
THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

VOL. V—NUMBER 2



LOWER LINE: PERMANENT TERRITORY IN 1939 UPPER LINE: DEMARCATION OF UKRAINE AFTER THE WORLD WAR

SPRING, 1949

\$1.00 A COPY

Published by UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

Edited by EDITORIAL BOARD
Editor-in-Chief NICHOLAS D. CHUBATY
Associate Editors—LEV E. DOBRIANSKY
STEPHEN SHUMEYKO

Published by UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA
with support of Americans of Ukrainian Descent

CONTENTS

	PAGE
America, Russia, and the Nations Subjugated by Russia <i>Editorial</i>	101-106
The American Russian Policy and its Danger <i>Editorial (translated) from "Ukrainski Visti"</i>	107-110
Ukraine's Participation in the Cultural Activity of the Ancient World <i>Andriy Kocevalov</i>	111-121
The Role of Ukraine in Present Five-Year Plan <i>Vasyl Marchenko</i>	122-134
Ukrainian Culture and Moscow in the Seventeenth Century <i>Clarence A. Manning</i>	135-143
The Genocide Convention <i>Roman Smal Stocky</i>	144-163
The Revived Myth of Ukrainian Anti-Semitism <i>Lev E. Dobriansky</i>	164-174
Current Ukrainian Chronicle	175-177
BOOK REVIEWS:	
<i>La Geste du Prince Igor</i> . . . d'Henri Gregoire, de Roman Jacobson at de Mark Szeftel, assistes de J. A. Foffe S. Hordynsky	178-180
<i>Storia della Chiesa Russa e dei Paesi Limitrofi,</i> by A. M. Amman S. J. <i>Dr. Bohdan Y. Lonczynna</i>	180-185
<i>Analecta Ordinis S. Basili Magni, Vol. I. (VII)</i> <i>N. Chubaty</i>	185
Soviet Russian Ideology of Today in English Translations <i>Dr. W. Dudra</i>	186-187
Ucrainica in American and Foreign Periodicals	188-192

*Picture on the cover: Vase in form of Venus, found in Phanagoria;
4-3rd century B. C.*

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

ANDRIY KOCEVALOV. Professor of classical philology at Kharkiv University (1926-41), associated with the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, in analyzing Greek inscriptions in Southern Ukraine. Contributor to *Wochenschrift fuer klassische Philologie*, *Zapiski* of the Institute of Material Culture of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, *Philologische Wochenschrift*, etc. Now DP. in Germany.

VASYL MARCHENKO. Ukrainian economist, new emigrant from Eastern Ukraine. Now lecturing at Ukrainian Free University in Munich.

CLARENCE A. MANNING. Professor of Columbia University, Dept. of Eastern European Languages. Author of the "Ukrainian Literature", "Story of the Ukraine" and others.

ROMAN SMAL STOCKY. Professor of Slavistics at Marquette University, Linguist and formerly editor of the "Studies of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute" in Warsaw. Former Minister of Ukrainian Republic.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY. Professor of economy at Georgetown University. Associate editor of this publication.

AMERICA, RUSSIA, AND THE NATIONS SUBJUGATED BY RUSSIA

(Editorial)

Formally the conference of foreign ministers which opened in Paris on May 23 of this year was convened in order to discuss the problems of Germany and Austria, but in actuality much more is involved. A fundamental issue is at stake—whether the world of tomorrow will be constructed according to the pattern of Western or Soviet “democracy.” Whether we shall have a world of free individuals and free nations or world-rule by force imposed by a minority and directed by Moscow.

In this global struggle it is not too far-fetched to propose that there may well be one factor which is more decisive than the atomic bomb—and that is the attitude of the millions of dissatisfied non-Russians, both in the Soviet Union and in the satellite countries, that curse the regime which has made them slaves. We are standing before a great battle on the ideological front, a battle which has been raging since the triumph of the Bolsheviks in 1917. A ruthless power through the unbridled use of terror has succeeded in gaining control of millions of innocent working people in all continents and enjoys the loyalty and good-will of many intellectuals. The successors of Ivan the Terrible possess fifth-columns ready not only to befriend Communism but even to betray their country. The catch-calls and techniques of the Kremlin’s propaganda have a telling attraction in a troubled and rudderless world.

