moscow declared its independence of the Mongols, and in the reign of Catherine II (1762-1796) it incorporated the former Kievan Rus' state into its empire, thereby destroying the Ukrainian Kozak state. Special attention is given to Muscovy and the reawakening of Ukraine, strongly influenced in the west by the dynastic union of Lithuania and Poland. Consequently, Catholicism was proclaimed as the only state religion in 1387. In 1508, under Prince Michael Glinsky, an Orthodox revolt in Western Ukraine broke out with the aim of restoring the old Kievan Rus' state. In 1552, Muscovy conquered the Kazan khanate, and, in 1554, the Astrakhan khanate. Ukrainian Kozaks with their *Sich* attracted many Ukrainians with their free life. The Zaporozhian Kozaks became the defeners of Ukrainian freedom and religion, and their so-called separatist movement was regarded as a threat to both Muscovy and Poland. In the section dealing with "Muscovy and the Cossack State," the author presents a short account of the development of the Kozak State and its virtual end with the signing in 1654 of the Treaty of Pereyaslav. After taking over the Kozak State, Muscovy signed with Poland, in 1667, the Treaty of Andrusiw, dividing Ukraine along the Dnieper River, with the right bank under Poland and the left bank under Muscovy. Ukraine's last vestiges of independence vanished in 1775 under Catherine, who abolished the Zaporozhian *Sich*. Ukraine became a province of the Russian empire. The Ukrainian language was forbidden, schools using the Ukrainian language were forced to close. Religion and the cultural and social life were Russified. The author exposes the workings of Russian imperialism with its policy of Russification and points out the strategic-geopolitical importance of a free Ukrainian state, once known as the Kozak State.

Our only regret is that the author presents this account of Russian imperialism up until the Communist revolution only. Today, Red Russian imperialism in Ukraine is prolonging this imperialistic Muscovite tradition.

Senior Librarian and Foreign Book Cataloger
Brooklyn Public Library

ALEKSANDER SOKOLYSZYN

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH AND THE BATTLE AGAINST AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN WORLD WAR II. By Wayne S. Cole. Index, Bibliography, Illustrations. [New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich], 1974, pp. 298.

America's entry into World War II as a partner of the Soviet empire may well be recorded as a watershed in American and world history. Our entry resulted in sweeping Soviet territorial expansion, perpetuation of the Soviet dictatorship, tremendous growth of Soviet power, and consequent weakening of United States eminence in world affairs. Resultantly, too, formerly free countries disappeared and whole nations remain imprisoned under Soviet-Great Russian domination.

Our participation in the conflict was preceded by over two years of bitter debate between the interventionists and those Americans who felt sure we had much to lose and nothing to gain by joining the fighting. After Hitler double-crossed his Soviet ally on June 22, 1941, the opponents of American intervention argued that our participation in the war could only benefit the Bolshevik dictatorship. On the other hand, a long Nazi-Soviet struggle would weaken—perhaps even destroy—the two totalitarian colossi.

Many prominent Americans opposed our entry: members of Congress, college presidents, business and labor leaders, authors, journalists, historians, actors and millions of average citizens. The most effective anti-interventionist voice—and the most controversial—was that of Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh. In thus raising his voice, the airman became the victim of one the most vituperative campaigns ever directed against an American.

In his *Charles A. Lindbergh and the Battle Against American Intervention in World War II*, Wayne S. Cole, professor of history at the University of Maryland, has done a masterly job. He explains the issues involved, untangles the logic of both sides and gives the reader a lucid account of a vital and complicated crisis of opinion. "My object," he writes in the preface, "has been neither to vindicate nor indict, but rather, to describe and explain." And he has succeeded.

The Lindbergh story goes back at least as far as the kidnapping and murder of his infant son Charles on March 1, 1932. After the child's body was found, photographers broke into the morgue and took pictures of the tragic little victim. Colonel Lindbergh could neither forgive nor forget the shocking act of vandalism. Some elements of the press continued to harass the Lindbergh family until, in December, 1935, "they quietly slipped out of the country and sought temporary refuge in England." Walter Lippman commented at the time that the Lindberghs were "refugees from the tyranny of yellow journalism" and had been denied "their inalienable right to privacy."

For nearly three and a half years the Lindberghs lived abroad, most of the time in Britain and France, with several visits to Germany and three trips to the Soviet Union. In France the Colonel worked on scientific projects with the French physician, Dr. Alexis Carrel. Conscious of Europe's steady drift toward war, Lindbergh became more and more immersed in the study of international affairs. He was convinced that conflict between the Franco-British and the Germans would constitute a civil war in the West which would endanger the very roots of civilization. He began to look on the Soviet Union, "the prison-house of nations," as the major long-time threat to freedom and civilization.

It was during this period that the Colonel had an experience that permanently harmed his reputation. The American Embassy in Berlin was somewhat cut off from German political life and military contact. Our able military attache,

Major Truman Smith, was anxious to be able to give Washington reliable reports on German military capability, especially in the field of aviation. He was instrumental in arranging a Lindbergh visit to Germany that would include meetings with Goering and other high aviation officials. The Nazis received the American flyer cordially and showed him a great deal of their aviation buildup.

Although his earlier tours of Germany had caused little criticism back home, his visit of October, 1938, proved a disaster for him. Two weeks after the Munich conference, American Ambassador Hugh Wilson gave a stag dinner for Lindbergh in the American Embassy. Goering arrived and was introduced to the guests. When he came to Lindbergh, the Nazi leader unexpectedly gave the American a small red box. It contained a high German decoration. Was this just boorishness on Goering's part or studied trouble-making? Having received many foreign decorations, Lindbergh seems to have taken the matter lightly. But when he got back to the Truman Smith apartment that evening, his wife, Anne, was horrified. She called the decoration an "albatross." Yet, Dr. Cole points out, "to have refused the medal in that setting would have embarrassed America's Ambassador..."

Lindbergh returned to the United States in April, 1939. He was happy to report to General H.H. Arnold, head of the American Air Force, what he had learned about military air power in Britain, France, and especially Germany. At the General's request, Lindbergh testified before the House Appropriations Committee "on behalf of funds for the Air Corps." He gave his time freely to help bolster American preparedness.

Suspecting that if war broke out in Europe, Lindbergh would oppose American involvement, the Roosevelt administration moved to silence him. By round-about means, the White House tried to buy him off by offering him a Cabinet position. Lindbergh turned it down; the die was cast for the historic struggle between him and Roosevelt.

Two weeks after World War II began, Lindbergh made a radio speech over the three major networks urging his fellow Americans to stay out of the fighting. "His battle against intervention was formally launched; it did not end till the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor brought the United States into World War II twenty-seven months later." The famous flyer was immediately and bitterly attacked by the interventionists. Columnist Dorothy Thompson "portrayed him as the pro-Nazi recipient of a German medal."

Many prominent Americans, on the other hand, agreed with Lindbergh. Diplomat William R. Castle, columnist Frank R. Kent, General Robert E. Wood, Herbert Hoover, Dr. Charles A. Beard, Norman Thomas, Kathleen Norris, Henry Ford, Fulton Lewis, Oswald Garrison Villard and a considerable number of senators shared his apprehensions about intervention. Committees were formed by the isolationists and, from Madison Square Garden to the Hollywood Bowl, large anti-war rallies were staged. Right from the start, however, Lindbergh and his followers were under attack from the White House and a large proportion of the news media. It was uphill all the way for the Colonel. Dr. Cole comments: "He had become the most praised, the most tenaciously independent of the major opponents of the Roosevelt administration's policies toward the European war." Senator Robert A. Taft denounced Roosevelt's campaign against the airman as "cowardly."

Although Lindbergh had devoted friends and able advisers, he stubbornly rejected expert counsel. When men like Castle and Kent offered to preview his speeches to screen out blunders and indiscretions, he turned them down. One conse-

quence was his disastrous speech in Des Moines on September 11, 1941, when he assailed the interventionist efforts of the British, the Jews and the Roosevelt administration. His enemies pounced on the speech as proof of Nazi sympathies. The New York Chairman of the America First Committee, John T. Flynn, wrote to the Colonel and expressed his reaction as "one of utter distress." Others resigned in protest from non-interventionist committees. The author of this book calls the Des Moines speech an "extremely serious political blunder." Had the Colonel listened to advice, he would have been spared this fiasco.

Lindbergh's indignation toward what he considered the blind fanaticism and hypocrisy of many of his opponents is understandable. "The idealists who have been shouting against the horrors of Nazi Germany," he charged, supported the Soviet Union "whose record of cruelty, bloodshed, and barbarism is without parallel in modern history." Over and over he emphasized that he "never wanted Germany to win the war."

In a conversation with this reviewer in April, 1941, Lindbergh predicted a Nazi-Soviet war. If left to fight it out between them, he thought, the two totalitarian powers would exhaust each other. He expected conservative German officers to revolt against Hitler. And he expressed the hope that a long conflict would fragment the Soviet empire, with the Ukrainians, Balts, Tartars, Caucasians and other captive peoples striking out for independence. In his opinion, American intervention would dangerously enhance Soviet power vis-a-vis a disastrously weakened Western Europe.

In the light of what happened subsequently, was Lindbergh so far wrong?

New York, N.Y.

HENRY C. WOLFE

THE COLD WAR BEINGS: SOVIET-AMERICAN CONFLICT OVER EASTERN EUROPE. By Lynn Etheridge Davis. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1974, pp. X, 427.

The slow but gradual erosion of the influence of the United States in Central-Eastern Europe since 1945 is brilliantly described in this academic eulogy of the tragic series of steps undertaken by the U.S. decision-makers, utterly ignorant of or unabashed before Mackinder's classic dictum:

"Who rules East Europe commands the Heartland;
"Who rules the Heartland commands the World Island;
"Who rules the World Island commands the World."

That Soviet Russia does not as yet command the world is due to the recent developments of the atomic bomb and its possible utilization by long-range jet planes; yet Mackinder's prophecy can become reality should the policy of Washington, "peace at any price," persist.

Another aspect of this defeatist policy has been the fatal framework of reasoning that has been unable to comprehend the well-established principle of politics that every military strategy is inseparable from politics, as shown by "the unwillingness of both General Marshall and General Eisenhower to allow political considerations to interfere with military operations" (p. 360).

This fallacious reasoning has had its serious side effect: the idealism expressed in the Atlantic Charter principles in 1941 eluding implementation owing to the ignorance of Washington of the two factors of *Realpolitik* mentioned above.

Dr. Davis, using recently released documents of the State Department details in her competent study how the views of U.S. officials on postwar peace precluded approval of Soviet efforts to establish Kremlin's colonialism in Eastern Europe through the imposition of Communist regimes. She describes how American officials interpreted Soviet actions as intent to expand into Western Europe and how the subsequent undermining of Allied cooperation around the world led to the Cold War.

It is probably to the academic credit of Dr. Davis that she limits herself mostly to the examination of the available official documents, without surveying extensively the more emotionalized available studies of the period by the participants in these tragic developments as shown in her limited bibliography (pp. 403-411), and especially in her very poor citation of only 11 items listed under "Periodicals and Articles" (pp. 411-412).

Nevertheless, the author's evident determination to search out and evoke the dizzying official diverse materials of her subject deserves respect, and what she has presented is quite informative and, in some respects, quite fascinating—and deserves public recognition.

City University of New York (Ret.)

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

THE MYTH OF LIBERATION: EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE IN U.S. DIPLOMACY AND POLITICS SINCE 1941. By Bennett Kovrig. 360 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

With the exception of Victor S. Mamatey's *The United States and East Central Europe, 1914-1918: A Study of Wilsonian Diplomacy and Propaganda* (1957, Princeton, Kennikat, Port Washington, 1972), there have been very few systematic studies of the role played by the United States in the world-shaking decisions shaping the history of Central-Eastern-Balkan Europe since World War I. It is to the credit of Kovrig that he has given us a very expert incursion into this more or less neglected field of history since 1941.

Kovrig's basic conclusion is that the United States, "remaining loyal in principle to the prescriptions of the Atlantic Charter, must look upon East-Central Europe as a living testimony to the limits of its power" (p. 296). The author then proceeds to describe in detail how the near collapse of Washington's policy during that period had eroded, due not so much to its power as to the ignorance of the decision-makers in Washington in exerting its power on the course of geopolitical events and the relationship of that area to America's world strategy. (In this respect, for instance, Kovrig underplays the fatal decision of General Eisenhower, rooted in Washington's miscomprehension of the role that the Soviet Union had promised to play in Central-Eastern Europe and its "good will" toward Stalin. At any rate, the Pilzen incident and General Patton's directive not to liberate Prague is noted only in passing [p. 42] by Kovrig, and his references are certainly very poor).

From that point of view, and other details, the work can be criticized not so much for what it covers as for its failure to explore more deeply such similar incidents, such as that of Pilzen, that appear minor but had a fatal impact on the loss of Washington's ability to influence the power relationships in Danubian Europe and the surrounding area. In this respect, Kovrig's numerous "Notes" (pp. 297-333) and his "Selected Bibliography" (pp. 335-347) could have been strength-

ened by including more references dealing with such happenings. Furthermore, the author has investigated nearly entirely only the diplomatic game as carried on in the respective capitals, but has shown hardly an interest in informing us about the related phenomena affecting Washington's decisions, such as ethnic pressures or such personalities as Louis Adamic (not mentioned at all in the otherwise adequate Index) or Z.K. Brzezinski (also not Indexed) on the White House Mentality.

Nevertheless, Kovrig has displayed eminently his command of a vast body of official primary sources, but less so of secondary sources, and his narrative, in its wider implications, opens up vistas not yet fully scanned. His work is an illuminating prelude to our comprehension of the erosion, if not collapse, of Washington's diplomacy vis-a-vis Central-Eastern-Balkan Europe.

City University of New York (Ret.)

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

SOVIET NAVAL POWER CHALLENGE FOR THE 1970s. By Norman Polmar. [New York: Crane Russak, 1974, rev. ed.], 129 pp. paper.

The Soviet Union today boasts the world's largest and most modern surface navy, largest nuclear propelled submarine fleet, largest ocean research and fishing fleets, and one of the most advanced shipbuilding industries in existence.

This is a unique, authoritative, and fascinating account of how the Soviet naval forces work in unison with the Soviet merchant, fishing, and research fleets to further economic, political and military policies of the USSR.

The author, an editor of *Jane's Fighting Ships* and a leading authority on Soviet naval history, strategy, and technology, also provides an up-to-the-minute analysis of the transition of the USSR from a primarily land power into a dominant sea power since World War II.

The Soviet Union does not have aircraft carriers (although two are apparently under construction) because it realizes it would be futile to attempt to counter where the U.S. Navy is strongest. The Russians have, rather, developed an antiship strike force consisting of surface ships, submarines, and landbased aircraft.

The contention that the Soviet Navy cannot operate effectively at sea because it lacks seabased aircraft has been invalidated to some extent by Soviet acquisition of overseas bases, with Russian-piloted warplanes using airfields in Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Libya, Guinea, and even Cuba. The additional Soviet-built aircraft flown by indigenous pilots in these and other countries, and the potential availability of bases in such places as Mauritius, Yemen, and Sumatra, where the Russians have other active interests, in some instances of a quasi-military nature, are other factors to be taken into consideration.

The ability of Soviet warships to operate at sea without air cover has been enhanced by the development of new radar and surface-to-air missile (SAM) systems. Thus the absence of carriers does not axiomatically imply that the Soviet Navy lacks an oceangoing capability. The USSR is building two ships which will provide an ocean-going STOL (vertical/short-take and landing) capability.

Soviet ships are smaller and generally more heavily armed and faster than ours, thus they probably sacrifice fuel capacity and hence endurance in compari-

son with western counterparts. The Soviet Union, without aircraft carriers or Pacific Ocean experience, has built a fleet for operations of more limited endurance and duration. Moreover, Soviet ability to sustain naval forces out-of-area for long periods has been amply demonstrated, with the warships supported by merchant and naval replenishment ships.

The Soviet designs that sacrifice endurance for striking power fit into what Fleet Admiral Gorshkov has described as the "first salvo" concept: "The old well-known formula—the battle of the 'first salvo'—is taking on a special meaning in naval battle under present-day conditions (conditions including the possible employment of combat means of colossal power). Delay in the employment of weapons in a naval battle or operation inevitably will be fraught with the most serious and even fatal consequences regardless of where the fleet is located, at sea or in port."

