

---

---

# THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

---

---

VOL. IX. — NUMBER 4.



LOWER BOUNDARY: PREWAR TERRITORY OF UKRAINE      UPPER BOUNDARY: TERRITORY OF UKRAINE AFTER THE WORLD WAR

---

AUTUMN 1953

\$1.25 A COPY

---

*Published by* UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

---

---

---

---

**EDITORIAL BOARD FOR THE PUBLICATIONS  
of the THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA:  
LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, *chairman*; NICHOLAS D. CHUBATY, WALTER  
DUSHNYK, BOHDAN KRAVCIV, LUKE MYSHUHA, MATTHEW  
STAKHIV, ROMAN SMAL-STOCKI — *members***

---

***Editor* NICHOLAS D. CHUBATY  
*Associate Editor* LEV E. DOBRIANSKY  
*Artistic Advisor* SVIATOSLAV HORDYNSKY**

---

***Subscription: Yearly \$ 5.00; Single Copy \$ 1.25*  
*Checks payable to: UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA***

---

***Editorial and Managing Office: THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY*  
50 Church Street, S 252, New York 7, N. Y.  
*Tel.: BEekman 3-8886***

---

***Editor's Address: DR. NICHOLAS D. CHUBATY*  
250 Franklin Turnpike, Mahwah, New Jersey  
*Tel.: CRagmere 8-3767-M***

---

---

•

## CONTENTS

<b>Minorities and Majorities in the USSR</b>	293
<i>Editorial</i> .....	
<b>The Great Stalin Myth — The Solution of the Nationality Problems in the USSR</b>	300
<i>R. Adm. George F. Mentz</i> .....	
<b>The Problem of Irrigation in Southern Ukraine</b>	309
<i>Gregory Makhiv</i> .....	
<b>Polikarp Sikorsky — Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church</b>	313
<i>Nicholas Chubaty</i> .....	
<b>Destruction of Upper Classes of the Enslaved Nations — a Traditional Policy of Moscow</b>	317
<i>Vasyl Hryshko</i> .....	
<b>The Kremlin and The Eastern Catholic Church</b>	324
<i>Geza B. Grossschmidt</i> .....	
<b>A Modern Theory of Nationality</b>	335
<i>Clarence A Manning</i> .....	
<b>Three of a Kind — On H. Con. Res. 58</b>	343
<i>Lev E. Dobriansky</i> .....	
<b>The Soviet Scholar and Communist Reality</b>	351
<i>Nestor Korol</i> .....	
<b>In the Kolyma Gold Mines of Nizhny Khatynakh</b>	358
<i>Petro Kolymsky</i> .....	
<b>Answer to Shevchenko</b>	368
<i>Agnes Louise Hovde</i> .....	
<b>BOOK REVIEWS:</b>	
<b>What Europe Thinks of America, by James Burnham</b>	372
<i>Lev E. Dobriansky</i> .....	
<b>Russian Assignment, by Lealie C. Stevens</b>	374
<i>Clarence A. Manning</i> .....	
<b>L'Origine du Nom des Ruthenes, by B. Unbegaun</b>	375
<i>S. Hordynsky</i> .....	
<b>Outline of Comparative Slavic Literatures, by Dmitry Cizevsky</b>	376
<i>S. Hordynsky</i> .....	
<b>The Struggle for Transcaucasia, by Firuz Kazemzadekh</b>	377
<i>Yury Fedynsky</i> .....	
<b>Ucrainica in American and Foreign Periodicals</b>	379
<i>L. E. D.</i> .....	

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

**GEORGE F. MENTZ**, Rear Admiral in the US Navy in Retirement, active during World War II in various war theatres. Now member of the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism.

**GREGORY MAKHIV**, *Ph. D.*, authority on soil science of Ukraine. Former Professor of Kharkiv University under the Soviets, migrated to the USA. Died 1952.

**NICHOLAS CHUBATY**, Ukrainian historian and author. Former professor of East European History in Ukraine. Editor of this publication.

**VASYL HRYSHKO**, former professor of History of Ukrainian Laws in Kiev and Staff member of All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev under the Soviets. Now in USA.

**GEZA B. GROSSCHMIDT**, Sociologist, author, professor at Duquesne University, political emigrant from Hungary.

**CLARENCE A. MANNING**, Professor of Russian and Ukrainian Languages and Literatures at Columbia University. Author of *The Story of Ukraine, Ukrainian Literature, Ukraine under Soviets* and others.

**LEV E. DOBRIANSKY**, Ph D., Professor of Economics at Georgetown University and author. President of the *Ukrainian Congress Committee of America*.

**NESTOR KOROL**, *Ph. D.*, Soviet Ukrainian biologist, former professor of Moscow University and advisor to the Soviet authorities on agriculture. Now in USA.

**PETER KOLYMSKY**, (*pseudo*), a Ukrainian agriculturist from Soviet Ukraine. Now in this country.

**AGNES LOUISE HOVDE**, American poetess, author of "*Song before Sleep*," student of Ukrainian culture.

## MINORITIES AND MAJORITIES IN THE USSR

### *Editorial*

"Up to the First World War the United States developed largely in detachment from the rest of the world. During the few years that have elapsed since the end of the Second World War we have seen the tragic — perhaps one may say fatal—results of our ignorance of the peoples and countries of the world in general. Seven years ago we missed knowing that the situation in China would inevitably lead to communism. . . The thousands of American casualties and the billions of dollars expended are part of the payment on ignorance of Korea."<sup>1</sup>

A similar opinion was expressed in a letter to the Editor of the *New York Times* by Mr. Henry Chequer: "A great part of the dangerously complacent provincialism of our people in world affairs, I am convinced, is due to something lacking in the teaching of geography."<sup>2</sup>

The catastrophic ignorance of the actual situation in various parts of the world among the very influential Americans who not only form the public opinion of our country but even shape the world policy of America is doing tremendous damage to the free world in general and especially to our own country.

### WE MUST KEEP THE INTEREST OF THE RUSSIAN NATION

It is natural that the leading citizens of a world power as America is now, must most of all know the situation in the Soviet Union, our mortal enemy. The use of the word "Russia" as a synonym for the Soviet Union has become a chronic disease and it hides from the American people a true conception of our Bolshevik opponent. The professional assertions of the American geographers that Russia is not the same as the Soviet Union are worthless; the sacrosanct word "Russia" is constantly used in our press and even in our scientific works, even though the Russian national Communist government in the Kremlin, cannot identify the conceptions of Russia and the Soviet Union, much as it would like to do so.

---

<sup>1</sup> Prof. John Wesley Coulter of the Department of Geology and Geography of the University of Cincinnati, *New York Times*, Sept. 13, 1953.

<sup>2</sup> *New York Times*, October 4, 1953.

For some Americans the use of the word "Russia" instead of USSR is an old custom, which they find hard to give up; yet for many prominent Americans who are engaged in the formulation of our foreign policy, there still does not exist any Soviet Union, but there is the old Russia of 36 years ago, a unified nation with unified national aspirations. We only need to cite a journalist of the stature of Walter Lippman who in his column in the *New York Herald Tribune* writes exactly in these words: "It is not our business, and in any event it is quite beyond our power, to bring about the overthrow of the Bolshevik regime. *Our business is to see to it that we and our allies take a position about our relation with the Russian State and nation that Russian patriots will recognize and respect.* If we do that, they must do the rest. They, and not we, must do everything, that is to say, that is to be done inside the U.S.S.R."<sup>3</sup>

On reading such a statement from a man of the stature of Walter Lippman, we must ask ourselves whether he has been asleep for 36 years, so that he does not know that in the east of Europe there is no longer a single Russian state and a single Russian nation as there apparently was in his young years, for that disappeared during the administration of President Wilson in the flood of Russian Revolution after 1917.

This would not be a major misfortune, if Walter Lippman did not draw from his false conception of the old Russia, now the USSR, false practical conclusions, which he presents to the American people and the American government—and we believe he does it in the best of faith. He urges us to listen to the national aspirations of the Russian people, but this means the national aspirations of a people who form a minority in the USSR and who through their red overlords are oppressing the majority, i.e. the non-Russian peoples. What is going on in the USSR is, in the opinion of Walter Lippman, the affair of the Russian people and their aspirations as a great power, and America must not interfere in this question. America therefore must obviously not take advantage of the weakness in the USSR, especially the revolutionary movements for the liberation of the non-Russian peoples, for the Russians would not like it. His practical advice is for the American people to wait until the Russian people see their real interest and overthrow their Bolshevik regime. Practically he wishes us to make a clear distinction between the Stalinist regime and the Russian nation and he even goes further, when he advises: "*If we are wise, we shall encourage the national movement by acknowledging Russian interest in security and access to the world markets.*"

---

<sup>3</sup> *New York Herald Tribune*, July 14, 1953.

Whoever knows the propagandistic slogans of the Russian emigres who defend the one and indivisible Russia will be on guard, when they are voiced by such an American as Walter Lippman in this form: 1) we must separate the Stalinist government and the Russian people; 2) America must respect the national aspirations of the Russians; 3) America must not interfere in the internal questions of Russia, i.e. the USSR; 4) the Russian people will overthrow the Bolshevik government in their time for their own national interests.

Why does Walter Lippman, without doubt a good American, proclaim principles which help not America but Russia? The reason is to be found in the fact that he does not know the nationalities problem of the old Russia, the present USSR. He does not understand that within the USSR there exist now not only the aspirations of the Russian people but also the patriotic aspirations of the other nations of the USSR, for the USSR is not the "national Russian state and nation" as he writes but it is a Union of 16 principal nations, among which the Russian only occupies the first place.

Walter Lippman does not know that the national interests of the Russians are best represented by the aggressive government in the Kremlin with its hostility to America, that side by side with this the national Russian religious interests are represented by the Patriarch of Moscow, the Head of the Third Rome, and so the American people would have to wait a long while before the Russian people overthrow their Bolshevik regime. This is the tragedy; ignorance of the national conditions in the USSR prevent an influential American from seeing the real allies of America—the enslaved nations, the Achilles' heel of the USSR. Walter Lippman advises the Americans not to interfere in the internal questions of the USSR but obviously to leave the non-Russian peoples to be the booty of the national aspirations of the Russian people and to give up voluntarily that dynamic ally and leave to the persecution of the Kremlin what could absolutely be not to the interests of America.

There is no doubt that the use of the word Russia instead of USSR is favored by the very influential Russian reactionary emigrés in the USA and the fact that they still have a great deal of influence is the reason why the word "Russia" still keeps its present meaning in the American publications.

#### DENOTING THE NATIONAL MINORITIES OF THE USSR

Now as the word "Russia" which has hidden the territories of the USSR is slowly becoming obsolete, and soon—we believe—will acquire its legitimate meaning, for even the Russians can no longer deny the

existence of the non-Russian peoples, a new term is appearing in American journalism more and more frequently, but this is as confusing as the word "Russia". It is the NATIONAL MINORITIES OF RUSSIA, or the national minorities of the USSR. There is no doubt that this term was invented by the same Russian imperialists. They are anxious to show to the Western world that the USSR is the Russian state ruled by the Bolsheviks, which contains some ethnic non-Russian groups. These form an unimportant minority of the population and so they are called national minorities.

Majority rule is a democratic principle and if the Russian people of the USSR were the majority of the population and the non-Russians were the real minority, there would be no reason and in fact it would be unjust to the Russian people to divide Russia into national states, for no one of the minorities would form a state. A minority in a democratic system has the claim to minority rights but never to the role of a state nation, which represents a majority of the population.

The words, "national minorities of the USSR," deceive the American people and it is to the interest of America that this confusing phrase invented relatively recently by the Russian imperialists and their fellow-travellers and often accepted in good faith by some Americans, should disappear as soon as possible from the dictionary of words applied to the USSR, for it is deceitful and harmful to the American interests.

The phrase "national minorities" is relatively new in its application to the USSR. Juridically it goes back to the proclamation of the doctrine of self-determination by President Wilson. He declared that every people had the right to form its own state on its own national territory, i.e. where a given people formed the majority of the population. In Europe on the borders of the nations there are found territories with mixed populations. In these it was a question of determining the majority of ethnic element and the rest were the minorities.

The right of self-determination of peoples recognized that the majority of the population in a given territory should decide that the territory would become part of a national state of the people. In case of dispute as to the actual majority, there should be a plebiscite. Yet a minority should not be handed over to the pleasure or displeasure of the majority of a national state. Wilson's doctrine was too humane to approve the expulsion of populations, i.e. the use of such brutal methods as on the inspiration of the Bolshevik government were applied after the last war, when millions of people were driven from their homes and their property was confiscated only because they were of another ethnic group. So in connection with the application in the Versailles Treaty of the right of self-determination for the majority, measures were included



for the welfare of the minority who were guaranteed civil rights and the right to cultivate their faith and culture.

As we have said, national minorities exist only on small border territories of the old historical peoples. On the contrary when the term "national minorities" is applied to the non-Russian peoples of the USSR, it is used to hide the fact that the nations of the USSR are old historical nations, often older than the Russians, who have been living for one or several thousand years on own large territories. These territories ethnically, culturally, historically and often also economically have been definite national units with overwhelming majority of the population concerned, and are often far larger than that of the small independent states of Europe.

As an example, Ukraine according to the status of 1939 occupies an area with an undoubted Ukrainian majority of population of 728,500 square kilometres. Its population is 49,500,000. It has an area and population larger than France. Of this number, 75.3% are Ukrainians, 9.7% Russians, 5.3% Poles, 5.9% Jews, and 3.8% others.<sup>4</sup> Thanks to the fact that Ukraine was under the rule of Russia, the Russian minority was the largest. The Russian national minority was largest in the east; the Polish largest in the west. Yet Ukraine forms a geographical unit which is bordered on the south by the Carpathians, the Black Sea and the western Caucasus and on the north by the Polissyan marshes. The Ukrainian population forms a definite whole with its own culture and history going back over a thousand years.

The same is true of White Ruthenia, of the separate Baltic states, the separate Caucasian peoples and Turkestan. Their history and culture were always distinct from that of Russia and were a thousand years older than Russian. Do these nations constitute any of sort of minorities?

It is obvious that in the USSR we are dealing not with a single nation but many; of these 16 have been so ready for independent state life that even the Bolsheviks have not been able in their own interests to deny the fact and so they reconstructed the old Russian Empire into the Union of Soviet Republics, each of which is a special entity.

When we add to all this the fact that the Russian people form at present a minority of about 46% of the population of the whole USSR after the annexation of the western areas of Ukraine and White Ruthenia and the Baltic states added to the USSR (1940-1944) 24.3 millions of

---

<sup>4</sup> *Geography of Ukraine* by W. Kubijowycz, Cracow-Lviv 1943, p. 314.

non-Russians, living on a territory of 640,000 square kilometres, it is obvious that the Russians form a minority of the population.<sup>5</sup>

But as it was said the USSR is not a national state. It is a Union of national states and the 15 non-Russian republics cannot be treated as minorities of the Russian Soviet Republic but only as separate state structures.

As we see by the example of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, more than 75% of the population of its territory is Ukrainian and the rest are national minorities, Russians, Poles, Jews, and others. *So if we can speak of national minorities in the USSR, we can only speak of national minorities in the individual national republics.* Thus in the Ukrainian Republic there is a Russian national minority just as in the Russian Soviet Republic there is a Ukrainian minority. The same can be said of each national republic of the USSR.

#### COMPARING USSR AND THE USA

The Russians and their fellow-travellers in America frequently love to compare the USSR with America, which is also composed of 48 states with a population of American culture, all generally employing the English language in their daily life. This comparison is completely incorrect and false. America is a new special nation which has been formed during three centuries on a new and almost empty territory, for it belonged to no one except the Indians. The American nation was produced by the coming of various nationalities who accepted the then existent American civilization and enriched it by adding their own cultural elements. But no national group is connected with any part of the American territory which it regards as its native land. For an American the state of New York or of California is the same country, for it is part of America.

It is different with the old, historic nations of Europe and Asia. There each nation is connected with its own national territory, and its history for hundreds of years has been connected with that same area, and this has attached the sentiments of the population to it. It can be ended only by the physical extermination or the violent removal of the population i.e. the destruction of the nation can give its territory to another people. The Russian Bolsheviks are working in this direction and so did the old Russian government so as to make the territory of the non-Russian peoples by genocidal extermination or russification territory of the Russian people. This is the essence of the national struggle for the self-

---

<sup>5</sup> *Economic Geography of the USSR* by Balzak, Vasiutyn, Feign., New York, 1949, p. 544.

preservation of the nation and it is this which Americans so poorly understand. Yet this shows why there can be no comparison between the United States of America and the republics of the USSR.

To a certain degree Siberia is like America, for there as in the USA are almost empty territories settled by all the nationalities of the USSR. Yet for not one of them is Siberia a native land in the same sense as that from which they came. At the present time there are over 4 million Ukrainians in Siberia but every one of them considers Ukraine his native land.

From what we have said, it is obvious that the conception of national minorities of the USSR as applied to the non-Russian peoples is a conception made by the Russian imperialists for the deception of the American people and has been accepted by Americans unaware of the political problems of the USSR. The object of this new term is only to confuse still more the question of the national problems of the USSR and to show to the world that the USSR is a Russian state with some national minorities, which like all minorities, can have no right to independent national existence, but which are part of Russia of every color with some right to that cultural autonomy which is deserved by all minorities under present international law.

The practical application of this conception of national minorities in the USSR toward the Ukrainians in American publications is well shown by the criticism of an American Russian, Alexander Dallin, Assistant Director of the Research Program on the USSR under the Ford Foundation, on the volume of Prof. Clarence Manning, *Ukraine under the Soviets*.<sup>6</sup> For this Russian American it is apparently unintelligible why Prof. Manning speaks of the national persecution of the Ukrainian people by Russia; why the author uses the Ukrainian and not the Russian name of Ukrainian cities and why the author uses the name of Soviet institutions on Ukrainian territory in their Ukrainian and not in their Russian forms, and why the Ukrainian Insurgent Army which fought for the liberation of Ukraine from every Russia should be considered a patriotic army and not fascist band of dissatisfied minorities. The Ukrainians as a national minority have obviously no right to their own national history, for minorities cannot have such.

The terms "Russia" instead of "Soviet Union" and the term "Russian National Minorities" or "National Minorities of the USSR" as used so often in America are confusing and harmful primarily to America. It is necessary to say with Mortimer Graves of the American Council of Learned Societies that ignorance in geographical matters is "a neglected facet of the national security problem" (*New York Times*, Sept. 13, 1953).

---

<sup>6</sup> *New Leader*, November 30, 1953.

## THE GREAT STALIN MYTH—THE SOLUTION OF THE NATIONALITY PROBLEMS IN THE USSR

By **GEORGE F. MENTZ**  
Rear Admiral, U.S.N. Ret.

On March 6th, 1953, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union announced the death of Stalin. This was in the form of an impassioned appeal to unity of the "Soviet people" under the Communist party.

A few days later, Malenkov, Beria and Molotov gave their orations at Stalin's funeral. In the very first part of Malenkov's oration he refers to Stalin's solution of the nationality problem.

"In the history of the development of human society and the national question, the greatest theoretician of the national question, Comrade Stalin, secured, for the first time in history within the frontier of a huge multi-national state, the liquidation of national strife. Our sacred duty is to strengthen and further the unity and friendship of the nations of the Soviet Union and to strengthen the Soviet multi-national state and friendship among the peoples of our country. We are not afraid of any internal or external enemies. Under the direct leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Soviet army was created and strengthened."

There you have it. Malenkov's first concern was the nationality problem. This was followed by fear of internal and external enemies and a dissertation on the Soviet armed forces.

The first sign of internal dissension in the USSR happened in Ukraine when the Communist Party leader, Leonid G. Melnikov, who is, of course, a Russian, was charged with carrying out a policy of intense Russianization of the Ukraine. He was a protege of Nikita S. Krushchev, also Russian, who won his spurs in the Ukraine for his ruthlessness and brutality and has now risen to the position of secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This incident was closely followed by similar measures in Georgia, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia and Turkestan. Then there were reports of unrest in Poland and strikes in Pilsen and Bohemia, followed by the rebellion of June 17th in East Berlin which spread to the entire Soviet Zone of Germany. Shortly afterwards, a new policy was proclaimed in Hungary and in Rumania. The industrialization plan for Hungary was drastically modified as was the collective farm program. These measures seem to point to a temporary easing of harsh measures, at least in the satellite countries. Finally, in

late June, expulsion from the party and the arrest of Lavrenti P. Beria, Deputy Premier and Minister of the Interior, boss of the Secret Police, the internal and external espionage service, the slave labor camps and the atomic energy program.

These events point to heavy strains and stresses in all of the non-Russian nations of the USSR and in the satellite countries. We hear nothing, however, of any dissension, political or otherwise, within Muscovy itself. It is in the non-Russian nations of the USSR and in the satellite nations that the unmistakable signs of unrest and even rebellion are apparent. The fear on the part of their Russian masters must be plain to all but the most naive.

We, in the United States, are confronted with a ruthless determined enemy, Russian Communist imperialism, dedicated to the destruction of our American tradition and our ideals of freedom and liberty. This is an indispensable step in the path leading to conquest of the world. Yet we seem, even now, after our experience in a full scale war in Korea, unable to adequately appraise or fully identify and understand our enemy.

The events from March to August last, and still continuing, show unmistakable weakness in the imperialist arsenal of communism. Are we ready for it? Were we ready on June 17th to take advantage, without recourse to a full-scale war, of a succession of revolts if they had seriously spread to Poland, Hungary, Czechia, Slovakia, Rumania and Bulgaria?

A scant fifty years ago we were emerging from the Spanish American war and beginning to take our place in the councils of the Great Powers of the world. To-day, we are the most powerful military and industrial nation the world has ever seen. The heritage of liberty of the individual, freedom for all, government of the people by the people and for the people and belief in God according to one's own conscience has placed us in a unique position of leadership of the free world.

Let us for a moment glance backward in order to profit from past experience in international policy. What is known to-day as the West had, prior to World War I, Central Europe, largely under Austro-Hungarian rule, as a bastion against the East. Following World War I, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia and many other nations declared their independence. The Austro-Hungarian empire which was primarily an economic federation was dissolved and succeeded by a number of independent states in Central Europe. Bohemia was joined with Slovakia to form the republic of Czechoslovakia. This was an artificial product of the peace conference with Austria and Hungary, the vanquished nations, the victims. The population of Czechoslovakia was made up of approximately 6.5 million Czechs, 3.3 million Germans, 2.5 million Slovaks and large minorities of Ukrainians, Hungarians and Poles. Furthermore, the rich industrial area of Bohemia was

vital to Austria since it had been founded with Viennese capital. We have never been allowed to forget this fact.

In what is to-day the Soviet Union, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia and ten other non-Russian nations of the Czarist empire had declared their independence. But it soon became apparent that the Provisional Government took the same position with respect to the non-Russian nations as had the imperialistic Russian government of the Czars. The Kerensky government, despite its weakness and inability to cope with the menace of Bolshevism, concentrated all its efforts on preventing the non-Russian peoples from establishing their own independent states.

During that short period, before the successful Bolshevik coup d'état in Moscow, Kerensky made two trips to Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, and refused to recognize even the federated state of that country. Later the overwhelming majority of the Ukrainian people forced the exiled Kerensky to recognize that nation as a fully independent state, despite his prior efforts to undermine the young republic and bring the Ukraine under centralized Russian chauvinistic domination.

The tragedy after World War I was the failure of the Western democratic leaders to recognize the full significance of the struggle in the political vacuum created by the downfall of the Czarist Russian Empire. Full recognition of these facts in the 1920s would have prevented re-establishment of Russian imperialism (under the communists) and could very well have prevented the rise of Hitlerism and World War II. The Allied statesmen, opposed as they were to Communism, failed to understand the potential political forces in Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations of the empire in their struggle for freedom and independence from imperialist Russia, whether Czarist or communist. This was the great error of the first half of our century.

Instead, they gave their support to the remnants of the Czarist armies under Denikin and Baron Wrangel. These forces fought in Ukraine, Caucasus and other non-Russian regions where the newly created freedom-loving republics had no desire to return to Russian autocracy under a Czar. The White Russian armies were, in the end, defeated and the tragic result of this struggle was only to prepare the way for the new conqueror, Moscow dominated communism. The rebirth of nations in the vast non-Russian areas was mortally weakened by the morally bankrupt efforts of the remnant Czarist armies.

In Great Russia proper there was no civil war and very little resistance to communism. However, in each of the non-Russian nations the Bolsheviks met with stubborn armed resistance which took years to overcome. In comparing Ukraine with Russia Lenin stated: "In the course of two years we finally succeeded in securing the sentiment and support of the greater part of the workers and peasants of Great Russia, but we did

not end with winning over the sentiment and support of the majority of the working class of Ukraine."

The Allies, though opposed to communism, failed to understand the non-Russian nations' struggle for independence from Moscow nor the imperialistic *Russian* character of communism.

In World War II our armed forces fought the Japanese empire virtually single-handed and, at the same time, we fought Hitler and his allies, in the Mediterranean and on the continent of Europe. We secured our foothold from North African bases, first in Sicily and then Italy. Later came the invasion of Normandy. In Europe our objective was military—unconditional surrender and defeat of Nazi Germany. An overall plan for the political settlement of Europe, particularly Central Europe and the Balkans, seemed singularly lacking. Instead of mounting the invasion of Southern France from Italy and North Africa we could have proceeded up the Italian peninsula (which we did anyway) and, by means of amphibious landings, occupied northern Yugoslavia. From there, our armies, in coordination with our forces in France and Germany, could have liberated Austria, Hungary, Czechia, Slovakia and other nations now under Moscow. How different would the world picture be to-day had we pursued this plan of action!