The most significant of the propaganda slogans employed by the Communist world is the promise of economic equality, a goal held to be of a higher type of democracy, a progressive ideal despite the fact that the most reactionary and brutal means are used to realize it. The Communist world placates its friends with the argument that terror and restrictions on human rights are temporary and necessary in the transitional period devoted to the extirpation of “reaction” and the preparation of the future paradise.

Western democracy must oppose these Communist appeals with ideals of its own. The usual reply to Communist claims refers to bitter reality in the Soviet Union and points out that after thirty years of experimentation on one-sixth of the earth’s surface the fruits of Communism are poverty, hunger, and limitless suffering. The West usually counters the Communists on the ideological front with the ideals of

free men and free nations in a free society. The slogan of the free individual and the ideal of a free nation are so powerful that they are capable of pulverizing the Communist slogan of the full stomach. However to do so the Western world must produce evidence that its slogans are backed by deeds, a proof that is not always available. The Atlantic Charter was proclaimed during the heat of the war, but little is spoken today about its consequent application. A genuine American product was Wilson's majestically attractive ideal of self-determination of nations, the democratic right of each nation to decide its future, but today this great ideal lies neglected, trampled, and even abhorred by many responsible political leaders. A case in point is Winston Churchill's speech delivered not long ago under the auspices of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The ideological struggle will result in the triumph of Western ideals only when the slogans of individuals and national freedom are translated into reality without mental reservation or tactical limitations. Without sincerity and genuine conviction Western ideology cannot successfully oppose the propaganda of the Kremlin.

What success Western democracy has gained in this ideological war can be ascribed to the moves made by Great Britain and America in an effort to translate into reality the slogans of freedom that they have championed on paper. The United States granted independence to the Philippine Islands and thereby gained a friend and a moral victory saluted the world over. America's position regarding the aspirations of the Asiatic colonial peoples, such as Indonesia, has also helped to elevate its international moral stature.

The granting of independence to India and the opportunity given to the Indians, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma to decide their own future has brought credit to England's Labor government and proved that the slogans of freedom were not mere propaganda. England's honest policy with her formal colonial subjects benefited all concerned and preserved the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The time is now ripe for considering the nations under Soviet control. It seems natural to expect that to defeat Russia in this ideological struggle Britain and America would apply the same tactics to Russian-dominated nations that they have applied to the Philippines, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma. In truth only such tactics can assure success.

This approach in regard to the nations subjugated by Moscow is all the more recommended because these nations have a historical

hatred of Russian rule and have been struggling since the 1917 revolution for national liberation. This struggle adjusts itself to the times and circumstances. As a classical example the Ukrainian struggle for liberation may be considered. In 1919-20 the Ukrainian people fought an organized war against Russia, and in our day a similar struggle took shape in 1943. In the 1930's the Ukrainian struggle was expressed in organized passive resistance to Russian domination. Today the nations subjugated by Moscow and the peoples of the satellite states demand that the Democratic West at least apply to them a measure of understanding equal to that they have given to Asiatic colonial peoples. They desire the same right to decide their own future both as individuals and free nations.

It is certain that the nations under Russian control strongly oppose the overlordship of any Russia, Red or White, and world peace requires that they be given the democratic right of self-determination. We cannot prejudge the choice these nations may make, be it complete independence or federation corresponding to their national aspirations and vital needs. All evidence seems to indicate, however, that from the ruins of Communist Russia federative states will emerge, and therefore fear of "Balkanization" in Eastern and Central Europe appear to be without foundation. This is a problem for the constituent assemblies of the liberated nations to solve, and like colonial peoples of earlier times, they can chart their political future according to a number of plans. Against federation thrust down their throats from above the subjugated nations will react with arms and uprisings until the Russians are shorn of their *herrenvolk* proclivities and consent to negotiate as equals with equals. The Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, organized in 1943 by underground movements within Soviet Russia, and embracing 23 nations, is evidence that peace in that part of the world is impossible without the gratification of desires of national liberty.