The Russians are investing more resources in military and naval research and development than is the West. During the past six years, the USSR has put to sea more classes of submarines and surface warships, radars and missile systems than the West.

In the important category of nuclear-propelled submarines, the U.S. Navy, world pioneer in the field, lost its lead to the Soviet Navy during the winter of 1970-1971, when each superpower had just over 90 such craft at sea. Today the USSR is ahead in numbers of nuclear submarines, and according to SALT 1, the Soviets can build up to 64 such ships, compared to 44 for the U.S.

The Soviet Navy is a newer Navy than the U.S. Only one of the seven cruisers in the active U.S. fleet was built since 1945; only three of about 30 Soviet cruisers are of pre-1950 construction, with the older ships used primarily for training. There are areas where the U.S. Navy does have modern ships, primarily in the categories of destroyer leaders (frigates), slow ocean escort ships, and amphibious ships. But in overall comparison of active fleets, the Soviet Navy is now larger on the surface and underwater, and significantly more modern in certain categories.

LeMyone College

ANTHONY T. BOUSCAREN

MARIE OF ROMANIA: The Intimate Life of a Twentieth Century Queen. By Terence Elsberry. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972, 293 pp. plus Index and Illustrations.

Biographical studies of royalty are either hero worshipfully platitudinous or nastily unfair, the main reason being—probably—the love-hate attitude of the average American reader toward what he considers a progressively extinct race, but which nonetheless fascinates him, as do so many crowned movie stars.

Thus it is a pleasant surprise for those interested in this aspect of history to discover a royal biography which is intelligently critical, beautifully conceived and humanly quite fascinating. The subject is the late Queen Marie of Romania, and the author a young man not quite thirty years of age, hailing from Iowa.

As a matter of fact, it is somewhat astonishing, in view of his Mid-western upbringing, that Terence Elsberry should have been able to write not only with so much knowledge about a distant East European country like Romania, but

also with sensitivity and understanding about such a many-sided personality as its second Queen.

For Marie of Romania was the product of two antagonistic worlds, her father the first Duke of Edinburgh being Queen Victoria's second son, and her mother Czar Alexander II's daughter; hence she was related to most of the emperors and kings of her day, which politically speaking was—to say the least—a certain asset in those palmy days before World War I.

Having married in 1893 Ferdinand of Hohenzollern, the heir to the Romanian throne, she became Queen of her country of adoption in 1914, whereupon she threw herself fervently into Romania's political maelstrom. Until then she had only been known in the courts of Europe as one of the greatest beauties of the incipient 20th century, mother of six stunningly handsome children, a woman of wit, intelligence, imagination, love of life and a certain unconventionality which shocked people on their bad days and delighted them on their good ones.

With the entry of Romania into "the war to end all wars," a quite unexpected new dimension of her personality came suddenly into being: a tireless energy, a stubborn patriotism, a relentless, pushing, almost overwhelming resistance against adversity and tragedy, which confounded her most critical adversaries.

She embodied this resistance during the war when Romania, partially occupied from 1916 to 1918 by the Central Powers, fought for her very existence; she pursued it at the Versailles peace conference in 1919 when she stood up for the rights of her country, which had doubled in size, to become eventually the Greater Romanian Kingdom of almost twenty million people.

"Yes, I believe I am a winner in life!" she proclaimed rashly in the early twenties, when crowned "Queen of all Romanias" and her oldest daughters had become Queens of Greece and Yugoslavia. From this high point of her outwardly brilliant life the author follows her step by step along one political and family drama to another, until her untimely end, dying of a rare disease at the age of sixty-two, lonely but still undaunted.

This absorbing royal and historic record—covering both national and international events from the nineties of the last century to the eve of World War II—is, we repeat, dispassionately analyzed and humorously assembled in a vast tapestry of European greatness and folly, feeling and historical perspective rarely to be found in someone of Mr. Elberry's age, or any age for that matter.

"Life is too short to be narrow." Queen Marie used to quote Disraeli, her Grandmother Queen Victoria's favorite Prime Minister.

Hers, by all human standards has, apparently, been anything but narrow in triumph or in tragedy.

New York, N.Y.

GEORGE I. DUCA

WALL STREET AND THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION. By Anthony C. Sutton.
Arlington House, New Rochelle, New York, 1974, pp. 228.

Academic writers have studiously avoided consideration of the link between "international bankers" and "Bolshevik revolutionaries." With rare exceptions, historical reporting has maintained the fiction of a Wall Street-Bolshevik dichotomy (after all, everyone knows that capitalists and socialists are bitter enemies).

To suggest a duplicity of certain banking gentlemen, in particular the Morgan-Rockefeller complex represented at 120 Broadway and 14 Wall Street, is to court ridicule. Nevertheless, as Sutton demonstrates, some Wall Streeters were leading advocates of the Soviet cause in the backrooms of politics while publicly pretending support for the anti-Bolshevik movement.

Sutton contends that there has been a continuing, albeit concealed, alliance between international political capitalists and international revolutionary socialists. Marxist bias to the contrary notwithstanding, monopoly capitalists are the bitter enemies of laissez-faire entrepreneurs. If an alliance can be made with the socialist powerbrokers, the totalitarian socialist state is the perfect captive for monopoly capitalists.

The extreme "right" and the extreme "left" of the conventional political spectrum are absolutely collectivist. Both the national socialist (fascist) and international socialist (Communist) systems require monopoly control of society, and rest on naked, unfettered political power and coercion of the State over the individual. While monopoly control of industries was once the objective of J.P. Morgan and J.D. Rockefeller, Sutton writes, by the late nineteenth century the inner sanctums of Wall Street understood that the most efficient way to gain an unchallenged monopoly was to "go political" and make society work for the monopolists under the name of the "public good" and the "public interest."

In the late nineteenth century, Morgan, Rockefeller, and Guggenheim had demonstrated their monopolistic proclivities. In *Railroads and Regulation 1877-1916* Gabriel Kolko has demonstrated how the railroad owners, not the farmers, wanted state control of railroads in order to preserve their monopoly and abolish competition. So the simplest explanation of our evidence is that a syndicate of Wall Street financiers enlarged their monopoly ambitions and broadened horizons on a global scale. *The gigantic Russian market was to be converted into a captive market and a technical colony to be exploited by a few high-powered American financiers and the corporations under their control.* What the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission under the thumb of American industry could achieve for that industry at home, a planned socialist government could achieve for it abroad—given suitable support and inducements from Wall Street and Washington, D.C.

Sutton contends blankly that "the Bolshevik Revolution was an alliance of statists: statist revolutionaries and statist financiers aligned against the genuine revolutionary libertarian elements in Russia. It is not that the financiers were ideologically motivated, but that they were *power* motivated, and were ready to lend assistance to any group that was in opposition to a truly free individualistic society." This cabal of bankers was neither Bolshevik, Communist, socialist, or even American. Their overriding goal was captive international markets. "In 1917, it had a single-minded objective — a captive market in Russia, all presented under, and intellectually protected by, the shelter of a league to enforce peace."

Sutton feels that where the United States could have exerted its dominant influence to bring about a free Russia, it marched to the objectives of a few powerful Wall Street financiers who, for their own purposes, could accept a centralized Czarist Russia or centralized Marxist Russia, but not a decentralized

Russia. He demonstrates the mutual partnership between international monopoly capitalism and international revolutionary socialism.

Specific topics include Wall Street support for and financing of Trotsky, Lenin and German assistance for the Bolshevik Revolution, American bankers and Czarist loans, the International Red Cross and the Revolution, corporate allies for the Soviets in the U.S. and Europe, the role of the Federal Reserve, Soviet gold and American banks, the struggle for Russian business in America and Germany, and the goal of commercial exploitation of Russia.

Wall Street did achieve its goal. The Rockefeller empire was responsible for selling the Soviet regime to the gullible American public in the late 1920s. In the 1930s foreign firms, mostly of the Morgan-Rockefeller group, built the five year plans. American firms controlled by this syndicate built the Soviet Union, and have continued to build Russia economically and militarily (see Sutton's *National Suicide: Military Aid to the Soviet Union*, 1973, for documentation of Western military and economic nurture).

What was doubtless a profitable policy for the Wall Street Syndicate stoked a nightmare for millions outside the elitest power circle and the ruling class. The final human cost of this unholy alliance of like types under different sandwich boards has fallen upon the shouders of the individual Russian and the individual American. Entrepreneurship, Sutton writes, has been brought into disrepute and the world has been propelled toward inefficient socialist planning as a result of these monopoly maneuverings in the world of politics and revolution."

Mississippi College

TOMMY W. ROGERS

PERTINENT DOCUMENTS

I. 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 'ASSOCIATION FOR THE LIBERATION OF UKRAINE' AND 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRIAL OF ITS LEADERS

December, 1974

Following the armed defeat of the Ukrainian National Republic (UNR) by imperialist Red Russia in 1921, the Kremlin introduced in Ukraine a Russian Communist reign of terror, the so-called "War Communism," directed against the Ukrainian patriotic forces, which under various forms continued the resistance against the enemy. Yet, with some economic improvement during the "New Economic Policy" (NEP) period in the USSR, an illusion was created in the minds of some Ukrainians that Ukraine could exist as a national state—the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic—and as a member of the USSR.

The local authority at that time in Ukraine in great measure was in the hands of anti-national elements, Ukrainian Communists and their puppets, who endeavored to create the impression that the UkrSSR was a "sovereign state" of Ukrainian peasants and workers.

It was absolutely imperative to have exceptional political perception to foresee the future development of events in the UkrSSR, as well as to demonstrate superhuman patriotism and heroism and, above all, to "love Ukraine in a dire time" more than one own's life, in order to establish under existing conditions an underground center to direct the struggle for an Independent and Sovereign Ukrainian State.

This task fell upon a great man, "an intrepid knight," as he was characterized by the late Prof. Alexander Shulhyn, and a "conscience of Ukraine," as he was called by the Ukrainian people. He was *Serhiy Yefremov*.

In December, 1924, Academician S. Yefremov, along with Academicians A. Krymsky and K. Vobly, and Professors O. Hermaize, V. Vynohradov, V. Durdukovsky, O. Hrebenetsky and others, established an illegal organization in Ukraine, the "Association for the Liberation of Ukraine" (*Spilka Vyzvolennia Ukrainy*—SVU), which replaced another illegal organization, the "Brotherhood of Ukrainian Statehood" (BUD), and which was also headed by Academician S. Yefremov.

The Association for the Liberation of Ukraine rejected any and all compromises with the Russian Communist occupiers. It was an all-Ukrainian underground movement, which endeavored to penetrate all sectors of Ukrainian life under the Soviet regime and direct it toward the development of national interests of the Ukrainian nation. That task at the time was not so difficult, inasmuch as the Ukrainian Communists had not as yet developed their own

cadres, and all important posts and positions in Ukrainian social and community life were occupied basically by the non-Communist Ukrainian intelligentsia.

Thus, the SVU challenged the Marxist "class struggle" with the all-national Ukrainian concept:

"The State is Above Parties—the Nation is Above Classes!"

Under conditions of colonial subjugation of the UkrSSR by Russia, the Association for the Liberation of Ukraine continued the 1917-20 liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people in adapting itself to the Soviet circumstances.

Through the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (VUAN), whose vice-president was Acad. S. Yefremov, the SVU kept in its hands the direction of the national education of the Ukrainian people, especially the youth.

One of the leaders of SVU, Prof. V. Durdukivsky, as Director of the Scientific-Pedagogical Commission of the VUAN in Kiev, succeeded in expanding educational activities in such a way that it, and not Mykola Skrypnyk and his "People's Commissariat of Education" of the UkrSSR, was actually the ministry of education in Ukraine.

The Association for the Liberation of Ukraine had its members in leading posts of such state publishing houses of the UkrSSR, as "Slovo," "Knyhospilka," "Syalvo" and "Rukh."

The gigantic underground work embraced the youth in the lower schools and students in intermediate and higher institutions of learning throughout Ukraine, and was conducted by the Ukrainian Youth Association (SUM) (headed by student Mykola Pavlushkov), a component member of the SVU. The same work went on in scientific institutions, in literature and the arts; in the armed forces, industry and in agricultural organizations, especially in the cooperatives. Literally speaking, Ukrainian national, non-Communist activities encompassed all sectors of Ukrainian life in the USSR.

Moreover, the SVU, through Prof. Volodymyr Chekhivsky, was closely allied with the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church, headed by Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky. The Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church exercised great influence upon the masses of the Ukrainian people, imbuing them with a religious and national-patriotic spirit.

It is quite understandable that the national and cultural renaissance of the Ukrainian people was a thorn in the side of Communist Russia and the Ukrainian Communists. But inasmuch as the "Ukrainization" of Ukraine, which actually began in the times of the Ukrainian National Republic, continued unabated, the Communists attempted to harness it and utilize it for the purpose of "building Communism," especially among the Ukrainian peasantry, which at that time constituted 75 percent of the Ukrainian population in the UkrSSR.

This problem was emphasized in "The Theses of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bolsheviks of Ukraine on the Results of Ukrainianization" (the June, 1926 Plenum) as follows:

"Our party in Ukraine is dependent on the working class, the majority of which speaks the Russian language. Likewise, the majority of our old Bolshevik cadres is of Russian origin. The party should pursue the Ukrainianization so as not to be separated from the working class (i.e., *Ukrainian*—italics ours) and thus prevent the alienation of the working class from the peasantry. The delayed tempo of Ukrainianization could lead to alienation from the peasantry..."

[*Working Book from Ukrainian Literature, Kharkiv, 1930, p. 618*]

In his address at the XIth Congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPbU), Stanislav Kossior, the general secretary, stated:

"We must admit that in the last few years we have undoubtedly seen the growth of Ukrainian nationalism.... The cause of this growth is the lack of our cadres of specialists--economists, scientific workers, and so forth. But as we know, the Ukrainian bourgeois intelligentsia has a strong hold in all the apparatus and scientific institutions..."

[*Working Book from Ukrainian Literature, Kharkiv, 1930, p. 648*]

The uncovering of the SVU and SUM began in the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Already in the spring of 1929 the Soviet secret police began mass arrests of the Ukrainian intelligentsia throughout the whole of Ukraine. During the entire year of 1929 intensive investigations were conducted of SVU and SUM members. Finally, a trial of 45 leading SVU and SUM members was held from March 9 to April 19, 1930 before the Supreme Court of the UkrSSR in Kharkiv. All the defendants were accused of planning to destroy the "Soviet authority" and to sell out the Ukrainian people to "landowners and capitalists" and to bring Ukraine under the domination of Poland.

The trial was held in the great hall of the State Opera in Kharkiv to which some people were admitted as evidence that the trial was "open."

The trial ended on April 17, 1930, but the verdict was announced two days later, on April 19. Of the 45 defendants, twelve, including Academician S. Yefremov, were condemned to death, while the rest received severe terms of imprisonment. Eventually the death sentences of the twelve SVU leaders were commuted to 8-10 years imprisonment as a proof of Soviet "leniency." Actually, all 45 leaders, with the exception of one, perished in Soviet jails.

But only 45 leading members were put on a "show trial," while thousands of other SVU and SUM members throughout Ukraine were executed without trial or investigation.

After the trial, Mykola Skrypnyk, then the Commissar of Education of the UkrSSR, and former *chekist* and Commissar of Justice, who personally conducted the inquiries and investigations, wrote on the subject:

"Relying on the influence of Yefremov as vice-president of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, the 'SVU' was holding in its hands a series of scientific institutions of the VUAN, such as the Scientific-Pedagogical Commission, the Institute of Scientific Language, the All-National Library, the Medical Society, and others. The 'SVU' organized at the same time a number of group-branches in several cities of Ukraine: Odessa, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Poltava, Chernykhiv and Vynnytsia, embracing for the most part the old Ukrainian bourgeois intelligentsia..."

"The 'SVU' had in its ranks a significant number of professors and lecturers of various VYSH-es (institutions of higher learning--explanation ours) in Kiev and other cities, pursuing stubborn yet surreptitious educational work among students for counterrevolutionary cadres.

"The young counterrevolutionary forces were united in a supplementary organization of 'SUM' (Ukrainian Youth Association), whose members were scheduled to become mass agitators of 'SVU' among students and the *kukul* peasantry. Parallel to that, the 'SUM' was also destined to serve as combat

groups of the counterrevolutionary organization. The 'SUM,' upon the instructions of Yefremov and others, planned and prepared terroristic attacks on a number of Communist workers..."