It is vital to our defense and our national interests, as well as the vital interests of the cause of human freedom, that we evolve an overall plan for Central Europe and Eastern Europe including the captive non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. We must, above all, know our enemy and the weak spots in his armor. This enemy is Russian communist imperialism. Furthermore, we must realize that he has a plan for world conquest; in India, in Southeast Asia, Japan, the Middle East, Africa, Western Europe and South America. Yes, even our beloved America.

We have recently signed a treaty with Spain. The provisions of this treaty grant to us the use of a number of air and naval bases. This is the result of a strategic concept long advocated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The wonder is that it comes so late. Spain and Portugal are vital to the strategic defense of the Northern American continent. Spanish influence, culture and literature are of tremendous influence to Central and South America. Yet, a few years ago, the United States along with Britain and France, withdrew their Ambassadors from Madrid under pressure from the Soviet Union and its world wide propaganda. In June 1945 the leaders of the Communist Party in the USA received a new party line from Moscow. All the American comrades in key positions were told of the new policy which, in substance, had for its main objective, the undermining and weakening of the United States. This, of course, came straight from Moscow. Among the various plans was: "The establishment of a Red Spain (to be carved quickly out of a 'Republican Spain') to be used as

a jumping off place for alliances in Latin America by which to weaken the United States.”<sup>1</sup> Again in 1945-46 was the attempted formation of a “Republican Government” for Spain by the world communist movement. i.e. Moscow. Dr. José Giral was chosen by the Spanish republican refugees in Mexico to be President or, in reality, another Kerensky, pending a Red régime in Spain.

Here we have *Russian* communists, fresh from Moscow, dictating the communist Party line to the American comrades of the CP-USA. These agents, foreign Russian agents, set the pace in America, come and go under false though technically perfect passports, and use our country as a base of operations for conspiracy in Mexico, Canada and South America under plan of world wide policy dictated by the Kremlin. All of which seeks to isolate the U.S. from its allies and then to destroy us at their convenience.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party in Moscow is the headquarters of a movement which is world wide. It must have been apparent during the Korean war that the North Koreans took their orders direct from Moscow or from Moscow-appointed party officials in North Korea and China. In every one of the satellite countries, with the one exception of Yugoslavia, the present leaders spent the entire World War II in Moscow, the capital of world communism. This includes post-war France and Italy where Thorez and Togliatti were designated as the party leaders after years of subordination and indoctrination in Moscow. All matters of policy emanate from Moscow. When necessary, and as a sop to local pride, the top leader appointed is a native of the country. In Poland all officers above field rank are said to be Russian. Marshall Rokossovsky, the Minister of Defense, is a Russian who has spent his whole life in the Soviet army. His name, however, appears to be Polish and he is dramatized as being of Polish origin.

In the Baltic States, Byelorussia, Ukraine and most of the other captive non-Russian nations of the USSR, the top party leaders, always, of course, appointed from Moscow, are Russian. Melnikov, recently ousted from Ukraine, was Russian as was Khrushchev, today, one of the very top party functionaries and Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Highly centralized rule by terror is the normal policy with regard to the non-Russian nations of the Russian Communist empire. The slave labor camps are filled by mass deportations from these nations. The Baltic states, Byelorussia and Ukraine are glaring examples. Russian imperialism has never been able to subdue the longing for independence of these people. In Ukraine, in 1932-33, after some 13 years of communist rule and mass deportations of tens of thousands of Ukrainians,

---

<sup>1</sup> From “This Is My Story” by Louis Francis Budenz, p. 310.



the Kremlin deliberately created an artificial famine resulting in over 3,000,000 deaths from starvation in an effort to crush the Ukrainian peasant because of his freedom loving resistance to forcible Russian collectivization.

Such crimes perpetrated in the non-Russian nations are carried out as the official policy of the Communist Party. The overwhelming majority of the Communist Party in the USSR is Russian—practically all of the top leaders are Russian, with one or two exceptions, and the party activists charged with the implementation of such mass murders are Russian. Is it any wonder that all of the captive non-Russian nations of the USSR want, once and for all, their independence from Moscow? Can the Polish people ever forget the mass murder of thousands of Polish officers in the Katyn forest during the war? Can the Ukrainian people ever forget the forced famine of 1932 and the efforts to liquidate its intelligentsia?

A careful study of the German invasion of the USSR, particularly in the initial stages, should be mandatory study for all top level planners in our government, both military and civilian. Fortunately, captured German documents are available to us. German propaganda, by radio and other means, to the non-Russian nations preceding the invasion, was highly effective. Byelorussia, Ukraine, North Caucasus and other nations were promised their freedom and independence. In the initial stages the German Wehrmacht found no opposition from the captive populations. The Germans were greeted as liberators from Russian imperialistic communism and deserters from the Red army numbered in the millions.

Three conflicting elements entered into the formulation of German policy with regard to the occupied areas of the Soviet Union, namely, the Wehrmacht, the Foreign Office, and the Nazi party. Hitler made the overall decision with the result that the Nazi party under Himmler's SS troops were given jurisdiction over the occupied areas and the people of those areas were treated little better than slaves. It is important to note that the Ukrainians soon realized that the Nazis were their mortal enemies and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army fought from then on effectively on two fronts, against the Nazis on the West and the Red army on the East.<sup>2</sup>

In recent years of the cold war our policy towards "Russia" has, in one degree or another, been the following:

Contain the Soviet Union within its present frontiers (including the satellite nations). Be ready to stop communist expansion in any part of the globe (i.e. Greece, Korea, Indo-China, Malaya, Indonesia, Western Europe, etc.). Do not, however, encourage or lend moral support to either the captive

---

<sup>2</sup> A Russian army was organized under command of the former Soviet General Vlassov. This army performed purely guard duty, mainly in Czechoslovakia, and never fought a battle. At the very end of the war, on their first contact with the Red army, the Vlassov forces deserted en masse to the Reds.

non-Russian nations of the USSR or the satellite countries for fear of offending the Russians. Sooner or later the Russian people will overthrow the yoke of the communist system and then each individual non-Russian state of the USSR may determine the question of independence or federation with Muscovy.

From the above policy the question of sovereign independence of the captive non-Russian nations is relegated to some distant future when the Russians, the Muscovites, have thrown off communism. In the meantime, despite the lessons of World War II, the effective resistance of the non-Russian nations from 1920 until the present day, virtual admission by top Communist leaders such as Malenkov, of serious trouble in the non-Russian nations particularly since the death of Stalin, we must do nothing to interfere with the indivisibility of the Red empire. This must be an "internal" question. There must be no pre-determination of the captive nations because this would require us to support the cause of human freedom. People advocating the independence of the Baltic states, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, North Caucasus, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, are crude "Separatists." (We must forget and hide the fact that the founding fathers were "separatists"). "No such problem exists in the Soviet Union" — "No nationality desires self-determination." The Soviet Union is "a voluntary Union of equal nations."

This is certainly the official Soviet line. Moreover, it is practically identical to the line used throughout the whole of the Russian emigration both the old ex-Czarist and new emigration. At all costs, no "dismemberment of the empire" White or Red.

A more subtle form of propaganda would have us believe that all of the nations of the USSR, Russian as well as non-Russian, are in the same communistic prison. That all are suffering equally under the Kremlin. But this fails to take into account the ruthless genocide in the form of mass deportations, killings and deliberate starvation perpetrated against the non-Russian nations; the extreme measures resorted to in order to force collectivization of the peasantry. The Russian people are unquestionably under the communist yoke, but have they suffered from deliberately planned genocide? Were extreme, cruel measures and deliberate starvation necessary to force them into the collective farms as was the case in Ukraine during the years 1932-33? The answer is obvious. The ethnic Russian people offered no resistance as did the non-Russians to the collective farm program. Nor did they, in 1917, put up a fighting resistance to the Bolsheviks in any way comparable to the outright warfare that even now endures in the non-Russian nations of the USSR.

In this cold war we must clearly know our enemy, his strength and his weaknesses. We must determine on a set policy in the best interests of the United States and the universal cause of human freedom. And above all, we must recognize our real friends and natural allies.

Is it possible to envisage, given the right conditions, an effective resistance on the part of the ethnic Russian people against their communist masters? Since 1917 there have been no signs to indicate it although during the war they did show their doubts about the ability of the regime to survive. Did not these people emerge straight from medieval Czarist autocracy into 20th century communist slavery without even understanding the first principles of freedom, liberty and democracy?

On the other hand, we have concrete examples, over a long period of years, of the stubborn resistance put forth by the non-Russian nations to Moscow dominated communism. Certainly World War II proved that they can be depended upon to fight for their freedom.

It has always been in the American tradition to offer sympathy and encouragement to oppressed peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence. Our policy must not be one of mere containment. It should boldly come out in support of the liberation of enslaved nations.

There are, unfortunately, many obstacles to be overcome right here in freedom-loving America before we can launch such a positive policy. For years we have, in the United States, drawn our experts on the USSR from the Russian émigrés. In our universities the professors of Slavic studies are practically all Russians. In the Department of State, the Army, and most branches of the government all too many of our experts on the USSR are Russians. In the press and even in official communications, the term "Russia" has become almost synonymous with the term Soviet Union or USSR. The distinguished Ukrainian professor Roman Smal-Stocki mentions in his scholarly book "The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union" that he found, upon his arrival in the United States some five years ago, a virtual intellectual Iron Curtain throughout American universities and colleges in which the Russian émigré line is perilously close to the Soviet line on all questions to do with the nationality problem of the Soviet Union. Far more serious is the number of Americans, who, either through ignorance or long study of Russian language, history and literature under Russian teachers, become carried away with all things Russian to the point where they know little or nothing of the non-Russian nations. What is more tragic, they lose sight of their country's fundamental interests.

As an example, one out of many, Eugene Lyons, in his most recent book "*Our Secret Allies — the Peoples of Russia*," just published, states on page 325:

"Not long ago a minor American official, addressing a Ukrainian mass meeting, spoke movingly of "the fate of the Ukraine under the domination of the Bolsheviki," reciting the litany of mass killing, exiles, forcible collectivization, suffered by Ukrainians. He was wasting his breath, turning his good intentions into a travesty, by implying that only Ukrainians or espe-

cially the Ukraine were victimized. He forgot that all the peoples of the Soviet Union are in the same prison state and that they will remain there unless they force its wall together."

Mr. Lyons was, of course, referring to the Honorable Edward M. O'Connor, former United States Commissioner of Displaced Persons and widely recognized as the foremost non-marxist American authority on the USSR, and more particularly its people and the captive nations therein. The analysis of Commissioner O'Connor's historic address on "*The Tragedy of the Ukrainian Nation*" by Lyons is completely inconsistent with both the content and purpose of that address. An examination of that address will show that Commissioner O'Connor established these vital points of fact about the USSR:

- 1) That it is an empire made up of many captive nations.
- 2) That there is only one Russian nation in the USSR.
- 3) That there are fifteen distinct non-Russian nations in the USSR, all of which despise Communism and Russian Imperialism, and have through the centuries sought their independence from Moscow domination.
- 4) That the majority peoples of the USSR are non-Russian. The Russians comprise an absolute maximum of 45.6% of the population of the USSR and the non-Russians make up 54.4%.
- 5) That U.S. and free world security depend upon support of the non-Russian nations of the USSR because they are the natural allies of human freedom and all those who seek to preserve and extend its warm benevolence throughout the world.
- 6) In making these facts clear the Commissioner developed the heroic struggles of the Ukrainian people against Russian Imperialism and, since 1917, against the new Imperialism of Moscow called Communism.

It is worth noting that approximately two weeks after Commissioner O'Connor delivered this historic address none other than Lavrenti Beria released in Moscow the "new" census figures of the USSR, all of which sought to discredit the scholarly and factual population figures developed by Commissioner O'Connor. What Beria attempted to do was to create the impression that the Russians made up the majority of the peoples of the USSR. This was no coincidence and in every way was a great compliment to the accuracy of Commissioner O'Connor's analysis of the peoples and nations of the USSR.

Now, does it not seem strange that Lyons at this time perverts the address of Commissioner O'Connor and seeks to discredit him as an authority on this all important issue: Laverenti Beria tried to do the same thing. Could this be an accidental association of the Russia First movement in the United States?

Clearly we cannot afford, at this stage of the cold war, to lose sight of our country's primary interests. Too many sacrifices are at stake. It seems high time that we fully understand and appraise our enemy — the enemy of traditional American freedom and Christian civilization.

## THE PROBLEM OF IRRIGATION IN SOUTHERN UKRAINE

By GREGORY MAKHIV  
(*Posthumous publication*)

Prof. G. Makhiv, a Ukrainian soil specialist during the 1920's made special studies of the soil on the empty steppes north of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov. The work of a special Committee with G. Makhiv as a most active member culminated in a plan for constructing an irrigation system for south-eastern Ukraine to be supplied with water from the lower Dnieper. Unfortunately when the Ukrainian Soviet government submitted this to Moscow, it was rejected and only revived in 1951. The so called GES — Khakhivka Project included in the Five Year Plan 1952-57 is to be finished in 1957. (See "The Ukrainian Quarterly", Vol. VII page 17.) By that time Prof. Makhiv had come to the United States as a DP and worked in this country until his death in 1952. (Editor).

The southern steppe of Ukraine because of the heat during the growing period is a prospective region for many southern crops which need heat. At the same time the harvests of the leading grains like the most valuable sorts of hard spiked wheat, barley, sunflowers for oil, etc. often fail because of the lack of sufficient moisture in the soil and air, so that the fight against drought is one of the most vital problems of southern Ukrainian agriculture. Usually dryness can be mastered by carrying through a complex of agricultural methods, among which are: the fertilizing of the soil, the regulation of the snow cover on the fields, the reforestation of the steppe, the fight against erosion, the regulation of the surface flow of water, and the artificial irrigation of the crops. The latter method is of dominant importance, for it makes up for the chief cause of the loss of the harvests, the lack of water in the soil and increases at the same time the proportional moisture of the air above the irrigated fields. If these fields are surrounded by protective belts of forests, the air remains moist in the intervening fields quite a long time. The carrying out of artificial irrigation requires much preliminary study and research, i.e. the choice of certain strains of various plants to increase the crops, and to find those which do not react badly to irrigation. An unscientifically developed irrigation can stop the growth of cotton and prevent a good harvest before the frost and certain drought-resistant strains of wheat can under irrigation show a tendency to lodge and be infected by various fungus and bacterial diseases. Besides, unscientific ir-

rigation can run down the condition of the soil by causing their renewed salination, as a result of drawing the salts from the deeper levels along with the capillary absorption of the irrigation water during the drying of the surface. Watering by a general pouring on of water on the surface of the field or by infiltration from springs beside the possible salination, can also produce the phenomenon of fibulation. This happens when the granulated soils under the influence of surface streams of water arrange their particles more densely, reducing their size and this causes in places surface deposits, the formation of holes and finally it destroys the irrigation system.

In Ukraine prior to World War II there was developed the so-called "oasis irrigation," where there were irrigated separate small fields of some hundreds of hectares, or 1,000-5,000 acres each. For this system there was used river water or water from artesian wells. There are important areas of oasis irrigation on both banks of the Dnieper between the Khortyt'sya dam of the DniproGES and the mouth of the river Samara for on this stretch, the level of the Dnieper has been considerably raised by the building of the dam of the DniproGES. The most of this oasis irrigation with river water is usually on the left banks of the rivers, on low level terraces, which rise only 15 m. above the level of the river. There are many irrigated spots on the left bank terraces of the Dniester, Boh, Inhul, Dnieper, Molochna and other rivers. Usually irrigated are the garden crops for the feeding of the great industrial cities (Sicheslav, Kryvy Rih, Zaporizhzhya, Mykolayiv, Kherson). Near Kherson on the terrace of the Dnieper—Boh pond, there is one plot of 3,000 hectares, which produces not only fresh garden produce but also the fruits for a canning factory. Oasis irrigation is easy to develop in the region of activity of the DniproGES for it uses for the spreading of the water the electric energy of its network.

In the steppe depressions it is easy to use pond irrigation by building an earth wall on a ridge below the slope. This holds the water which flows in spring and after the rains into the basin formed at the bottom of the slope. This water is gradually let out through sluiceways in the wall and is used for watering crops below the depression. In this way the entire bottom of the depression can be planted with rice by making at the bottom collecting pits to take off the water.

Along the shore of the Black Sea at Syvashiv there is a great dike — a basin for underground artesian waters. In this region at 20 metres depth lie cavernous chalk beds through which is filtered the waters of the lower Dnieper and they hold the pontic stratum of artesian waters. The water of the pontic level is of good quality and has sufficient pressure. Under a thin layer of the pontic chalks are white and gray maeotic chalks. In this level we have another water-collecting layer with

water of good quality and great pressure. Still deeper are the Sarmatian chalks, the deeper of which in the Dnieper region have also a stratum of artesian waters. Below the Sarmatian lie deposits of the Central land-sea level which have a stratum of artesian waters with a pizometric level of 6.5-8.5 metres above the water level. The water of this central land-sea level is rich in salt, sodium, magnesium and calcium. By using the water of the pontic and maotic levels it is possible to irrigate a larger area for grain and cotton cultivation on the seashore steppe. In this region there is the highest heat, a very growing season—so that by irrigation it is possible to secure frost-free harvests of raw cotton of 30-35 centner (100 kilograms) from 1 hectare. From one well, depending on its pressure, can be irrigated from 50 to 100 hectares. It is especially profitable economically to irrigate that part of the shore region (Skadovsk-Kalanchak-Khorly) where the springs gush. Formerly, there were many irrigated fruit orchards, often of considerable size up to dozens of hectares or even hundreds. Most of these are still in existence.

The region of the Lower Dnieper-river Molochna which lies south of the line Kakhivka-Melitopil, offers exceptionally favorable conditions for a large scale irrigation from the waters of the Lower Dnieper. Now there is being carried out a plan for using the Dnieper water to irrigate the southern steppe areas of Ukraine north of the Sea of Azov. The building of a dam on the Dnieper at the mouth of the Inhulets will give the needed water supply which by electric power can be pumped into the main canals of the irrigation system. The general slope of the land from the Dnieper toward the sea will secure the circulation of the water in the irrigation system and so there is no need to install auxiliary electrical stations to pump on the water.

In 1927 a plan was proposed (but afterward rejected by the government of the USSR) to irrigate in southern Ukraine 2 million hectares of land with the aid of the electricity of the DniproGES. As a basis for this work there was carried out (Makhiv, 1927-31) a detailed study of the soils of the Black Sea steppe and a map was made of them on a scale 1:10,000; along with the topographies. The detailed study of the water and physical properties of the soils of the area planned to be irrigated showed that the soils were not in danger of fibulation, for their basic structure was not granular but glauclay. On this area there were predominant dark brown soils, lightly alkalized and brown alkalized soils which showed no danger of being salinized by irrigation with moderate norms of water, for the salinized levels were quite deep and did not have a great concentration of salts. Salinizing was possible only on the spots of "solonchaks" which at a depth of 0.5-0.75 metres had an important amount of salts. The best way of irrigating solonchaks is by sprinkling, for this totally removes the possibility of salinizing the soils by irrigating.

At the same time it was shown that the southern saline soils and solonchaks have a favorable combination of salts of sodium and calcium, because thanks to the physiological antagonism of these salts and the protective role of calcium, the toxic power of the salts of sodium will not appear on the cultivation of the plants. This is supported by the fact of the normal development of irrigated orchards and windbreaks of trees on the chloride-sulphate solonchaks on the shore of the ponds of the Black Sea.

The study of soil and the object of their improvement have made it possible to introduce much that is new into the technique of irrigation. Hitherto there have been very complicated problems as how to protect the dikes against undermining by the water. The Ukrainian students of soils have recently proposed a simple and cheap method, i. e. the watering of the walls and bottom of the ditches with a solution of common salt. The sodium of the salt forces from the soil the collected calcium, takes its place and forms in part NaOH and causes a peptization of the colloids of the soil, which swells up from the water and plasters all the cracks and crevices between the particles of soil and makes it impermeable for water.

The study of the soils at the bottom of the great depressions has shown that these steppe depressions can be turned into auxiliary reservoirs of the irrigation system. The soils of the depressions have at their bottom about a half metre deep earth enriched by peptized colloids which expand in soaking and insure the complete impermeability of this layer.

The artificial irrigation of 2 million hectares of the steppe of the Lower Dnieper will make it possible to support in this area a 5-6 times larger maximum production of grain, cotton, oil plants (sunflower, kuznet, arachis and ricina), vegetables and fruits (oranges, blue tomatoes, pepper, cabbage), orchards and melons.

The question of irrigating the southern sands of Ukraine which cover enormous "arenas" on the Lower Dnieper, Don and Kuban is a totally different problem. It is impossible to include the sands of the Lower Dnieper in a general system of irrigation because of their permeability by water. On the other hand all crops with a shallow root system (tobacco, melons, garden crops) need irrigation on the southern sands. Grape and fruits with rootstocks (apricots and cherries) grow well on the sands without irrigation. The irrigation of the sands can best be done by watering with water from the artesian wells and the subsoil waters which can be easily secured from the sands i.e. it is a question of shaft wells in connection with the slight pressure of the water in the sands; but the wells alone are not sufficient for irrigation of sands, there is need of constructing reservoirs to collect the subsoil water so that it can later be drawn off for local irrigation.



# POLIKARP SIKORSKY—METROPOLITAN OF THE UKRAINIAN AUTOCEPHALOUS ORTHODOX CHURCH

(*Obituary*)

By NICHOLAS D. CHUBATY

Polikarp Sikorsky, Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Exile, died in Paris on October 22, 1953 at the age of 79. He was already a historical figure in the ranks of Ukrainian Orthodoxy not only because of his own work but because of the role which he played in the foundation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

When in 1686 by the pressure and intrigues of Moscow, the Patriarch of Constantinople agreed to place the Ukrainian Orthodox Church then headed by the Metropolitan of Kiev, under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Moscow, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church lost all its autonomy and became not only a part of the Russian Orthodox Church but worse, was an instrument of russification and of that Russian policy which aimed to destroy the identity of the Ukrainian people. The control of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was in the hands of the Patriarch of Moscow and after the reforms of Peter I, in the hands of the Holy Synod, chiefly in the tsar's lay bureaucrat there, the Over Procurator of the Holy Synod.

It is not surprising that the Russian Revolution of 1917, as far as Ukraine was concerned, turned into a national movement of liberation which involved the liberation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. The de-russianizing of this met with unconquerable difficulties. Tikhon, the newly elected Patriarch of Moscow, refused any autonomy to the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, and attempts against the will of Moscow were hopeless because in all Ukraine there was not a single Ukrainian bishop to head this movement of emancipation, for all the Orthodox bishops in the Ukrainian Republic (1918) were Russians.

The Kievan Metropolitan, Antony Khrapovitsky effectively sabotaged the decree of the Ukrainian Government of January 1, 1919 for the establishment of a Ukrainian Autocephalous Church. The rapid advance of the Bolshevik occupation prevented the full emancipation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church until 1921 under difficult and tragic circumstances.

In 1921 there was called in Kiev a Church Congress of the clergy and the faithful of Ukraine. No bishop was present who would initiate the hierarchy of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in a canonical manner, which caused the Congress to take a revolutionary course. Without the participation of a bishop, the faithful and the clergy by the laying of hands extended to Vasyl Lypkivsky, priest, the post of Metropolitan of Kiev and the head of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. He consecrated in the usual manner by the laying on of hands, bishops for all the dioceses of Ukraine.

Thus amid the enthusiasm and the national and religious feeling was born the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. It was organized with Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky as its head against the Orthodox Church in Ukraine which recognized Patriarch Tikhon. The latter body was weak because of its hostility to the masses of the Ukrainian people who amid the storms of revolution had awakened to their own national life. The strength of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church did lay in its popularity among the masses and its weakness was the non-canonical hierarchy, which was contrary to Orthodox principles. Yet among the storms of the revolution few in Ukraine paid attention to this defect and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church became in Soviet Union an important factor in the support of Ukrainian political independence.

The Bolshevik government, even in the time of the political NEP, the period of Ukrainization, could not face this fact indifferently.

The Bolshevik government in Ukraine, then very weak, was opposed to the Patriarchal Moscow Church, for it saw in the Moscow Patriarch Tikhon an open foe of the Bolshevik government. As a result, in the first years of the organization of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, the Bolshevik government looked at it with indifference. Later, as the Bolshevik government became stronger and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church became a strong pillar of Ukrainian independence, the regime began to persecute it. In 1927 the Bolsheviks removed Metropolitan V. Lypkivsky and replaced him by another Ukrainian, Mykola Boretsky. In 1930 they tried a majority of bishops, liquidated some and exiled others. The Church ceased to exist and the Bolsheviks began to support the Patriarchal Moscow Church, especially after the Metropolitan Sergiy of Moscow and the locum tenens of the Patriarch cooperated with them.

World War II again reopened the question of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. Outside the Soviet Union there had been established with the approval of the Patriarch of Constantinople an Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Poland. The head of this was a

Russian, Dionisy Valedinsky, who because of the needs of the Ukrainians in Poland had consecrated two Ukrainians: Archbishop Oleksy Hromadsky and Bishop Polikarp Sikorsky for Volyn. In 1939 both of these Ukrainian Orthodox ecclesiastics passed under the control of the Bolsheviks and were compelled to define their positions toward the Patriarch of Moscow who promised to give the whole of Ukraine a formal church autonomy that would be analogous to the political autonomy of the UkSSR in the Soviet Union.

Archbishop Oleksy accepted the supremacy of the Patriarch of Moscow, but Bishop Polikarp Sikorsky despite pressure from Moscow declined to recognize the supremacy of the Patriarch of Moscow over himself, for he desired to see the renovation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. The expulsion of Bolsheviks from Ukraine (1941-1942) favored his plan and made him the leader of the Orthodox Ukrainians.