We feel obligated to call the attention of the American government and the American people to these realities, for it is unfortunately true that Russian-enslaved nations have not heard any program or promise from the Western world regarding their present plight or future disposition. On the contrary, the activities of certain American governmental agencies, not to speak of a large section of the American press, have evoked great alarm among the non-Russians within the Soviet Union, coupled with fears that the United States approves and will continue to approve their subjugation.

The newspaper *Ukrainski Visti*, which is published by refugees from Soviet Ukraine who were educated under the Soviet regime, asks a very direct question: "Is the American propaganda designed for the peoples of Eastern Europe, and which is staffed and executed by Russian-Americans, more Russian than American?" This same paper affirms that American information policy is a real threat to the anti-Bolshevik forces within the Soviet Union.

There are two explanations for this policy. One is that many pro-Russian elements occupying strategic positions within the government still hope to appease the Kremlin. The other is the influence of Russian Whites, socialists, and pseudo-democrats to whom self-determination for Ukraine, for example, is anathema, and who are carrying on a typically imperialist campaign for the preservation of the integrity of Russian frontiers in the hope of maintaining the bulging borders that fire and sword have drawn and the knout has made eternal. Otherwise, how can one explain the grave-like silence in America concerning the dynamic Ukrainian independence movement, which is the Achilles Heel of the Soviet Union? Justice for the Ukrainians can be one of the strongest weapons in opposing Red imperialism.

While official American circles remain silent regarding the liberation of approximately one hundred million non-Russians, public opinion is completely uninformed about the national question in Russia. Even leading liberals and men of good will are harnessed to support Russian imperialism and oppose liberation of the non-Russian nations.

"The American Committee for a Free Russia," whose declaration was recently published in the *Commonweal* (Dec. 31, 1948) well illustrates the confusion of Americans of good will but weak orientation in Russian affairs. These worthy people simply do not know that "Russia" is not a "Fatherland" to the subject nationalities ruled by Russia, and in place of the love and patriotism that swell a Russian heart chagrin and hatred are associated in their hearts and minds when Russia is mentioned. The way out of this dilemma is clear: the removal of Russian supremacy and the opportunity for these nations to decide their own future in much the same way that has been done with Asiatic colonials. To appeal to the persecuted non-Russians to help preserve the "integrity of frontiers" of the Russian empire is sheer infantilism, just as is the failure to understand the elemental fact that "the heritage of the Russian revolution" among non-Russians consists largely of the right to struggle against Russian domination.

Americans are strangely unbalanced in their approach to Russia. All empires in the world must disappear—with the exception of the Russian, which must continue as a special preserve wherein 49 percent of the people, the Russians, lord it over scores of nations of varying degrees of culture and civilization, often surpassing the Russian level. All this despite the fact that rule by the Russians has retarded rather than aided the progress of these nations and has caused their cultural decline. All this despite the fact these nations hate Russian rule and desire most explicitly escape from Russian bondage.

These facts, however, are well known to the sovereigns in the Kremlin as well as to their would-be successors. Both species of Russians, therefore, will employ all means to save the Russian empire from ruin should a physical clash between the East and West break out. Many non-Communist Russians are ready to make common cause with Stalin when the integrity of Russian frontiers hangs in the balance. Americans must realize that many Russian pseudo-democrats would rather have Stalinist totalitarianism rather than democracy in Eastern Europe that would enable the non-Russians to throw off the yoke of Moscow.