[*M. Skrypnyk*, Vol. 1, p. 413, 1930, Kharkiv,
Ukrainian Institute of Marxism-Leninism]

Mykola Skrypnyk, as People's Commissar of Education of the UkrSSR, and Panas Lubchenko, as a "community leader," upon orders from Moscow, in exploiting the trial of the SVU and SUM members, destroyed almost all the Ukrainian national intellectual elite. From 1929 to 1933, 200 Ukrainian writers alone were executed.

After the trial, on orders from Stalin, S. Yefremov was brought to Moscow. There, in the presence of S. Kossior, secretary general of the Central Committee of the CPbU, and Lazar Kaganovich, one of the hangmen of the Ukrainian people, Stalin proposed that S. Yefremov write a statement repudiating all activities of the SVU in exchange for "freedom" and "scholarly work" in Moscow. Prof. Yefremov rejected Stalin's proposal, and like all other leading members of the SVU, perished in a Soviet dungeon.

[*Collection of SVU-SUM*, No. 2, p. 70, 1964]

Subsequently, the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church was destroyed, and Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky and 32 archbishops and bishops were liquidated, while thousands of the faithful were sent to concentration camps.

In the so-called *Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia*, Vol. 11, pp. 577-578, in the column titled, "Trial of SVU," the concluding sentence reads:

"The open trial in the case of the SVU had a great political significance. It revealed the inimical designs of the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists to sell out the Ukrainian people into capitalist slavery and to transform Ukraine into an illegal colony of imperialistic vultures..."

Needless to say, at the trial of the SVU and SUM members forty-five years ago no crimes imputed to these Ukrainian patriots were proved. It is possible that the editors of the *Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia* wrote the above statement in describing the present-day status of the Ukrainian people in the so-called "sovereign" Ukrainian SSR, where Ukrainians are subjected to Russian Communist slavery, and the UkrSSR is a veritable colony of Communist Russia.

For centuries the Russian colonialists have been trying to destroy the Ukrainian national liberation movement, but to no avail. The same brutal persecution and oppression of the Ukrainian people is being carried on today by the Russian Communists. They, too, will fail.

The aspirations of the Ukrainian people for the attainment of their independent and sovereign state continue and will continue unabated until the Ukrainian nation achieves full victory—the establishment of a free and independent state of the Ukrainian people.

*EXECUTIVE BOARD
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA*

**II. TELEGRAM TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL
OF CHURCHES OF THE U.S.**

National Council of Churches
New York, N.Y.

February 18, 1975

On behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, representing over two million Americans of Ukrainian descent, we express our indignation at your sponsorship of the 20-man delegation of "Soviet churchmen," who will tour the nation and propagate alleged "freedom of religion" in the USSR. All the peoples of the USSR are oppressed and persecuted by the Kremlin in all phases of their lives, including religious beliefs.

The church leaders you are hosting in this country of freedom do not represent the true churches of their respective peoples, but are handpicked puppets and collaborators of the atheistic Kremlin regime.

They and their predecessors did not raise a word of protest, when in 1937 the Soviet regime ruthlessly destroyed the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church and arrested Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky, three other Ukrainian Orthodox metropolitans, 30 archbishops and bishops, and hundreds of thousands of the faithful. Likewise, they did not utter a word of protest when in 1945-46 the Kremlin "liquidated" the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine by arresting the entire hierarchy and hundreds of priests and forced over five million Ukrainian Catholics under Russian Orthodoxy, against their will and desire. Of the eleven Ukrainian archbishops and bishops, only one survived. He is Joseph Cardinal Slipyj, who was released in 1963 upon direct intervention of the late President John F. Kennedy.

The late Patriarch Alexei of Moscow was not only a close ally of Stalin, but he openly instigated the destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. His successor, Patriarch Pimen, only a year ago, called for the subversion and destruction of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Ukrainian Catholic Churches outside Ukraine.

None of your guests, especially the representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church, protest current large-scale arrests and convictions of Russian Orthodox leaders, such as Anatoly Levitin-Krasnov and mathematician Boris Talantov, who died a martyr's death in a Soviet jail; the conviction to ten years at hard labor of the Lithuanian Catholic Bishop J. Stepanavicius; the Ukrainian Catholic priest Vasyl Romaniuk and the Ukrainian Baptist leader George Vins, who was condemned on January 31, 1975 to ten years at hard labor and exile for "unauthorized religious activities."

Furthermore, among your guests is also Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Halych and an "Exarch of Ukraine," who does not represent the Ukrainian Orthodox population, but is an appointee of the Moscow Patriarchate and who tolerates Soviet Russian oppression and persecution of the Ukrainian people, especially the arrests and trials of some 600 Ukrainian intellectuals in the last three years.

In sponsoring these spurious Soviet "church leaders," the National Council of Churches indirectly upholds the Communist persecution of religion in the USSR, because it cooperates with handpicked Communist appointees rather than supporting the common people in all the countries of the world.

The National Council of Churches of the United States has failed in its understanding and perception of the true religious situation in the Soviet Union by hosting these Communist-approved "church leaders" in this country.

**EXECUTIVE BOARD
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA**

**III. SOVIET REVISIONIST POLICY STUBBORNLY RESISTED
IN UKRAINE**

(Official "Hsinhua" Release, October 15, 1974, Peking)

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique, taking over the mantle of the old Czars, has carried out the Great Russian chauvinistic policy of national discrimination and oppression against the Ukrainian people. This has aroused their ever-growing discontent and tenacious resistance.

The Ukrainian nationality with over 40 million people or one-sixth of the entire Soviet population is the biggest among the non-Russian nationalities in the Soviet Union today. The Bolshevik Party, led by V.I. Lenin, formulated a series of correct nationality policies, and adopted quite a number of measures favorable to the development of the Ukrainian nationality. But after usurping the state power, the Khrushchev-Brezhnev renegade clique has completely betrayed the nationality policy of Lenin and turned the Soviet Union into "a prison of nations" of the Czarist Russian type.

The Czarist Russian ruling clique had declared: "As long as a people preserves its faith, language, customs and laws it cannot be considered subdued." Therefore, the alien peoples must be integrated "with the conquerors," it has said. Brezhnev and his like act exactly on the principle of the old Czars in Ukraine. They have taken all possible measures to strengthen forcible assimilation of the Ukrainian people.

The Brezhnev clique openly declared that the Russian nation naturally deserves the "genuine respect of various nationalities" of the Soviet Union; the non-Russian nationalities "are faithful sons of great Russia," the Ukrainian nationality is merely "under the leadership of the great Russian nation" either in the Czarist Russian period or at present. Anyone in Ukraine who dares to show discontent about such conspicuous manifestation of great Russian chauvinism will be tagged with the labels of "national arrogance," "haughty," etc.

It was revealed that the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has kept "undermining Ukrainian culture materially and spiritually" in order to accelerate the elimination of the national characteristics of the Ukrainian nationality. The new Czars have been enforcing the popularization of Russian in Ukraine to replace the local language. "The Ukrainian language is virtually banished from the inner spheres of life."

During the period under Khrushchev-Brezhnev rule, books and periodicals in the Ukrainian language published in the Ukrainian Republic had dropped consistently in number, with a reduction of one-fifth for books and one-third for periodicals from 1960 to 1970. Art troupes in Ukraine "are by no means propagators of Ukrainian art."

In one of his reports Brezhnev had the effrontery to describe the forcible assimilation of non-Russian nationalities and the elimination of their culture and national characteristics as "internationalization of the whole life."

Proceeding from great-Russian chauvinism, the Brezhnev clique does not permit the establishment of a comprehensive economic system in Ukraine but attempts at "regional division of labor" and "specialization," which actually means the practice of lopsided colonialist economy. The Soviet revisionists have brazenly stipulated that Ukraine should remain "the most important base for coal and metallurgical industries and the main sugar beet producer for the whole of the USSR" formed historically (i.e. in the period of Czarist Russia). Many economic departments are unable to develop as a result of the pursuance of this policy. Referring to the fact that there has been little progress in all industrial departments in Western Ukraine except mineral extraction, members of the Lvov [Lviv] Council of National Economy pointed out:

"The industry of that region resembles a monster with elephantine feet, a stunted body and a microcephalic head."

The Ukrainian Party Central Committee confessed at its plenary meeting last September that the speed of development of animal husbandry in many farms had been "intolerably slow." In Ukraine, those who refuse to accept readily the colonized economy and exploitation by the new Czars are accused of striving for "self-sufficiency in economy" and of "stirring up national limitations," etc.

Where there is oppression, there is resistance. The great-Russian chauvinistic policy of national oppression followed by the Brezhnev clique in Ukraine has aroused strong discontent and mounting resistance among the Ukrainian people.

In an open letter to the Soviet paper *Pravda*, two Ukrainian miners asked the Soviet revisionist authorities did they think that "the time for the final Russification of the Ukrainians has come" and that "the Ukrainian language should develop or disappear?" In a letter to the Soviet Central Television Station, two Kiev viewers angrily pointed out: "There is virtually no national language" in Ukraine. In a joint letter to the Soviet authorities, 17 Ukrainian women pointed out that the policy pursued by the present Soviet leaders "is anti-constitutional, anti-Leninist, anti-Party and anti-Soviet" and that "it differs in no respect from the policy of powers which formerly occupied Ukraine." They also declared that the education method pushed by the Soviet leadership in Ukraine was "great-Russian chauvinist and reactionary."

An underground organization in Ukraine said in a leaflet in 1972 that Brezhnev and his gang had already become "social-imperialists." The leaflet said that the non-Russian republics in the Soviet Union "had practically been reduced to administrative areas of the new Russian empire and controlled as colonies by the Moscow rulers."

In recent years, the Ukrainian people's resistance has been growing steadily. As far back as in 1966, mass demonstrations broke out in Kiev, capital of Ukraine, Odessa, Ivano-Frankivsk and other cities in protest against the policy of great-Russian chauvinism. In November, 1967, several thousand workers in the Khar-kov [Kharkiv] Tractor Plant went on strike. 600 workers in the Kiev Hydro-Electronic Power Station sent a letter in May, 1969 to the authorities in protest against poor living conditions. Another strike was staged by workers of the Kerch Shipyard in 1970. In September 1972, a large-scale workers' strike flared up in Dnipropetrovsk in protest against national oppression. In the same year, large groups of people rose in resistance in Dniproderzhinsk. They smashed the

offices of the regional Party and government organs and the "KGB" buildings there.

In recent years, underground resistance organizations have appeared one after another in Ukraine. They published printed matters, distributed pamphlets and organized mass struggles.

The development of the Ukrainian people's struggle has thrown the Soviet revisionist ruling clique into panic. In the past few years, the Brezhnev clique repeatedly blamed Party and government leaders in Ukraine for "failing to discharge their duties" and "lack of aggressiveness" in "overcoming the remnants of nationalism" and so on and so forth. In May, 1972, the Soviet revisionist leadership relieved Peter Efimovich Shelest of his post of First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party. In addition, a large group of other highranking officials in Ukraine were removed. Meanwhile, the Brezhnev clique stepped up its suppression of the Ukrainian people. It was revealed that large groups of people in Ukraine were searched, arrested and tried behind closed doors. *Pravda of Ukraine* admitted that a total of 7,000 students were expelled in one year from various institutes of higher learning in Ukraine for "ideological reasons."

The great revolutionary teacher Lenin pointed out: "*Force will not check the Ukrainians. It will only embitter them.*" By intensifying the suppression and persecution of the Ukrainian people, the Soviet revisionists can only make the Ukrainian people see still more clearly the true features of Brezhnev and his gang as the new Czars and arouse still stronger discontent and resistance.

UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PERIODICALS

"UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY," an observance statement by Representative Daniel J. Flood. *Congressional Record*, Washington, D.C., January 23, 1975.

On January 23, under the co-leadership of Representatives Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania and Edward J. Derwinski of Illinois the annual event of Ukrainian Independence Day was observed in the U.S. House of Representatives. This was the 57th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, which was achieved and declared on January 22, 1918.

In his address Congressman Flood raises the question, "Why is this annual event so basically important from our American viewpoint and security interest?" After describing the Russian conquest of Ukraine, the legislator stresses the importance of Ukraine as the largest captive non-Russian nation not only in the USSR but also in Eastern Europe generally. He answers the question in these words, "The colonialist base of Moscow's empire is one of the most critical to Moscow's global objectives and doubtlessly deserves our utmost, concentrated attention.

Joining the Congressmen were over a dozen other prominent legislators, each emphasizing different aspects of the Russian domination over Ukraine. The full text of the letter sent by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, to Congress followed Flood's address. Also, other material dealing with the continued imprisonment of Moroz, the crimes of Kosygin and other subjects was included, too.

"JAILED USSR WRITER DYING," a commentary. *American Penewsletter*, American P.E.N. Publications, New York, December 18, 1974.

This impressive commentary dwells at length on the condition of Valentyn Moroz. The publication circulates internationally. As the commentary states at the outset, "The gravely deteriorating physical condition of Valentyn Moroz, the Ukrainian intellectual and writer imprisoned by the USSR, has led to renewed efforts to obtain his release." The P.E.N. American Center has sent appeals to USSR General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev.

Mr. Jerzy Kosinski, president of the publication, personally appealed to President Ford on behalf of Moroz. He declared, "Do not allow the death of Valentyn Moroz to cast one more ominous shadow on the relations between our two countries and the very purpose of your trip to Vladivostok." Senator Jackson's appeal and those of others are quoted in the piece.

The heavy mass of mail received at the White House in November set the stage for important intercessions that led to the discussion of the Moroz case in Vladivostok. Soon thereafter Moroz ended his long fast. He was promised release from solitary confinement.

“‘I FOUGHT NAZIS.’ SAYS FIGURE IN PROBE,” an article by Carolyn Weiner.
The Herald Statesman, Yonkers, New York, June 12, 1974.

Similar to a period after World War II, certain influences are at work to incriminate individuals for alleged collaboration with the Nazis in a variety of atrocities. It is noteworthy that this collaboration charge has consistently been advanced by Moscow and other communist capitals, and in the two climates of detente legitimate means and agents have been engaged in legally considering the charge. The most recent episode involves individuals who were thoroughly cleared upon their arrival and are now unjustly being placed under public suspicion.

One such individual is Lev Futala, a member of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. As detailed in this article, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, a division of the Justice Department, listed him as one of 37 persons under investigation as an alleged Nazi war criminal. Actually he fought the Nazis, and is now compelled to fight against a host of public maligners. One source has claimed him to have been a “commander of the Ukrainian Fascist Army.” No such army ever existed. The fact is that the Immigration Service should never have released the list. Yes, conduct the investigation, and based on their results then release the established facts and also for public record the names of both the accused and the accusers.

The suggested course is the proper one, and not the one being pursued. Citizens should not be subjected to public suspicion for the sake of certain publicity-seekers. As the writer shows, months had passed following the release, but Futala hadn’t even been informed of any investigation. Those who know of his heroic anti-Nazi record are certain about his complete innocence in the matter.

What should be noted in this case is the fact that the Immigration and Naturalization Service actually has taken Futala’s name off the list that had received such shameful publicity. In a letter dated November 18, 1974, Commissioner L.F. Chapman, Jr. admits that no substantive evidence exists to support the slanderous charges and explicitly states, “Based upon the foregoing, Mr. Futala’s name has been removed from the active list of alleged Nazi Criminals residing in the United States and the investigation relating thereto inactivated.” Fine, but what of all the costs of anguish, torment and public slander that this victim and others have had to suffer in this time?

“DECOLONIALISM AMOK?,” an article by C. L. Sulzberger. *The New York Times*, New York, January 22, 1975.

While Americans were celebrating the January 22nd event of Ukrainian independence, very appropriately this renowned foreign affairs columnist produced a penetrating article on colonialism within the USSR. The piece deserves to be

read and re-read because of its powerfully expressed views. He starts by pointing out that, contrary to widely-held opinions, the strongest political force in this century is not Communist ideology and the revolutions it has precipitated nor is it the implications of nuclear weapons or the strategic value of raw materials found by the developing nations.

In highly explicit terms he states, "The strongest political force is the spread of decolonialism, not only in the traditional overseas empires like Britain's, France's and Portugal's but also in land-bound agglomerations of which the outstanding example is the Soviet Union and its bloc of East European neighbors." The writer is to be commended for this emphasis.