Bishop Polikarp Sikorsky was born of a clerical family on June 20, 1875 not far from Kiev. After completing the religious seminary in Kiev, he enrolled in the Law Faculty of the University of Kiev. At the outbreak of the Revolution in 1917-1918, he worked in the Ministry of Cults in the Ukrainian National Republic and from there went with the Ukrainian Government to the west.

He felt drawn to religious work and entered a monastery in Volyn (1922) and became archimandrite first in Derman in Volyn and then in Zhyrovytsi in White Ruthenia. In 1932 he was consecrated bishop for the diocese of Volyn and was at this post until World War II when overtaken by the Bolshevik and the German occupation of Volyn.

The occupation of Ukraine by the Germans reopened the question of a renewal of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, which had been destroyed by the Bolsheviks in 1930, independent of the Patriarch of Moscow. This time the position of such a Church was much better, for there were Ukrainian Orthodox Bishops who could canonically restore the Church. Bishop Polikarp undertook the task, for the other Ukrainian bishop, Oleksy Hromadsky, remained loyal to the Patriarch of Moscow and under the Germans headed a Ukrainian Autonomous Orthodox Church dependent upon the Patriarch of Moscow.

After the entrance of the Germans into Volyn the head of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Poland, Dionisy, appointed Bishop Sikorsky ruling bishop of Volyn, administrator of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine and thus *locum tenens* of the Metropolitan of Kiev.

In this capacity Metropolitan Polikarp started the building of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine. At first he was aided by Alexander, bishop of Pinsk; the two consecrated the first two

bishops of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in 1942 and then along with the newly consecrated bishops still others for almost all the dioceses of Ukraine. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was an accomplished fact.

This brought about a sharp reaction in Moscow. The Patriarch of Moscow ordered Metropolitan Polikarp *in absentia* before a court condemning him to the loss of his episcopal rank, but this was obviously of little practical importance in Ukraine. However the Patriarch of Moscow obtained help from Archbishop Oleksy and then named him administrator of the Autonomous Orthodox Church in Ukraine which remained under the Moscow Patriarchate.

This divided the Ukrainian Orthodox into Autocephalists and Auto-nomists. The first were headed by Metropolitan Polikarp Sikorsky and the second by Oleksy Hromadsky.

The masses of the people by an overwhelming majority supported the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. The Germans at first assumed an ambiguous position, deliberately supporting now one Church and now the other on the principle of "Divide et impera." In 1943 they came out on the side of the Auto-nomists, for they feared the dynamics of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church which was supported by the independent circles of Ukraine. The interference of political circles into this ecclesiastical controversy led to tragic actions. Archbishop Oleksy Hromadsky was, in public opinion, regarded as a traitor to the interests of the Ukrainian people and murdered, as is guessed, by circles close to the anti-Nazi and anti-Communist underground.

When the German front in the east broke and the Bolshevik forces again moved west, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church had been almost fully reorganized on both sides of the Dnieper. Its fate was sealed by the military events.

In view of this, Metropolitan Polikarp emigrated to the west, first to Germany and then to France, where in 1950 in Paris he set up the headquarters of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church with the task of serving the Orthodox Ukrainians throughout the world until they could return to a liberated Ukraine. In the eyes of the Orthodox Ukrainians abroad, Metropolitan Polikarp became their undoubted leader throughout the world.

The historical service of Metropolitan Polikarp is that he helped the reestablishment of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church which had been established to 1921 to assume a canonical form instead of its older revolutionary system. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox now have their own hierarchy and ecclesiastical organization which is in harmony with the old traditions of Ukrainian Orthodoxy.

## DESTRUCTION OF UPPER CLASSES OF THE ENSLAVED NATIONS—A TRADITIONAL POLICY OF MOSCOW

By VASYL HRYSHKO

The Communist government of Moscow uses in succession various methods in its struggle against the nations which have been enslaved and brought into the Soviet Empire, so as to destroy their identity and to bring the masses of these peoples into the Russian monolithic state. One of the first methods is to destroy the leaders and thus to behead a nation which is unwilling to accept the Moscow yoke. The destruction of the "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" i.e. the advocates of Ukrainian independence, was started by the Kremlin in its brutal attack upon the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (1930) and on the Ukrainian scholars, writers, artists and political leaders. Moscow thus tried to destroy the Ukrainian intellectuals. The same tactics have been pursued by red Moscow in its work against the White Ruthenia, and the peoples of the Caucasus and Turkestan. This destruction of the brain of a nation is the first step in the Muscovite attack upon the enslaved peoples and accordingly red Moscow either physically liquidates or deports to distant lands for physical or spiritual destruction all the leaders of the non-Russian peoples who may oppose her.

Nevertheless history shows that the methods now used by the present red Moscow are not its own invention but that they were used by Moscow from the time when it set its mind to create a Muscovite Empire.

The principality of Suzdal and Vladimir, the predecessor of Moscow, acquired a doubtful glory by its wars against the Volga Bulgars, Novgorod, Smolensk, Vyatka, Pskov, Tver, Ryazan, as well as against Kiev, the capital of Ukraine. The men of Suzdal under their prince Andrey Bogolyubsky in 1169 attacked their great rival Kiev and this is described in the Kievan Chronicle in these words: "For two days they plundered the entire city, Podolye and the Hights and the monasteries and St. Sophia and the Church of our Lady of the Tithes and they showed no mercy to any one or any place; they burned the churches, killed the peasants and bound others; they carried off women into captivity, separated them by force from their husbands and the children sobbed at the sight of their mother's fate; they seized the property and stripped the churches of ikons, books and vestments and carried off the bells... every sacred object was removed and the Pechersky monastery was plundered by the pagans...

and every one in Kiev was dejected and sad and inconsolable and tears flowed constantly.”<sup>1</sup> We must not forget that this devastation of the religious shrine of the old Rus’ state, Kiev, the Mother of the Cities of Rus,’ was carried out by Suzdal Christians of the same faith and even ecclesiastically dependent upon the Metropolitan of Kiev.

The Suzdal prince Vsevolod in 1180 in the same way savagely annihilated Ryazan and carried from there to Suzdal “the prominent citizens of Ryazan.” 28 years later Prince Vsevolod ordered Ryazan to be burned to the ground and all the population to be taken to Suzdal. The Russian historian Struve in commenting upon this remarks that it was the first “planned and massive removal of the population and government” in Eastern Europe for punitive purposes. “In its methods,” he writes, “we feel the inspiration of the Muscovite spirit; Vsevolod anticipated Ivan III and Ivan IV, the Terrible. This episode of course pertains to Ryazan and not Kiev but it clearly shows the manners and spirit of the new power.”<sup>2</sup>

At the beginning of the XIV century the centre of this principality was transferred from Vladimir to Moscow. Now its great rival was the principality of Tver which was acquiring real strength. The Muscovite prince Ivan Kalita made it his object to establish Moscow as the capital of the entire northeastern fringe of the old Rus’ state completely alienated from Kiev, as a basis for bringing the lands of the old Rus’-Ukraine under the control of Moscow. He executed these plans so savagely and absolutely that the events found a place in the Muscovite hagiographic literature.

The Muscovite bookmen in 1327-8 tell with pride of the union with Moscow of the land of Rostov. However, from the *Life* of the Blessed Serge of Radonezh, included in the *Chetyi-Mineyi* of Metropolitan Makary, we learn what a deep psychological impression was made upon the saint for his entire life by his memories of the union of Rostov to Moscow, which were connected with the bitter events of the conquest and the harsh results for the élite of the Rostov region.

“There were taken away,” we read in this *Life*,” power and principality and property, and honor, and glory and everything was taken to Moscow.” The father of Serge “with his whole household and his entire family were moved and resettled from Rostov to Radonezh,” as were many others “because of need and hatred.”<sup>3</sup> These expressions understated as in hagiographic literature hide behind such words as “taken

<sup>1</sup> *Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles*, Vol. II. *Ipatsky Chronicle*, p. 545, Petersburg, 1908, 2nd ed.

<sup>2</sup> P. B. Struve, *Social and Economic History of Russia*, p. 84, Paris, 1952.

<sup>3</sup> V. Malinin, *The Starets... and his Mission*, Kiev, 1901, pp. 89-90.

away," "resettled," "need and hatred," the unconcealed terrors of the plundering results of the Muscovite conquest.

Likewise the *Life* of St. Stefan of Perm who lived in the same XIVth century, repeats the complaint of the Zyryans, the natives of the Perm area against the hated Moscow, which in a brutal manner trampled on their rights, destroyed their tribal traditions and their ancestral religion, robbed them economically and plundered their lands, stopped their customs and spiritual life and first of all disposed of the leaders of the Zyryans. Moscow deliberately as in Rostov isolated the leaders from their people and sent them to the distant Tobolsk area to Velyky Altim. They sent here the Zyryan shaman Pam. Without their leader, the Zyryans could not withstand the pressure of Moscow, the advance of which is told in a touching but restrained manner in the *Life* of St. Stefan of Perm. Here are the words of the Zyryan leader: "Brothers, men of Perm, do not forsake your father's gods and do not forget their sacrifices and needs, and do not abandon the old duties (i.e. traditions—our words), do not change the old faith; do what our fathers did; hearken to me and not to Stefan who has just arrived from Moscow. Can anything good come to us from Moscow? Is that not whence our troubles come, our heavy taxes and acts of violence, the bailiffs, and the lords and their armed retainers? Therefore do not listen to him but"—and these are the words put in the mouth of the Zyryan leader Pam—"listen to me, who wish you well; I am of your stock and of the same land as you, the same family and tribe, the same generation and language; it is proper that you hearken to me, your spiritual leader and your father, and not to that Muscovite."<sup>4</sup> We can only imagine the real hate against Moscow and the true picture of the treatment of the Zyryans, when a Zyryan is made the author of this statement and not the author of a *Life* of a man from Muscovy.

We must call attention to one detail which points to the refined hypocrisy long assimilated by Moscow and by means of which it disintegrated the peoples. Moscow because of the high racial and territorial consciousness of the Zyryans ("I am of your stock and of the same land as you, the same family and tribe, the same generation and language... What good can come to us from Moscow?") undertook to create a Zyryan alphabet and to translate into Zyryan the books necessary for the conqueror, so that by his agents (the bailiffs, lords and armed retainers) it could break the Zyryan unity and bring in the alien Muscovite spirituality. Moscow acted in the same way toward the Lopary who lived along the Arctic Ocean by compelling its conquerors and missionaries to learn the Lopar

---

<sup>4</sup> Makary, *Hist. of the Russian Church*, Vol. IV, p. 347.

language and this made it easier for Moscow to disintegrate the neighboring tribes.<sup>5</sup>

That the representatives of Moscow showed brutal cruelties toward the Lopary is evident from the *Life* of St. Trifon of Pechenga. There is no doubt that this *Life* was composed in the interests of the official Moscow Church but it has one passage which can reveal the actual picture of the torments and terror, received by the Lopary from the Muscovite missionaries. The author of the *Life* of Trifon presents it as if the Lopary in their efforts to drive away the preacher Trifon did him "indescribable vileness; they tore him by the hair, threw him on the ground and beat him and shoved him" and made an attempt on his life.<sup>6</sup> We can only imagine what the *Life* does not say, when the Lopary were compelled to act so to the preacher himself. The destruction of the Lopary took place in the middle of the XVIth century.

The phrase, "collection of the lands," as it is called in Muscovite history covers an almost open satanic system of cruel and violent methods by Moscow. The local Yaroslav *Chronicle* does not restrain its anger at Moscow when it says of the Muscovite governor in that city "it is not possible to write or read his strange acts, for he was a devil in the flesh."<sup>7</sup> In the same Yaroslav there appeared a new criminal Ioann Agafonovich Sushchey, the collector of the Yaroslav land—and the Chronicler continues: "He took away from one a good village, from another a good estate, he took them and registered them for the Grand Prince and if any one was good, a boyar or a boyar's son, he registered him too."<sup>8</sup> In this way Moscow removed the upper stratum of the population so as to undermine its intended victim. The same methodical "collection of the lands" Moscow repeated in 1489 in the Novgorod, province of Vyatka where after the triumph of its arms Moscow did as the *Chronicle* says: "It brought the men of Vyatka to kiss the cross (take the oath—our remark) and carried off the more prominent people with their wives and children... and punished the traders with a great death."<sup>9</sup> The inhuman expedition to Vyatka is described in more detail in the *Archangel City Chronicle*.<sup>10</sup>

We must pay special attention to the annexation of Novgorod the Great, the democratic republic of northern Europe, to the Moscow principality in 1478. This action is described in the *Pskov Chronicle* in the words of Prince Ivan III: "And there shall not be in Novgorod mayor nor leader

<sup>5</sup> Filaret, *Hist. of Russian Church*, Period III, 1862, pp. 40-41.

<sup>6</sup> Ye. Golubinsky, *Hist. of Russian Church*, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 856, Note 1.

<sup>7</sup> *Complete Collection of Rus. Chron.* Vol. XXIII, p. 458.

<sup>8</sup> We cite from A. E. Presnyakov — *The Formation of the Great Russian State*, Petersburg, 1918, p. 421.

<sup>9</sup> *Coll. of Rus. Chron.* Vol. VI, p. 239.

<sup>10</sup> See A. E. Presnyakov, *op. cit.*, p. 431.



of a thousand, nor a popular meeting and the meeting-bell (a Liberty Bell) we took down and carried to Moscow.”<sup>11</sup> In another place the same *Chronicle* gives more definitely the fate of the Novgorod democracy: “And there were left no Novgorod old institutions, no popular-meetings, no courts, no class-representatives, no leaders of thousands. The Great Prince arranged this, saying: My country is yours and neither Pskov nor Novgorod needs anything, I and my regent rule... and it is not for the bishop of Novgorod, except for his ecclesiastical court, or an official or a commander of a thousand, or all Novgorod to act in anything; there will be no popular assemblies, no sending of delegates by us to them or receiving delegates from other lands. This is the final order of the Grand Prince Ivan Vasilyevich and his son Ivan Ivanovich to all Great Novgorod. And then the Grand Prince left and he took with him 6 Novgorod boyars and he carried off Martha with him to Moscow and imprisoned the whole Novgorod land; some he killed with the sword and others he carried away alive.”<sup>12</sup> But Novgorod did not at once become reconciled to its fate. Within a year Novgorod rebelled against Moscow. Ivan III put down the rebellion and took from Novgorod to the Moscow areas more than a thousand prominent persons, chiefly sons of boyars and merchants and industrialists and replaced them by Muscovites. Uprisings and plots against Moscow did not stop. Ivan III repaid them with unexampled repressions and especially by the traditional system of removing the population. So in the one year, 1488 more than 7,000 men of Novgorod were moved to Moscow.<sup>13</sup> In this way Ivan III liquidated the sovereign rights of Great Novgorod and its republican political order; the conciliar system, a self-governing form with a mayor, the power of the bishop, prerogatives of the court. Novgorod was reduced to a provincial district of Moscow. After taking Novgorod, Moscow came into direct contact with the northern part of Lithuania and this gave it a contact with the West.

The same tactics Moscow employed in taking the republic of Pskov (1510) usually friendly to Moscow about which we read in the *Chronicle*: “The Grand Prince Vasily Ivanovich came to Pskov... and he changed the customs of Pskov and destroyed the old order... and established his own customs and appointed new taxes... And he took away estates from the men of Pskov and carried 300 families from Pskov to Moscow and brought in their place his own people; and he removed the Pskovians from the Zastenya... and there were about 6,000 houses in this area; and there was great wailing and sorrow in Pskov, because of the separa-

---

<sup>11</sup> *Pskov Chronicle*, p. 258.

<sup>12</sup> *Pskov I Chronicle*, pp. 260-261. The mentioned Martha is the heroic defender of Novgorod liberties — Martha Boretzka, the last woman-Mayor of Novgorod.

<sup>13</sup> *Encyclopaedia of Brokhaus and Efron*, Vol. 26, p. 660.

tion.”<sup>14</sup> In the fourth *Pskov Chronicle* there were added the following words: “for this (Muscovite) tsardom spreads and its robberies multiply. Oh, alas!”

As a result of the suppression of the Pskovians “there fell upon them fear and confusion and sadness”—says the *Chronicle*—“and their throats dried up from their sorrow and grief, and their lips were parched; however many times the Germans had attacked them, there was never such sadness and sorrow as now”. . . The Great Prince “took” 300 families of Pskovians who had begun “to murmur to Moscow” with their wives and children and they took with them small animals but they abandoned all the rest and went quickly with weeping and sobbing.” Then wholly in the style of the old *Tale of Ihor's Armament*, the Chronicler notes: “And then vanished the glory of Pskov, and it was captured not by men of another faith but by people of its own faith. And who will not weep and sob... their truth flew up to heaven and evil began to come upon them... the poor people of Pskov did not know the truth of Moscow... then from their taxes and violence many fled to alien cities, they left their wives and children, for they could not live in Pskov, but the land cannot flee and cannot fly up.”<sup>15</sup>

We are struck by this system inherited by Moscow of removing from captured cities and regions the leading classes of the population and their replacement by Muscovites. We have seen it happen in the areas of Ryazan, Rostov, Perm, Vyatka, Novgorod and Pskov. Moscow applied the same policy but on a broader scale to the Kazan Tatars, the Crimean Tatars, the Volga Bashkirs, the Caucasians and many other peoples.

This practice Moscow has tested for centuries and has always turned to it to neutralize and then to liquidate a possible resistance of a conquered people. This practice of deportation and of destruction of the leading classes of an enslaved people has become for Moscow more than a historical tradition; it has become simply a law of struggle with enslaved peoples, and so it is still.

A manifesto of the Ukrainian government of Hetman Vyhovsky previously warned the western world of the danger of Moscow, that it was preparing to destroy the Ukrainian population as it had the White Ruthenian. This manifesto announced to the world: “200 noble families, although they were quiet, were taken by force to Moscow; 12,000 free people were deported from the district of Mohyliv and the rest of Byeloruthenia to the Moscow forests and in their places colonists were brought

---

<sup>14</sup> *Pskov I Chronicle*, p. 282.

<sup>15</sup> *Pskov I Chron.*, p. 285-288.

in.<sup>16</sup> On the destruction of the leading classes of Ukraine not volumes but libraries could be written.

The well known Moscow scholar, S. Platonov, tells these brutal facts about the annexation of Dorpat: "So Ivan the Terrible took Dorpat in 1565; he ordered removed the burgermeisters, and officials and counselors, all Germans, for their treason to Vladimir, Kostroma, Nizhny Novgorod and Uglich."<sup>17</sup> It is interesting that this practice of deportation and destruction of the leading classes has not been denied even by Moscow historical science. Thus the historian Byelov admitted that the process of building the Muscovite State was carried on "in a mercilessly cruel form"<sup>18</sup> V. O. Klyuchevsky, in retelling the methods of Muscovite expansion cited among other methods of colonial conquest and conquest by violence and conquest by diplomacy. Of the time of Ivan Kalita, A. E. Presnyakov says: "Through the summaries and fragmentary hints of the *Chronicles* we feel the rise of a growing displeasure at the Muscovite violence." In regard to the entire period of the expansion of the Moscow state, the same scholar says: "Even the few, fragmentary data of our sources allows us to imagine the wide extent and crushing intensity 'of the reexamination of peoples and lands' and the practices of removal, when in large groups people were torn up from their natural roots and thrown into new places for resettlement."<sup>19</sup>

Of the Muscovite princes Milyukov wrote in his *Sketches of Russian Culture*: "They probably could not develop any other program except that of the old tradition which had become instinctive: to 'trade' still more and to amass as much power as possible."<sup>20</sup>

The Russian ethnographer Pypin thus characterizes the formation of the Russian Empire: "In extreme cases as in Novgorod, the Muscovite government helped the unification by the simple extermination of the resisting population, the deportation of the natives and the transplanting of Moscow residents in their places."<sup>21</sup>

This demonic method of a savage use of violence by Moscow against the people that it has enslaved, especially the destruction of the leading classes of a conquered people, who might be able to organize resistance, still waits for a systematic study by a historian. The genocidal methods of Russian Communists had deep roots in the Muscovite past.

---

<sup>16</sup> V. Lypynsky. *From the History of Ukraine*, p. 590.

<sup>17</sup> *Moscow and the West*, Berlin, 1926, p. 23.

<sup>18</sup> S. A. Byelov, *Russian History to the Reform of Peter the Great*. 1895, pp. 107, 188.

<sup>19</sup> A. E. Presnyakov, *op. cit.* 1918, pp. 23, 156 and 455.

<sup>20</sup> Milyukov, *Sketches of Russian Culture*, III, Part I, p. 29.

<sup>21</sup> A. N. Pypin, *History of Russian Ethnography*, Vol. III, p. 2, 1891.

# THE KREMLIN AND THE EASTERN CATHOLIC CHURCH

By GEZA B. GROSSCHMID  
*Duquesne University*

In his encyclical letter, *Orientalis Ecclesias*, dated December 15, 1952, and addressed to the episcopacy of the Eastern Catholic (Uniat) Churches in the captive countries, Pope Pius XII severely criticizes the Communist governments of those countries for the special persecution of those churches. He particularly deplored the situation in Bulgaria, Rumania, and Ukraine.<sup>1</sup>

The Uniat Church was founded in Ukraine and White Ruthenia in 1595 and introduced into Transylvania in 1698.<sup>2</sup> It acknowledges the Pope as its religious leader, but differs from the Roman Catholic Church in that it uses the Byzantine rite and church Slavonic instead of Latin in the church services. The Eastern Catholic Churches are the principal targets of the Communist war against religion in this area.

In their drive to kill all religion in the captive countries, the Communists have applied to it the same methods that they found effective in politics. A complicated combination of the divide-and-conquer and the Trojan Horse technique has been used against the churches; not only have the Communists wanted to divide the churches from their contacts with the West, but they also have attempted to conquer them from within by infiltration of their clergy and hierarchy.<sup>3</sup>

The conquest of the churches has been executed in three stages. The first stage begins with the creation of an atmosphere of fear and violence; members of the clergy and important laymen are intimidated, arrested, imprisoned, or simply disappear. Religious education is separated from the church, and youth organizations are transformed into anti-religious federations.

---

<sup>1</sup> *The New York Times*, December 31, 1952.

<sup>2</sup> The following terms will be used interchangeably: Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite, Catholic Church of the Greek Rite, Catholic Church of the Oriental Rite, and Uniat Church.

<sup>3</sup> "The Red and the Black," *News from behind the Iron Curtain*, II (1953), 2, 16ff.

The second stage intensifies the grip of the Archimedean screw. The clergy are kept under police surveillance, printing establishments are taken over, censorship is extended to the pulpit. Stages one and two aim at the separation of the clergy from the flock and at the disruption of the internal organization, and consequently of the ability of the churches to resist.

The third stage completes the total subjugation of the churches to the communist state. The church hierarchy is openly persecuted; churches and seminaries are closed. Church property is confiscated, charitable institutions are nationalized, religious orders dissolved.

Almost half of the total population of the new areas of Europe which came under communist control was Catholic, one-third of whom were Eastern Catholics. The Church was solidly established, with both a long tradition of autonomy and with connections with the Western world. It also represented the most powerful and efficient organization in the whole area to fight communism. Consequently the fight against Eastern Catholicism has been especially bitter.

In the case of the Roman Catholic Church (always the prime target of the Communist drive against religion), the Red aim is to create a national Roman Catholic Church which will swear loyalty to the State. Its episcopate, once it is divorced completely from Rome, will be totally subservient to the Communist state.

In the case of the Eastern Catholic (Uniat) Churches, the Kremlin using the various Communist governments as its tools, has supported the campaigns by the Russian Orthodox Church for the "return to the fold" of the Eastern Churches. The total extermination of the Eastern Catholic Churches and their members has been a special concern of the Russian Orthodox Church, since these Churches have been powerful competitors as well as ties to the West. The Moscow patriarchate did not refuse to co-operate with the Soviet NKVD to achieve its goal.

I now propose to show how the standard methods of atheist drive and religious persecution have been and are being applied against the Eastern Catholic Churches.<sup>4</sup>

The Russian Orthodox Church, which proved to be an invaluable asset to the Soviet Government during the "great patriotic war" is now an officially recognized institution of the Soviet State. But the Orthodox Church is completely subordinated to the Soviet Office of Church Affairs,

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Geza B. Groszschmid, "Communism vs. Religion," *Social Order*, III (1953), 293-300.

and is nothing but the political mouthpiece and tool of Soviet global imperialism.<sup>5</sup>

Orthodoxy has always been a state religion. Its attitude towards Catholics has depended on the rite they followed. Those of the Eastern Rite were always regarded as rightful members of the Orthodox Church, and thereby renegades who had accepted the supremacy of the Pope. They were heavily persecuted under the tsars, and later felt the main weight of communist persecution both in Russia and in the captive countries.

#### UKRAINE AND BYELORUSSIA (WHITE RUTHENIA)

Ukrainians almost without exception belonged either to the autocephalous Ukrainian Orthodox Church or the Eastern Catholic Church. Because of the close connection of Ukraine and Russia since the seventeenth century, Catholicism survived only in those parts of Byelorussia and Ukraine which had formerly been part of Austro-Hungary and before 1939 of Poland and Romania.<sup>6</sup>

Of the some eight million Ukrainians in Poland, more than three and a half million were Eastern Catholics. They belonged to the metropolitan see of Lviv (Lemberg), with the three dioceses of Lviv, Stanislaviv, and Peremyshl. The Eastern Catholics in Carpatho-Ukraine numbered half a million and there were a hundred thousand among the Ukrainians of Bukovina and Bessarabia. The total number of the Ukrainian Eastern Catholics (with the Ukrainians who emigrated to the United States and Canada) in 1939 was probably five million. The Ukrainian Catholics in Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland had in 1937 some 4,480 churches and chapels, 210 monasteries and religious houses, 2,960 diocesan priests, 600 monastic priests, and 1,250 nuns.<sup>7</sup>

The Eastern Catholic Churches owned some land in Romania, Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, but the income from it was barely enough to maintain the priests and their families.