We suggest that the interests of the Western world and those of the anti-Communist Russians are in direct conflict. The latter are allies of doubtful value in the light of realities in Eastern Europe. It is folly to expect the Western powers to guarantee the integrity of the new Russia and to agree in advance not to allow its dismemberment. It is anti-democratic dynamite not to grant the Russian-enslaved nations the same opportunities given the Burmese and Indonesians. The Russian leaders are firm in their opposition to the non-Russians and insist that they alone have the right to speak for all the peoples in Russia. They seek to plant the fiction that the future government they consider best will also be accepted as such by the non-Russians. Again we emphasize the dangers of this fallacy and repeat that 100 million non-Russians are not anxious to exchange Russian Communist subjection for another of the same origin and content.

A Russia not dismembered can never be democratic. To have a state dominated by 49 percent of its population without a tradition of democratic rule in the hope that this minority will "democratically" rule over the majority of non-Russians is an obvious fantasy. Every government in the Russian empire necessarily must be based on the principle of the elite and must be held together primarily by force applied against the non-Russians. All talk about Russian democracy

under such conditions is hallow phrase-making. The Russians are not English, and in the nationality question there is no difference between the views of the Russian Social-Democrats, let us say, and the Russian Fascists and near-Fascists.

Great Britain and the United States must examine carefully the political concepts advocated by the Russians in the light of their translation into reality in Eastern Europe. To agree to the "democratic desires" of Russian imperialists means not only that the Western democracies must abandon their dream of creating a brave new world on the basis of a world federation of free nations. It also means the abandonment of the revolutionary movements now operating in the Soviet Union, the only internal ally that can provide real assistance in the struggle against the Politbureau on its own soil. It is useless to expect a revolution against Stalin on the part of the Russians—they have too much to lose. Both economically and politically they are top-dogs in the Soviet Union, "the elder brother" of all the "happy peoples" there. Their nationalist and messianic thirst has been amply watered, and Stalin has made Russia a power such as she never had been before.

Unless the Western democracies counter the flaming slogans of Moscow with the equally flaming ideal of self-determination and liberation of constantly revolting nations from the Russian yoke, they cannot hope to gain active support in Eastern, Central Europe and Western Asia. The example of Hitler's policy in the East is a grim reminder to every opponent of Stalin that it is fatal to ignore the national aspirations of the nations subjugated by Russian-based Communism.



THE AMERICAN RUSSIAN POLICY AND ITS DANGER

This article is a translation of the editorial printed in "Ukrainaki Visti" March 24, 1949, a newspaper established and published in Neu-Ulm, Germany, U.S. Zone, by new Ukrainian emigrants from Soviet Ukraine. It is our deep conviction that we are rendering to our country a good service by familiarizing the American people with the way of thinking of leading non-Russian personalities once living in the Soviet Union between two World Wars.—(Editor.)

The news report broadcast over the air-waves from America on March 14 of this year concerning the creation of the "Committee for the Liberation of Russia" with Alexander Kerensky at its head has evoked justifiable excitement among all nationalities now under the yoke of Bolshevik Russia. Especially among Ukrainians great consternation has been aroused.

And justly so. One reason for this consternation is the very name Kerensky, who has assumed the highest official position in this significant movement in the United States. For he is an old Russian politician notorious for his widely publicized pronouncement: "*It is better to have Stalin than the dismemberment of Russia.*" By "dismemberment" he means the gaining of independence on the part of nations subjugated by Russia. A more favored term, however, among his followers is criminally vicious "separatism."

Moreover an even greater reason for uneasiness is the fact that the creation of the Kerensky committee is officially publicized by the "Voice of America"—something which was not so in the case of the establishment of responsible centers of liberation of the non-Russian nationalities controlled by the Soviets. This fact is indicative of the strong influence the Russian imperialist emigration has in America. Apparently the United States has given Russian political action a special privileged status denied the non-Russian nationalities. That is why we again affirm the fear that the calamitous Russian view on the problems of Eastern Europe and Asia, entrenched by centuries of world-wide propaganda, is riding high today, as it did in critical times not long past, among the "strong of this world."