The well-written piece covers the power of freedom and liberty and treats of cases in Africa and elsewhere. The possible combination of the U.S., China and Japan is cited as a source of worry to Kremlin. "But," as he puts it, "a great chunk of Moscow's western and Slavic domain also privately worries the Kremlin. That is the Ukraine."

He goes further to observe, "The Russians calculate that because of the plain facts of power, they will never have to be concerned about unrestrained nationalism in little Baltic lands—Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania. But the Ukraine is something else." The author cites its large population, thriving agriculture and industry. He points out, too, that despite the Kremlin's many overtures, the persistence of Ukrainian nationalism is a source of embarrassment to it.

"UKRAINIAN CONGRESS ASSAILED VISIT BY SOVIET CHURCHMEN IN AMERICA," a release. Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, February 18, 1975.

The sponsorship by the National Council of Churches of the United States of a 20-man delegation of "Soviet churchmen" is brought under severe, factual criticism in this release. Representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church, the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Church, the Armenian Apostolic Church and others constitute the delegation. As the release states, "the church leaders you are hosting in this country of freedom do not represent the true churches of their respective peoples, but are handpicked puppets and collaborators of the atheistic Kremlin regime."

Incorporating the full text of the telegram sent to the National Council, the release recounts the destruction of both the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches in Ukraine, and stresses that these so-called church leaders and their predecessors have failed to raise a word of protest. During their visit here they had the temerity of publicly stating that freedom of religion exists in the Soviet Union.

"CARDINAL VIRTUES, TEMPORAL VICES, a review by Roman Rakhmanny. *The Montreal Star*, Montreal, Canada, January 11, 1975.

An extensive and detailed review is presented here of the *Memories of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty*. The writer, who is a prolific Canadian journalist and keen analyst of Soviet affairs, rightly extols the courage and towering stature

of the Hungarian prelate. For the Cardinal stood up for his ideals and compassion not only to the despotic Hungarian regime but also to a vacillating Vatican. These points receive special emphasis in the review.

The Cardinal is aptly quoted on the dependency of the Russian Orthodox Church upon the Kremlin and "how the Soviet Union had used all the old methods of religious persecution to subjugate the Greek Rite Catholic Church in the western Ukraine." These guided him in the posture and position he had to take toward the Red Budapest persecutors. The writer recounts the personal price the Cardinal had to pay in the way of arrests, drugging, flailing and so forth.

What is significant is the disclosure of the Vatican's opposition to the publication of this work. It found the memoirs of a Catholic hero "truly valuable, fascinating, overwhelming" but, for political reasons, not publishable. As the writer ends, Mindszenty performed many services, including the "great service to all human beings who find themselves in the path of the great leveller—the institutional bulldozer."

"NOTES ON PEOPLE," a column of commentary. *The New York Times*, New York, January 31, 1975.

Note is taken here of the arrival and quick departure of Aleksandr N. Shelepin, now the head of the Soviet Federation of Trade Unions, during his recent visit to West Germany. He was supposed to have visited with Heinz Oskar Vetter of the West German labor organization. Instead, it was abruptly cut short by a wave of criticism by those who remembered his hand in the murder of two Ukrainian leaders at the end of the 50's.

Reference is made here to the murders of Rebet and Bandera. At the time Shelepin was head of the Soviet KGB. Enough was disclosed at the trial in West Germany about Shelepin's engineering of the two murders. Many Germans demonstrated that they have long and vivid memories by this protest.

"SOVIET UNION: A MELTING POT THAT SIMMERS," an article by John Dornberg. *Washington Star-News*, Washington, D.C., January 8, 1975.

With the usual confusion of terms, such as the USSR being a "nation," the writer nevertheless produces a very stimulating article concerning the non-Russian nations and peoples in that empire-state. The piece covers the broad spectrum from the Baltic states to Central Asia. The writer tends to agree with some observers who forecast "a nationalist explosion in the USSR."

Andrei Amalrik's book, "Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?" is emphasized as the writer observes that Jews, Volga Germans and Meskhetians seek to emigrate, while Ukrainians and Lithuanians are jailed for demanding more cultural and economic autonomy, and Armenians are being tried for secessionist activities.

This exceptionally well-written and fairly accurate piece ends quoting a Moscow journalist. The quote is a choice one. "This is the biggest problem we have to face," he said, referring to the multinational make-up of the USSR.

"But," he continues, "the party and government do nothing except paint a picture of harmony. How do you solve a problem if you cannot even admit it exists?"

"SOVIET NATIONALITIES RESTIVE," an article by John Dornberg. *Washington Star-News*, Washington, D.C., January 7, 1975.

Actually this article preceded the above one, but it was placed second here to follow the above concluding question. The writer points out that within "recent months there have been signs of even more unrest and growing resistance to Soviet nationalities policy in some of the principal republics and among a number of the key minority groups." He, here too, stresses the Ukrainian and Lithuanian opposition to "Great Russian" chauvinism and russification and their demands for greater freedom within the Soviet Union.

Ukraine is depicted as the second-largest of the Soviet republics. It is also described as "potentially the most viable as an independent nation." The author shows that hundreds of prominent intellectuals have overtly participated in the demand for greater cultural autonomy. Also, as the writer states, "Moroz is only one of scores of Ukrainian intellectuals arrested and imprisoned in the past two years." The writer made a veritable contribution with his two articles.

"VALENTYN MOROZ," an editorial. *Jewish Chronicle-Review*, Montreal, Canada, December 1974.

Against the background of Ukrainian-Jewish relations, which is alluded to here, this editorial is truly remarkable for its objectivity and passion. Centering its attention on Moroz, it states that the Ukrainian intellectual's "great sin is that of having promoted the idea of Ukrainian peoplehood." It describes how he has been harassed and incarcerated for it.

The sins of Ukraine's fathers against the Jews are mentioned. There may be some difference of interpretation since some Ukrainians in Hitler's SS were far offset by Ukrainians who protected the Jews from the Nazis. But, aside from this, the editorial makes the point that "We Jews do not believe in the transmission of sinfulness to the sons," and comes out fully and forcefully in protest against Moroz's treatment. As it says, "For the sake of justice, truth and religion we must support his right to be free."

"REMEMBER THE UKRAINE," a report. *Philadelphia Daily News*, Philadelphia, Pa., January 22, 1975.

The observance of Ukrainian Independence Day in the city of Philadelphia is mentioned in this report. Mayor Rizzo proclaimed the Day for the citizens of the city of brotherly love. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America branch participated in the event, which was observed in other cities across the nation as well.

In accepting the proclamation, Dr. Ivan Skalchuk, chairman of the branch, declared in an urging that "all residents of the city to be mindful of the democratic standards of living that we possess with the hope and prayer that freedom and independence will be restored to the Ukraine." From Congress to the States and cities this message was similarly conveyed.

"V.V. SHCHERBITSKY'S ARTICLE AND ITS MEANING," an analysis by Boris Lewytskyj. *Radio Liberty Dispatch*, New York, February 7, 1975.

An excellent analysis is furnished here of a much publicized article written by the First Secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Mr. Shcherbitsky. The article appears to advance the usual Soviet nationalities policy for the solution of the problem of the multinational state, but, as the writer amply shows, it strongly suggests the existence of "grave difficulties" in the area.

The article, titled "The International Implication of the Experiences of National Relations Within the USSR," appeared in the journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism*. The writer quotes sections dealing with questions of economics and the continual emphasis on the theme of mutual help among the Soviet people" to indicate the problems that rest below the surface and to which the First Secretary is really addressing himself.

"UKRAINIANS CELEBRATE INDEPENDENCE DAY," a report. *Daily Times*, Delaware County, Pennsylvania, January 22, 1975.

Among the numerous reports on the Ukrainian Independence Day celebrations across the nation, this serves as a further example. With photo and all, the event is displayed on the first page of this paper. The caption reads as given above.

The principal speaker at the festivities on the steps of Chester City Hall was William Pastuszek. A proclamation was issued. The president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee branch in Delaware County, John Fedak, led the festivities. Debra Hawrylak, age ten, is shown with flowers and donned in a colorful Ukrainian costume. The general impression conveyed to the community at large cannot but prove salutary and contributory in the area of American understanding of the problems of Ukraine in the Soviet Union.

"THE ORDEAL OF VALENTYN MOROZ," an article by Andrew Michniak. *AFL-CIO Free Trade Union News*, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C., December, 1974.

This important periodical of the department of international affairs in the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations carries this well-written article on Moroz. The author is a versatile student who directs the Committee for the Defense of Valentyn Moroz in Washington, D.C. On numerous occasions, through UCCA efforts, the President of the AFL-CIO, George

Meany, has spoken out on issues of the captive nations, Moroz and other subjects.

Much of the article's contents consists of essentials surrounding his background and imprisonment. The writer cogently states, "For Moroz had become a symbol of the growing Ukrainian self-preservation movement and also for the human rights movement throughout the USSR." The role of Andrei Sakharov in the Moroz case is adequately described.

"PRISONER IN SOVIET IS SAID TO END FAST," a report. *The New York Times*, New York, December 11, 1974.

According to this report, Moroz informed his wife, Raisa, that he ended his 20-week hunger strike. The decision was predicated on the Soviet promise to improve his prison conditions. The various pleas made last November, prior to the President's trip to Vladivostok, were not without humanitarian effect.

"IDEOLOGICAL TRENDS AND PORTENTS: A REVIEW OF SOME RECENT DEVELOPMENTS," an article by Terry McNeill. *Radio Liberty Dispatch*, New York, October 4, 1974.

In what is a very careful and detailed analysis, this writer depicts the chief drives of Moscow "against political dissidence and nonconformist behavior." The stimulus for these drives was provided by the last Party Congress. The analysis is well documented throughout.

As the writer stresses, "after more than a year of intensive counterblows against ideological deviation, it would seem that all is still not right in the Ukrainian body politic." Over and over again, among the various targets mounted, that of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism and international Zionism is raised. In Georgia, too, tolerated abuses have been cited, causing Moscow to suspect that the party secretary, Mzhavanadze, had a soft spot for Georgian nationalists. He was removed along with his closest associates.

"COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SCHOLARS ON BEHALF OF VALENTYN MOROZ," an advertisement. *Columbia Spectator*, New York, December 6, 1974.

Well over forty prominent scholars at Columbia University lent their names in behalf of Moroz and his release from prison. Names such as J. Barzun, Z. Brzezinski, C.M. Wilbur and others grace the impressive list. The ad was sponsored by Columbia Students Concerned for Valentyn Moroz.

The form that makes up the appeal is an open letter to the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. In the name of humanity and human rights the signers call upon the presidium "to act swiftly and judiciously to reconsider the case of Valentyn Moroz and thereby adhere to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of which your government is a signatory."

"GOAL-MINDED UKRAINIANS AIM HIGH," two articles by Clarke Thomas. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, Pittsburgh, Pa., January 23, 1974.

As a wide-ranging rendition on Ukrainian Americans in the Pittsburgh area, the two articles published in the *Gazette* are most timely and absorbing. It is quite evident that the writer did his homework well. The coverage encompasses Shevchenko, the first Ukrainian immigrant to Pittsburgh, Ukrainian eggs, choirs, Cardinal Slipyj and a variety of other interesting topics.

The writer's style and punchy sentences may be gleaned from this: "Ukrainians are unique among ethnic groups in not having a tag they resent." He continues, "They cheerfully call themselves 'Ukes' and 'Ukies,' and in some parts of the country soccer and basketball teams blazon the words on their jerseys." Mrs. Wolodymyr Masur is quoted on the attitude of Russians toward Ukrainians, and Mr. Michael Komichak explains the need for greater American understanding of Eastern Europe. The two articles make for enjoyable reading.

"APPEAL FOR HELP FOR DISSIDENTS," a letter to the editor by Orest Szczudiuk. *The Boston Globe*, Boston, Mass., September 3, 1974.

An appeal to citizens in the Boston area to help the dissidents in the USSR is made by an activist of many years. The writer is vice president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America branch in Boston. In a fairly long, six paragraph letter he urges his fellow Americans to write to the President, Senators Kennedy, Brooke and others.

The intercession sought is across-the-board. Our people are asked "to intercede with the Soviet government to release Moroz, Plyushch, and all Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Jewish and other political prisoners." The writer is correct in stating that the free world media helped both Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov. He seeks the same for these Ukrainian and other prisoners.

"NAME SOMEONE ELSE WHO HAS SERVED IN ARMIES OF FIVE NATIONS," an article by Earl Arnett. *The Sun*, Baltimore, Md., January 20, 1975.

This fascinating account deals with the life of General Peter Samutyn. The general is now 77 years old. He actually served as an officer in five armies—the Russian, Ukrainian, Czech, Polish and German. The detailed interview was arranged by the Ukrainian Education Association of Maryland.

During the interview Professor Hlib S. Hayuk of Towson State College served as the interpreter. As the writer points out, the general has resided in communities in the United States where it was not necessary for him to perfect his language facility in English. The experiences, thoughts and events described in this lengthy article are exceedingly well portrayed.

Active as ever, General Samutyn participates in public anniversaries. The article concludes in this vein: "'Harbor no bitterness,' he will probably tell them." "'Remember that the most important human virtues are love and respect for others, no matter what their rank or position in society. Be patient, for eventually truth and justice will prevail!'"

L.E.D.

CHRONICLE OF CURRENT EVENTS

I. UKRAINIAN LIFE IN THE UNITED STATES

30th Anniversary of 'The Ukrainian Quarterly' Observed in New York.

—Over one hundred persons attending the conference "Ukraine in a Changing World" and two hundred and forty participating in the Jubilee Banquet, paid tribute on Saturday, December 7, 1974, in New York City to the founders, editors and publishers of **The Ukrainian Quarterly** on the 30th anniversary of its founding.

The scholarly Conference on "Ukraine in a Changing World" was held in two parts at the Ukrainian Institute of America, in which a dozen Ukrainian, American and Canadian scholars delivered papers dealing with a variety of topics on Ukraine and the Ukrainian people.

The conference was opened by Dr. Walter Dushnyck, editor of **The Ukrainian Quarterly** since 1957, who depicted the historical background of the founding of the review and the circumstances under which the founder and first editor, as well as the UCCA, had to act thirty years ago. He then introduced Dr. Konstantyn Sawczuk, professor of history at St. Peter's College in Jersey City, N.J., as moderator of the morning session.

The first speaker on the program was Dr. Michael Sosnowsky, associate editor of *Svoboda*, political writer and publicist. He dwelt extensively on "Dissent in Contemporary Ukraine and the Idea of Secession of the Ukrainian SSR from the Soviet Union," underscoring the depth of this movement as well as its expansion. He especially centered his talk on the group of Ukrainian jurists who pressed for the constitutional right of Ukraine to secede peacefully from the USSR.

Prof. Bohdan R. Bociurkiw of Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada, spoke on the "Religious Situation in Ukraine and in the USSR" and cited statistical data on various religious denominations in Ukraine, such as the Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant, and the pressure of Russian Orthodoxy in the western areas of Ukraine, where more than 60 percent of all Orthodox churches in Ukraine are located, in areas which were predominantly Catholic prior to 1939.

The problem of "Economic Exploitation of Ukraine" was discussed by Prof. Z. Lew Melnyk, head of the Department of Business Administration of the University of Cincinnati. Employing statistical data, charts, diagrams and tables, the speaker demonstrated how Ukraine is being sapped of its economic wealth by Moscow to the detriment of the Ukrainian people.

The "Role of Ukrainian Women in the Resistance Movement in Ukraine" was assessed by Prof. Natalia Pazuniak of the University of Pennsylvania, who contended that the participation of Ukrainian women in resistance to the forcible Russification of Ukraine and in the struggle for the national and cultural rights of the Ukrainian people is attested to by an

evergrowing number of Ukrainian women arrested and condemned to serve terms of imprisonment.

Toward the end of the morning session, Mrs. Irene Woloshyn read excerpts from Prof. Stefan T. Possony's paper, "From Gulag to Guitk," dealing with the Soviet concentration camp system today. Prof. Possony of the Hoover Institution had accepted the invitation to the conference, when it was scheduled originally for a week earlier. But when it was shifted to December 7, he was en route to South Africa for a series of lectures he was committed to deliver.

Before the luncheon recess a question-and-answer period took place, during which queries of several members of the audience were answered by the panelists.