<sup>5</sup> N. S. Timasheff, "Religion in Russia," in Waldemar Gurian ed., *The Soviet Union* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1951), p. 155.

<sup>6</sup> Gray MacEoin, *The Communist War on Religion*. New York, Devin-Adair, 1951, p. 59.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* Also: *Action of the Sobor of the Greek Catholic Church*. (March 8-10, 1946). Lviv; "The Church Statute," Ukrainian S.S.R.; (January 31, 1945); De Vries, "La Persecuzione contro i Cattolici Ruteni," *Documenti e studi di espansione cristiana*, V., (1948), p. 273; *Statistica con Centi Storici della Gerarchia e dei Fedeli di Rito Orientale*. (Rome, 1923); *The Ukrainian General Encyclopaedia*, III, (Lviv, 1934-1937); "The Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Europe in the Years 1939-1947," *The Ukrainian Voice*, No. 43 (1947), No. 13 (1948). "Russian Church Policy in Ukraine," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. II, No. 1.

Since time immemorial, the Church and the diocesan and monastic clergy have played an important role in the life of the Ukrainians. The Metropolitan of Lviv was the political as well as the cultural leader of the people; the most prominent intellectuals usually came from the clergy and their families. Social organizations were also closely connected with the Church, as was education at all levels. The importance of the Church also manifested itself in the numerous educational and charitable organizations it maintained and in the number of periodicals and scientific magazines published.

The beginning of the end came with the Nazi occupation of Soviet Ukraine. Under the Nazi authorities, who strongly favored the Orthodox Church, the Ukrainian Catholic Church suffered many restrictions.

In 1945 almost the entire Ukraine was incorporated into the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Some eight million Ukrainians inhabited the former Eastern provinces of Poland which had been incorporated by the USSR in 1939 and reconquered by the Soviet armies in 1944. These changes of frontiers did not result in new problems for Roman Catholics because some one million Polish Catholics who lived in the transferred territories were repatriated in 1946 to the new Poland.

But for the Ukrainian Eastern Catholics this was the end; there was absolutely no place for them in the Soviet scheme. On November 1, 1944 Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky died. This was the signal for the Communists to remove the smug mask of religious tolerance and to reveal their true plans. With the help of the Communist-dominated and subservient Russian Orthodox Church, the Communist government started a drive against the Ukrainian Catholics to compel them "to return to the faith of their fathers," to accept the supremacy of the Moscow Patriarch, and to renounce their connections with Rome.

This drive was enforced in April, 1945 by the arrest of the entire Ukrainian hierarchy consisting of the Metropolitan and six bishops, and many priests. The number of priests arrested in the diocese of Lviv alone was over five hundred. Many were shot without trial; others deported.

In May 1945, three apostate priests set up a "Committee of Initiative for the Transference of the Greek Catholic Church to Orthodoxy." This Committee quickly recognized by the Kremlin, issued an appeal to the clergy to recognize its authority and submit to its decisions. In highly patriotic language, this appeal declared Rome "a destructive force, proud of its conquest of power, a collaborator with Poland for the destruction of the Ukrainian Rite, the Ukrainian Church, and the Ukrainian people."<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Gray MacEoin, p. 70 ff.

Out of 2,700 Ukrainian Catholic priests, only forty-two answered the Committee's appeal.

In March 1946, the Committee convoked a *sobor*, synod of the "Greek Catholic Church" in Lviv to "reverify the decisions of the Brest-Litovsk Union of 1596" and to "annul them and detach the Ukrainian Catholic Church from Rome and unite it with the Russian Orthodox Church." The handful of "delegates" in no time repudiated the Church Union of Brest-Litovsk and declared that the Ukrainian-Greek-Catholic Church now was united with the Communist-dominated Russian Orthodox Church.

During the enforcement of these decisions all clergy and faithful were forced to join the bolshevized Orthodox Church. Those who refused and insisted on the freedom of their Church were either deported to Soviet Asia or liquidated. Of the seven arrested bishops four died as martyrs in the Soviet Union.

The 461,000 Uniate of *Carpatho-Ukraine* shared the same fate. As soon as the Russians occupied Carpatho-Ukraine the drive to force the Catholics of the Eastern Rite to join the Russian Orthodox Church began. Soon all churches and church property were confiscated, priests were arrested, and schools and presses closed. The Church property was assigned to Orthodox parishes. The monastic orders at Munkachevo and Uzhorod were liquidated. Msgr. Theodore Romza, Bishop of Uzhorod, was killed on November 1, 1947. In 1948, out of the 345 Uniate priests of Carpatho-Ukraine, 210 were detained in prisons or in concentration camps; those who continued their resistance were deported to Soviet Asia. Yet there was only one priest in 1948 who joined the Orthodox Church.<sup>9</sup>

The liquidation of the Ukrainian Catholics in Slovakia was conducted along the same lines. Most of the Basilian fathers and nuns were deported, the schools and property confiscated, priests imprisoned.

*The Way* summed up the fate of the Ukrainian Catholic Bishops: Msgr. Andrey Sheptytsky, Archbishop of Lviv, died under mysterious circumstances in 1944. Msgr. Joseph Slipy, Metropolitan of Lviv, is doing forced labor in a labor camp in the subarctic region of Soviet Asia. Msgr. Gregory Chomyshyn, Bishop of Stanislaviv, died in a prison in 1948. Msgr. Josaphat Kocylowsky, Bishop of Peremyshl, died near Kiev after a long imprisonment. Msgr. Gregory Lakota, Auxiliary Bishop of Peremyshl, died in Soviet Asia in 1950 in a slave labor camp. Msgr. Niketa Budka, former Ukrainian Bishop in Canada, Auxiliary Bishop of Lviv, went insane from torture and died in prison. Msgr. John Latyshevsky, Auxiliary Bishop of Stanislaviv, is in a slave labor camp in Soviet Asia. Msgr. Nicholas Charnetsky, Apostolic Visitor of the Ukrainians in Vol-

---

<sup>9</sup> William Juhasz, *Persecution of Churches behind the Iron Curtain*.



hynia, Kholmshchyna, and Pidliasye, is a prisoner in the North Urals. Msgr. Theodore Romza, Bishop of Uzhorod, was murdered. So was Msgr. John Shimrak, Bishop of Krizevci for the Ukrainian settlers in Yugoslavia. Msgr. Paul Gojdic, Bishop of Presov, was sentenced to life imprisonment in January 1951. His auxiliary, Msgr. Basil Hopkov, is in prison without trial. Msgr. Peter Verhun, Apostolic Visitor for the Ukrainians in Germany, has disappeared, reportedly kidnapped by the Communists.<sup>10</sup>

#### ROMANIA

In Romania religious persecution has been perhaps more ruthless than in the other satellite countries; the Eastern Catholic Church there was the second largest denomination. It had some 1,600,000 adherents, approximately ten per cent of the total population of that country.<sup>11</sup> The Uniat Church dates back to 1698, when the reunion of the Romanian Church of Transylvania with Rome was solemnly proclaimed by a plenary synod. The hierarchy was organized in 1853, and an archdiocese and four dioceses were set up in 1930. Article 23 of the old constitution (1923) assured complete freedom of religion in Romania with a preferred position for the Orthodox church. The relations with the Catholics of the Eastern and Latin rites were regulated in a concordat with the Vatican, ratified in 1929.

The Eastern Catholic Church has played an important role in the religion, culture, and politics of Romania. According to the 1938 figures, it had 1,725 churches, served by 1,594 priests, thirty-four canons, and seventy-five prelates.<sup>12</sup>

As in other captive countries, for a time there was no direct action against the churches. Soon, however, the Eastern Catholic Church was singled out as an important Communist target. Several priests were arrested in 1948. The concordat was declared null and void; all church property was confiscated, the Catholic press eliminated. All bishops were required to take an oath of allegiance to the new constitution.

---

<sup>10</sup> *The Way*, March 17, 1951. "Metropolitan Slipy — the Ukrainian Stepinac — in Labor Battalion. *The Ukrainian Quarterly*. Vol. III. No. 2.

<sup>11</sup> "The Red and the Black," pp. 30 ff. *Persecution of Religion in Rumania*. (Washington, D. C., Rumanian National Committee, 1949); "Romania" in *La Civilita Cattolica*, July 16, 1949; "Persecuzione Religiosa in Romania," *ibid.*, October 16, 1949; W. de Vries, "Kirchenverfolgung in Rumanien," *Stimmen der Zeit*, LXXVIII (1952), No. 2, 89 ff. Hugh Seton-Watson, *The East European Revolution*. (New York, Praeger, 1951), pp. 3, 289-90.

<sup>12</sup> "The Red and the Black", p. 31.

On May 15, 1948, an appeal was addressed to the Eastern Catholics in Romania to sever relations with the Vatican and join their "brothers in Orthodoxy," i. e., the "patriotic" Orthodox Church. His Beatitude, the Orthodox Patriarch Justinian, a Communist Party member, addressed the Uniats in June 1948 as follows: "What separates us at this time? Nothing but the faithful submission you still give to Rome. Give back this loyalty to the Church of our nation, the Church of our forefathers and of yours."<sup>13</sup>

This campaign of "persuasion" led to the Congress of Cluj, held on October 1, 1948, to "return the Greek Catholic Church to the Orthodox Church." Two priests were to represent each district at the Congress and members of the clergy were asked to sign blank designations of delegates. Every possible means of intimidation, and even murder, were used to obtain the signed blanks.

Administrative censorship and systematic terror invoked by the *Sigurantza* have prevented the episcopate from presenting its point of view and opposition to the forcible separation of their Church from the Catholic Church and its amalgamation into the Orthodox Church. Thirty-eight prelates, canons, and priests, who had been "elected" to represent the Eastern Catholic Church at the Congress of Cluj, met and accepted "unanimously and with great enthusiasm . . . the reentry into the bosom of the Romanian Orthodox Church and the definite severance of the ties with Papal Rome."<sup>14</sup>

The resistance of the clergy and the protests from the Papal Nuncio were met by mass arrests; some seven hundred priests, mostly prelates, and all the six Bishops of the Eastern Catholic Church were arrested. Two of them, Msgr. Valeriu Frentziu, Bishop of Oradea Mare, and Msgr. Vasile Aftenie, Bishop of Alba Julia, have died in prison. Hundreds of priests were intimidated into stating adherence to the Communist-controlled Orthodox Church. Catholic churches were closed and handed over to the Orthodox Church.

And on December 1, 1948, by Decree No. 358 of the Presidium of the Grand Assembly, the Romanian Eastern Catholic Church was dissolved and its *de jure* existence was declared null and void. It now exists only underground.

#### BULGARIA

Eastern Catholics in Bulgaria number only slightly more than 57,000 in a population of about eight million.<sup>15</sup> Because of their connections with

---

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> *Universal*, October 15, 1948.

<sup>15</sup> "The Red and the Black," p. 33.

the Vatican and their influence in the field of education, however, the Communists used the usual means to annihilate the Catholics. The clergy and the faithful were forced to join the Soviet-controlled Orthodox Church; those who refused were intimidated, jailed or deported. The high point of the persecution of the Catholics was finally reached in a trial held between September 21, and October 4, 1952, at which forty Catholics were accused of spying by the Bulgarian Government. Msgr. Eugene Bossilkoff of Nicopolis, and three of his priests were sentenced to be shot and twenty-four priests and twelve laymen received long prison sentences.<sup>16</sup> The remaining clergy are now under complete Communist control and supervision. "The violence that is striking Bulgarian Catholics with perfidious and calculated cowardice," said *L'Osservatore Romano*, "does not aim at protecting the state from impossible attacks, but only to strengthen a tyranny."<sup>17</sup>

#### CZECHOSLOVAKIA

This country is predominantly Roman Catholic; there are, however, large Protestant groups in Moravia and Orthodox and Eastern Catholic minorities in Slovakia among the country's twelve million inhabitants. We have already told how almost half a million Eastern Catholics of Carpatho-Ukraine were forced to join the Russian Orthodox Church. The liquidation of the Eastern Catholics in Slovakia having their diocese in Presov, including some 100,000 Greek Catholic repatriates from the Soviet annexed Carpatho-Ukraine, was conducted along identical lines.<sup>18</sup>

In addition to nationalizing all schools and confiscating all Church property, the government suspended *Missionar*, the monthly organ of the Ukrainian Eastern Catholics in Slovakia, on the ground of "shortage of newsprint." Three Basilian monasteries were closed, seventeen Basilian priests and thirty Basilian nuns imprisoned. This was followed by an all-out raid on all monasteries and convents on April 13, 1950; all monks and nuns were taken to concentration monasteries, and many were shipped to slave labor camps in the USSR. The new State Office for Church Affairs created by a November 1949 law, virtually made all churches completely subservient to the state. From then on, civil authorities could appoint and remove priests and censor publications and sermons of the clergy.

---

<sup>16</sup> *The New York Times*, October 5, 1952.

<sup>17</sup> *L'Osservatore Romano*, October 4, 1952.

<sup>18</sup> See Cavalli's articles in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, December 7, 1946; August 6, 1949; Also "Cecoslovacchia," *ibid.*, July 16 and October 16, 1949; "La Persécution Religieuse en Tchécoslovaquie" in *La Documentation Catholique*, November 6, 1949.

The Communists staged a meeting at Bratislava of about three hundred persons on Apr. 28, 1950, which recommended the union of the Presov diocese, with the Russian Orthodox Church. Swiftly, the Eastern Catholic diocese of Presov, the only Uniat diocese in the country, was liquidated and the parishioners were forced to join the Russian Orthodox Church. Msgr. Pavel Gojdic, Bishop of Presov, has been under a life sentence since January 15, 1951.<sup>19</sup> His diocese has been taken over by a Russian Orthodox Bishop and priests sent from the Soviet Union. These priests, as reported by Msgr. Ivan Buchko, the only Ukrainian Bishop to escape the Russians, are not priests at all, but agents of the MVD. Some forty thousand of these trained agents were specially ordained as priests by the Orthodox Metropolitan of Kiev to be sent to the captive countries to disrupt religion.<sup>20</sup>

#### HUNGARY

According to the figures of the 1949 census, there were 230,000 Eastern Catholics in Hungary, or 2.5 per cent of the total population. The majority of the Hungarians, 67.5 per cent, belong to the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>21</sup>

The Communists, eliminated the outspoken leaders of the opposition, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop of Esztergom and Prince Primate of Hungary, and Msgr. Joseph Grosz, Archbishop of Kalocsa, founded a State Office for Religious Affairs in 1949, and placed all churches under its control.<sup>22</sup> The Government also sponsors a movement of apostate priests, the so-called Priests' Peace Committees. "Peace" priests have been given high church positions and have filled the episcopal posts of those who have resigned, been put under house arrest, imprisoned or executed.<sup>23</sup>

On August 30, 1950, the Bench of Bishops was forced to sign a Church-State agreement. The regime guaranteed complete freedom of religion and activity for the Catholic Church in accordance with the constitution.<sup>24</sup> A further inroad on the Church was made when the Bench of Bishops, after having opposed it for four years, resolved to take the oath

<sup>19</sup> "Prag und der Vatikan," *Osteuropa*, II (1952), No. 2, p. 136.

<sup>20</sup> MacEoin, p. 13.

<sup>21</sup> "The Red and the Black," p. 18.

<sup>22</sup> *Szabad Nep*, *Majus* 19, 1951.

<sup>23</sup> *Hungary in the Year 1651*. (New York, Hungarian RIC of the NCFE, 1952), pp. 6 ff.

<sup>24</sup> *Magyar Nemzet*, August 31, 1950.

of allegiance on July 21, 1951.<sup>25</sup> This was done only after the Hungarian government had resorted to force and declared that all church activities would be stopped if the Catholic bishops did not take the oath. By this action the life of Msgr. Stephen Szanthay-Szeman, Eastern Catholic Administrator of Hajdudorog was saved.

In spite of all these Communist measures and the constant and careful surveillance of those who continue to lead a religious life, church activity and religion in Hungary are still very much alive. The Eastern Catholic Church in Hungary is the *only* Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite in the satellite countries which has not as yet been forced into the Orthodox Church nor forcibly divorced from the Vatican.<sup>26</sup>

#### POLAND

The following report is taken from the March, 1952, issue of the *News from behind the Iron Curtain*, concerning some Eastern Catholics in Poland:

"Recently the Russian Patriarch of Moscow sent Metropolitan Makary to Poland as Metropolitan of the Polish Orthodox Church. Metropolitan Makary, instead of concerning himself with the members of the Polish Orthodox Church, is travelling through the country searching for Uniates [Eastern Catholics] who may be masking as Roman Catholics of Western rite in order to 'convert' them to the Orthodox creed. The Uniates, however, are hiding their faith for fear of repercussions. As in 1946 and 1947 Makary gained prominence in the Soviet Orthodox Church when he took an active part in the liquidation of the Uniate Church in the Eastern Polish territories incorporated into Russia. He was responsible for the deportation of resisting Uniate priests and for the fact that Uniate churches and the administration of parishes were taken over by Orthodox priests."



The picture is indeed a sad one. In their attempt to de-Christianize the captive countries, the Communist regimes have made several significant inroads on Church authority. The Eastern Catholic Churches of Ukraine and Romania have been completely annihilated by compulsory conversion to and merger with the Russia Orthodox Church. In Ukraine the Moscow Orthodox Patriarch actively cooperated with the NKVD in the destruction of the Ukrainian Eastern Catholic Church. In Romania,

---

<sup>25</sup> *Nepszava*, July 22, 1951. The decree of July 4, 1951, made all senior appointments of the Catholic Church "subject to government consent." *Nepszava*, July 4, 1951.

<sup>26</sup> "The Red and the Black," p. 21.

Bulgaria, Poland and Albania, the Orthodox Churches have been converted into docile servants of Communist policy subject to the Moscow Patriarch. In the satellite countries, the regime succeeded in transforming, at least partially, the Roman Catholic Church into "national" Catholic Churches under government domination.

It must be understood that the final aim of Communist policy toward religion is its extinction. "Marxism as materialism is absolutely atheistic and resolutely hostile to all religion," said Lenin. "We must combat religion: that is the rudiment of all materialism and consequently of Marxism. The fight against religion must not be confined to abstract ideological preaching. The fight must be linked with the concrete practical work of the class movement, which aims at eliminating the social roots of religion."<sup>27</sup>

But the Eastern Catholic Churches became a special target of the Kremlin policy. They were condemned to death at once by the Kremlin; all church organizations were to be annihilated and by force put under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarch. In this direction the Kremlin followed the Russian Tzarist imperialistic policy which was applied to the Uniat Churches throughout centuries. What is the reason for such a policy? It lies strictly in the political sphere. Any Russian regime needs the Orthodox Russian Church as an obedient tool of the regime; the Catholic Church cannot be such. Secondly, the Russian Orthodox Church, a faithful servant of the regime, is unable to stand competition with the morally higher Catholic Church of the same Eastern rite. The masses, accustomed to the Eastern rite, never would accept Catholicism of the Latin rite, but the morally higher Catholicism of the Eastern rite is able to capture the souls of the masses by deserting the official Russian Orthodox Church, a pillar of the Russian empire. This is the reason why the Eastern rite Catholic Churches must be exterminated. In Ukraine and in White Ruthenia Eastern Catholicism is a spiritual force supporting national aspirations for independence from Russia.

In spite of the conquest of Churches and Church organizations, the destruction of religious forms does not signify the death of religious faith; religion will remain the main source of strength for the oppressed people. "The green shoots of man's belief in God grow and flourish nevertheless, nor will they be battered out of existence by the Communist hammer or the Stalinist sickle."<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Lenin, "Attitude of Workers' Party towards Religion," 1908, *Selected Works*, (New York, International Publishers, 1943, XI, p. 666.

<sup>28</sup> "The Red and the Black," p. 38.

## A MODERN THEORY OF NATIONALITY

By CLARENCE A. MANNING

It has long been recognized that nationality and allegiance to a state were inseparable in a world that was built upon the principles of law and order. The stateless person in the sense that was used in the celebrated Nansen passports was indeed an anomaly for it made the unfortunate recipient a person living in a vacuum; it was universally known that this was an unenviable position for any human being and not conducive to the highest development of his potentialities. It was indeed a temporary expedient created on the spur of the moment to save a certain number of human lives in the hope and expectation that the conditions in Russia and certain other parts of the world would return to the normal in a short period of time.

By the end of World War II with the growing flood of displaced persons and the steadily increasing numbers of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, such palliatives have lost most of their excuse for being but the need which they served has by no means diminished. It has rather increased in urgency and importance. Governments in exile have multiplied; new causes have increased for self-imposed exile; and the problem has been complicated as Communism has expanded its area of control. The question is then of finding a new series of definitions that can be adapted to the modern situation and these in turn have led to a new definition both of nationality and the state.

It is often forgotten that neither of these words has maintained itself unchanged throughout the course of recorded history. In their usually accepted forms they are scarcely three or four centuries old and they are still meaningless for all but a small part of Western Europe and parts of the Americas.

In a short article it is impossible to do more than indicate a few of the chief stages in the development of the usual concepts. Once we accept the existence of the clan or the large family as the earliest stage of human political relationships with the head as both political and religious leader (priest), we find these groups combining either through a discovery of mutual interests, language, self-protection, etc. or through conquest by a more powerful group which arrogated to itself the supreme control. This process continued through centuries and millenia until there developed

the city states of Greece, vaguely conscious of a common heritage and the empires of ancient Asia or of the nomad tribes which gained power as a snowball gains in size when rolling downhill and breaks with the same facility.

The development of the Roman Empire and the adoption of Christianity gave Western Europe the concept of a great Christian Empire which was to include the whole of the civilized Christian world and was to possess a common ruler, a common Faith and more or less a common mode of life. It was a grand ideal but it rapidly proved incapable of practical achievement. In practice it became a more or less absolute monarchy held together by the feudal oath to the superior taken by the head of the group or state.

As these local or state leaders felt themselves able to defy successfully the central authority, they became themselves the local kings, princes and barons who in the late Middle Ages came to be on their own and developed the medley of states that we find in the Europe of the day. An intricate series of successions and rights complicated the process and the oaths of allegiance to a dynasty, which were the one binding element, and lost much of their meaning when the superior did not prove to be a ruler in fact and not merely in theory.

When the scythe-bearing peasants and the yeomen with their crossbows and long bows showed themselves the superior of the armored knights in battle, this theory of nationality and statehood received a death blow for more and more the states were transformed into units in which the common welfare and the common language played a dominant role. The past died hard and before it went, it created the great European Empires of the nineteenth century which were largely built upon the old principles.

The growing interest in the common man, democracy and the rights of the individual could not fail to menace these empires. Yet no less important were the spread of education and of literacy and the growing ease of communication which facilitated the exchange of ideas between the members of the same group. The study of the past under such auspices could not fail to bring home to individuals and groups that they had once possessed states and cultures of their own, which they might hope to repossess.

The same phenomena appeared within the Ottoman Empire and made it the sick man of Europe. Yet there was a difference. The Bohemians, Poles and Hungarians were fully conscious of their old national states with definite boundaries. The Greeks, Serbs and Bulgarians, while equally conscious of their past, had no such clear picture. They had, however, the common element of Christianity by which they could move



Europe to help them against the Mohammedans, and during the nineteenth century they recovered their liberty but with a large number of unresolved disputes, often of great seriousness.

Such was the map of Europe in 1914. In the west, historical development had for all intents and purposes settled the map and there were few changes to be made. Austria-Hungary was in large part a collection of forgotten states which still remembered their political past. Imperial Russia and with it the great empires of Asia, China and India, and the great colonial aggregations in Africa and elsewhere lived on the denial of the rights of the subordinate groups. They regarded the population as a whole as a formless mass, taking their nationality from that of the controlling dynasty exactly as had the Persian Empire of the fifth century B.C.

World War I was largely a European war despite colonial interludes in Africa and to a lesser degree in Asia. When it culminated in the defeat of Germany and Austria-Hungary, the former lost Alsace-Lorraine, almost the last remaining point of discord in Western Europe and the former Polish province of Poznan. Austria-Hungary was separated into its former constituent states. Yet in authorizing and proposing this, President Wilson enunciated the ideal of self-determination of peoples. He may have been thinking only of the older states but his ideas were so phrased that they appealed to men everywhere and he and his associates were surprised at the Congress of Versailles at the claims that were put forward by almost unknown peoples, peoples unknown to the traditional modern maps of Europe and Asia.

But there came also the collapse of imperial Russia. This was an empire formed not by popular will or by the union of old entities which retained their value only on paper, but by the destruction of all pre-existing internal forms and areas of administration. There was left intact in 1914 scarcely a single boundary which had existed prior to the incorporation of its inhabitants with the Empire. Yet the people had remained in their native homes and when the Empire fell, they definitely proclaimed their right to self-determination.

The Allied leaders in this position made several unfortunate decisions. They wisely recognized the special position of Finland and they saw that it was necessary to give a revived Poland part of the area that had been in the old Polish state. Beyond that they worked upon the theory that a unified state, upon changing its government to a democratic form, should maintain its old boundaries. They persevered in this policy as they had when they stood a few years earlier for the unity of China on the occasion of the fall of the Manchus. The rise of the Bolsheviks injured their plans and they looked with a lack of comprehension at the war

which followed, for it was between the peoples struggling for their rights and the remains of the old state organization trying to reassert itself. The victorious Allies did not wish the return of a monarchy nor the dismemberment of the state. Under such conditions the Bolsheviks triumphed, but with superior diplomacy, they communized the individual peoples, subjected them to the indirect rule of the Russian Communist Party and left them the form of ostensibly independent states, so that in the end of all the valiant efforts for independence only Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania received more than a shadow. Then a few years later with the creation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the way was open for Moscow to recover all but the name of independence, which it still left to its victims as a means of making further conquests in the future.