The problems arising from these developments are of critical importance. Analyzing concrete facts connected with American radio propaganda, which is in the grip of Russian imperialist emigre elements, we have put the question, whether the American so-called "Russian policy" has not become in reality a Russian policy and has

ceased to be an American policy. Such an assumption is indeed great cause for alarm to all to whom the struggle against Bolshevism is precious, inasmuch as here we are concerned with the policy of the greatest anti-Bolshevik force in the world today. In the meantime all facts plainly speak that in essence every Russian imperialist-unifier abroad has become literally, if not intentionally then unintentionally, an agent or sub-agent of the fifth-column of Russian Bolshevism, the contemporary form of militant Russian imperialism.

The impression of a certain parallel between the tendency of the contemporary American "Russian" policy and the fatal "Russian Policy" of Hitler's Germany during the Second World War is inescapable. This forces us to recall several aspects of the history of the German policy, which can serve as a genuinely terrifying warning.

The German ruling clique and in reality the entire German community, because of the strong historical ties of the Russian aristocracy and bourgeoisie with Germany, were always so permeated with Russian influences (and the other way about as well) that the former's "Eastern policy" despite the clash of imperialist interests was always a captive of Russian imperialist conceptions, according to which for the Germans in the East there existed only Russia. Particularly permeated by Russian political influence through the penetration on the part of White Guard elements was the German policy of Hitler, whose "Eastern policy" rested completely in the hands of a Russian White Guardist of Baltic-German blood—Rosenberg. This fact explains why, in opposition to the obvious interest of Germany itself (and in opposition to the falsified affirmations of Russian propaganda), the Germans in the late war did not use even for tactical reasons "separatist" slogans in regard to Ukraine, but on the contrary dug their own grave by waging a relentless struggle against Ukrainian "separatists" with the aid of Russian White Guards.

It is generally known that the German leadership literally brought defeat upon itself in the war in the East by its phenomenal political stupidity. Among the many manifestations of this stupidity the most glaring was the monopoly position as German "political advisers" of none other than the Russian White-Guard "specialists in affairs of the East," who simultaneously were Russian imperialist agents (and in the given situation they played the role of either subjective or objective agents of Bolshevik Russia). It was they who were the main authors of a German policy which took exception only to the Communist form of the subjugation of the nations in the USSR, retaining inviolate its

Russian imperialist substance, endeavoring not to destroy but to preserve it through such movements as those of Krasnov and Vlasov. For this reason even the possibility of a temporary tactical identification of the German "struggle against Bolshevism" with the liberation movements among the non-Russian nationalities was excluded.

Therefore as the Russians today preach the thesis that the world should restrict its struggle merely to the elimination of the Bolshevik regime, refraining from molesting the Russian imperialist system, it is necessary to emphasize that the Germans were guided by exactly the same "wisdom" in their war against the USSR. Their objectives consisted merely of the destruction of the Communist regime and they did nothing to encourage the justifiable "separatisms" of Russian-subjugated nations. What was the result of that policy? The nations enslaved by Russia in no wise wishing to exchange one imperialist yoke for another, rose to combat both Russian and German imperialism. . . .

The German example, of course, is not limited to the blindness created by adherence to the Russian approach to the subject nationalities and the fatal role of Russian chauvinist agents. The German Nazis themselves were imperialists and were the apostles of totalitarianism in the same way as the Russian Communists. All these factors taken together rendered impossible a German victory. The example of parasitism on the part of the Russians, who sapped the energies of an anti-Bolshevik force and channeled it to a program advantageous both to Russian imperialism and to Bolshevism, should be studied very closely today. All concerned must study the problem in its present form, especially America and Western democracies. It seems clear that today the West, in contradiction to the Germans, has great superiority over the Bolsheviks primarily because of the fact that it represents the ideal of the liberation of nations from the agony of Communist *totalitarianism*, an appeal the Germans were unable to champion. However, it is far from clear whether the Western countries will not choose to follow the fatal policy of the Germans in regard to the subject nationalities. Will they too become the prisoners of the world-wide Russian imperialist machine?