The moderator of the second session of the conference was Prof. Nicholas Bohatiuk of LeMoyne College in Syracuse, N.Y., who was introduced by Dr. Dushnyck, Conference chairman.

The initial speaker in the afternoon was the Hon. Paul Yuzyk, Canadian Senator of Ukrainian descent and professor of history at the University of Ottawa, who discussed the "Religious Life of Ukrainians in Canada Since 1945." His paper was interlaced with numerous statistical references concerning the present status of the Ukrainian Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant churches in Canada as well as a projection for their future development.

The Hon. Howland H. Sargeant, President of "Radio Liberty Committee," dwelt on the impact of the radio broadcasts of his organization to Ukraine. He stated that "Radio Liberty" broadcasts, despite heavy jamming by the Soviet government, are penetrating into Ukraine and are well received by Ukrainian listeners. He also explained how the Ukrainian-language program is organized and what contents are transmitted to Ukraine.

Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, who is President of the UCCA and Chairman of the Editorial Board of *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, spoke on "Trade as a Weapon of Soviet Foreign Policy." His main guiding point was that the USSR is using its trade policy to enhance its military and political power in the world to the detriment of the Western powers, which more often than not are oblivious to that aspect of their relationship with the USSR.

Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren of LeMoyne College spoke on "Detente: Who Is Benefiting by It?" and cited data in support of his principal thesis that the West is engaged in a suicidal policy by providing the USSR with vital economic and technological aid without any meaningful concessions by Moscow.

Prof. Peter G. Stercho of Drexel University discussed "Ukraine and Its Southwestern Neighbors: Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Hungary," and concluded that, with few exceptions, exiled leaders from these countries are becoming reconciled to the fact that the Ukrainian problem is a vital factor in their policies and that the return to *status quo* before 1939 is unthinkable.

The final speaker at the afternoon session was Prof. Joseph S. Roucek, outstanding American educator of Czech descent, who discussed "Neglected Aspects of the Slavs in American Historiography." He concluded that earlier discrimination against the Slavs in the American academic world has largely

subsided, and Americans of Slavic background are gradually becoming a powerful force in American life.

After a question-and-answer period, the conference was closed by Dr. Dushnyck. All papers were on a high academic level and contained much data and information on the topics discussed.

Jubilee Banquet and Presentation of "Shevchenko Freedom Awards."

—The second part of the observance of the 30th anniversary of the founding of **The Ukrainian Quarterly** was the Jubilee Banquet at the Commodore Hotel in New York City. Before the banquet a reception was held for honored guests, Ambassador and Mrs. John Davis Lodge and Prof. and Mrs. Nicholas D. Chubaty. Attending the reception were the Most Reverend Basil H. Losten, Auxiliary Bishop of the Ukrainian Catholic Archdiocese of Philadelphia; Mr. Guy Wiggins, Senior Consultant, the U.S. Mission to the U.N., and Mrs. Wiggins; the Hon. Howland H. Sargeant, President of "Radio Liberty Committee"; Mr. Alexander Salzman, member of the Board of Directors of the International League for the Rights of Man, and Mrs. Salzman, a Vice President of the National Council of Women of the U.S., and Lady Malcolm Douglas-Hamilton, President of the "Committee to Unite America."

The Jubilee Banquet was opened by Dr. Dushnyck, who called on Bishop Losten to deliver the invocation. Thereafter, Prof. Dobriansky was asked to act as master of ceremonies.

The speakers at the Jubilee Banquet were the Hon. Paul Yuzyk, Canadian Senator, who was introduced by Mr. Joseph Lesawyer, UCCA executive vice president and president of the Ukrainian National Association, and Ambassador John Davis Lodge, introduced by Prof. Dobriansky.

Senator Yuzyk spoke on the important role of **The Ukrainian Quarterly** in disseminating knowledge and information on Ukraine and the Ukrainian people.

The principal feature at the Jubilee Banquet was the presentation of the "Shevchenko Freedom Award" to Prof. Nicholas D. Chubaty, founder and first editor of **The Ukrainian Quarterly**, and to Ambassador Lodge. The awards were presented by Prof. Dobriansky, who spoke briefly on the contributions of both recipients to Ukrainian culture and to the cause of freedom for the Ukrainian people.

Prof. Chubaty, in accepting the coveted award, thanked the UCCA for the honor and reminisced on the founding and growth of **The Ukrainian Quarterly**.

In his address Ambassador Lodge spoke of Taras Shevchenko whom he compared to Abraham Lincoln, and on the current repressions in Ukraine and the heroic stance of Valentyn Moroz and Leonid Plyushch. He ended his speech with the words "Shche ne vmerla Ukraina" ("Ukraine is not dead"), which was then sung by the audience.

The entertainment part of the program included musical numbers by the Lesya Ukrainka Female Bandurist Ensemble and recitations in English and Ukrainian of poems by Taras Shevchenko and Vasyl Symonenko by William Shust, noted Ukrainian American Broadway stage, TV, radio and screen actor, who was introduced by Mrs. Mary Dushnyck.

Dr. Dushnyck, present editor of this review, was also honored by Prof. Joseph S. Roucek, who presented him with a certificate of honorary

membership in the International Social Science Honor Society, Delta Tau Kappa.

Dr. Dushnyck was interviewed by the "Voice of America" and "Radio Liberty" and provided information on **The Ukrainian Quarterly** to listeners in Ukraine. The "Voice of America" also interviewed Prof. Z. Lew Melnyk, one of the conference speakers.

Notables Greet 'The Ukrainian Quarterly' on Its 30th Anniversary.—The White House, a U.S. Senator, seven Ukrainian Catholic Bishops, and other persons and organizations sent messages of congratulations and good wishes to the editor of **The Ukrainian Quarterly** on the 30th anniversary of its founding.

Two messages came from the White House. One, signed by Ron Nessen, Press Secretary to the President, read, in part:

President Ford has the utmost respect for the institutions and publications that aid people in the studies and perception of the world in which we live. On his behalf, I want to extend a warm wish for continued success and fulfillment in the vital service **The Ukrainian Quarterly** has provided these thirty years to persons throughout the world...

In another message, signed by William J. Baroody, Jr., Assistant to the President, the White House stated:

We were pleased to receive a copy of **The Ukrainian Quarterly** and your report on its contributions to academic literature over the years. Please accept our best wishes on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the **Quarterly**...

The Hon. James L. Buckley, U.S. Senator from New York, in a personal message to the editor, stated:

Over the past three decades **The Ukrainian Quarterly** has distinguished itself in the field of East European and Communist affairs. Its promulgation of liberty and freedom combined with its objectivity and scholarship makes it one of the most valuable journals in its field.

During this holiday season let us offer a special prayer for the fate of Valentyn Moroz and other Ukrainian political prisoners currently held in the Soviet Union.

The Most Reverend Maxime Hermaniuk, Archbishop-Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Canada, wrote from Winnipeg:

...First of all I wish to congratulate the leadership of the UCCA for the establishment and steady support of **The Ukrainian Quarterly**, this very important Ukrainian English-language journal, which in the course of its 30 years existence rendered great services to the Ukrainian people, and also to our Ukrainian Catholic Church. Its true and critical information for the English-speaking world about Ukraine and its people, especially now in the most difficult period of its history,

has opened the eyes of great masses of the Western world as to the rightness of our political and religious aspirations. For your meritorious work, Dear Editor, I offer you full recognition and gratitude... With a Divine blessing for the further success of **The Ukrainian Quarterly** and for your continuous endeavors, I remain...

The Most Reverend Myroslav Marusyn, Apostolic Visitator for Ukrainian Catholics in Western Europe, wrote from Rome:

...I wish to congratulate the "Jubilarian"—**The Ukrainian Quarterly**—and all those who work, support and disseminate your review in America and in the world... My illustrious predecessor, the late Archbishop Ivan (Archbishop Buchko) read every issue with diligent attention, and I have been reading it assiduously for the past twenty-five years... I bless you and all your associates...

The Most Reverend Jaroslav Gabro, Bishop of the St. Nicholas Catholic Diocese of Chicago for Ukrainians, wrote:

...I wish to congratulate you and the entire staff of **The Ukrainian Quarterly** for the excellent work you have performed during the past years. A scholarly journal such as yours is a very important contribution to the Ukrainian scene in the Free World.

On the occasion of the 30th anniversary of your journal, I extend to all those connected with the **Quarterly** my sincere best wishes for many more years of success and scholastic excellence...

The Most Reverend Basil H. Losten, Auxiliary Bishop of the Ukrainian Catholic Archdiocese of Philadelphia, wrote:

...I extend my best wishes for a successful conference and banquet and wish you success and God's blessing in your future endeavors at **The Ukrainian Quarterly**...

Congratulatory messages also came from the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, Archbishop-Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Philadelphia; the Most Reverend Joseph M. Schmondiuk, Bishop of the Ukrainian Catholic Diocese in Stamford, Conn., and the Most Reverend Volodymyr Malanchuk, Bishop of the Ukrainian Catholic Eparchy in France.

The Hon. Thomas J. Cuite, Vice Chairman of the City Council of New York, in a personal message to the editor, wrote:

For many years, we have enjoyed participating in programs of national significance, including Freedom Foundation and the All-American Conference to Combat Communism. Your contribution as a representative of the Ukrainian people has been outstanding as is your work in connection with **The Ukrainian Quarterly**.

We, who have been familiar with your activities for more than the last two decades, salute you as **The Ukrainian Quarterly** and the Ukrainian Congress observe the Thirtieth Anniversary of the found-

ing of the journal. Congratulations for your continued efforts in the areas that affect the everyday lives of so many Americans...

Dr. Patrick Cranley, president of the Western Australian Chapter of the World Freedom League in Perth, wrote:

The Western Australian Branch of the World Freedom League greets you, and congratulates you on the 30th anniversary of *The Ukrainian Quarterly*. Over the past twelve months we have been receiving your magazine and reading it with enjoyment.

The Ukrainian Nationals in Western Australia are some of our strongest supporters and delight us at concerts and demonstrations with their color and enthusiasm. We, in Australia, pledge to continue the fight against totalitarianism and wish you continued success in your campaign for freedom in Ukraine...

Charles W. Wiley, executive director, National Committee for Responsible Patriotism, wrote:

...I would like to join in saluting the publication, Editor Walter Dushnyck and all Ukrainians—especially those who, at this very moment, fight and suffer on behalf of all free men. Americans who rejoice in "detente," should check with Ukrainians who live under Communist tyranny to learn how it really works!...

John Kosiak, president of the Byelorussian Congress Committee of America, wrote to the editor:

We have the pleasure to express our congratulations to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and to you for the magnificent achievements in promoting the freedom cause of Ukraine, enslaved and oppressed by Soviet Russia today.

The publication of *The Ukrainian Quarterly* during the past 30 years constitutes a very important part of this struggle for the liberation of Ukraine. Hostile forces, opposed to the liberation of the captive nations from Soviet Russian domination, are disseminating misleading propaganda concerning these victims of Russian imperialism. In rectifying this misinformation your review has been supporting the liberation cause of Ukraine as well as all other captive nations. We convey our best wishes for the success of *The Ukrainian Quarterly* and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America...

Greetings and congratulations were also sent *The Ukrainian Quarterly* by the following Ukrainian associations:

The Shevchenko Scientific Society (Prof. J. Andrushkiw and Prof. N. Chirovsky); Council for Cultural Affairs of the World Congress of Free Ukrainians (V. Lassovsky and R. Kobrynsky); Ukrainian Evangelical Alliance of North America (Pastor W. Borowsky); Ukrainian Medical Society of North America (Dr. G. Kushnir and Dr. T. Shegedyn); Ukrainian Music Institute of America (Mrs. Melania

Bailova and Miss Halyna Kuzma); The Sharvan Ukrainian Radio Program in Buffalo, N.Y.; Prof. Alexander A. Granovsky, honorary president of ODWU, and others.

Observances of Ukraine's Independence Anniversary.—On January 22 and thereafter Ukrainians in the United States and throughout the free world marked the 57th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence, proclaimed on January 22, 1918 in Kiev, and the 56th anniversary of the Act of Union, whereby all Ukrainian lands were united into one sovereign and independent state of the Ukrainian people.

As in previous years, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA) in special directives to its branches and member organizations urged to appropriately observe this important and significant date in the modern history of the Ukrainian people. Likewise, upon request from the UCCA an impressive number of governors and mayors proclaimed January 22 as "Ukrainian Independence Day" in their respective constituencies, and asked all citizens regardless of descent to join Americans of Ukrainian origin in marking this historical event.

Manifestations, programs, special rallies and concerts centering on the 57th anniversary of Ukraine's independence and the 56th anniversary of the Act of Union were held in several American cities. These included: New York, Chicago, Boston, Detroit, Carteret, Passaic, Newark, Yonkers, Washington, Buffalo, Houston, Maplewood, Elizabeth, Bismarck, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Syracuse, Chester, Bridgeport, Lehigh Valley, Jersey City, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Clifton, Denver, Hempstead, Berwick, Cleveland, Youngstown, Ellenville, Phoenix, Miami, Rochester, Trenton, New Haven, Hartford, Minneapolis, Portland, Seattle, Willimantic, Amsterdam, Binghamton, Allentown, Wilmington and others. In many cities and states the Ukrainian national flag was hoisted alongside the American flag.

Appeal to U.S. Legislators.—On January 13, 1975, UCCA President Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky sent a special letter to all U.S. Senators and Congressmen, urging them to voice their support of the Ukrainian people in their quest for freedom and national statehood.

"You might not believe it," said Prof. Dobriansky, "but what Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn and Andrei D. Sakharov, the two towering Russian freedom advocates, have been revealing to the world about the empire-state of the USSR, this committee, in its educational role, has been disseminating for over two decades... We urge you to express this abiding concern on the occasion of the 57th Anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine... Through various media your inspiring words will reach the people of Ukraine... In all sections of our country this significant anniversary will be observed on January 22. On this date in 1918, the Ukrainian nation declared its independence and founded the Ukrainian National Republic, which, as in the case of other non-Russian nations, was destroyed in 1920 by Moscow armed conquest. Today, the 48-million Ukrainian people constitute the largest non-Russian nation under Moscow's domination, both within and outside the USSR. Its very size and exploited importance to Moscow's global objectives surely makes it deserving of our concentrated interest..."

The appeal concluded:

Basic human rights are universal, and no current myth of 'non-interference in internal affairs' can becloud this truth for free men. An empire such as the USSR, built and maintained on conquests and foreign domination, cannot logically justify the national, non-interference principle. With our technology, know-how and capital flowing to this empire, we have every right and duty to move forward for (1) a strict Congressional accounting of across-the-board emigration from the USSR; (2) an equally strict accounting of deals by our businessmen who are admittedly confused by present rules in U.S.-USSR trade; (3) in the spirit of Senator Jackson's appeal to Brezhnev on September 10, 1974, the release of Valentyn Moroz; (4) Congressional hearings on the resurrection of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches genocided by Stalin; (5) a short-term Select Committee on the Captive Nations to crystallize for our citizenry a reality that no amount of diplomacy can conceal.

Observance of Ukraine's Independence Anniversary in U.S. Congress.

—From January 22 on a number of U.S. Senators and Congressmen introduced statements and resolutions relative to the anniversary of Ukraine's independence into the **Congressional Record**, but the official observance took place on February 4, 1975. On that day, the Very Rev. Msgr. Walter Paska, of the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary of St. Josaphat in Washington, D.C., officiated the following prayer:

Almighty God, source of all authority and rights of humanity, bless our esteemed President and august Congress, sharers in the responsibility of government, that their efforts may culminate in peace and security.

As we pray for the United States, we also petition for the welfare of the Ukrainian nation whose proclamation of liberty 57 years ago commemorated the united effort of a freedom-loving Christian people to share in the blessings of democracy so abundantly evident in this country. Respect for individual liberty, opportunity for cultural development, and the freedom to acknowledge Your divine existence have always been integrally united with the aspirations of a free Ukraine.

We humbly pray for this realization, through Your omnipotence in bestowing Your infinite charity for all humanity.

(The above prayer appeared in the February 4, 1975 issue of the **Congressional Record**.)