Thus the Western political leaders drew a line between those countries which had retained but rendered powerless the old provincial organizations of forgotten states and those countries which had completely destroyed all vestiges of the former governments of territories which they had seized in one way or another, even when as in the case of Turkestan which had staged a serious revolt in World War I, the Russian control had lasted scarcely a half century. It was a distinction that was to return to plague them in many parts of the world. And the end is not yet.

Even the old Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire had been wiser even if less theoretical or legal. In its futile effort to maintain itself the Sublime Porte had sought to create trouble between the Bulgarians and the other Christians of the Balkans by recognizing the Bulgarian people as entitled to a national church, although they had no state and by the use of this theory they kept the territories from which they had been driven in a state of turmoil. The Russians used the displeasure of separated Asian peoples to cover their own advance into the Amur and Ussuri regions. They encouraged the Mongolians after the fall of the Manchus to seek independence from the Chinese Republic and willingly gave them aid. They did the same in Chinese Turkestan. In a word, the early promises of Lenin and the Bolsheviks and their dream of using Communism as a disintegrating force of the Russian Empire and a reintegrating force in the new Russian Communist Empire were but a continuation of the old Russian imperial policy, even to the destruction of the ancient and traditional boundaries.

It was the same policy that Stalin applied in 1939 when he "liberated" Western Ukraine and those parts of Byelorussia that had been under Poland and "united" them to their brothers in the "independent" Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Republics and then added to them Carpathian Ukraine from Czechoslovakia. It was to lay a basis for further

actions of the same kind that Stalin secured from the Allies in World War II the control of East Germany and Northern Korea.

At the same time and following the same policy that had been applied to Russia in 1918, the English in withdrawing from India which they had unified, recognized a single Indian government for all except the areas included in Pakistan. The Dutch turned over the Dutch East Indies to a single government of Indonesia. In both cases democracy was placed above nationality on the ground that a democratic regime would not be bothered by local divisions which could be peacefully arranged. Yet within five years, India has been forced to see the development of at least semi-Communitistic regimes among the Telegus and the Tamils in the south on a linguistic basis and the Indonesians are plagued with religious and other revolts, while the Communists are trying to work their way into the central regime. Yet Eire which had maintained its traditional counties speedily found itself with no serious internal discord, once its independence was recognized.

It is very evident to-day that however closely connected the twin movements toward democracy and the independence were in the nineteenth century in Western Europe and in Central Europe, they were not entirely the same thing. There was an element in each which was not in the other and the misleading term in the parlance of the day was "autonomy", the right of the subordinated area to receive from the superior certain privileges of freedom which could be revoked at the will of the superior. When the word autonomy was first used in President Wilson's Fourteen Points, it awoke the displeasure of the Czechs and the Southern Slavs. When the Poles talked of it in connection with Western Ukraine after 1918, it did not satisfy the Western Ukrainians. What they sought was independence and that was the often forgotten goal of the United States in the American Revolution.

The Thirteen Colonies that created an alliance for the carrying on of the Revolution signed through their representatives the Declaration of Independence and became Thirteen Sovereign and Independent States under the Articles of Confederation. It was only later when the need for unity was fully understood that those Thirteen States ratified the Constitution and established a single nation. Little Rhode Island held out and was admitted to the Union only a few months before the fourteenth state of Vermont. The frequent American dreams in the Revolution that French Canada, still smarting from its capture in 1763, would join the new combination, were all rudely blasted not by British armed action but by the actions of the French Canadians. If the American example shows anything it is the folly of the Allied course in all the great empires that have fallen in the past years and the erroneous nature of the idea that

the mere application of political democracy will stifle the desire for independence on the part of a people.

There was needed in 1917 a new theory of nationality based upon the American example and the unconscious practice of the Concert of Europe in recognizing the independence of the Balkan states and of England in turning over to Greece the Ionian Islands. This was hidden by the religious conflict of Christian against Moslem but it recognized the germ of truth. A people that love a part of the world where they live well enough to fight for liberty deserve to have it. Once they have achieved it, it is time to consider how they will group themselves into a larger entity but that grouping is from below not from above.

Even the danger of what is sneeringly called Balkanization is less important to-day when such areas as Luxembourg can find its own place in the Atlantic Community and the NATO.

Self-determination in 1918 was often the victim of its friends. There were too many small communities that appeared at Versailles. It was the victim of the democratic idea which rested too much upon a belief in the continuing legality of the old states. It is a victim to-day of those groups of anti-Communist Russians and others who stick to the old ideal that there can be no local institutions without the will of the superior. Exactly as the Provisional Government of Russia refused to recognize the Ukrainian Rada until the Constitutional Assembly finished its work, so to-day the Russian "democrats" oppose recognition of any Ukrainian or other non-Russian peoples, until some hypothetical time in the future, when they themselves will be solidly in control.

If self-determination is to be something more than a plaything of international idealistic thinking and dreaming, it must be based upon a sound political reasoning. That has been given in the remarkable articles of Major Poltava of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army which before his untimely death were smuggled or carried from behind the Iron Curtain. The slogan, "Freedom to man and freedom to the nation," which were the twin goals of that heroic movement can provide the answer, for this envisages not only a democratic but also a national world. It looks forward to a world of law and order in which the nation can be defined as a group of people with sufficient common interests to act as a unit in world affairs but it looks forward also to the time when that group will be free to make its own choice on matters of vital moment to itself. It recognizes that with the disappearance of a feudal aristocracy, of which only the hereditary head can speak, the common man with his fellows has a right to be heard and within broad limits that common man and his fellows will give due weight to the fact that he and they speak a common language, inhabit a compact territory and share common ideals and a com-

mon culture. It emphatically denies the ideal of a permanent and static division of the world. It gives a newer and broader sense to the meaning of nationality, yes and of democracy for it denies both racial and class superiority and cuts directly at the roots of both forms of totalitarianism.

This is no new idea, although it is expressed in a new form and with a new emphasis. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had their own word for it, the right of belligerency. Western Europe knew at that time what this meant. War was still an accepted part of international law but once an armed movement had come out into the open, once it had secured a base of operations, it could receive this right. It could openly send its representatives, its captured soldiers received the right to be treated as prisoners of war, the population of the area was guaranteed against outrages and excesses, it could buy abroad munitions and supplies, without a necessary declaration of war by the superior against the sympathetic friends of the rebels.

All this is what the Ukrainian patriots of World War II, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, had the right to expect from the free nations. They did not receive it for the free world with its horror of continued war and its noble aspirations both in 1918 and in 1941 allowed itself to be lulled to sleep by the bright dream of an ever peaceful future — the idea that boundaries might be changed peaceably when the population of an area wished was inherent in the League of Nations, in the Atlantic Charter and in the United Nations. It was never implemented but the possibility of it so being was used to justify a static world and to protect concentration and labor camps and to admit genocide, starvation and mass murder. It is utilized to-day by neutralists in all lands and by the advocates of appeasement and containment to oppose any attempt at liberation of the people under the yoke of Moscow or any other aggressor, to repatriate anti-Communist prisoners with or without brainwashing, to repudiate ardent and sincere patriots and to strengthen and make more solid the Iron Curtain. It is used to abolish international law and to substitute for it an ever increasing tendency to surrender to brute force in its crudest form.

The mere extension of the idea of a nation and of nationality can transfer the struggle to the diplomatic field. It can do in the present and the future what the old right did in the past and it can become a powerful weapon not only against the aggressor but as a positive force for good. It is the opponents of such measures, the advocates of a static world, the guarantors of Soviet boundaries who are declaring in effect that the free world should surround itself with a Maginot Line which can be easily turned or are calling for World War III because they deny the possibility of a peaceful change.

What would the recognition of this new theory of nationality mean? It would give the representatives of Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Georgia and the other members of the Soviet prison of nations the immediate right to speak as openly and as freely as did the Czecho-Slovak and Polish National Committees in Paris during World War I, as did the representatives of the revolting Balkan Christians in the nineteenth century. To-day or to-morrow it would give the same privileges to the peoples of Asia opposing the new colonialism dictated from Moscow. The day after it will make it possible for a peaceful reconsideration of the peoples of Africa. For a world which has renounced war, it offers the only means for a peaceful consideration of the unfinished business of national boundaries. It will enable the spokesmen for the people to answer the arguments of the Russia firsters who pretend to speak for a discredited regime and the Russian appointed Communist spokesmen without the stigma of being called separatists and any other words of abuse that may suit the popular ear. It will give back to the word "minority" its true sense, a group of people who by some unfortunate twist of boundary lines or by their choice of habitation are in another group of people and not their own. It will stop the misuse of that word to express large masses of people living on their ancestral lands with own language, culture and historical traditions conquered by aliens and annexed by force.

The noble concept of a Christian Empire to embrace under one government the Christian world failed. It was a grand ideal but the emperors proved incapable and the system was too rigid for mankind. The Holy Alliance failed. It could not stop the march of progress. It could not halt the South American movement for independence. It could not stop the westward expansion of both the Americans and the Canadians.

President W. Wilson proclaimed the word self-determination. The oppressed peoples heard it but the diplomats refused to solve the problem of Russia. After World War II that same problem is more acute in all the continents. The United Nations was an attempt to solve problems on a world scale. Yet, if it too, is to work only for a static world, it will go the way of its predecessors. Mankind cannot and will not stand still and the world cannot exist half free and half slave. The free world must face that fact and it must recognize that the silent are finding their voices despite the machine guns and the concentration camp. It must hear them and with the words of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) "Freedom for the individual and freedom for the nation" with this new and expanded but not vitally changed sense of the nation and nationality, it has the means of forging new links in the chain of freedom of raising the hopes of the oppressed and of drawing to its service the Ukrainians and the other oppressed nationalities for the well being of mankind, the brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God.

## THREE OF A KIND—ON CON. RES. 58

By LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

Toward the close of the first session of the present Congress — on July 15, 1953 to be exact — a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs conducted hearings on House Concurrent Resolution 58 which favors the extension of diplomatic relations with the republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia (White Ruthenia), the two largest non-Russian republics in the Soviet Union. On the basis of these open hearings and the cogent and well documented arguments that were presented in support of the measure — which is sponsored by the Honorable Lawrence H. Smith of Wisconsin, — the special subcommittee under the able chairmanship of the Honorable Frances P. Bolton voted unanimously in favor of the resolution. A careful reading and evaluation of the various authoritative testimonies submitted in behalf of H. Con. Res. 58 will enable one to appreciate the compelling reasons for this unanimous approval and the desirability, not to say the virtual necessity, of the passage of the resolution by the full committee in the second session commencing in January.<sup>1</sup>

Naturally, as on all issues of crucial import to the security interests of our country, cold objectivity and a dispassionate inquiry into the accessible facts must constantly serve as our guides of active thought if the ideas and opinions advanced on any particular question are to be intelligently assessed and prudently acted upon. Hollow assertions and mere expressions of unfounded judgment can never endure the rigorous test of objective criticism. On this specific issue, involving American diplomatic representation in the capitals of Kiev and Minsk, the Bolton committee liberally availed itself of considerable factual material on which to rest its favorable decision. Indeed, it can be fairly stated that every conceivable argument delivered in opposition to the resolution was squarely and adequately answered by the expert proponents of the bill who appeared as witnesses at the hearing. From the viewpoint of an objective treatment of the numerous points considered, it appears that there is no theoretic ground left for further rational opposition to this unique resolution.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hearing, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Special Subcommittee on H. Con. Res. 58, U. S. Gov't. Printing Office, Washington 1953.

Now aside from the pure, objective aspects of the matter, there developed a most illuminating alignment of forces on the political level which cannot but be of absorbing interest to our legislators, executive members, and political observers generally. Congressional consideration of H. Con. Res. 58 served to crystalize on this plane two distinct tendencies of thought, sentiment and motivation that are clearly reflected in this alignment of groups and individuals who display their interest in East European affairs, in particular the Soviet Union, from radically different premises of understanding and moral valuation. On the one hand, placing themselves in support of the resolution are such American organizations as the Polish American Congress,<sup>2</sup> the Slovak League of America, the White Ruthenian Congress Committee, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and others of Armenian, Georgian, Rumanian, and Baltic background. On the other hand, one finds a strange alliance of a few fellow-traveling Ukrainians, a motley combination of Russian emigre groups, and the Kennan loyalists in the Department of State opposing the passage of this resolution.

To anyone conversant with the subject of Russian Communist imperialism, this political alignment scarcely comes as a surprise or as an event of statistical coincidence. Represented by the national organizations cited above, Americans of non-Russian ancestry—be it Polish, Lithuanian, Slovak or Ukrainian — maintain an informative interest in the developments occurring in the various Moscow-dominated countries of Eastern Europe, including the national republics in the Soviet Union, with the primary view of factually reinforcing the sound formulation of our own foreign policy adapted to the maximum protection of American security in the current struggle with Russian Communist imperialism. On the basis of their intimate knowledge of East European history, which for centuries has been marked by the dark impress of autocratic Russian imperialism under various ideological guises, they share the essential view that in order to deter the feverish Russian Communist program of consolidation within the present Soviet Empire and to prevent the formation of this requisite base for world conquest, a forthright policy of liberation, pitched to a universalised American Declaration of Independence, one that would inflame the patriotic heart of every Pole, Balt, Ukrainian etc. with the hope of national freedom and independence from the foreign domination of Moscow, is indispensable at this time. This policy of being *for* something as well as against significantly points in the humanitarian direction of providing a historic opportunity — one

---

<sup>2</sup> Full statement reproduced in *The Ukrainian Bulletin*, Sept. 1-15, 1953, Vol. VI, Nos. 17-18.



they've never had before — for the long enslaved masses of the 92 million Russian nation to begin to enjoy the fruits of the elimination of the costly burdens of empire by concentrating on the development of democratic institutions and the improvement of their economic lot.

Thus, it is no wonder that groups and individuals of this easily supported conviction are urging the passage of H. Con. Res. 58. The resolution symbolizes a keen and moral American interest in the subjugated condition and aspirations of the two largest non-Russian nations in the East European sector of the Soviet Union, one of these, namely Ukraine, being also the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain. Those few opposing the resolution do not, however, view it in this light. As we shall carefully note below, although for different causes, they represent on this and cognate issues — three of a kind, in what one nationally known political analyst has aptly characterized as the Russia First movement in this country.<sup>3</sup>

### 1. THE REPUGNANT SECT OF FELLOW-TRAVELING UKRAINIANS

Needless to say, in the political realm one meets with diverse species of humans. The satellite and captive nations of Eastern Europe, including the non-Russian republics in the Soviet Union, have their small crop of quislings who provide the native window-dressing for imperialist Moscow rule in their nominally independent governments. We ourselves are constantly endangered by the infiltration of traitorous individuals into sensitive areas with the consuming purpose of betraying their native land to the foreign domination of Moscow. Whatever the cause or reason of origin, this human species is simply repugnant to the millions who are bound by patriotic devotion to the cultural values of their national existence and being. In the eyes of every patriotic Georgian, Stalin is properly deemed as the great quisling of his native country, Georgia.

Ukraine, of course, is not beyond the pale of this general affliction. It also possesses its share of quislings, those who currently work in behalf of Communist Moscow and those thoroughly Russified types — generically known as Gulays — who operate with imperialist Russian emigré groups opposing Russian Communism but at the same time aspiring to preserve its original empire, now in the guise of the Soviet Union. In both instances, the spirit of patriotic devotion and natural love of country are non-existent. For both cases there exist a small number of Ukrainians, residing even in this country, who are sympathetically ex-

---

<sup>3</sup> Americus, "The Russia First Movement in the United States," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Summer, 1953, Vol. IX, No. 3.

pressive of these unsavory tendencies. It is from one of these sources that opposition to H. Con. Res. was expressed.

The fact that objection is raised by a group which can draw only our disrespect and ill-esteem, especially in the light of the tremendous human sacrifices borne by the heroic patriots of Ukraine in their unyielding resistance to a philosophy and power completely alien to their native soil and culture, furnishes additional evidence of the American self-interest reflected in the Smith resolution. The Russian Communist overlords themselves appear to be disturbed over growing American interest in the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. Just recently Moscow has determined the prohibition of the export of all major newspapers and magazines published in the non-Russian areas of the Soviet Union. More than fifty publications issuing from fifteen of the sixteen constituent Soviet republics are to be kept from the outside world.<sup>4</sup> Only those emanating from Russia itself, i. e. the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, are permitted to be exported. This measure is obviously in the nature of Russian Communist imperialism. And the basic truth of this phenomenon has nowhere been stated as vividly and honestly as in the classic work of this century's greatest Russian philosopher, Nicolas Berdyaev: "Bolshevism is the third appearance of Russian autocratic imperialism, its first appearance being the Muscovite Tsardom and its second the Petrine Empire."<sup>5</sup>

## 2. THE RUSSIA FIRST ANTI-COMMUNIST CABAL

The second of this unholy trinity in kind which voiced its opposition to H. Con. Res. 58 is what has precisely come to be called the Russia First anti-communist cabal, operating in this country as well as in Europe. It is made up of the Permanent Conference of Six Russian Anti-Communist Organizations, consisting of a relatively small number of Russian emigrés that range in political complexion from the Marxist Menshevik pole to the reactionary monarchist one. Although in the title of this amorphous Conference it is indicated that they are anti-communist, in the sense of being *against* the present regime in Moscow, the only point of attraction bringing them together on the more important level of being *for* something is the preservation of the territorial framework of the Russian Empire and further Russian domination over the majority non-Russian nations in the present version of the empire, the Soviet Union. For surely the League of Struggle for Russian Freedom, made up of "democratic" Marxists, have little in common from a technical

<sup>4</sup> *The New York Times*, Saturday, October 31, 1953, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> "The Origin of Russian Communism," p. 120.

ideological viewpoint with the Russian NTS which one disinterested study discloses to be anti-Semitic and fascist in character.<sup>6</sup>

In the course of the open discussions last July on H. Con. Res. 58, this multi-colored group circulated under rather clandestine circumstances a statement entitled "Goodwill and Communist Tactics." This statement of opposition to H. Con. Res. 58 was deposited in a number of offices on Capitol Hill with the sole reference of its source given in the name of the above Conference. As to the nature and type of the six Russian organizations referred to, one had to glean this information from a list published in a Russian organ in New York which in its anti-communist efforts is likewise dedicated to the "one and indivisible Russia (Empire)" idea.<sup>7</sup> In addition to the two mentioned, the others are similarly of alien character. It now appears understandable as to why more specific designations were omitted in the memorandum.

Again, as one would expect, no direct arguments of objective worth are advanced in this statement to justify the opposition of this group to H. Con. Res. 58. In fact it appears that they do not, nor care to, understand the objectives and content of the resolution. For example, item 1 in the statement reads: "Why is there the desire to limit diplomatic relations to only these two Soviet republics and not include the other fourteen? *One already begins to suspect the purpose of this move.*" Concerning the first part of this particular statement, the simple fact is that the legal framework of the resolution is the representation of Ukraine and Byelorussia in the United Nations. None of the remaining fourteen is so represented. Moreover, the reader should not be misled by this question into thinking that this imperialist Russian emigré group is honestly concerned about the diplomatic status of the other non-Russian republics. For if it were, it would side with those of Baltic, Georgian, Armenian and other non-Russian backgrounds in support of the resolution, practicably covering at least two of these non-Russian republics.

To appreciate with some degree of light humor the underlined part of this given statement, one has to read the entire memorandum for its somewhat ludicrous play on innuendo and false suggestion. In essence, with the evident purpose of capitalizing on the relative unfamiliarity of many Americans with the multi-national realities in the USSR, it attempts to convey the impression that H. Con. Res. 58 is the product of a communist plot exploiting the goodwill of benign Americans. Hence the title, "Goodwill and Communist Tactics." It sounds silly, but the first two

---

<sup>6</sup> "NTS—The Russian Solidarist Movement," Office of Intelligence Research, Department of State, Dec. 10, 1951, Wash., D. C.

<sup>7</sup> *Novoye Russkoye Slovo*, August 2, 10, 1953.

paragraphs set the unmistakable pitch of the entire memorandum by dwelling on ways and means of Communist infiltration. "Communists can still work in many fields with a great deal of success," it is stated. Then in the third paragraph, with reference to H. Con. Res. 58, we read, "Recently a typical case was observed in Washington which represents not a direct Communist move, but is certainly a move whereby all advantages will finally accrue to the Communists." The obvious suggestion here is that H. Con. Res. 58 is an indirect communist move and that our goodwilled legislators supporting it have been shamelessly duped—as one outstanding political writer on communism humorously put it—by the sinister MVD in Moscow! This statement in itself reveals all three.

In addition to that provided above, the first can be further illustrated by their use of the old imperialist term, "peoples of Russia," as though the Soviet Union were identical with Russia which actually is only one segment of the former. The second on slander is viewed in their free use of such terms as "willing tools of Communism" and their absurd statement (which the Canadian Government would relish) that "Nearly all so-called Ukrainian homes in towns and villages of Western Canada are Communist centers and are really Communist homes." Factual distortion, which abounds in this statement, is best exemplified by quoting this misleading statement that "we know from long experience that all people in *Soviet Russia* suffer in exactly the same way from Communist evil-doing." One need only consult the Senate Hearings on the Genocide Convention of January-February, 1952 to observe upon whom Soviet Russian genocide has been perpetrated. Not even an iota of evidence can be furnished with regard to the Russian nation, but an abundance of evidence exists in respect to the captive non-Russian nations throughout the Soviet Russian Empire.

In short, the opposition of this group to H. Con. Res. 58 is founded on the hope that no intimate contact be established between our country and Ukraine and Byelorussia for fear that a deepened interest in these two large non-Russian nations may eventually result in our support of their aspirations for national independence and self-government. This would undermine their empire objective, despite the fact that it exists as one of America's most formidable weapons against Russian Communist imperialism. Russians of the stature and integrity personified by Berdyaev have long recognized the course of imperialism in Russian politics and its negation of the truth that no nation can really be free if it dominates and tyrannizes other nations. For the task of eliminating this curse and building the foundations for the future freedom of the Russian nation, they have urged, in the spirit of the last testimony of the late Russian Christian scholar, George Fedotov, that "For this great

task the Russian intelligentsia in exile should prepare itself right now—instead of chasing after the phantom eagles of empire.<sup>8</sup>

### 3. THE KENNAN LOYALISTS

In terms of numbers and influence the groups mentioned here are politically unimportant in this country as well as abroad. By nature they are not even American. They are considered here for the purpose of demonstrating how on a given issue certain Americans can, by virtue of inculcated misconceptions and erroneous premises of moral understanding, find themselves channeled into avenues of unfortunate ideologic association with as strange a political array as the one shown above. Thus, making up the third component of this three of a kind is the Kennan following which still occupies important posts in the State Department.

As was brought out in the hearing on H. Con. Res. 58, the letter to the Honorable Robert B. Chipfield, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, ostensibly setting forth the position of the Department of State in opposition to the resolution, was an almost verbatim duplication of the one sent in reply to an inquiry on the same issue by the Honorable H. Alexander Smith more than a year ago when the department was under the complete reign of the Kennan "containment group." The many miscalculations and errors of judgment of this particular group in the determination and execution of American foreign policy are well known to close students and observers of the subject. Their poor judgment is reflected also in the "position" taken in behalf of the department on H. Con. Res. 58. When one considers the dominant premises of thought and the ruling conceptions of this group, it is not difficult to understand why.

First, it is an established fact that the "Russian experts" of this group, brought up on "Great" Russian literature and history which were generally as heavily censored under the imperialist Russian Tsars as now under the more imperialist Russian Communists, have virtually little understanding and warm appreciation of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. One need only read the literary output of Mr. Kennan which consistently maintains the interchangeability of Russia and the Soviet Union, as though the latter were a nation rather than a prison of nations, to be duly impressed by this fact. His conception of these non-Russian nations may be gleaned from the following classic statement: "An American who wishes his influence to be beneficial in that part of the world would do well to impress on any friends he may have from

---

<sup>8</sup> "The Fate of Empires," *The Russian Review*, April, 1953.

the Iron Curtain countries the folly of a continuation... of these dreary and profitless manipulations with so-called national boundaries and with the *naive loyalties of bewildered linguistic groups* which have passed for statesmanship in that area in the past."<sup>9</sup> Nations with histories extending back centuries before Christ and graced with many peaceful eras of national independence and self-government, are for him merely "bewildered linguistic groups." Moreover, it would seem that in the eyes of this expert any non-Russian area that falls prey to imperialist Russian aggression, becomes necessarily an integral economic part of Russia. In his view, "...the Ukraine is economically as much a part of Russia as Pennsylvania is a part of the United States." The phenomenon of economic colonialism, which is scarcely experienced by the state of Pennsylvania, appears to be of no consideration to Mr. Kennan.

Second, it is also important to observe the basic orientation of this group to international problems. Justice, moral order and fundamental inalienable rights of nations and peoples appear to carry only conventional, nominal meaning for these people. As Mr. Kennan puts it "...I see the most serious fault of our past policy formulation to lie in something that I might call the legalistic-moralistic approach to international problems."<sup>10</sup> In another place he emphatically states that "The tendency to achieve our foreign policy objectives by inducing other governments to sign up to professions of high moral and legal principle appears to have a great and enduring vitality in our diplomatic practice... I think we have grounds to question its soundness and suitability."<sup>11</sup> Philosophically, the alternative approach suggested here is scarcely different from the pragmatic materialistic and sheer businesslike approach pursued by the Russian Communists.

Since last July there have been indications of a change of attitude in the State Department toward H. Con. Res. 58. A real change naturally requires the repudiation of such ill-founded views as have prevailed among the Kennan loyalists. It is sincerely hoped that this change will crystallize in the second session of Congress, assuming the form of a departmental support of the resolution. In this event, the three of a kind will probably continue, but not to the embarrassment of Americans who by conviction and passion look to foreign policy negotiations which are founded on accurate knowledge, truth, moral law and perennial principles of individual, national and international order.