The following U.S. Congressmen made appropriate statements in the House of Representatives, which subsequently appeared in the **Congressional Record**:

Joe Moakley (I-C., Mass.), John H. Buchanan (R., Ala.), William F. Walsh (R., N.Y.), James A. Burke (D., Mass.), Leo C. Zeferetti (D., N.Y.), Philip M. Crane (R. Ill.), Ronald A. Sarasin (R., Conn.), Paul S. Sarbanes (D., Md.), Daniel J. Flood (D., Pa.), Samuel S. Stratton (D., N.Y.), Edward J. Derwinski (R., Ill.), Barber B. Canable (R., N.Y.), James M. Hanley (D., N.Y.), Mark Andrews (R., N.D.), Edward I. Koch (D., N.Y.), John D.

Dingell (D., Mich.), William S. Broomfield (R., Mich.), Benjamin A. Gilman (D., Pa.), Mario Biaggi (D., N.Y.), Robert A. Roe (D., N.J.), James J. Blanchard (D., Mich.), Joseph P. Addabbo (D., N.Y.), John J. LaFalce (D., N.Y.), Matthew F. McHugh (D., N.Y.), Edward J. Patten (D., N.J.), James J. Delaney (D., N.Y.), William R. Cotter (D., Conn.), Robert N. Giaimo (D., Conn.), Peter A. Peyser (R., N.Y.), Henry J. Nowak (D., N.Y.), Frank Annunzio (D., Ill.) and Richard F. Vander Veen (D., Mich.).

Also, the following U.S. Senators introduced appropriate statements on the Ukrainian Independence Anniversary into the Congressional Record:

James L. Buckley (C-R, N.Y.), Harrison Williams, Jr. (D., N.J.), Milton S. Young (R., N.D.), Quentin N. Burdick (D., N.D.), William V. Roth, Jr. (R., Del.) and Paul J. Fannin (R., Ariz.).

UCCA Executive Committee, Policy Board, Meet in New York.—On March 1, 1975, the UCCA Executive and its Policy Board held their respective meetings in the morning and afternoon at the Ukrainian Institute of America. Chairing the first meeting was Joseph Lesawyer, UCCA Executive Vice President, who welcomed Ivan Oleksyn, President of the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association (UWA), the second largest Ukrainian American fraternal association. Welcomed also were two representatives of the group, Dr. Michael Danyluk and Dr. Vincent Shandor, who will serve on the UCCA Executive Board.

UCCA Executive Director Ivan Bazarko reported on several recommendations of the UCCA Presidium, which included the renewal of publication by the UCCA of *Kongresovi Visti* (Congress News) under the editorship of Ivan Kedryns-Rudnytsky, sending a UCCA representative to a conference at the University of California at Berkeley; signing of a contract for the renovation of the UCCA-UNWLA building in New York City; contribution to the World Congress of Free Ukrainians, and the publication of a book, *The Ukrainian Heritage in America* by the UCCA under the editorship of Dr. Walter Dushnyck on the Bicentennial of American Independence. After an exhaustive discussion in which many members took part, all proposals were accepted.

In his report UCCA President Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky touched on a number of points pertinent to the UCCA and its policies. These included new resolutions in Congress calling for a Presidential Proclamation of "Ukrainian Independence Day"; state of the U.S.-Soviet trade agreement and a growing number of critics thereof; and a serious disagreement between the American Council for World Freedom and the WACL resulting from anti-American attacks by some of the latter's Latin American members. Consequently, the American Council is sending its observers instead of delegates to the 8th WACL Conference in Rio de Janeiro in April, 1975. Hence, Prof. Dobriansky recommended that the UCCA send two observers to the conference, Mr. Ignatius M. Billinsky, a UCCA secretary, and Dr. Walter Dushnyck, which recommendation was accepted.

In reference to the Bicentennial of the American Revolution, the UCCA President urged the election of a Ukrainian National Bicentennial Committee, which would provide guidance and direction to Ukrainian communities with regard to the observances in 1976.

Mr. Taras Szmagala of Cleveland, Ohio, chairman of the Preparatory Commission for the Observance of the Bicentennial, reported briefly on the

work of the Commission, participation in meetings in Washington, and so forth. His remarks were supplemented by Mr. Lesawyer, who also attended a number of meetings in Washington.

Mrs. Ulana Diachuk, UCCA Treasurer, presented a detailed report on the finances of the UCCA and gave a breakdown on the total donations and contributions to the UCCA in 1974. These included donations to the Ukrainian National Fund, subscriptions to *The Ukrainian Quarterly* and other UCCA publications; the UCCA building fund; contributions to the World Congress of Free Ukrainians and to the Fund for the Defense of Human Rights in Ukraine. She also outlined briefly plans for the 1975 fund-raising campaign this fall.

In the afternoon of the same day, a session of the UCCA Policy Board was held, chaired by its executive committee with Prof. Ivan Wowchuk as chairman, Mr. Stephen Kuropas as vice-chairman and Dr. Ivan Nowosiwsky as secretary. The agenda of the session included the reading of the minutes from the previous session; report by Mr. Lesawyer on the Bicentennial of the American Revolution; reports by Prof. Wowchuk and Mr. Bazarko on the last session of the Secretariat of the World Congress; an address by Mrs. Stephania Bukshowana on "International Women's Year," and projection of plans of the Policy Board for the coming year by Prof. Wowchuk.

Conference on Ukrainian Studies at University of California at Berkeley.—On March 6, 1975, a day-long conference between authorities of the University of California and Ukrainian representatives was held at Berkeley to discuss the possibilities of establishing Ukrainian Studies at that noted American educational center.

Taking part in the conference from the Ukrainian side were Dr. Walter Dushnyck, representing the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America; Joseph Lesawyer on behalf of the Ukrainian National Association; Julian Revay, representing the Ukrainian Institute of America; Michael Car, chairman, UCCA Branch in San Francisco, and Leonid Romaniuk, on behalf of the Ukrainian community in northern California. Dr. Walter Hucul, a Canadian professor of Ukrainian descent who for many years has been associated with the University at Berkeley and was instrumental in getting discussions under way, also took part in the conference.

The Ukrainian conferees met in three separate conferences with the following university officials: a) Regent Allan Grant, President of the State Board of Food and Agriculture; b) Chancellor Albert H. Bowker, who also represented Dr. Charles J. Hitch and Dr. Chester O. McCorkle, Jr., President and Vice President of the University, respectively; and c) members of the "Ad Hoc Committee on Ukrainian Studies": Prof. Richard E. Erickson, Assistant Chancellor; Prof. Delmer M. Brown, Chairman, Department of History; Prof. David Hooson, Chairman, Department of Geography; Prof. Andrew Janos, Chairman of the Center for Slavic and East European Studies, and Prof. Woodrow Middlekauff, representing Prof. Anne Kilmer, Dean of Humanities, who was indisposed.

The conference centered on such matters as the importance of Ukrainian Studies on the west coast of America; a possible number of Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian students; one or three chairs (Ukrainian history, language and literature); a permanent chair or visiting professorships in Ukrainian Studies; the problem of funding (on the basis of matching funds) and the

establishment of a Ukrainian library at the University. A detailed proposal, after study by the university authorities, would be submitted to the Ukrainian conferees for consideration.

Ukrainian National Committee on American Bicentennial Established.

— On March 1, 1975 a Ukrainian National Committee on America's Bicentennial was established in New York which will guide and coordinate nationwide Ukrainian participation in the observances of the 200th anniversary of American Independence next year.

The election of the committee took place at the meeting of representatives of Ukrainian central organizations, held between the sessions of the UCCA Executive Board and Policy Board. The composition of the Committee, as proposed by Ivan Bazarko, UCCA Executive Director, and approved unanimously, consists of the following: Taras Szmagala, Walter Bacad, Joseph Lesawyer, John Wynnyk, Yaroslav Haywas, Dr. Stepan Kurylas, Dr. Ivan Skalchuk, Atty. Bohdan Futey, Atty. Julian Kulas, Prof. John Teluk, Dr. Ivan Kozak, three representatives of women's organizations, one each from youth and professional organizations, and Ivan Bazarko. The Committee will expand as time goes by through the inclusion of local representatives and chairmen of various special committees. An honorary committee will include hierarchs of Ukrainian churches and outstanding Ukrainian immigrant pioneers.

The overall objectives of the Ukrainian Bicentennial Committee, in addition to participation by Ukrainian groups on the state and city levels, are as follows: a) publication of a book, *The Ukrainian Heritage in America*, a project to be undertaken by the UCCA; b) publication of a pamphlet, *Ukrainians in America*; c) issuance of a Ukrainian Bicentennial Commemorative medallion, and selection of important Ukrainian places or objects to be declared "historical sites," as for example, the grave of Rev. Agapius Honcharenko, first Ukrainian priest in America, in Hayward, Calif., some Ukrainian churches, etc.

Symposium on Cybernetics Sponsored by Ukrainian Engineering Society of America.—On December 14, 1974 a Scientific Symposium was held at the Ukrainian Institute of America in New York City, sponsored by the Ukrainian Engineering Society of America. The Symposium encompassed a number of topics on cybernetics and was dedicated to Leonid Plyushch, Ukrainian dissident cyberneticist, who is imprisoned in a psychiatric asylum in Dnipropetrovsk because of his defense of human rights, being trodden by the Soviet government in Ukraine. The plight of Plyushch has been extensively reported in the Ukrainian, American and international press. He is being forcibly treated by his jailers with heavy doses of antischizophrenic drugs, which have damaged his health and mind. However, Leonid Plyushch remains steadfast and refuses to renounce his writings on behalf of human rights in Ukraine.

The Ukrainian Engineering Society of America which has many cyberneticists and mathematicians in its ranks, feels duty-bound to intercede on behalf of its professional colleague by vigorously protesting against the inhuman treatment Plyushch has been subjected to, and by writing letters on his behalf to President Ford, the U.N. and other national and international agencies.

The symposium on cybernetics consisted of four papers. The first paper, delivered by Dr. Roman Andrushkiw, covered the action of the International Congress of Mathematicians in Vancouver, B.C. The second paper by Mrs. Maria Honczarenko dealt with the application of cybernetics in business planning and to production problems. Dr. Wasyl Zacharkiw in the third paper gave an overview of computers in engineering and their applications. The last paper, by Dr. Oleh Tretiak, described the use of computers in creating two- and three-dimensional images and their application in biomedical engineering. The chairman of the Symposium was Mr. Lubomyr Onyshkevych, with Mr. Roman Hawrylak as host and organizer of the event.

Name Head of Ukrainian History Chair at Harvard.—Prof. Omelan Pritsak, acting head of the Ukrainian Research Institute at Harvard University, was named head of the Ukrainian History Chair at the university, according to a release from Harvard President Dr. Derek C. Bok, dated January 4, 1975.

The Chair will be named after Professor Michael Hrushevsky, foremost Ukrainian historian and first President of the Ukrainian National Republic. Prof. Pritsak was one of the principal driving forces behind the establishment of the Ukrainian Studies program and the Ukrainian Research Institute at Harvard University.

Ukrainian Printing Exhibit at New York Public Library.—The Slavonic Division of the New York Public Library mounted an exhibit, entitled, "Four Hundred Years of Ukrainian Printing," to honor the history of Ukrainian printing. On display in the Second Floor Central Corridor of the Library's Central Building, the exhibit was open to the public from 9:00 A.M. to 9:00 P.M. from January 1 through March 15, 1975.

Ukraine, corresponding to what is now the Ukrainian SSR in Eastern Europe, has a long history of language and literature. Printing was first brought to Ukraine by Schweipolt Fiol (Svyatopolk Fiola) (1460-1525), who began printing for Ukrainians in Poland as early as 1491, only thirty years after the printing of the **Gutenberg Bible**. During the next century, a number of works, primarily works of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, were printed outside of Ukraine.

It was four hundred years ago, however, in the city of Lviv, that Ivan Fedorovych printed the **Apostol** (Book of the Apostles), the first book printed in Ukraine itself. An original edition of **Apostol**, printed in 1574, was on display at the exhibit. The style of type resembles manuscript writing, and is richly illuminated with Renaissance style ornamental plants. Also, Fedorovych's shop printed a series of distinguished works, including a **Bukvar** (The Primer)—the first school book printed in a Slavic country. Fine printing continued in Ukraine throughout the next two centuries. The leading publishing house of the time was the Pechersky Monastery in Kiev. The first Ukrainian dictionary (1627) from the monastery was on display in the exhibit.

The exhibit also showed examples of printing of the 1870's, when the repressive policies of the Czarist government forced authors to have their works printed in Western Ukraine (which was under Austrian rule). "Four Hundred Years of Ukrainian Printing" concluded with samples of contemporary works. Recent policies of the Soviet Union in Ukraine to stress Russian at the expense of Ukrainian printing resulted in the decline of

material printed in Ukrainian. Therefore, Ukrainian printing outside Ukraine has gained in importance, particularly in Canada, the U.S., Germany and Italy.

Soviet Churchman Says 'Ukrainians Do Not Own Church' in Ukraine.

—“The Ukrainian Orthodox faithful do not wish to have a Ukrainian Orthodox Church and the faithful of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church decided in 1946 to return to their ancestral Church and united with the Russian Orthodox Church,” said Metropolitan Filaret, who also bears the official title of “Metropolitan of Kiev and Halych and Patriarchal Exarch of all Ukraine” for the Russian Orthodox Church.

Metropolitan Filaret led a group of 20 leading officials of various churches in the USSR, who toured the United States at the invitation of the National Council of Churches, which said they were returning a visit made last summer by 20 American church leaders to the Soviet Union.

The Soviet churchmen were introduced to the American press at a press conference, held on February 18, 1975 under the auspices of the National Council. The group included 13 officials of the Russian Orthodox Church and seven chief administrators of other Christian churches of the USSR, namely: the Roman Catholic Church of Lithuania (Msgr. Cheslav Krivaitis); the American Apostolic Church (Bishop Arseny Berberian); the Georgian Autocephalic Orthodox Church (Metropolitan Elias); the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia (Archbishop Yanis Matulis); the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Estonia (Deputy Archbishop Edward Hark); the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians-Baptists (Dr. A.M. Bychkov).

Among some 50 reporters present were four Ukrainian press representatives: Dr. Michael Sosnowsky (Svoboda), Zenon Snylyk and Ihor Dlaboha (**The Ukrainian Weekly**) and Dr. Walter Dushnyck (**The Ukrainian Quarterly**).

Questions from the floor dealt with such problems as the absence of representatives of the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in the group; the destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church; the imprisonment of Joseph Cardinal Slipyj and his subsequent release; arrests of Lithuanian Archbishop J. Stepanavicius and Ukrainian Baptist leader George Vins; the death sentence imposed on a Soviet Jew for a minor “economic crime,” and the religious situation in the Baltic countries. Answering the questions were Metropolitan Filaret, Metropolitan Yuvenaly and Dr. Bychkov, all of whom said that all religions are treated “equally” in the USSR, and that those arrested are only individuals who “break the Soviet law.” It was at this point that Metropolitan Filaret stated:

“There is no separate Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine. In the 1920’s the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church was dissolved by the Ukrainian Orthodox faithful, who did not wish to have a Ukrainian Orthodox Church and united with the Russian Orthodox Church.

“As for the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, its faithful decided in 1946 to return to their ancestral faith and joined the Russian Orthodox Church.” He said that “we do not know under what circumstances Joseph Cardinal Slipyj had left the Soviet Union. He is now in Rome.”

After the conference, Metropolitan Filaret, pressed by the Ukrainian newsmen, said that he “administers 18 separate eparchies in Ukraine and has a seminary in Odessa with 120 seminarians.” He also stated that “Val-

entyn Moroz is no concern of ours. There are Soviet laws which must be obeyed, and everyone is treated equally under the law."

The press conference was conducted by Dr. Rebert Marshall of the Princeton Theological Seminary Dialogue and was held at the headquarters of the National Council of Churches in New York City. Outside the building, a group of Americans led by Dr. Carl McIntire, fundamentalist preacher, demonstrated during and after the press conference.

Nationwide Protests Against Visiting Soviet Churchmen.—The visit of 20 Soviet churchmen to the United States in the latter part of February and in the beginning of March, 1975, provoked large-scale protests and demonstrations, especially by the Ukrainian groups, which were joined in some places by Lithuanian and Jewish organizations.

On February 18, 1975 the Executive Board of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, in a telegram to the National Council of Churches, assailed it for sponsoring the group on a tour of America, stating that "the church leaders you are hosting in this country of freedom do not represent the true churches of their respective people, but are handpicked puppets and collaborators of the atheistic Kremlin regime..." It further said that the National Council "indirectly upholds the Communist persecution of religion in the USSR," and charged that it "has failed in its understanding and perception of the true situation of religion in the Soviet Union..." [see text of telegram in the "Pertinent Documents" column—ed.].

Archbishop-Metropolitan Ambrose Senyshyn of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the U.S. and the Carpatho-Ruthenian Bishops (at one time an integral part of the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy) reacted swiftly.

On February 10, Metropolitan Senyshyn sent a letter to every bishop in the U.S. Catholic Conference in which he charged that the Russian Orthodox Church in the USSR "is totally governed and directed by the atheistic Soviet regime and as such is exclusively a tool used to further the interests of the Soviet Russian imperialistic Communist state." With his letter the Metropolitan sent the Roman Catholic Bishops a copy of a pamphlet entitled, **Persecution and Destruction of the Ukrainian Church**, authored by Gregory Luznycky, Ph.D., and published in 1960 by the UCCA in New York.

That same day the Carpatho-Ruthenian bishops issued a communique signed by all four bishops in which they reminded the visiting Soviet churchmen of the loss of religious freedom in their country of origin and pointed out the abrogation of the Union of Uzhorod of April 24, 1646, whereby their church was united with the Holy See. They stated that this precluded any participation on their part in the functions in honor of the visitors. Signing the statement were Archbishop Stephen J. Kocisko of Munhall, Bishop Michael J. Dudick of Passaic, Bishop Emil J. Mihalik of Parma and Bishop John M. Bilock, Auxiliary of Munhall.

On February 13, the Consistory of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the USA met in Bound Brook, N.J. in a special session devoted to the visit of the Soviet churchmen. The meeting, which was attended by Archbbishop-Metropolitan Mstyslav Skrypnyk and Archbishop Mark Hundiak, resulted in a communique issued on February 14 and signed by Protopresbyter Artemy Selepyna. It voiced "great concern" and "deep regrets" over the invitation to this country of the delegation of Soviet clergymen by the National Council of Churches.

Dr. Mary Klachko, president of the Friends of the Ukrainian Catholic University, in a telegram to Claire Randall, general secretary of the National Council of Churches, charged that the visiting clergy "are not only un-representative of believers in the USSR, but through their collusion with the regime have been found repeatedly to be chief instruments in closing churches, compromising leading laymen and suppressing religious observances in the Soviet Union..."

Public Demonstrations Against Soviet Churchmen.—On Saturday, March 8, 1975, more than 500 shouting demonstrators, mostly Ukrainian American Catholics, massed outside St. Nicholas Orthodox Cathedral on New York's upper East Side to jeer a group of 18 visiting Soviet churchmen as "henchmen" of Moscow and "instruments" of the Soviet regime. Organized by the United Ukrainian American Committee of New York, the protesters waved placards and carried coffins to symbolize murdered Ukrainian churchmen, and jostled police and onlookers from behind wooden barricades. They directed most of their verbal attacks at Metropolitan Filaret, who bears the title of "Metropolitan of Kiev and Halych and Patriarchal Exarch of all Ukraine," whom they described as a "collaborator" of the Soviet regime. Many placards read "KGB Agents in Clerical Robes," "Not Churchmen but Henchmen," "Filaret and Company Are Quislings," "Church in Chains," and so forth.

On Sunday, March 9, a larger group estimated at 2,500 and organized by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America gathered in Passaic, N.J., to stage another protest as the Soviet church delegation attended a liturgical ceremony at SS. Peter and Paul Russian Orthodox Cathedral there.

Mother Marie Dolozyska, OSBM, of the Sisters of St. Basil the Great, Astoria, N.Y., an 87-year-old Ukrainian Catholic nun, wore chains to dramatize her feelings about the religious persecution in Ukraine. "What saddens me most," she said, "is the fact the Soviets, in their drive to destroy the Church and all religion, have found collaborators among Russian Orthodox bishops... Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholics, Baptists and Jews have no freedom of religion..."

Miss Eva Piddubcheshen, the principal speaker at the rally, said that "much of what Metropolitan Filaret and his companions have been saying is music to the ears of the uninformed listeners... that these men [who] are preaching a message of love and brotherhood do not speak in such loving accents in their own country..."

While the Soviet churchmen were inside the Russian Cathedral, a memorial service was celebrated outside for the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic bishops, clergy, nuns, and faithful murdered by the Soviet regime. The service was led by Very Rev. Canon W. Bilynsky of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Passaic and Very Rev. Mitrat Theodore Forsty, pastor of the Holy Ascension Church in Clifton, N.J., from the Ukrainian Orthodox Church.

On February 27, 1975 a group of Ukrainian and Lithuanian Catholics protested the arrival of three Soviet churchmen at the Union Club in Boston, charging there is no religious freedom in the USSR. The three were Vladimir, Archbishop of Dmitrovsk, Protopresbyter Vitaly Borovy, Rector of the Patriarchal Cathedral in Moscow and Professor of the Theological Academy,

and Metropolitan Elias of the Georgian Autocephalic Orthodox Church (all three were part of the 20-man Soviet churchmen's delegation).

The Ukrainians were especially incensed over a statement made at a New York press conference by Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev that the Ukrainian Catholics are now Russian Orthodox.

In a press release sent out by the Boston Branch of the UCCA, that statement was labeled a "colossal lie." It stated "Ukrainians wish to have their own churches; Ukrainians had Christianity before the Russians formed their own state... and they do not need Russians to represent them or speak for them on religious matters..."

Mr. Orest Szczudluk, vice president of the group, said, "We want the opportunity to bring our cross before the American public. These men are not true representatives of the church or the religious in anyway. They are agents of the government..."

The charges of discrimination in Lithuania had been voiced by Auxiliary Bishop Vincentas Brizgys of Kaunas, now living in Chicago. He cited a memorandum to the U.N. signed by 17,000 Lithuanians denouncing religious persecution in their country.

On March 2, 1975 a group of local Ukrainian Americans demonstrated outside the Muhlenberg College Enger Chapel in Allentown, Pa., where inside three Soviet churchmen were officiating at religious services for "Christian unity and love." The three were Archbishop Vladimir of Dmitrovsk, Archbishop Yanis Matulis of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia, and Archpriest Matthew Stadniuk, Secretary of the Patriarch of Moscow.

The Allentown demonstration was organized by the local UCCA Branch, headed by Prof. Albert Kirpa, and its vice president Ivan Stasiw summarized the purpose of the demonstration. Steve Postupack, former president of the League of Ukrainian Catholics, candidate to the U.S. Congress last November and well-known area radio broadcaster, issued a press release scoring the Soviet delegation on its visit. The statement was carried by several local newspapers.

A group of Ukrainian Catholic youth and members of the University of Minnesota's Ukrainian student Iromada club, protested against the group of Soviet churchmen visiting Minneapolis, Minn. on February 28. A Ukrainian girl walked to Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev during a press conference and asked him: "Why are you spreading so much false information about our Church? I want to tell you that I will pray to God to forgive you your sins for lying." The protest action against the Soviet churchmen was organized by the Organization of Ukrainian Catholic Youth with its spiritual adviser, Very Rev. Msgr. Stephen Knapp, and eventually joined by the Orthodox and university youth.

In Chicago, Ill. more than 1,500 persons protested against the Soviet churchmen at the Civic Center Plaza on Monday, March 3. The protest was organized by an ad hoc committee set up by the Chicago Branch of the UCCA, and included Ukrainian Catholics, Orthodox and Baptists. Also taking part in the demonstration was Dr. Carl McIntyre, editor of *The Christian Beacon* and founder of the International Council of Christian Churches. During the protest Prof. Vasyly Markus of Loyola University read a resolution denouncing the Soviet churchmen as agents of the Kremlin.

In Elmhurst, Ill. the All-Ukrainian Evangelical Baptist Fellowship warned Americans to be wary of pronouncements concerning religious freedom in the USSR made by visiting Soviet churchmen.

"They don't represent the sentiments of believers there, especially in Ukraine," said Rev. O.R. Harbuziuk, president of the Fellowship. He said that the recent 10-year sentence imposed on Ukrainian Baptist leader George Vins in Kiev illustrates the type of "freedom" they speak of.

Observe 25th Anniversary of Gen. Chuprynska's Slaying.—The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the World Congress of Free Ukrainians and the World Ukrainian Liberation Front issued special appeals calling for the observance of the 25th anniversary of the death of Gen. Taras Chuprynska (Roman Shukhevych), commander-in-chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), head of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), and head of the General Secretariat of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (UHVR).

Long after the end of World War II Gen. Chuprynska and his UPA fighters continued to wage underground warfare against the Soviet authorities in Western Ukraine. Finally, on March 5, 1950 he and his staff were trapped near the village of Bilohorshcha, near Lviv, and slaughtered by KGB and Red Army security troops. Not content with slaying the father, the KGB arrested his 14-year-old son, Yuriy Shukhevych, who has been in and out of Soviet jails since. He is presently serving a 10-year sentence, imposed on him in a secret trial on February 27, 1972.

State Department Takes Notice of Repressions in Ukraine.—The U.S. Department of State said that it was "aware" of the arrest of Valentyn Moroz, Leonid Plyushch and other Ukrainian intellectuals now in prison, and has raised the question in discussions with Soviet officials, according to the Department's Public Information Newsletter dated January 10, 1975. The text of the statement reads:

The U.S. Government has traditionally condemned the persecution of minorities and the suppression of fundamental human freedoms. We strongly disapprove of pressures exerted by the Soviet Government aimed at restricting the national, religious and cultural freedom of individuals and groups in the Soviet Union.

The arrests of dissident figures in Ukraine appear to be directed against advocates of an enhanced Ukrainian national identity. We have been aware of the tragic situations of such well-known Ukrainians as Valentyn Moroz, Leonid Plyushch and others for some time and have condemned their arrests as violations of the principles outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Although the Soviet Government does not recognize a foreign government's right to intercede officially on behalf of Soviet citizens accused of violating Soviet laws, we have discussed the question of human freedom with Soviet authorities on numerous occasions. Public concern lawfully manifested by organizations and prominent personalities in the United States can importantly complement these governmental efforts.

For the future, we are convinced that an expanding and improving relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union

will provide the most reliable framework within which traditional American views can be most effectively communicated to Soviet authorities.

OBITUARIES: a) **Petro Sahaydachny**, noted Ukrainian journalist and veteran of the Ukrainian national armies which fought for the independence of Ukraine in 1917-1920, died on January 12, 1975 of a heart attack while on his way to church in New York City.

Mr. Sahaydachny was born in the city of Berezhany, Western Ukraine. In 1914, as a young student, he volunteered for military service in the ranks of the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen Legion, approved by the Vienna government; for three years he fought against the Russian Czarist armies, and was taken prisoner.

With the outbreak of the revolution in Russia in 1917 and the establishment of the independent state of Ukraine, Mr. Sahaydachny joined the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen Corps, one of the best Ukrainian military units, commanded by Col. Eugene Konovalets, and remained in the army until the fall of the Ukrainian republic.

He returned to his native city, completed his education and took a very active part in Ukrainian cultural and social-political life. In the early 1930's he moved to Lviv, capital of Western Ukraine and became a staff member of the Ukrainian Press concern of Ivan Tyktor as one of the editors of *Novy Chas* (New Time), a very popular Ukrainian daily newspaper. He gained especial prominence in 1938-39 through his effective reports on events in Czechoslovakia and the establishment of the autonomous and then independent state of Carpatho-Ukraine. In September, 1939, when Soviet troops seized Western Ukraine, Mr. Sahaydachny, along with thousands of Ukrainians, escaped to German-occupied Poland, where he was for some time a member of the editorial staff of *Ukrainski Visti* (Ukrainian News), which appeared in Cracow.

After the outbreak of the German-Soviet war in June, 1941, he returned to Ukraine and was editor of *Nova Ukraina* (New Ukraine) in such cities as Vynnytsia, Poltava and Kharkiv before the Gestapo and other Nazi security organs began the persecution of Ukrainian nationalists and the Ukrainian people as a whole.

At the close of World War II he found himself, along with thousands of Ukrainian refugees in Salzburg, Austria, where he became editor of the Ukrainian-language newspaper *Novi Dni* (New Days), before coming to the United States under the U.S. Displaced Persons Act in the early 1950's.

In New York, he edited another Ukrainian-language newspaper, *Sim mynulykh dniv* (The Past Seven Days), and for some time was editor of *Nash Svit* (Our World), published by the Ukrainian Self-Reliance Association of America.

Mr. Sahaydachny was a founding member of the Ukrainian Journalists' Association of America, and for the past twenty years was a member of the office staff of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

b) **Dr. Zenon Wynnysky**, an active member of the Ukrainian community, died on September 17, 1974 at the age of 52. He was born on March 22, 1922 in the village of Nahuyevychi, Drohobych County, where his father was an attorney and his mother a school teacher. He terminated a gym-

nasium in Lviv in 1940, and a year later, in 1941, was already involved in the Ukrainian nationalist movement. In the fall of the same year he was arrested by the Gestapo, and kept in the "Montelupy" prison in Cracow and then in the concentration camps in Auschwitz and Ebensee. He survived the horrors of the camps, and after the war he attended medical schools at the universities of Erlangen and Munich. In 1948 he became a member of the executive committee of CESUS (Central Union of Ukrainian Students) and took part in various international student gatherings.

He came to America in 1952 and settled in Cleveland, Ohio, where he plunged into student activities and was a founding member of the Federation of Ukrainian Student Associations (SUSTA) in 1954. In 1955 he returned to Munich to finish his medical studies and received a degree of doctor of medicine in 1958. Upon his return to Cleveland, he held positions of doctor-internist in various hospitals. Lately he was director of a medical clinic at St. Vincent's Hospital. In addition to his professional duties, Dr. Wynnytsky was a member of the Ukrainian Studies Chair Fund at Harvard University, a member of the Ukrainian Medical Society of North America, the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms of Ukraine, head of a chess club, and for some time editor of the *Cleveland News*, a Ukrainian-language bulletin.

c) Prof. Stephen P. Marion, an associate professor of chemistry at Brooklyn College, died on October 7, 1974 at the age of 63. He was a son of Ukrainian immigrant parents. Prof. Marion, on the staff of Brooklyn College since 1931, had been an early experimenter in the use of television as a teaching aid. From 1959 to 1961 he directed an experimental television program and in 1967 coordinated a project for the use of television facilities in teaching chemistry.

Prof. Marion was a candidate for the State Assembly in 1966 and a Conservative party candidate for Congress in 1968. He was a member of the American Chemical Society, the New York Academy of Science and Sigma Xi.

II. UKRAINIANS IN THE DIASPORA

CANADA

Appoint Dr. Olinyk Head of Ukrainian Service of CBC.—Dr. Roman Olinyk, well-known Ukrainian Canadian journalist, was appointed on January 20, 1975 the head of the Ukrainian Section of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), widely known as the "Voice of Canada." Dr. Olinyk is a veteran publicist whose keen and perceptive articles on the USSR and Eastern Europe have appeared in many Ukrainian, Canadian and French Canadian newspapers for the past decade. His penetrating article on the Canadian ethnic structure, "The Canadian Option for 1975 and Beyond: Unity Through Diversity," which he wrote under his pen name of Roman Rakhmanny, appeared in the Summer 1974 issue of *The Ukrainian Quarterly*.

Parliamentary Amnesty Group Begins Work in Ottawa.—A steering committee of Senators and MP's representing all political parties was elected at a meeting of the Canadian Parliamentary Group of Amnesty International held on February 12, 1975 at the Parliament Building in Ottawa. Named to

the Committee were Sen. Paul Yuzyk (Cons.), Sen. Andrew Thompson (Lib.), and MP's Eudore Allard (Soc. Cred.), Andrew Brewin (NDP), Gordon Fairweather (Cos.), Lloyd Francis (Lib.) and Dr. Mark MacGuigan (Lib.). The committee, chaired by Senator Yuzyk, will meet soon to plan work to be undertaken by the Parliamentary Group.

Speaking at a luncheon meeting attended by a group of Senators and MP's, Dr. John Humphrey recalled his 20-year relationship with the U.N. Human Rights Commission. Dr. Humphrey, who is also President of the Canadian Section of Amnesty International, said that although the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the two International Covenants on (1) Economic and Social Rights and (2) Civil and Political Rights have become binding upon member states, their application is far from being universal.

During the discussion several parliamentarians raised the issue of the dissidents in the USSR, such as Valentyn Moroz, Leonid Plyushch, Andrei D. Sakharov and others, as well as the question of political prisoners in Vietnam, the Philippines, Romania, Chile and other countries.