---

<sup>9</sup> "America and the Russian Future," *Foreign Affairs*, XXIX, No. 3, April, 1951, (underscore mine).

<sup>10</sup> *American Diplomacy 1900-1950*, p. 95.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

## THE SOVIET SCHOLAR AND COMMUNIST REALITY

By NESTOR KOROL

Science in the universities and colleges of the Soviet Union is, so to speak, unofficially divided into three groups: a) the group of sciences directly connected with Marxism, Bolshevism and their ideology; b) the group deriving from the first as its direct result: Darwinism, history, geo-history, and geopolitics; and finally, c) the group of technical subjects comprising the rest of the sciences.

In accordance with this division, *the professors also are divided unofficially into three groups, according to their standing in the Communist Party.* The first group, naturally, consists of Communists only; the second, of Communists or, if non-party people, absolutely trusted and reliable persons; the third group includes those true experts in their field of science and knowledge, who in no way are distinguished from the vast number of experts in the national economy. It should be noted that these groups do not harbor enmity against each other; however, there are no sincere and cordial relations among them. Whereas, the third group consists of persons who are true experts in their profession (and in fact consider themselves as such); the first group and their knowledge does not relish the authority and respect which the third group commands. Of course, there are no visible signs of such a differentiation; nevertheless, the attitude of the professional scientists toward "scientists" of the Communist stock is that of disdain, which they voice to their friends in private conversations.

On the other hand, the first group considers the third group outmoded and conservative (although comparatively few pre-revolutionary professors are in the group). The second group strives to play the role of mediator and pacifier. They declare that it is necessary to be progressive and that the Soviet form of co-existence of mankind is something progressive. It must not be forgotten that the Communists have been systematically infiltrating Communists into all branches of knowledge and science. However, there are often cases where a scientist of some importance is forced against his will to join the Party. This is done for propaganda and advertising reasons — so as to underscore that "the best are among the Communists." This concerns only noted experts and

scientists whom the Communists badly need. In principle the Communists do not practise such methods to gain members, on the contrary, they are very strict in admitting new members to the Party, especially, if the candidate is of "bourgeois" origin.

In the Soviet Union science is utilitarian and as such must be in the services and of use to the State. Consequently, there are no free universities — the universities are not autonomous educational institutions as is the case in non-Communist countries.

The rector of the university is apparently elected, but the candidate is appointed unofficially by the Communist Party first and he must be approved by the Committee in Charge of University Education. This Committee is something similar to the Ministry of University Education, except that it retains far greater rights and deals with the highest educational institutions exclusively, such as universities and colleges and their various branches.

Although professors are selected in a contest by the Professors' Council, the final word rests with the Committee, which has the right to reject or confirm the selection. Besides, the Committee, in accord with the Supreme Attestative Commission, may recommend this or that person to the post of a professor or lecturer, but there are cases where the professor gets his post as a result of competition. The chairman of the Committee and the head of the Supreme Attestative Commission is one and the same person.

As a rule, rectors of colleges are appointed by the Committee, after they have been selected by the Personnel Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, and they must be Communists. Professors are selected in the universities, but appointment by the Committee of Education is more frequent. The title of Professor is given by the Committee on the grounds of an evaluation by the Supreme Attestative Commission. In the event of dismissal (which is often the case with those who have served terms as political prisoners), the title of professor remains for a period of five years after which, if a professors' examination is successfully repeated, the person may ask the Committee to award him again the title of Professor.

It would not be redundant to mention here that in the Soviet Union there are two scholarly degrees: the first scholarly degree is that of a *Candidate of Science* and the second that of *Doctor of Science*. In conformity with the statutes for scholarly degree in the USSR, the first degree of a Candidate of Science can be awarded by the Council of Professors of the university or college on the basis of a supporting thesis by the candidate in which he must prove himself as scientist-researcher in his branch of knowledge. The title of Doctor is bestowed only



after the submission of a dissertation which must contribute something new and unknown in a given field of science and be confirmed by the Council and Supreme Attestative Commission. Therefore, in the Soviet Union there are very few persons, with the regular title of Doctor, save those who have the title extraordinarily without proof only for "previous scientific works." Only a few higher educational institutions are entitled to award scholarly degrees. Aside from a few in other Union republics, all these institutes are concentrated in the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic even though professors there are often less competent as compared with those in the analogical institutes in the non-Russian Union Republics. To award a scholarly degree, particularly that of doctor of science, the institution must have three persons on its staff of professors who have received degrees in that particular field, or some field closely related to it. Consequently, many institutions have indulged in competition to lure as many professors as possible holding the scholarly degree of doctor to their own institute. Provincial institutes have no professors bearing a doctor's degree at all. As for the first scholarly degree, not all institutes have the right to award it to its former students, and the provincial institutes are entirely debarred from awarding it.

A special Committee for the whole of the Soviet Union often awards to the favorites of the regime both academic degrees for "previous scientific works" without a supporting thesis. Such persons, however, are usually not wanted by any educational institute except the provincial ones.

Most of the higher educational institutions, which have at their disposal good professors holding the title of doctor and are located in larger cities, are also entitled to maintain an institute called an "*Institute for the Preparation of Aspirants*," at which aspirants are trained to fill the posts of the higher educational institutions after two or three years of study. Upon completion of their terms, the aspirants write their research theses for the first scholarly degree of candidate of science and obtain positions as assistants or lecturers. Later they may establish themselves in the position of docent (the American equivalent is Assistant Professor) and that of professor (the American equivalent of full Professor).

To be able to enroll in the Institute for Aspirants, one must finish his studies at the higher educational institution with excellent marks. Students of "proletarian or poor peasant extraction" have often priority when they command less knowledge than the candidates of bourgeois origin.

Very often good specialists from industrial plants or research experimental institutions are invited to lecture, especially on technical and agricultural subjects. They may at first lecture as lecturers, but later on as docents and professors, depending upon their abilities.

Professors are held in high esteem and respect in the Soviet Union, especially in Ukraine; however, the title becomes often a matter of speculation. The Communists, too, have great respect for scientists and professors.

*The relations between professors and the students* are also only on an official basis. There is scarcely any contact at all outside the universities or colleges. Professors, who for whatever reasons — political or scientific — oppose the dominant views, observe utmost caution in contacting their students. Yet some professors do manage to put across views contrary to those accepted by the Party, or even betray their attitude toward the regime, but, of course, very cautiously. The late Prof. Evhen Votchal of the Kiev University, honorary member of several European Academies of Science, once lectured on the colors of plants and remarked that red — though dominant in nature — is the most unstable color. It tends to become white, he asserted, when it fades. A student challenged his view and asked why it was so. The Professor answered that the genes in the plants have characteristics which bring about such a change. "What nature has bestowed upon you is all you get, and so it is in human society." Thereupon the student countered with the famous statement of Lenin, "Every woman-cook should know how to conduct the affairs of the State." The Professor is known to have retorted, "It is because Lenin was a very great joker, but the people took his words in all earnest."

*The extent of thought control* is incredibly broad. Suffice it to say that the vast system of administration, police, schools, propaganda cadres, the press and radio, are institutes whose duty it is to ensure that everybody in the Soviet Union has the same outlook on life. This goes for science and the schools too. It is a matter of fact that no one can exercise complete free thought, except in conformity with the Party line. In the schools, textbooks are the "Bibles" by which the Professors must abide. The Committee for University Education, the Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Educational Affairs, and the Party Collective of a given institution are the guardians who see to it that they do not drift away from the views officially sanctioned. The third group of professors, who are not Communists, yet experts in science, are subjected to even stricter control of thought. Exceptions are the cases where the experiments and experiences of a professor or scientist are of use or can be of use to the Communists. They are given

a more of a free hand in expressing their views. But the general rule is, that the professors try to adapt themselves to the circumstances, a vitally necessary means in tactics. For example, the case of Marr in philology and that of Pokrovsky in historiography. As we know, Marr and his views were tolerated for some time even after his death, but after the famous Stalin speech which branded him almost a saboteur, his teaching has disappeared from the universities. The same is true of the historical views of Pokrovsky. Condemnation of Pokrovsky's historical school by the Central Committee of the Communist Party (1934) eliminated Pokrovsky's historical views. Mendel's teaching was accepted by the Soviets until Lysenko came along with his theories, which fitted into the Communist ideas. Scores of professors have ended up in prisons or concentration camps only because their views happened to contradict those of Marxism, Leninism or Stalinism or simply those of the Party at a given moment (which did not mean that the views of the Party would not change overnight). And these professors did not succeed in adapting themselves in time. The thought control is evident everywhere in the schools; thinking is done by the Party. In science, except for rare and daring cases, the situation is the same. Where no free science exists, there can be no free thought; indeed, these thoughts may constitute a danger to one's own life.

A crushing example of what science has come to in USSR is the case of genetics. This science, developed by the Western world through the theories of Mendel and Morgan, was flatly rejected when Lysenko appeared with his theory of heredity, denying the materialistic factor in heredity and proposing environment as decisive in acquiring characteristics.

The Communists would readily renounce one or two letters from the orthodox teachings of Marx if it served their aims. Therefore, the Communists and the Communist materialist-scientists have denied the materialistic theory of Mendelism and Morganism.

Generally speaking, *the Soviets do not reject Western science*, especially when it cannot easily interfere with their tenets. They teach Western science in schools and universities, but whenever it is possible and the views can be distorted, the Soviets give the science a different content, a different flavor and explanation, so as to make it a Marxistic science. They express contempt for the theories of the West if these do not tally with their way of thinking, along the lines of Marxism, Leninism, and Stalinism. Furthermore, they cannot tolerate any glorification of the "Western bourgeois" science. It is so to say, a matter of principle, the supremacy of Soviet science must be stressed on every possible occasion in order to enhance their prestige.

The feverish efforts with which the Soviets are working to convince their people and those who sympathize with them abroad, are well known. They do not refuse to make the most fantastic claims in the field of discoveries, inventions or theories which lead to unbelievable absurdity. But here the Soviets avail themselves of their motto: "The ends justify the means." How can the Soviet reader or student check on the authenticity of their contentions, or rather on those of the Western sciences? The slightest efforts of Russian scientists of the past have been acclaimed as actual inventions; mere vague notions have been credited as developed theories, discoveries have been shamelessly invented, etc. And each and every case is taken as an occasion to assail the Western scientists for plagiarism, or to maintain that the West arrived at the results much later, or, that the poor Russian scientists had no means to uphold their research works and were compelled to sell their ideas to the West. The Russian man or Soviet man (identical now) is to feel that he was chosen to lead and carry the torch of science and progressiveness to the backward world. It is no exaggeration to state that the Soviets oppose any Western ideas, inventions, and theories, although they do not wholly reject them, for the sole reason that accepting them would not tally with their statements about the "rotten West." This is to keep aloft the myth of Russian messianism and carry out the conquest of the world.

Soviet information lists some 890 higher educational institutions, but in reality there are far fewer. It is hard to consider the 223 Teachers' Institutes as higher educational institutions as the Soviets list them, for to enroll in these schools one does not have to have graduated from high school, which consists of 10 years of study. It is sufficient to have 8 or 9 classes of high school to be admitted to these institutes. Furthermore, it is also difficult to count the so-called *Academies of Socialist Farming Industry*, or the *Academies of Socialist Industry* into these categories, for they are Communist Party schools for semi-illiterate Communist favorites (Communists from the lowest strata pushed forward to high posts) who upon completing their studies assume administrative posts in the Soviet industry plants, and state farms or kolkhozes.

Many high *educational institutions* are highly specialized so that people who have ended their studies at these schools are quite illiterate in other fields of knowledge. Some of them highly specialized, to mention a few, are: the Agricultural Institute in Poltava at which only pig keeping is taught; the Hlukhiv Agricultural Institute where the students specialize in hemp cultivation; the Zagorsk Institute of Poultry Industry near Moscow, the Moscow Institute of Gold Mining, the Odesa Institute of Food Conserve Can Industry, the Ceramic Institute near Kiev, the

Silicate Institute in Kiev, and many similar schools throughout the Soviet Union. The Communists themselves are very well aware of the low level of education at these institutes.

Administratively, the Soviet Institutions of higher education in the USSR are subordinated to the ministries of their respective union republics and are maintained by the same. Each of the numerous Soviet ministries has its own educational institutions. The Ministry of Agriculture has its agronomical, veterinarian, zootechnical, and others. The Ministry of Health has its medical, pharmaceutical institutes (colleges); the Ministry of Education — its pedagogical and teacher's institutes, etc.

Apart from this, there are almost in every separate republic so-called "Institutions of Higher Education of All-Union Subordination" which are subordinated to the ministries of the USSR and not to the respective ministries of the certain Union Republics. They are also maintained by the former. The language taught at these institutions is throughout Russian — not the language of the republic. Such institutions are increasing in number from year to year. After the last war all 37 universities in the USSR were relegated to the Ministry of Higher Education of the USSR (formerly, All-Union Committee for Affairs of Higher Education) although they had been previously subordinated to the authorities of the Union republics. The same happened to many Institutes of Technic and Technology which were taken over by the competent ministries of the USSR. In the competency of the local Union Republics there remained institutes of secondary importance only. This tendency has been intensified more and more by each passing year, becoming thus a method of russification.

## IN THE KOLYMA GOLD MINES OF NIZHNY KHATYNAKH

By PETRO KOLYMSKY

After several days of travelling by steamboat over the waters of the Pacific Ocean, there came a loud whistle as we approached the bay of Nagayevo. The crowds of criminals who had been the entire time on deck shouted together that they could see the city of Magadan. The ship began to reduce its speed and soon we felt a blow as it approached the wharf.

About five hours after the ship docked, they began to unload us. When we got on shore, it was late at night. We were surrounded by men of the NKVD with dogs and taken to a bath house on the outskirts of the city. No one slept that night, for we went through a general sanitary inspection.

Before undressing we were told that for the disinfection we should give only articles of value and throw away everything old, for we would receive what we needed in new things. Taught by our bitter experience in the Bamlag, we did not believe this and handed over everything for disinfection. After washing, we went from the bath into the dressing section. As we passed a table, we were given underwear, summer clothing and footwear, all new, so that all the prisoners left the bath with new prison clothes.

From the bath we were taken under the same heavy guard to a distribution center a long distance from the city of Magadan. We arrived at about seven o'clock in the morning. Each of us was called by name and checked against our photographs. This centre was very large and covered a large area with a great number of barracks and huts. Assigned to it was the entire group from our ship, the Dalstroy, and also some prisoners remaining from the preceding convoy. In the barracks there were bare bunks on which the prisoners slept without any bedding. As in Vladivostok there was a throng of ruffians who terrorized the political prisoners. They were interested in our own clothing which had been left to some, and our money. Just as on the ship these criminals were the complete masters of the camp.

On the day when we arrived, we were told that we would not remain long in this camp. Three days later almost the whole camp was transferred to the place where we were to work. It was the end of August and the NKVD was in a hurry to get the prisoners away, so as to

increase the number of slaves in the washing of the gold, for the season for getting it out was coming to an end.

Among the prisoners in the Soviet jails and concentration camps there had passed from mouth to mouth the joking remark, "Kolyma, Kolyma is a new planet, twelve months winter and the rest summer." Since I imagined Kolyma as a land of eternal freezing, I was delighted with the weather which prevailed at Magadan in the third week of August, 1938. In the daytime, the weather was sunny and comparatively warm. Only on the southern slope of one of the highest mountains was there a white covering of snow.

#### THE AUTOROAD FROM MAGADAN TO THE MINES AT KHATYNAKH.

We travelled for three days from Magadan to the gold mines.

We travelled only by day and spent the nights in transportation points built specifically for this purpose. The majority of these looked like cattle fences surrounded with barbed wire. At each one were two or three tents without beds or bunks. The prisoners were driven into these and covered the earth with their bodies like a thick blanket.

During the three days we went west in autos from the Sea of Okhotsk along a paved autoroad which ran more than 600 miles to the Aldan Gold Mines through high mountains. The 370 miles which I covered ran exclusively through mountains and often crossed mountain crests almost perpendicularly.

The valleys of the rivers and the mountains were covered with forests and moss. The dominating tree was the Arctic pine. On the lower third of the slopes were a few scanty birches. About 280 miles from Magadan the great river Kolyma which gave its name to the country cut our road. Where it did, the river had a well defined broad valley, surrounded by low mountain frames. Further to the west the mountain peaks were noticeably lower than on the right bank of the River Kolyma.

In Yagidna, not far from the gold mines of Khatynakh, in a broad, unforested valley were to be seen the poor vegetables of Kolyma, cabbages, beets and squash. The local green vegetables were used for treatment against scurvy, which in the winter attacked everybody and especially the hungry prisoners who were exhausted by hard work. There was so small an amount of the whole vegetables that they were given only to the hired workmen and the prisoners were fed substitutes from the needles of a dwarf cedar called the *Stanik*.

#### THE ARRIVAL AT THE MINES OF KHATYNAKH AND THE DISTRIBUTION TO THE CAMPS.

On the third day at about 4 o'clock in the afternoon, we reached Khatynakh. As we left the autos we were called by name and checked

against our photographs. Many like me received new formulas of accusation. In Vladivostok my K. R. (Counter-revolutionist) had been changed to K.R.D. (Counter-revolutionary activity). In Khatynakh it was again altered to N.K.R.D. (Nationalistic Counter-revolutionary activity). We prisoners were almost completely indifferent to what accusation they fastened upon us, for the prison was the same for all. We were expecting hard physical labor with a pickaxe, wheelbarrow and a spade in our hands.

They placed in a special group those whose sentences were for 15-25 years; I was also included although I was condemned only to 10 years. This group of 22 men were loaded into three autos and sent to the post of Nizhny Khatynakh. It was only when we arrived there, that we were told and saw that it was a punitive station. Unlike the central point in Khatynakh the camp at Nizhny Khatynakh was surrounded with barbed wire with watch towers on all four corners, manned by guards with machine guns.

In the middle of the camp the commander received us and divided us into the special brigades with which we were to go to work every day. On our arrival a lot of young criminals gathered around us and began to shout at us "Counter-revolutionists, Trotskists, Fascists, Hitlerites, spies," etc. We had previously heard such epithets from the lips of the criminals, for the NKVD definitely fostered it in the camps, but we had never heard such a flow of vileness.

This went on for about 15 minutes. The man who received us paid no attention to the howling of the criminals, for, as we learned later, he was one himself. At the end of our reception a man came up to us and began to call the shouters to reason. After his remarks the shouts diminished and soon completely stopped. That evening we learned that our defender was a product of this camp and that he was a condemned prisoner but not for political reasons.

In the camp of Nizhny Khatynakh were 12 large barracks which could house about 1,500 men. Each prisoner had a sack filled with moss and a cotton blanket — this was the entire bedding of the prisoners.

#### DAILY GOLDMINING LIFE

The next day at 5:15 A.M. there came a sharp whistle and the guards roused all the prisoners from their beds. Those who had their own towels washed in the yard by the barracks, and those who did not, either did not wash or dried themselves with their dirty clothes. In Magadan we had been given clothing, footwear and underclothes but no towels. As a rule the barrack guards were criminals and murderers who had the power to beat the prisoners with rubber truncheons or wooden sticks, if they did



not get up voluntarily. Then the prisoners went to the mess hall, where they received a glass of oat or barley soup without potatoes, vegetables, and fat and a glass of unsweetened tea. At 5:45, all the prisoners went to the gate and by brigades were formed into a compact column.

The guard at the gate counted the number of prisoners sent out and on their return counted the number that came in. On passing through the gates, the prisoners went directly to the tool houses where they received the necessary tools. Then the brigades under their brigadiers went into the mine to their assigned places.

At 6 A.M. the day shift began and at 6 P.M. the night shift. It was the end of August and the washing of the gold continued two thirds of the day, while the water was freezing and it was possible to carry off the empty slag without gold.

Before they began work in the mine, the newly arrived prisoners were told by their brigadier that all the prisoners in the camp received an *amount of food in accordance with the norm of production*. For the performance of 101% of the work, they would receive 800 grams of bread and two dishes of food in the mess hall. For the performance of 121% of the norm, they would receive 1,000 gr. of bread and an extra dish at dinner (25 grams of white bread and of a glass of sweetened tea). For 151%, they would get 1,200 gr. of bread and an extra course twice a day. If they did from 76-100%, they would get 600 gr. of bread and the ordinary food. From 51 to 75%, 400 gr. of bread and unsweetened tea. The fulfillment of less than 50% would cause the transfer of the prisoner to the jail on 400 gr. of bread and water. Those who were in the jail worked under armed guards and slept in the jail. The first failure to produce more than 51% was punished by 3 days in the jail. A second failure meant 5 days, and a third, 10 days. The fourth time the prisoner would be brought before a court and accused of sabotage.

The norms of production varied with the conditions. When the ground was frozen from 50-100 cm., and the moving of the rock by wheelbarrows was 100-130 metres, the norm was 10 cubic metres of earth mixed with stones, which was about 18-19 tons. When the rock was moved 170-200 metres, under the same conditions the norm was about 8.5 cubic metres. The prisoner had to dig out the rock with a pickaxe, load it on the wheelbarrow and cart it to the place for unloading the empty slag. The frozen ground, broken up by ammonia, had its own norms. As in every field, all the steps in the production were strictly provided with norms and also with an increase of those norms for the prisoners as compared with those of the hired laborers.

Hunger is the greatest spur. It drove the prisoners to seek a larger norm, even 101-105%. No one thought of more, for the norm of 100%

was so high that the prisoner had to work at full speed, to fulfill it.

But for purposes of deception both in freedom and in the concentration camp there was applied a system for the artificial increase of the percent of production for certain persons who in fact did no more than the others, so that they could be taken as models.

The brigadiers were mostly criminals and almost always agents of the NKVD. They did not work themselves and only saw to it that the prisoners under them worked all the time. So during the entire day, day after day, they sat in a prominent place and constantly repeated the hateful word "Faster, faster, faster." There is not a single prisoner who was not sick of hearing it. The German war prisoners so hated it that when they returned home to Western Germany, they made a film on the life of the prisoners under the title "Faster, faster, faster!" When the shouts had no effect, the brigadiers had heavy sticks or rubber truncheons with which they beat the prisoners so that they would work harder. As appeared later, these beatings by the brigadiers were so hard, that the prisoners were taken to the hospital and often died there.

The daily deepening of the bottom of the mine into the frozen earth called for the deepening of the water course and the side trenches through which the water carried off the frozen earth. This deepening was done under water with heavy iron and the work was far heavier than that in the mine. The worker was constantly drenched in the cold water which had a temperature of 37-41°F. The work continued until 9:30 P.M. for the day shift and until 9:30 A.M. for the night shift, some 15 hours of constant work.

#### WORK IN THE MINES IN THE AUTUMN

Everything that could be done for washing gold in the summer of 1938 was done. The fine weather of the whole of September compelled the administration to apply new methods, for the terror and violence to the helpless prisoners led to exhaustion and fatigue which was reflected in the productivity of their work and as a result the production of gold decreased. The entire part of the valley near the river where the gold-bearing stratum was not deep, was already worked out and there remained only the sections at the foot of the mountains, where the gold-bearing stratum was 8 metres deep. To remove the hundreds of thousands of cubic metres of frozen ground by the manpower of hungry prisoners, and by the methods of the NKVD, was a hideous nightmare. 600 prisoners were forced to dig 100 wells in the frozen ground to a depth of 7-9 metres.

After passing 0.75-1 metre in the rocky ground and 0.25-0.45 m. in gravel, it was a question of working the entire time in an icy cellar. All expressions of protest were cruelly punished. If any one dared to pro-

test, he was placed in a central isolator, at the disposal of the third section. After 4-5 days he was tried, and accused of sabotage and counter-revolutionary activity. The minor cases were sentenced to an additional 10 years in prison and the most flagrant were shot. In our camp 2 men were shot during the noonday rest in the mine before some 600 prisoners. The people "imprisoned without fault" cherished the hope that they might in time be released and so each was afraid to open his mouth, for he knew that these executioners would not hesitate about sending the prisoners to the next world.

In the second half of September the heavy freezes came at night and the temperature dropped to 5°—0° F. The water regularly froze at night and did not thaw enough to wash the gold and the surface thawing of the ground almost stopped. To thaw out the newly opened gold-bearing stratum it was ordered to bring fallen dry trees to thaw out the ground. In doing this a stricter method of guarding was introduced; a definite zone was laid out in the forest and woe to the man who lost his way in the semi-darkness of the night and crossed the limits of the zone; the guard shot him without warning. This thawing of the ground continued about 3 weeks. During this time 4 men were shot in the woods for crossing the boundary of the zone in their search for wood.

All the prisoners who came to Kolyma, like our convoy, received a full outfit in Magadan. As a rule, the seasonal change of clothing was 2-4 weeks late. This was painfully felt in the autumn. Beginning with the second decade of August, in the region of Khatynakh, the nights were frosty and every day it became colder and colder. In the beginning of September the temperature at night went down to 16°F. and in the second half to 9°—0° F.

The reduction in the gold output caused a reduction in the food of the prisoners. Along with the loss of energy in the performance of the hard physical labor, the prisoners wasted a great deal of their body energy in keeping warm. They had to work in a cold of 5-0°F. in summer clothing in the mine and the forests; the barracks and rooms too were terribly cold, for until the official beginning of winter the barracks were unheated. If the prisoners had been allowed to bring in wood through the gates, they would have heated the barracks but were forbidden to do so. The cold and the excessive 15 hour a day work in the autumn defined the situation in the winter of 1938-39. It was noticeable how all the prisoners began to waste what is called the physiological minimum, how they lost weight and turned into living skeletons.

#### THE KOLYMA WINTER

I can remember everything that I experienced as a prisoner but nothing has given me such a fear as thoughts of the Kolyma winter. In

1937 when I was arrested, I instinctively shuddered at the thought of this region, although in the cell there were people who knew the area. It is true that here in America I met an old emigrant who as a young man, on a mission from the Geophysical Commission, before the Revolution of 1917, had passed five years in the Kolyma region. When I saw him in February 1953 at an agricultural experimental station near Washington, it came out in our conversation that he was thoroughly familiar with the region.

In the neighborhood of Khatynakh, winter commenced in 1938 on September 29. On that day a light snow fell and it lay on the ground until the second half of the following May. With the snow the temperature fell to  $-2^{\circ}$ — $-22^{\circ}$  F. In November it was  $31^{\circ}$ — $49^{\circ}$  F. In December —  $58^{\circ}$ — $81^{\circ}$  F. In January —  $76^{\circ}$ — $88^{\circ}$  F. Even in the second half of April it went down to  $5^{\circ}$ — $13^{\circ}$  F. and in May  $18^{\circ}$ — $5^{\circ}$ .

In the camp there were prisoners who had been in Khatynakh 6-7 years. They told us that winter set in every year at the end of September. The real Kolyma winter found the prisoners in their summer (and usually ragged) clothing. The torn remnants of the winter clothing of the preceding year were made use of, but there was not enough of this. So the men had to work for two weeks in  $4^{\circ}$ — $22^{\circ}$  F. in summer clothing without gloves. Many prisoners had their hands and feet frozen. They were left in the barracks on the starvation diet of 400 gr. of bread and soup once a day. The winter clothing arrived on October 13. They gave to all the prisoners who were going to work a cap, padded trousers, a bushlyat or skin jacket, felt boots and gloves. In such a costume it was possible to work outdoors in the cold.

The heads of the camp, without any regard for the prisoners, tried to continue the washing even in the first weeks of winter. In the first half of October, they continued to warm the ground to wash the gold and used the same methods as in thawing the slag. In the second half of October, when all the water was frozen solid, they stopped the washing of the gold and transferred all the prisoners to the day shift.

With the publication of the order to stop the washing of gold on October 20, 1938, the food of the prisoners became worse for all categories lost 200 gr. of bread.

All the prisoners were transferred to the work of removing the upper non-gold bearing stratum. Instead of wheelbarrows, large sleds were used and these held 0.7—0.8 cubic metres of rock. Three men were assigned to each. When it was loaded, the three men pulled it to the pulley which transferred the rock further.

### THE JAIL IN NIZHNY KHATYNAKH

The post at Nizhny Khatynakh was the only place of punishment in the gold mines of Khatynakh. In the other posts no zones were set up in the mines or the forest; it was only at Nizhny Khatynakh that zones were mapped out and there was a stern order not to leave them. The other posts had neither fences nor armed guards while here a guard with machine guns was on duty all the time.

There was at Nizhny Khatynakh a unique jail where the sadism passed all bounds. This was 3-4 metres from a small stream in which even in summer the temperature of the water never was over 40°—41°F. In summer each day at 5 P.M. a fire pump was used to force water into the jail until it covered the floor to the depth of 5-8 cm. Those prisoners who had not performed 50% of their norm were driven in here to sleep. They passed the whole night on their feet for they could not lie down in the cold water and in the morning they were sent into the mine to work. They went from the jail to work under an armed guard. Sometimes there were guards who made no comment when one of the prisoners after three or four days in the jail sank down on his wheelbarrow and slept for 20-30 minutes. This, however, could only be done in the summer.

In winter water was not put on the floor, for there was none, but the jail was entirely unheated. To land in it in winter was certain death. It was possible to keep awake for one or two days but on the third the man fell down and went to sleep. So as to keep warm at night the prisoners did not sleep but walked around the cell and did physical labor in the mine. When the exhausted prisoner fell asleep in the jail, he was either badly frostbitten or completely frozen and so it was in the mine. In December, 1938, more than half of the prisoners in the jail were badly frostbitten and few lived until the summer of 1939.

### IN THE DEATH CAMP OF THE "POST MARCH 8."

The regime with its limitless exploitation of the prisoners, the cold and the hunger in Nizhny Khatynakh brought about by the middle of November a large percentage of prisoners bloated from starvation who were also suffering from scurvy. Many of these lay in the barracks with their bodies bloated, and those whose legs festered were taken to the local hospital. Almost the entire camp was on the penal diet, for they did not have the strength to fulfill the norm and this fact increased the bloating from starvation.

In the second half of December, 1938, a group of 60 men were sent to the post by the name of "March 8." All changes of location in the mine area took place after work. At 10 P.M. certain prisoners were ordered to assemble at the gate. At 10:30 four armed guards with dogs took us to

another post. That night a strong wind blew freezing our faces which were covered with a thick beard as they were until the end of April of the next year. We arrived at our destination at 3 A.M. We were temporarily put in a room where there were no stoves and the temperature indoors and outdoors was the same. Exhausted by 15 hours of work and a five hour march on a snow covered road, we fell asleep on the way. To keep our feet from freezing we lay down as "valets" and each prisoner put his arms around the feet of another to keep his feet from freezing in his sleep.

At 5 A.M. the whole camp was awakened, including us. We were shown to the mess hall and given the same kind of soup as at the preceding post. This post was small, and including us, contained 283 men. It was very different from Nizhny Khatynakh. It was not surrounded by wire or a fence and there was no armed guard. Compulsion was exercised by the chief of the camp and his staff which was composed like the chief of criminals, i.e. those prisoners called by the NKVD as socially related.

The work was the same as at the preceding post—the removal of the nongold-bearing stratum by the use of pickaxes, shovels and sledges. We at first thought that it was much better without the guard over us. But in the near future we became convinced that the unrestrained rule of armed thugs was more frightful than the real armed guard. That often had restrained the sadistic actions of the thugs who had the leading positions in the camp.

At the *Post of March 8*, we saw unparalleled examples of mercilessness and cruelty toward the sick prisoners. If a prisoner was sick and unable to get up, but had no medical permission (for the healthy thugs had them), the guard of the barracks and the so-called captain first beat the man with pliable sticks or rubber truncheons on his bed. If they saw that he did not get up, they took him by the hands and legs, undressed him to his underwear and threw him out into the snow and cold. In the Kolyma climate, it needed only 3-5 minutes to make such an undressed man a cripple or dead. Those who were thus frozen were left in the barracks until they rotted alive as a result of wet gangrene in their frozen body.

Seeing this inhuman attitude to the political prisoners, those who did get out of the barracks under their own power did so and preferred to freeze in the mine or the forest rather than suffer the inhuman treatment of finally perishing in the barracks or a room as a result of the villainous actions of the criminal elements.

The work of the prisoners in the *Post of March 8* continued from 6 A.M. to 9:30 P.M. We had two meals, in the morning before we went to work and in the evening after work. For 15 and a half hours the hungry and exhausted prisoners worked outdoors at  $-85^{\circ}$ — $-88^{\circ}$  F. At that tem-

perature, one could only keep warm by working. But to perform this work and warm one's own body, a man had to have energy. The lack of sufficient food made the prisoners take advantage of their own bodies.

In the second half of December and the beginning of January, very many prisoners turned into shadows and began to bloat suddenly but no one released them from working. They were driven into the mine and forest where they lost their strength and sank down into a hidden corner usually forever. In our mine during the two and half winter months 14 men froze to death. Among these were, Ukrainians, Uzbeks, Tadzhiks, Georgians and Russians. When a prisoner was found still alive, he was taken back to the camp. But almost all who were not frozen to death, when they came to, were panting from fever, although it was  $-85^{\circ}$ — $-88^{\circ}$ F. Of those who were found half alive, almost all died in a day in the camp.

The felt shoes distributed in October, were by January half worn out and had holes. The camp had a repair shop but the same criminals were in charge there. The shoes taken to the barracks of the guards were returned in the same condition. Despite this, the prisoners were driven from the barracks to work. So in the majority of cases the actually unshod prisoners returned to the camp with frozen feet. Due to torn boots I froze the big toe on my right foot. It was still more terrible to go out to the mine without gloves, for it was absolutely impossible to work in that climate with bare hands. You could barely work without gloves 10-15 minutes without freezing the fingers.

Beside the freezing prisoners there was blazing a huge fire. Around it were the brigadiers, the professional staff and the other criminals. The political prisoners were forbidden to go near the fire. At the beginning of the winter the prisoners had rushed to the fire but the brigadier criminals broke their arms and heads. So in January no one went near the fire. The man who became exhausted in the semidarkness of the Arctic day, sat down somewhere, knowing that he would freeze but he did not approach the fire and said nothing to anybody. If he told a brigadier that he was exhausted and could not work, he would be beaten to death. Two men were especially cruel: Chelintsev and Prasolov. They beat to death far more than one dozen of innocent, sick prisoners.

## ANSWER TO SHEVCHENKO

By AGNES LOUISE HOVDE

The big flood of Ukrainian emigration to overseas countries, especially to the United States and Canada, arouses deep interest among the idealistically minded Americans to the past, present and the future of this multi-million nation. The thousand year old freedom-loving Ukraine lives in Russian servitude, which destroys all efforts of this nation to material as well as spiritual progress. The denial of the Ukrainian nation as to its identity by the Russian overlords evokes deep sympathy on the part of several Anglo-Saxons, who had the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the Ukrainian Cause. Among such are Percival Cundy, Florence Randal Livesay, Clarence A. Manning, Arthur Coleman and others. To those idealistically minded Americans also belongs Agnes Louise Hovde.

How Miss Hovde found her way to the Ukrainian people is described in her article "My Discovery — Ukraine, Her Heritage and Culture" published in the Ukrainian periodical "The Woman's World" 1950, No. 9.

We take the liberty of quoting some excerpts from this writing.

"The story of my discovery of the nation, Ukraine, her heritage and distinct culture might be likened to the experience of a delver in the earth who was working with spade and pick and in the process of digging came upon a nugget of gold, and thenceforth knew himself to be a rich man.

"When was I the digger and where? That point bears a decisive share in the discovery which has enriched my experience to the place where I stand in possession of a new heritage; and I virtually profess citizenship morally and esthetically in a sphere where I should normally be alien. The ancient truth, "We become possessors only by appreciation," has been in this instance unmistakably manifested. Then like the digger buried in the bowels of the earth in a search for materials, I came suddenly and unavoidably upon the answer to the question: which nation has suffered most and longest under the practice of open terrorism and the more concealed method, genocide? The discovery was — Ukraine. The oppressor is Russia.

"This was the starting point of an experience and orientation to a country and a people, an individual ethnic group which traces its heritage and culture to the earliest civilized eras, a nation whose inherent fidelity to their special quality of culture becomes the badge of warriors, determined never to lay down the weapon until they have achieved their salvation within the bulwarks of a democratic self-administred nation with access to the feast table of the nations, untrammelled by the brute hand of superior forces.

This is the factual explanation to the question: why is the story of the distressed nation Ukraine, of interest in your literary work?

But there is also the mystical interpretation, equally determinative. The impalpable, that which cannot be explained by the medium of faith, that which cannot be defined by common experience and by common terms must also be counted among the earth's efforts which shape the destinies of men.



Therefore the selfsame question might be answered in this parable: 'And the angel of God appeared unto me in a dream, saying, 'Defend my people; for they are sorely afflicted.' — And I answered, 'Lord, who are Thy people?' And the Lord answered, 'Seek and ye shall find.'

The word and name, Ukraine, in English; Ukraina in French; and Ukraina, in the mother tongue, bears signal invitation to the poetic faculty for limitless poetic adventure. The word of itself has a captivating charm to the ear sensitive to sounds, such as music at twilight; wind on leafy trees; rain falling in the hush of night, bird cries in storm.

Ukraina is the sea-maiden idling in the brilliant sun, wetting her feet in the wash of the Black Sea tides. Close to her heart are the Dnieper and the Dniester Rivers; constant at her side are the Carpathian Mountains, ever at vigil for her sake.

Ukraina is the coveted daughter of riches: the harvest of the grapes, the ripe loads of wheat and rye; the rich black loam, and the hidden minerals, and the vast forests are her inheritance.

Ukraina, the mother of immortal offspring, — the incomparable poetry of Shevchenko and the vibrant utterances of Franko; the leadership of Hrushevsyky; the distinct language; the art seen in the dress of the peasant and his household implements; the haunting beauty of the songs and folk dances; the splendor of the religious architecture and the mystic solemnity of the religious rites; the sanctity of the family bonds; and the imperishable imprint of the institution of the Sich, the domain of the Kozaks, gallant warriors and dauntless bearers of the heart of liberty!

The present tragic situation of Ukraine finds her victimized by the practice of Soviet genocide which is an extension of the earlier traditional imperialistic Russification of conquered nations."

This is the way that led Agnes Louise Hovde to Ukraine. A new book by the author of "Answer to Shevchenko," marked for publication in the spring of 1954 is of special interest to the students of Ukrainian national rebirth. Its title will be "Prelude To A Journey." It is a dramatic narrative in free verse form with Ukrainian history of the middle 1800's as background. It is the intent and purpose of the author to print of the long struggle of this submerged but nationally conscious country against the aggressions of her neighbors, especially Russia under the Czarist regime and now under the Soviet dictatorship as an arch-example of a brave and indefatigable people striving for a free and independent national survival. The author makes frequent use of the lyric method when mood and contrast require. She is the author of a collection of lyrics, "Song Before Sleep," published by the Dierkes Press, Chicago, in 1948.

The book will appear under the imprint of *Vantage Press, Inc.*, N. Y. C. The author lives at her home, The Cedar Nook, near Glenwood, Minnesota. — *Editor.*

### ANSWER TO SHEVCHENKO

Taras Shevchenko — come forth from the bosom of God  
 Where you an hundred years have slumbered!  
 I have imbued deeply your "Epistle of Friendship,  
 To the Dead  
 And to the Living  
 And the Unborn,  
 Countrymen of Mine,

## *The Ukrainian Quarterly*

In Ukraine  
Or out of it."

I have read your Epistle that drew against itself  
the barbed words of the critics, the haters,  
they who declared it was in the language of swineherds;

But which your downtrodden countrymen of Ukraine knew,  
as the slaveridden masses of all Russia knew,  
to be the voice of their spokesman.

The Epistle, these your deathless words, have spoken to me,  
and I stand to make answer:  
Star of the Slav!  
Who chose without knowing  
the way of the cross;

Who on your burial day  
on the hill above the Dnieper,  
where gathered many people  
bestowing wreaths and flowers,  
was honored more by all these  
with a single wreath that was a crown of thorn.

But two days thereafter  
appeared the Ukase of the Czar  
that spelled the end of serfdom.

Say that I am not numbered with your countrymen,  
and speak not in your mother-tongue,  
and call upon God's name by other ritual;

While you allege your people to the Slavic kin  
and I my people to the Nordic kin;  
and though the cloud of a lost century  
interpose between your eyes and mine —

Still am I witness of the selfsame griefs in your country of Ukraine  
for which you sorrowed as you sang.  
Therefore reject me not!  
Nor name me charlatan  
who would address you as a kinsman would.

Kinsman in truth, with you I dare speak boldly and without hesitation:  
Here is my letter to the world  
with this advocacy :

In your beloved fruited land  
the grievous wrongs you mourned  
still bitterly oppress the people

who bend like trampled grasses  
under the beating hooves.  
Humble, poor, and slaves are they.

Ukraina's enemies have buried her alive  
and her millions of her people with her!

Kobzar of Ukraine! I shout my complaint that the ear of God be startled:  
The Muscovite Tyrant,  
the crafty slaughterer of men,  
whose brawny arms are stained  
with the blood of his brethren,  
keeps his henchmen continually whetting  
the knives for the murder by night.

Your country is bowed to her knees in disconsolance.  
The people are robbed and scattered;  
their mouths are stopped with gags;  
their hands are bound with chains.

In the frozen heart of Siberia the slave labor camps flourish  
like mushrooms in the damp and the dark  
of unknown places where lurk hunger and fear like wolves.

Not half a century has passed since nine millions  
of your countrymen died in the throes of hunger  
who would not submit to the commands of the Commander whose industry  
is the annihilation of spirits  
and the butchery of bodies.

Open, you graves of Vinnytsia!  
Spew out of your black mouths  
the secret terror and vileness.

Yield up your hidden harvest of hate against those  
who chose to defy the Son of Darkness —  
saying, death was better than life as his chattel.

Thou God of Pity!  
Thou God of Peace!  
Thou God of Love!  
Lord of the Hosts, the living and the dead,  
Gather the sheep into the fold:  
Hear my salutation!

• • •

## BOOK REVIEWS

**WHAT EUROPE THINKS OF AMERICA.** Edited and with an Introduction by James Burnham. The John Day Company, New York, 1953, pp. 222.

One scarcely needs to elaborate on the truth today that the thoughts and sentiments of other peoples and nations toward the United States and its manifold behavior are of crucial importance to us in our effort of leadership among the free nations of the world. As a matter of plain fact it is equally important for us to know and understand the feelings and attitudes of the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtains of Europe and Asia. In seeking this information, however, we frequently rely on sources that are not even representative of the prevailing temperament and mood of the majority of the people in a given country, and thus find ourselves poorly guided by biased reports that only serve to hamper rather than improve our endeavors to overcome misunderstandings and psychological obstacles obstructing the mutually desired path of harmonious adjustment.

The editor of this work, an outstanding political analyst in his own right, has performed an invaluable service in this respect by bringing together into a panel certain prominent European writers who are not generally known to the American reader but who, nonetheless, represent the governing views of the Center or the Right in Europe. To say the least, this work constitutes a solid and healthy antidote to the misapprehension generated here, whether by chance or design, that what the Left thinks, as expressed in its greater circulation here, is what Europe thinks. This in the face of the striking political fact that the Center and the Right are more important in weight and influence throughout Western Europe. To soundly rectify this unfortunate and even hazardous development, the editor accomplished his task superbly well. For his selection of writers is well grounded in authority and fine literary expression and the volume, from cover to cover, contains observations that provide valuable insights into the problem of American world leadership as related to free Europe.

Making up the interesting panel are such writers as Jules Monnerot (French), Vittorio Zincone (Italian), Yury Serech (Ukrainian), Sylvain Troeder (Belgian), Julian Amery (English), Joseph Czapaki (Polish) and other prominent literati. The work could, perhaps, have assumed a more comprehensive character by the inclusion of West German and Spanish writers, but apparently the selection was determined by the relative incidence of Leftist strength in the areas actually represented. As it is, the reader is confronted by a wide range of views clearly set forth by individuals whose backgrounds are expressive of European culture extending from the Atlantic to the Caucasus.

To be sure, the American reader would not feel disposed to accept as valid all the critical opinions advanced in this work. However, in the sense of attempting to understand what Europe really thinks of us and why, this is somewhat irrelevant. Being thoroughly friendly toward the United States, all of the authors present their views charitably and with rational objectivity. Whether right or wrong, they afford us much food for thought in the common endeavor to achieve

the maximum harmony of understanding in order that our relations may be more cohesive and our anti-communist unity virtually indissoluble. Needless to say, received in this good spirit, their many views and observations embrace a heavy measure of inescapable truth.

Jules Monnerot's essay on "*Misunderstandings*" is stimulating and forthright, and discloses many of our shortcomings in understanding Europe and its power complex. We should be hard put to dispute his statement that "Americans do not realize that by abandoning East Europe to Russia at a time when they alone were strong enough to intervene, they have opened the door of Europe to the Russians." His comments on our short comprehension of General de Gaulle's plans for a presidential republic, of France's failure to rebuild its foundations of strength, and of French administration in Morocco certainly cannot be taken lightly by an open-minded American reader. In regard to the last, however, his argumentation appears rather weak when it seeks to justify French control over Morocco by parallel reference to America and its experiences with the Indians. Concerning this problem, the essay by Sylvain Troeder on "American Anti-Colonialism" makes a more convincing impression on the reader by its factual analysis and relative freedom from empire rationalizations.

In his essay on "*Moral America*," Vittorio Zincone presents very timely impressions of American influences at work in Italy, ranging from the movies to the presence of American soldiers, and lucidly depicts the basic ties between his country and ours. There is undoubtedly much here for us to take pride in as well as to consider from the angle of self-correction.

Another essay of an exceedingly penetrating nature is Yury Serech's "*Top Hats and Dry Crusts*" which is a psycho-sociological analysis of Russia and its influence in Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. It analyzes the system of hypocrisy in Russia as manifested in the avaricious desire to possess money and lead a comfortable life and yet to regard it as something shameful, and concludes with the prediction that the incompatibility of the populist psychology ingrained in the Russian outlook with modern technology will prove to be one of the underlying forces leading to the disintegration of Russia itself.

The accounts furnished by Julian Amery on "*The American Choice*" and Raymond Aron on "*The United States as the Dominant Economy*" overlap in many respects with regard to their treatment of the economic problems confronting Europe. The former tends to give a more balanced picture of these problems in relation to the economic policy of the United States, posing a choice which either way will conduce to an augmentation of free world trade. Mr. Aron appears to press too hard a free trade policy on the part of the United States without recognizing many of the dangers inhering in such a policy at this time.

The two essays in the section on "*An East European Point of View*" are most instructive and absorbing. Mr. Czapski's impressions of America, which he visited three years ago, are vividly described and contrasted with those acquired from contacts with Americans in the diplomatic bureaucracy on the European terrain. Juliusz Mieroszewski's analysis of American foreign policy is cogent and forceful. His insight into the problem may be best demonstrated by this statement: "Let us get this clear: any political course that is not a policy of liberation is essentially a policy of containment." The chief defect of this essay appears to be the naive belief that durable peace can be attained by a withdrawal of the Soviet armies to the 1939 borders. From an economic as well

as a political viewpoint the possibility of any such withdrawal and the consequent liberation of the "satellite" countries is a vain hope. Nevertheless, this essay in combination with the others has made possible a true revelation of how the greater part of Europe thinks of America—an intellectual mirror of our merits as well as our faults, by which we can only profit by looking into it.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY  
*Georgetown University*

**RUSSIAN ASSIGNMENT**, by Leslie C. Stevens, Vice Admiral, USN (Retired). Boston, Little Brown and Company, 1953, pp. XV, 588. (With illustrations by Vera Drashevsky).

This is a peculiarly interesting and unsatisfying book. These two statements may at first seem contradictory but in reality they are not and if we can fully trust the remarks of the Admiral in the Introduction, we may believe that this impression was intended, for the work which is well written is important both for what it contains and for what it omits.

It is interesting because the author has put down with admirable fairness and keenness of observation the ordinary events of daily life in the Soviet capital and the cities which he was allowed to visit. He has described the difficulties of daily living under the Soviets, the problems of securing food and the necessary services, and the enforced isolation of the diplomatic staffs in Moscow, the daily amusements of the foreign colony, and the rare occasions when they were allowed to come into contact with some of the Soviet great and near-great. He has pictured the types of Russian servants, translators, etc., with whom he came into contact and given a mass of information on the cultural and artistic life of the Soviets. This has hardly ever been done better.

Yet the book is unsatisfying. In military parlance, the preparation of a report involves three stages, information, evaluation and intelligence. The last is the organization of the duly examined information into a consistent whole. This volume rarely goes beyond the first stage. So marked is this that a cynic might almost be tempted to remark that the entire task of the Admiral as Naval Attache was confined to entertainments and impromptu meetings and chats. He has leaned over backwards in cutting out references to even the most elementary tasks of the Ambassador and his own office.

Again and again as Admiral Stevens reviews the present and the past of Russia-USSR, he seems to be on the point of presenting a definite point of view and outside of a sentence or two that judgment is never forthcoming. Perhaps because "It seems to me that those foreigners who become the best adjusted to Moscow are those who continue in a state of passive puzzlement about the place, without ever arriving at any positive ideas of their own" (p. 477). His only considered opinion is in the epilogue. "Underlying all the dualities which the Russian nature has beneath the external conformities which are forced on it, if it is to survive, and in spite of an inherent partisanship which makes general compromise to them a betrayal of one's cause, in spite of their extremes of violence and of passive submission, the Russians to which decency must be applied are themselves basically a decent people." (p. 551). It is not a far step from this to the policy which the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism is carrying on.

There is the same vagueness about his attitude toward the nationalities problem. He comes closest to touching this when he asks Vishinsky "why such

aboriginal natives as the Mordvi and the Chuvashi had never been assimilated into Russia" (p. 544) or "'it would be interesting to know if a case could be made for the Great Russians as reapers of profits, exploiters of those with other blood. Many an Irishman and Scotsman say that this is the way England became great" (p. 498).

It is true of course that Admiral Stevens had few opportunities for personal contact. He read Byelorussian newspapers in Brest-Litovsk (p. 157). In Tiflis (Tbilisi) he sought for oriental color among the natives but it did not surprise him that the people that he met looked like Muscovites or that his Intourist guide who took him and Mrs. Stevens to the opera there was helpless in understanding it, for "it was in Georgian, an heroic drama of the past, with settings and costumes that looked like leaves from an illuminated Persian manuscript" (p. 462).

His references to Ukraine are even vaguer. He hears from his assistant that there had been a famine there the year before, i. e. since World War II (p. 68). On his trip to the Caucasus, "At Belgorod, on the edge of the Ukraine an armored train was on a siding... There have been many rumors about disorders in the Ukraine, and the Ukrainian newspapers have been full of brief, ambiguous notices of various officials who have died while carrying out their routine responsibilities. One could not help but wonder if the armored train had anything to do with those items" (p. 451). He notes that the Ukrainians regard Mazeppa as a hero and a patriot and not a scoundrel and a traitor, as the Russians regard him (p. 535). He notes differences in customs as seen from a car window. Yet none of these interest him to give any further explanation or consideration of the past as does almost the slightest unusual phenomenon among the Russians and he can make the extraordinary statement of Repin's *Reply to the Sultan*, "It has often seemed to me that except for the costumes and the haircuts this might well be a portrait of the Politburo composing a note to the United States or a speech for the United Nations." (p. 318).