Appeal for Ukrainian Women Prisoners.—In an appeal published in *The New York Times* on March 8, 1975 the World Congress of Free Ukrainians (WCFU) called for support for Ukrainian women prisoners in Soviet concentration camps.

Titling the appeal "1975 International Women's Year—Will These Women Still Be Alive in 1976," the WCFU pleaded on behalf of Nadia Svitlychny-Shumuk, Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets, Nina Strokata-Karavansky, Stephania Shabatura and Iryna Senyk as examples of the persecution inflicted on Ukrainian women for their political beliefs. The statement also included an appeal to Leonid Brezhnev, Nikolai Podgorny and Alexei Kosygin which can be cut out by the reader and sent to Soviet officials.

In addition, the WCFU also addressed an appeal to the U.N. General Assembly signed by Metropolitan Mstyslav Skrypnyk, Pastor Dr. Lev Zhabko-Potapovich, the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Dr. Basil Kushnir, WCFU president, George Shymko, WCFU general secretary, Senator Paul Yuzyk, chairman of WCFU Human Rights Commission, and Stephania Sawchuk, president of the World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations.

FRANCE

Ukrainian Bishop Charges French Hierarchy with Discrimination.—The Most Reverend Volodymyr Malanchuk, Exarch for Ukrainian Catholics in France, accused the French Catholic hierarchy of discrimination against Eastern Catholics. Speaking before a conference of French Catholic Bishops recently, Bishop Malanchuk charged the French Catholic hierarchy with "less than a brotherly attitude towards faithful of the Eastern Rite because, according to them, members of that rite are an impediment to ecumenism..."

"You are aware that steadfastness and loyalty to ethnic and religious traditions is a major aspect of the work of emigre priests," said Bishop Malanchuk, explaining that Ukrainian Catholics closely identify with their rite and heritage.

He said that French Catholics do not always look on Eastern Catholics as their brothers but frequently consider them as second-class citizens.

"Instead we should demand from the government equal rights for emigre workers, which would guarantee them the right to foster their heritage, to work, to lead a family life, to educate their children, to have social security—all in accordance with the laws of the land," said Bishop Malanchuk.

It is to be recalled that in France there is a Ukrainian Catholic Eparchy, an American Catholic Eparchy, and one consisting of all other Eastern rites. All three are an integral part of the French Catholic episcopate, pointing out that the Ukrainians belong to their Synod, headed by Joseph Cardinal Slipyj, Archbishop-Major of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, and the Armenians are under the jurisdiction of their own Armenian patriarch. The Archbishop of Paris is the Metropolitan of all Eastern-rite Catholics in France.

AUSTRIA

OBITUARY: General Roman Dashkevych, one of the few remaining military leaders who took part in the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people in 1917-1920, died on January 11, 1975 in Kufstein in the Austrian Tyrol at the age of 83. He was born into the family of a Ukrainian Catholic priest on December 6, 1892 in the village of Tustanovychi (Drohobych County). Even as a student in a gymnasium in Lviv, and as a law student at the University of Lviv, Dr. Dashkevych plunged into Ukrainian political life and emerged as an able organizer and leader. In 1912 he organized the Ukrainian Sich organization, a para-military group, and the Society of the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen, which took part in the huge manifestation in 1914 in Lviv, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Taras Shevchenko.

On the eve of World War II Gen. Dashkevych organized and equipped a company of volunteers at his own expense, and joined the Ukrainian Sich Legion to fight against the Russians after the outbreak of the Austrian-Russian war in 1914. He was taken prisoner by the Russians and spent two years in Russian captivity. After the fall of Czardom he escaped from a POW camp to Kiev, where he organized a battalion of Ukrainian Sich Riflemen (Sichovi Striltsi), and became chairman of its Military Council. As a colonel of artillery he organized an artillery brigade, consisting of 6 batteries totaling 77 artillery pieces.

In 1920 he returned to Lviv, then under Polish rule, terminated his law studies and became a practicing attorney. He married Miss Olena Stepanivna, a lieutenant in the Legion of the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen. He also restored for a short revival the prewar Sich, which was soon dissolved by the Polish government. Then he organized a new para-military organization, the "Luh" (Meadow), which became the strongest organization of that type among Ukrainians in Poland on the eve of World War II. When Soviet troops seized Western Ukraine in the fall of 1939, Gen. Dashkevych barely escaped the claws of the NKVD, while hundreds of "Luh" leaders were slaughtered at random by the NKVD or deported to Siberia.

After the war he settled in Austria, kept contact with Ukrainian military leaders throughout the world and wrote a book in Ukrainian, **The Artillery of the Sich Riflemen**, which is a rich, primary source on the history of the Ukrainian armed forces.

GERMANY

Ukrainian Free University Receives Grant From German Foundation.—The Ukrainian Free University (UFU) in Munich received a 450,000 DM (\$180,000) grant from the Bavarian National Foundation to help pay off the building purchased by the University at a price of 1,200,000 DM. The initial funds of 500,000 DM were donated by Joseph Cardinal Slipyj. In December, 1974 Dr. Wolodymyr Janiw, Rector of the UFU, met with Dr. Mathilda Berghofer-Weichner, the newly-elected Secretary of State of the Bavarian Ministry of Education and Religious Denominations; he was accompanied by Prof. Georg Schadt-muller, member of the Scientific Council of the Society for Fostering Ukrainian Scholarship, and Dr. J. Maurer, former curator of the Society.

In discussions with Dr. Weichner, Rector Janiw described the work of the UFU, its publications and future plans. The University published recently the eighth volume of scientific papers by UFU scholars, dedicated to the late Prof. Ivan Mirchuk, one-time rector of the UFU.

POLAND

Polish Priest Recognizes Right to Freedom for Ukraine.—In the course of a prayer service marking the 35th anniversary of the invasion of Poland by the Soviet Army in collusion with the Nazis, the Rev. Jan Ziej prayed for the freedom and independence of all nations, including Ukraine, Lithuania and Byelorussia, according to the November 1974 issue of *Kultura*, a Polish monthly published in Paris, France. The sermon was delivered by Rev. Ziej in the St. John Roman Catholic Cathedral in Warsaw.

"We must remember now... that south of us live and work a people once called the Ruthenians but now referred to as the Ukrainians, who also have the right to freedom and independence. We must recognize and remember this," said Fr. Ziej.

He commented that when a tiny African nation declares its freedom, everyone rejoices, "therefore how can we forget about those peoples closest to us." He added that it is a Christian obligation to remember that in thoughts and actions.

"Therefore, let us pray today for freedom and independence not only for us, but also for our Lithuanians, Byelorussians and Ukrainians—and freedom for all nations of the world," concluded Rev. Ziej.

III. IN CAPTIVE UKRAINE

Moroz Kept in Punitive Cell at Vladimir Prison.—Valentyn Moroz, the Ukrainian historian who held a hunger strike from July 1 to November 22, 1974 in protest against abuses and torture by Soviet jailers, was kept in a special punitive cell at Vladimir Prison from January 3 to January 19, 1975, according to a SIS (Smoloskyp Information Service) release. Moroz is serving his first six years of the 14-year sentence, imposed upon him in November, 1970.

The information about the new punitive measures against Moroz was provided by Tatyana Khodorovich, a leading member of the Initiative Group for Human Rights in Moscow, in a telephone conversation on February 21, 1975, with members of the Committee for the Defense of Valentyn Moroz in Toronto, Canada. In a statement, titled, "Punishment Without Crime," which she read over the telephone, Mrs. Khodorovich reported that the information about Moroz's new punishment was contained in his letter to his family written on January 19 (the Feast of the Epiphany). In veiled terms Moroz said that he could not write on Christmas Day (January 7), as he went on "hard bedding" and that he spent "Holy Christmas and the Eve of the Epiphany on cement." The reason for his new punishment was not ascertained.

Ivan Hel Also On Hunger Strike.—Ivan Hel, a Ukrainian political prisoner, staged a hunger strike from October 16 to October 30, 1974, in the "hard-labor" camp in the Mordovian ASSR, where he is serving a ten-year sentence for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." The information received in Finland from Ukrainian dissident sources was released by SIS. Hel abstained from food in order to dramatize four demands he had sent to the Soviet authorities. He demanded that: (1) the government define the status of political prisoners; (2) the International Red Cross be permitted to aid Soviet political prisoners; (3) medical services be taken out of KGB jurisdiction in the camps; (4) he be allowed to marry a woman who bore his child. It is not known whether any of his requests were granted.

Report Chornovil Moved to Lviv.—Vyacheslav Chornovil, noted Ukrainian journalist, was transferred from the Mordovian concentration camp to Lviv in Western Ukraine, allegedly to testify at trials of other Ukrainian intellectuals who were arrested in 1974, according to information received in Helsinki, Finland and released by SIS.

It said, citing unconfirmed dissidents sources in Kiev, that the KGB in Ukraine received orders from Moscow to intensify its efforts to extract recantations from certain Ukrainian political prisoners, who have not yet been broken. This was also cited by some as a reason for Chornovil's transfer to Lviv in November 1974.

In line with the recent move by the KGB to transfer Ukrainian political prisoners from camps in Mordovia and Perm back to Ukraine for further questioning, Ivan Hel and Mykhailo Osadchy were transferred to Lviv, and Ivan Svitlychny was moved to Kiev, according to the press release of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (UHVR). As in the case of V. Chornovil, it is stated that the reason for moving Osadchy, Hel and Svitlychny to Lviv and Kiev is to have them testify at the trial of other Ukrainian intellectuals and to extract "confessions" from them. M. Osadchy

is a writer and the author of *Cataract*; he was sentenced to two years at hard labor in 1965, and in 1972 he was again sentenced to three years. Ivan Svitlychny, noted critic and translator, was sentenced to seven years in 1972. Also, Ivan Hel, student and electrical technician, was sentenced in 1972 to five years at hard labor and five years of exile.

(After this report was set in print, a subsequent report by the press service of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council revealed that Vyacheslav Chornovil, Ivan Svitlychny and Ivan Hel were returned to the concentration camps in Mordovia and Perm after undergoing intensive interrogation in Kiev and Lviv. The press release said that although Mykhailo Osadchy was moved to Lviv for questioning, his name did not appear among those returned to a prison camp in January, 1975—Editor).

Information on 1972-1974 KGB Arrests in Ukraine.—The SIS received through Finland further information on the arrest of 51 persons by the KGB in Ukraine during 1972-1974.

The new list is a supplement to the information detailed in Nos. 7-8 of *The Ukrainian Herald*, its first appearance after an absence of two years. The *samvydav* journal revealed that in the Lviv area alone 1,000 searches and arrests were made and 2,000 underground manuals about searches and arrests were destroyed by the KGB. The majority of the arrests and detentions were conducted in Kiev, Lviv and Ivano-Frankivsk.

The latest list details the sentences and places of incarceration of 13 persons, three of whom were placed in psychiatric prisons and ten held in concentration camps, of whom six are students under the age of 25.

Several other unnamed persons who were arrested included engineers, doctors, teachers, students and laborers. In March 1973 the KGB made a mass raid on the Lviv State University and arrested many students in connection with an underground student journal, *The Trough*. Leaflets protesting the arrests of students circulated on the campus. The KGB was said to have resorted to physical torture of those arrested. A number of students were forbidden to visit Poland.

Underground Journal in Ukraine Asks for Non-Soviet Ukrainian Representation at U.N.—In an article entitled, "Ethnocide of Ukrainians in the USSR," published in Nos. 7-8 of *The Ukrainian Herald*, the editors of the underground review said that the World Congress of Free Ukrainians (WCFU) should represent Ukrainians on both sides of the Iron Curtain in the United Nations.

The editors of *The Ukrainian Herald* charged the Kremlin with "pre-meditated, methodical ethnocide of all non-Russian peoples of the USSR, particularly the Ukrainians." They requested the U.N. to immediately intercede in the matter, offering U.N. Secretary General Dr. Kurt Waldheim a series of suggestions on how to attain this, namely, to raise the question of liquidating Soviet Russian colonialism; establish a special U.N. Commission to investigate secret trials and inspect prisons, concentration camps and psychiatric wards in the USSR; send special U.N. personnel to Ukraine to observe elections to the governing organs of the Ukrainian SSR; to grant the World Congress of Free Ukrainians the right to represent all Ukrainians at the United Nations, and to disseminate these ideas among all U.N. delegates.

Kiev Organ Assails 'Radio Liberty,' Zionists, and 'The Ukrainian Quarterly.'—In the February 27, 1975 issue of *Radyanska Ukraina*, organ

of the Central Committee of the CP of Ukraine, the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR, there appeared a scathing attack on 'Radio Liberty' of Munich, the world Zionist movement, "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists," the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and its President, Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, and **The Ukrainian Quarterly**.

The article, titled, "A Criminal Alliance," was written by one R. Symonenko and deals with an "alliance" of the Zionists and "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists." The article was inspired, it would seem, by an essay on Soviet Jews, which appeared in an unnamed Zionist review in London and which was analyzed by "Radio Liberty."

Recalling the "close" cooperation of such known Zionist leaders as Chaim Weizmann, Vladimir Zabotinsky and Sirkin with the Ukrainian Central Rada in 1917, the author contends that this cooperation goes on even now, even though the Zionists are trying to deny such cooperation with Ukrainians, and states:

Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists not only are spreading this lie from the Zionist mouths, but are adding more of their own. So in reporting on an article on Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism as a weapon of anti-Communism, the trans-Atlantic **Ukrainian Quarterly**, which seems to be a personal organ of the ignominious American rightist Dobriansky, denied the fact that the latter in his address, "The Concept of Ukrainian Politics in the Countries of Our Settlement" had stressed the necessity of wider application of the ideology and practice of Zionism in the activities of current Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist organizations which operate in the emigration...

Symonenko further added that these principles were contained in Prof. Dobriansky's address, delivered at the "provocative First Congress of Free Ukrainians" [in 1967]. (For the record, **The Ukrainian Quarterly** has nothing on record of what was said above—Editor).

OBITUARY: Prof. Mykhailo Rudnytsky, well-known literary critic and professor at the Lviv State University, died in February, 1975, according to a notice appearing in the February 7, 1975 issue of **Literatura Ukrainska** of Kiev.

Prof. Rudnytsky hailed from a distinguished Ukrainian family which produced a number of prominent leaders. His sister, Milena Rudnytsky-Lysiak, was a member of the Polish Parliament before 1939 and an outstanding leader in the Ukrainian women's movement, particularly the "Union of Ukrainian Women." Three of his brothers came to the U.S. after World War II: Ivan Rudnytsky, noted Ukrainian journalist and former editor of the Ukrainian daily *Dilo* in Lviv and accredited correspondent to the Polish Diet in the 1930's, who also was associate editor of *Svoboda* (Jersey City, N.J.) for over twenty years. The second brother, Volodymyr Rudnytsky, a community leader, died in 1974 in Philadelphia. The third brother, Prof. Antin Rudnytsky, is a noted Ukrainian composer and conductor residing in New Jersey.

Prof. Rudnytsky was born on January 7, 1889 in the town of Pidhaytsi, Western Ukraine. He studied at universities in Lviv, Paris and London and became a noted literary critic and specialist on foreign literatures. He was the author of a series of literary essays on such Ukrainian writers as Ivan Franko, Vasyl Stefanyk, Mykhailo Pavlyk, Les Martovych and Marko Che-

remshyna, and of two larger works, **Writers Close-up** and a theatrical memoir, **In the Service of Melpomene**.

In 1939, with the seizure of Western Ukraine by Soviet troops, Prof. Rudnytsky remained in the country. The Soviet government was swift to capitalize on his renown and utilized him for anti-nationalist propaganda both in the press and at the university. Under his name there appeared several pamphlets against "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism," which in turn generated attacks on him by Ukrainians in the free world. Although he was awarded various Soviet literary prizes, he had no real power or influence in Ukraine.

'THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY' PRESS FUND

We gratefully acknowledge the following donations to *The Ukrainian Quarterly* Press Fund:

\$50.00: Dr. P.H. Koziak;
\$25.00: UCCA Branch, Buffalo, N.Y., E. Rokiwsky;
\$20.00: Dr. A. Strilbyckyj;
\$15.00: Zar Wacek;
\$10.00: N. Deychakiwsky, Lubomyr Zobniw.

U.Q. Administration