The strength and weakness of this book are clear. The strength is the honest facty garrulousness with which he describes Russian life. Its weakness is his failure to imprint his general outlook on the average reader. Admiral Stevens is too well trained, too intelligent not to have digested his material but if he has, he has gone to superhuman extremes in hiding the results of his thinking. A good American, he has left us with Russia as an enigma within a riddle and the cursory peruser of the work will emerge merely with the Admiral's conviction that "the problems created in a decent people by the forced maintenance of power will somehow in the end destroy that power." (p. 552). The book gives no hint or prophecy how that can happen or how the Russian people can be integrated with the free world and civilization, the great task of the present day.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

B. Unbegaun: L'ORIGINE DU NOM DES RUTHENES. L'Academie Ukrainienne Libre des Sciences. Winnipeg, 1953.

This small booklet, written in French by a known Slavic scholar and professor of the Strassburg University, is valuable for its collected material and its clear compilation. The author shows the Celtic origin of the name *Ruthenian* and its first mention abroad in the 11th century in connection with ancient Rus'-Ukraine. Slightly different forms such as *Ruzeni* were known still earlier. "The name *Ruthenians*, writes he, "is that by which the Westerners designated usually the Ukrainians, and less frequently the White Ruthenians."

However, the author, who knows how to collect the historic material, is lost mostly in explanations as to the correct application of this name. The cause of this lies partly in the incapability of the French (and also the English) language to discern the double and different (old and new) meaning of the terms *Rus'* — *Russia*. Ukrainian neighbors, Poles for example, will never make the mistake of calling a Ukrainian of the Kievan period a Russian, but a Ruthenian, — Russian for them is reserved entirely to designate the Moscovite Russian. Nevertheless, even taking into consideration these linguistic shortcomings, it seems strange to read in Unbegaun's book that "the term *Ruthenians* was applied to the *Russians*", or that the term *Rusyn* in the singular form designated *the Russian*. Such terminology leads to misunderstandings, because the Russians never used the name *Ruthenians*, nor does their language know a nominative form of their national name (*Rossiyanin* was coined later). Thus the term *Rusyn* — *the Ruthenian* of the 11-12th centuries cannot be translated as *Russian*; when the Russians translating the old Chronicle call the Kievan Metropolitan *Ilarion the Ruthenian* — a *Russian*, that is pure falsification of the text.

On the basis of Unbegaun's presentation of the material one can make the following nonsensical conclusion: the Ruthenians was a name applied to the Russians. The Russians, however, did not have such a form of name, and never called themselves Ruthenians, therefore this name cannot be applied to the Russians...

It will be interesting to note that it was Unbegaun who, incapable of explaining on the basis of the Russian language the name *Rusych* in the Tale of Prince Ihor's Campaign of the 12th century, wrote that "the more one meditates on this name, the more it appears to be obscure," and he held that it was "a neologism of the author (of the Tale), unnecessary and fantastic" (*Revue des Etudes Slaves*, Paris, 1938). But in the Ukrainian language, old and new alike, this word is not at all unusual, and its similar forms can be found in Ukrainian folk poetry.

Valuable as it is, this work of Unbegaun, with some of its unhappily formulated opinions, will add still more misunderstandings to this already confused subject.

S. HORBYNSKY

Dmitry Cizevsky: *OUTLINE OF COMPARATIVE SLAVIC LITERATURES*. — *Survey of Slavic Civilization*, Vol. I. American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Boston, Mass., 1952, p. 143.

Dmitry Cizevsky (Chyzhevsky), professor of Harvard University, gives in this book, perhaps for the first time in the U. S., a complete and comprehensive survey of the Slavic literatures from their beginnings to almost the end of the twentieth century. He strives to eliminate all political issues and to present the material from a purely literary aspect. Just as this view may be, it can hardly explain why some styles in certain literatures developed productively while others were hampered in its growth by oppression and often physical liquidation of the creators. The author represents all Slavic literatures with utmost impartiality, large and small — to him they all have equal importance. This viewpoint in a book meant for the use of American universities can be regarded, by the contemporary American standards for Slavic literatures, as almost revolutionary. Till now the meaning of the Slavic studies in the U. S. was limited mostly to the Russian literature and culture, with other literatures as secondary and less important ad-



ditions to the Russian. Cizevsky's book may be regarded as a proof that this problem begins to improve.

Cizevsky's method is to present in a condensed form the principal ideas and features of the predominant literary styles, and on this basis to describe in outlines the most important events in every Slavic literature. He starts with the early Middle Ages and presents the styles that followed — the Renaissance, Baroque, Classicism, Romanticism, Realism and Symbolism. Each has an explanatory article where the concepts and spiritual tendencies, the stylistic characteristics and the language are treated. Excellent as they are, the general aspect of presented literatures gives a somewhat disrupted and incomplete picture because the author limited himself strictly to the written literary works leaving oral (the folkloristic) works aside. And these were certainly not without major influence on the written literature. Even in the styles where this influence was of prime importance, as in the Romanticism, the author is far in acknowledging its dominating significance. In another place he suggests that there was no verse poetry in the literature of the early Middle Ages, and that only later did the new poetry evolve under the influence of various western systems of verse. The fact is that no early poetic works are preserved to our times, and therefore it is rather risky to generalize the facts that we do not know. We know only with certainty that there existed in this same time (and long before) an extremely rich pagan ritual poetry in song form, and that it seems improbable that this poetry did not influence the earliest forms of the literary verse.

However, in such a relatively small and condensed survey, as this, not all such complicated problems could have been presented extensively, and there are also some omissions. It is noteworthy that the author does not even mention the existence of the Soviet literature, that, as a purely political creation can hardly be seriously treated in a work dealing with literary ideas and styles.

The author tries to induce some order in what is called the "Old Russian literature" on the Ukrainian territory. He uses rather the term *Kievan literature*, but naturally, he cannot use such terms as "Kievans" or "Kievan language," and uses the misleading term "Russian." The inconsequence of this is apparent in comparison with another case: "*Sielanki nowe ruskie*" of a Polish author of the 17th century, he translates "*New Ukrainian Idylls*" which is likewise incorrect. In both cases the term *Ruthenian* with its exact translation of the meaning would be more appropriate.

S. H.

THE STRUGGLE FOR TRANSCAUCASIA, by Firuz Kazemzadeh. With an Introduction by Michael Karpovich. New York. Philosophical Library, 1951. pp. 356.

This book is of great value for every one who is interested in the efforts of the non-Russian peoples to free themselves from the old tsarist "prison of nations" and the modern Soviet Union. Exactly as in Ukraine, after the February Revolution, the Caucasian peoples secured their own independent lives. But the situation in Transcaucasia was perhaps even more complicated than it was in Ukraine. Transcaucasia was inhabited by three larger and many smaller peoples. The Georgians, Armenians and Azerbaijanians were the three larger peoples each with its own history, its own language, even its own alphabet, religion and its own political aspirations. While Georgia and Azerbaijan considered Russia their main enemy, the mortal foe for the Armenians was Turkey.

While Georgia seemed the least favorable area for sovietization (irony wished that Stalin came from there), Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan with its great mass of the proletariat, became the gate through which the Bolsheviks later captured all of Transcaucasia.

The author of this interesting and carefully prepared work, which secured for him the doctor's degree at Harvard University, has used all official and unofficial sources available in the emigration, and on the basis of these he gives a detailed picture of events in Transcaucasia up to the complete sovietization. Especially valuable are the Georgian, Armenian and Azerbaijanian sources, which the author cites in addition to a great mass of Russian and others. He shows in detail why the Transcaucasian Federation, which lasted as an independent unit only one month, could not last and made way for three independent republics.

The position of these three republics, also hostile to one another, was unusually difficult in the face of threats from various sides: the Russian Communists, the Volunteer Army of Denikin and the Turks. In this situation the position of the Western Allies, especially the United States, toward the question of the independence of these republics was very characteristic. "The United States Government was so reluctant to intervene in any manner, shape or form, that as early as 26th November, 1917, the Secretary of State, Lansing, telegraphed to the United States Consul in Tiflis, regarding the proposed financial aid to the local authorities: 'Please advise how under circumstances you describe the financial support you propose will not tend to encourage sectionalism or disruption of Russia or civil war. Department cannot encourage tendencies in any of these directions.' On the next day in a telegram to Colonel House, Wilson's adviser, Lansing stated: 'The American Consul at Tiflis will not be given authority to recognize de facto government until it is evident that such action will not tend to foster sectionalism or disruption of Russia or civil war.'" (p. 79-80). The events of later decades have shown that while the American policy was directed against the separation from Russia of the territories inhabited by non-Russians, it has worked to the disadvantage of these peoples, America and all humanity. This policy of America is the more surprising, because during the breakdown of the Spanish colonial empire in the beginning of the 19th century, America was not opposed to the formation of a large number of republics in South America and in Central America of several states which were very small and with a small population, in which there prevailed the same language, the same religion and the same historical background., etc.

The book of Dr. Kazemzadeh is written with full objectivity, without passing over events disadvantageous for the Caucasian peoples, which arose from their mutual hostility, but on the whole it shows deep sympathy for the efforts of the Caucasians to free themselves. The section in which he describes the aid of the Western Allies for the white Russian armies, against which the freedom-loving Caucasians and their ancestors were fighting is not without a justified bitterness.

The detailed description of the rapid conquest of Transcaucasia by the Bolsheviks is very enlightening for those who are now studying the technique of sovietization in the satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain and in their ignorance assert and write that the Russian Communists went beyond the borders of Russia for the first time in 1945.

YURY FEDYNSKY.

## UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PERIODICALS

"THE PROBLEM OF CAUCASIAN POPULATION STATISTICS UNDER TSARIST AND SOVIET RULE," by Vahe A. Sarafian. *The Armenian Review*, Autumn, 1953, Boston, Mass.

The attempt is made in this modestly written article to define the problem of Caucasian population statistics in the light of a critical survey of past Tsarist and Soviet Russian censuses and estimates, with emphasis placed on Armenian population figures. The heavy influence of deliberate national genocide and Russification which have characterized both Tsarist and Soviet Russian imperialism over the non-Russian regions of the empire is well accounted for in this demonstration of official statistical padding. With the imperial Russian census of 1897 and others, "knowledge of the Russian language has traditionally made a person be counted as a Russian." In the display of the 1897 census for the Caucasian provinces and districts, such as it was, the incidence of Ukrainian distribution in several of these areas is impressive.

The writer is on safe ground in his critical evaluation of the underestimates presented on the total Armenian population in the Soviet Union, which currently hovers about three million. A good portion of this does not reside in the Armenian Republic, however. In its endeavor to assign quantitative significance to the propagandized superiority of the Russian entity in the Soviet Union, Moscow has consistently distorted the Russian and non-Russian ratio in the empire. For the pre-World War I period, as Lenin pointed out, there can be no doubt that the non-Russian component was larger, approximately 57%. The striking disparity between the 1926 figures and those of the 1939 census has led Dr. Frank Lorimer in his study on "The Population of the Soviet Union," published at Geneva in 1946 by the League of Nations, to a conclusion based on the same factor of Russification as that mentioned above. A demographic analysis prepared for the Displaced Persons Commission shows that the current non-Russian composition in the Union approximates 54.7%.

Mr. V. A. Sarafian provides evidence for the Ukrainian character of Kuban district and strong Ukrainian settlement in the Stavropol district moving the ethnographic Ukrainian borders to the Northwestern slopes of the Caucasian mountains, the territory at present included into the Russian Soviet Republic.

"BENES AND STALIN — MOSCOW, 1943 and 1945," by Eduard Taborsky. *Journal of Central European Affairs*, July, 1953, Boulder, Colorado.

After having read this absorbing article on Dr. Eduard Benes' two journeys to Moscow during World War II, one cannot escape the impression that to some degree this Czech statesman was somewhat naive about Soviet Russian intentions and operations. Doubtlessly he was not alone in this respect, and the political factor of the traditional Czech orientation toward Russia certainly contributed much to it. Nevertheless, as the author who was his personal secretary repeatedly shows,

Benes was fully cognizant of the power complex developing in Eastern Europe and the terms in which he was compelled to maneuver in the hope of salvaging as much as he possibly could of the political framework known as Czecho-Slovakia.

The narrative presented here is deeply interesting, especially as it recounts in a most vivid way the impressions and events that made up the content of these two journeys. The description of Benes' trip with Alexander Korneychuk, a Ukrainian Communist, the Soviet Deputy Foreign Commissar, is revealing. The latter is depicted as having been amazingly frank on a number of delicate issues, and is quoted to have spoken with contempt of the "old ideology of leftist trends and deviations which were often abstractly international and had nothing in common with the tradition of the Russian and Ukrainian people." Benes' meeting with Stalin on the first occasion is also well portrayed. By March, 1945, the time of his second trip, he was not extended a similar diplomatic courtesy.

One of the chief problems in these negotiations was Carpatho-Ukraine and its ultimate disposition. In this connection it is odd for the author to refer to "Subcarpathian Ukraine" as "Russian terminology" applied to an area that has been historically and ethnically Ukrainian. In the face of the Soviet power, Benes had his evident doubts on the retention of this territory, but, nevertheless, did make an attempt in this direction. Not only this, he "asked also for Soviet support for his plans to transfer the Sudeten Germans to Germany." A creditable aspect of his first meeting was his moderation in regard to Stalin's offers of German territory for the new Czecho-Slovakia. Despite the promises that were made by Stalin, the communist machinery in occupied Carpatho-Ukraine went quickly to work to insure its annexation to Soviet Ukraine. "One cannot expect," according to a Molotov's quotation, "that the Soviet Union would oppose a spontaneous expression of the free will of a people feeling close affinity with the Ukrainian nation."

On the face of it, the Soviet argument could scarcely be met by Benes, aside from the factor of power. However, this is another instance of the Kremlin's exploitation of truth for its own evil ends. There is this affinity, naturally, but one seeking crystallization in a free and independent nation. In one of Stalin's speeches quoted here, the perversion of truth is given official sanction in these words: "We, Bolsheviks, or you can say communists, have another idea of slavism. We wish that all will be allied irrespective if small or large, but that every nation will preserve its independence and regulate its internal life according to its ideology and tradition, be they good or bad." It would seem that we Americans should profit from the natural force of enlightened nationalism toward the good end of eliminating the sources of Soviet power.

"THE INSIDE FACTS ABOUT RUSSIA," an interview with U. S. Diplomat, expert on Russian affairs. *U. S. News and World Report*, September 18, 1953. Washington, D. C.

The influence of the properly named "Russian experts" in the State Department is still powerful enough to becloud our understanding of the nations in the Soviet Union which are not Russian and about which these experts have learned little as yet. It is very likely one of these who managed to slip into President Eisenhower's recent address before the U. N. General Assembly the old Tsarist nomenclature of empire, "peoples of Russia," as for example, "We will never say that the peoples of Russia are an enemy with whom we have no desire ever to deal or mingle in friendly or fruitful relationship" (*Wash. Star*, Dec. 9, 1953). Although

in its full sectional context this usage may be technically construed to apply to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, which is at present ethnic and official Russia and does contain different peoples, in the popular sense it is confusing and misleading. This interview with a U. S. diplomat discloses similar elements of misunderstanding and unbalanced outlook.

The diplomat's name is not revealed in the report, thus allowing one to conjecture on the source of opinion. There are really just a few possibilities, but were one absolutely certain about the interviewed, a quick appraisal of his competence would not be difficult. On the whole the contents of the interview are factually founded and reflect a perceptive grasp of Russian phenomena more so than those of the non-Russian nations. His observations bring out the facts that the Russians in general are community-minded and collectivist, that they are typically fatalistic and in thought and behavior somewhat incomprehensible to the Western mind, that their one outstanding quality is "submissiveness to authority and an acceptance of authority as part of the scheme of things," to which is added a "complete inability to compromise differences of viewpoint." Speaking further about the Russians per se, he concludes, "I don't see anything in the Russian character which leads me to believe that we're apt to see a free government in that country." Though this is a well-grounded judgment adhered to by most students of the problem, it does not mean that with the independence of the Russian nation as such there will not be the opportunity for democratic development.

In its coverage of matters pertaining to the non-Russian nations in the USSR, the interview is loaded with inept questions and, as printed, with contradicting captions. For instance, throughout the interview the term "Russia" is used interchangeably with the Soviet Union, as though the two were identical, and not the slightest attempt on the part of the "expert" to correct this misconception is evident. Even Moscow, for political reasons of its own, consistently avoids this harmful error. Also, in answer to a question on unrest in the USSR, the diplomat refers to "the national minorities" as a source, but with regard to a question on population statistics, he's not sure whether the non-Russians constitute 55% or 40% of the total population. It never occurs to him to raise the fact that in fifteen of the national republics, which coincide with the individual countries of the non-Russian nations, the respective non-Russian peoples are in overwhelming majority. To follow his line of reasoning, one would conclude that if Poland were formally incorporated into the Soviet Union, a further addition would result to "the national minorities." To top it all, the reader is finally presented with the brilliant, expert observation that "it all depends upon whom you call a Russian and whom you don't call a Russian."

Further evidences of this expert quality of information are furnished with respect to resistance, the war experience, and the emigration from the Soviet Union. Although admitting some resistance in the Baltic states and in Western Ukraine, the interviewed expert is obviously familiar with the nature of the underground network extending even into the Caucasus. Concerning the war experience, it comes as no surprise that his interest is solely with the Vlassov liberation unit, which records show to have been a meager, disorganized group of "Russian liberators" that never fought a battle and willingly surrendered to the Red Army in its advance through Czecho-Slovakia. The heroic record of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army which fought both Russian Communism and Nazism, appears to be of no interest to him. As for the emigre issue, it is interesting to observe that his contacts were with "mostly Great Russians," which in itself accounts for his

absurd notion that Ukrainian nationalism is restricted to those coming from Western Ukraine. In West Germany as well as in USA there are thousands of East Ukrainian emigrés who testify to the contrary. The unjustified statement that Ukrainian defectors from the Soviet Union become nationally conscious after undergoing indoctrination by Ukrainian groups, is not difficult to disprove. The fact of the matter is that for some time hundreds of such defectors were compelled to go in hiding in order to escape the Russian political activity and indoctrination of the Tolstoy Foundation (a relief agency!), the NTS and others which posed as fully American-supported groups. This situation has changed under PEP as a result of considerable protest. In short, our "Russian experts" are in the process of re-education. However, the pressing question is: Will they re-educate themselves in the short time available?

"TEN YEARS IN A SLAVE-LABOR CAMP," testimony of Germans. *U. S. News and World Report*, October 30, 1953, Washington, D. C.

Soon after the interview treated above was published, Mrs. Mesta disclosed in her articles that when in Kiev — *which is in Eastern Ukraine*, — she committed the unpardonable mistake of addressing a number of Ukrainians as "Russians." Evidently, in no uncertain terms they let her know that they were Ukrainian nationals. About a month after the same interview with our "expert," *U. S. News* published interviews with German prisoners who were recently released by the Soviet Russians. The story is the usual one of hunger and mass deaths in the slave-labor camps. But perhaps more significant here, in connection with the expert observations of the interviewed American diplomat given the month previously, are the personal testimonies of these former prisoners who labored under unimaginable conditions with the various nationals in the Soviet Union.

To the question on "How do the workers of many nationalities in the Soviet Union get along?", the answer given was: "The Ukrainians and Georgians have a violent hatred for the 'Great Russians.' Also an Uzbek would be offended by being called a Russian. After Stalin's death, Caucasians were talking of their right to secession from the Soviet Union..." It is noteworthy, too, that on the Volga-Don Canal construction, the "largest groups were Ukrainians and Georgians," and the worst experiences of these German prisoners "were in camps where we were living together with Russian criminals. They are a ferocious lot who rule their fellow prisoners by terror." Anyone with a historical background and knowledge of the many nations in the Soviet Union can only view these experiences as part of a learning process, valuable in themselves to counter effectively the nurtured errors of experts who have not taken the trouble to equip themselves with such indispensable knowledge. It is heartening to note that even those under the strong Kennan influence have begun to improve on their historical perspective toward the Soviet Union. Francis B. Stevens of the State Department, for example, is quoted as follows: "The imperialistic urges of the Tsars — urges which were translated into efforts to penetrate the Near East, the Far East, and eastern Europe — did not die with the Tsars. The history of the past 30 years is replete with examples of the anxiety of the Soviet leaders to give expression to this historic imperialism" (*Wash. Post*, Aug. 28, 1953).

"THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION," address by Senator Homer Ferguson. Interparliamentary Union, October 14, 1953, Washington D.C.

This address by a distinguished American statesman gives eloquent expression to the perennial principles of truth which must constantly inspire and

underlie our foreign policy if we as a Nation are to endure. Taking the trite Soviet charge of Western imperialism, this eminent legislator counters with indisputable facts to demonstrate the utter falsity of this charge which he places squarely on Soviet Russia itself. "Now let us look for a moment at the Soviet record in regard to the right of self-determination. Again taking only the period since the end of World War II, we find that Communist imperialism has denied that right to 12 units of Government — Albania, Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, Tibet — plus Germany, Austria and Korea which are kept artificially divided despite the obvious wishes of the people. If we did not apply the arbitrary cut-off date of the end of World War II, the list would be distressingly longer. It would include peoples incorporated into the Soviet Union itself — Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, White Russians, Georgians, and others."

Pointing to India, Pakistan, Israel, the Philippines, Indonesia, Viet Nam, Ceylon, Libya, Cambodia, Jordan, and Laos, the Senator firmly argues that "the right to self-determination certainly does not need to be argued." "Why do they not allow the peoples of the Soviet Union itself to have the right of self-determination?" he asks. "Could they possibly be afraid that the peoples of the Ukraine, for example, or of Latvia, or Estonia, or Lithuania would prefer to manage their own affairs rather than have it done for them in Moscow?" The answers to these plain questions are obvious. However, toward the fulfilment of the natural aspirations of these many enslaved nations, we must prepare ourselves now. Speaking of illusions of peace, Secretary of State Dulles provided the pitch to our necessary outlook in these words: "One such illusion is a settlement based on the status quo. This present status involves the captivity of hundreds of millions of persons of distinctive nationality, race, religion and culture. The hardest task of the Soviet rulers is to beat this disunity into Communist conformity... It is of the utmost importance that we should make clear to the captive peoples that we do not accept their captivity as a permanent fact of history" (*Wash. Star, Amer. Soc. of Newspaper Editors*, Apr. 19, 1953).

"WHAT IS BEHIND THE KREMLIN'S LATEST MARCH OF CRIME?", a fact sheet. The American Jewish Committee, February, 1953, New York.

Practically all the significant events involving Soviet genocide and oppression in the most recent period are systematically recorded in this useful fact sheet. If it were extended back to the first two decades of Soviet tyranny, the list would abound with more gory episodes of Soviet brutalitarianism, especially as applied to the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR. Anti-Semitism is now a proven Soviet weapon, and, as it is clearly stated, in exploiting anti-Semitism, "the Russians are engaged in a march of crime which threatens the whole free world." With reference to the Russian Orthodox Church, it accurately points out that, "the Church has survived; but only as a servile organ of the state. Today it is supervised by the MVD (secret police)." The complete liquidation of the Ukrainian Uniate Church is descriptively reported. For the purpose of a general awareness of this blood-reeking phenomenon, this means of information is well chosen and moderately done, and should be circulated widely. Its contents are the very source of justification for observations which share the viewpoint expressed by Mr. Dulles that "Prolonged unwillingness to try new methods in solving international problems is condemning millions to despair, despotism and genocide, and is

endangering our own safety as Russian conquests are being consolidated against us" (*N. Y. Times*, Sept. 4, 1952).

"UKRAINIAN-JEWISH RELATIONS," by Dr. Jacob Katz. *The Jewish Post*, Thursday, January 1, 1953, Winnipeg, Canada.

The goal of complete Jewish freedom in a democratic and independent Ukraine, once the yoke of Russian Communist imperialism is vanquished, stands as the fixed objective of all Ukrainian political bodies working toward the liberation of their long-oppressed homeland. The process of realizing this end has already commenced with solid progress in the negotiations and intercommunication between Jewish and Ukrainian elements in many countries. This lucid and objective article, reflecting a sound historical understanding of Ukraine's traditional struggle for independence and the role of the Jews in it, contributes to this progress in mutual understanding and collaboration among Jewish and Ukrainian groups. It is factual, candid and objective.

"TWO SIDES OF THE COIN," a statement. American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism, Autumn, 1953, New York.

This most recent statement of the American Committee represents an additional attempt to justify its actions and policy before American public opinion. As the previous ones, it makes for interesting reading, and is undoubtedly skilfully prepared to attract the favorable sentiments of any unwary and thus uninformed reader. Many of the attacks upon this committee as displayed here are obviously unjustified and even malicious. In point of fact it would be unjust in any case to indict the American Committee as such for the grievous and inexcusable blunders, as well as certain premeditated acts reflecting the influence of a pro-Russian bias, of a directing few. It appears that with each new statement released by the committee, there is at least one note of improvement over the previous releases, either in the way of discreet political terminology or treatment of content.

Most of the specific cases adduced against the actions of certain members of the committee in the Congressional Record of July 8, 10, 1953 cannot be so easily obscured by misleading general statements of policy or a detailed reference to the two-sided attack — Russian and non-Russian — made upon the committee. These cases are yet to be accounted for to the satisfaction of all concerned. On the matter of policy, the state of ideologic suspended animation represented by the meaningless concept of no-predetermination, which the author of this statement presumes to associate with the principle of self-determination, will require a capacity for dialectics greater in strength than what is shown here. To be sure, only the peoples involved can decide their individual destinies, but how in the modern context can this be achieved other than through independence and self-government which are of the very nature of self-determination? In many respects it should be a treat to listen to some of the committee's representatives apologize for its position which was conceived to accommodate the empire thesis of Russian emigré politicians who otherwise would have no dealings with the committee at all. In short, there is no middle ground between independence and self-government and empire and foreign interference in the affairs of any nation.

L. E. D.