The apparent acceptance of the Russian point of view in American propaganda and the colonization of American informational organs by exclusively Russian and pro-Russian elements give basis to the fear that powerful anti-Bolshevik forces will again be exploited successfully by parasitic Russians. These elements have consolidated

into a single imperialist front and a clear line of demarcation between the Bolsheviks and the anti-Bolshevik Russians cannot be drawn in certain vital questions. The strength of this front is tremendous and is felt at all times. Its "fifth-columns" in the person of Russian "anti-Bolsheviks" are engaged continuously in wrecking the anti-Bolshevik front.

As an advance detachment of this anti-Bolshevik front, the Ukrainians consider it their great misfortune that this damage exhibits itself most strongly in the form of frantic anti-Ukrainian activity by the Russians. The world, however, eventually must understand that this Ukrainian misfortune broadens into general world-wide significance; that every one interested in the strength of the anti-Bolshevik front must struggle against the Ukrainian tragedy.



UKRAINE'S PARTICIPATION IN THE CULTURAL ACTIVITY OF THE ANCIENT WORLD

By ANDRIY KOCEVALOV

PROF. IVAN MIRCHUK has shown in detail in his article "The Western Tendencies in Ukrainian Culture",¹ that Ukraine has always had, since the ninth century A.D., typical Western ideals belonged to the sphere of influence of Central and Western Europe, and taken the lead spreading Western civilization among the people of East Europe.

M. Rostovtsev, V. Scherbakivsky and other scholars, however, think that the history of Ukraine commences much earlier than that time. According to Prof. Rostovtsev² the Kievan Rus had the same kind of organization as the States that existed before it north of the Black Sea: its population was divided into the dominant conquerors and the subjected peoples and with its well developed trade, ranging from Scandinavia to Greece ("the highway from the Varangians to the Greeks"), into northeast Siberia, and into Central Asia. The traders paid considerable sums of money to the local rulers for the trading privileges, and thus contributed to the wealth of the country.

That is why it would be interesting to find out how Ukraine was affected in ancient times by Western civilization and by Greece, the main representative of that civilization, and what Ukraine gave in its turn to that civilization.

Starting in the eighth century B.C., the Greeks, prompted by their commercial interests, started to establish their colonies along the northern shores of the Black Sea: Tyras (near the present day Akerman, Olbia (on the western side of the Dnieper, near the Lyman, near the village of Parutyn), Panticapaeum which later became the capital of the Kingdom of Bosphorus (on the site of the present-day Kerch), Phanagoria (on the Asian side of the strait of Kerch, near the station of Sinna), and Chersonese (near the present-day Sebastopol). These Greek colonies maintained lively contact with Greece, with the Greek cities in Asia Minor, etc. Many inscriptions have been found on the monuments at Olbia, Chersonese, Panticapaeum, and at other places, of Greeks with foreign names. State papers have been

¹ The Ukrainian Quarterly, Vol. IV., No. 3, 1948.

² The Iranians and Greeks in South Russia.

found at Olbia, Chersonese, and of the kings of Bosphorus in honour of Greeks with foreign names. Also state decrees have been found at Athens, Delphi, Delos, Tenedos, Kos, etc., in honour of the Greeks of the Black Sea region.

Apparently in the fifth century B.C. Nymphaeum, Olbia and other colonies of the Black Sea region belonged to the first sea confederation of Athens. At about 334 B.C. Olbia and Miletus concluded a treaty of alliance, giving the people from Olbia the right of citizenship at Miletus and the same rights to the Miletians living at Olbia. At the end of the second century B.C. the Greek Black Sea region passed into the hands of Mithradates Eupator, the king of Pontus, and later to the Romans.

Greeks and the Native Population

Towards the seventh century B.C. the native population of the Black Sea region was represented by the ruling race of the Scythians. Later their place was taken by the Sarmatians, and still later by the Alans, and by other tribes. The native population had dealings with the Greek colonists and in time intermarried with them.

Herodotus gives evidence of the Greek influences on the Scythian population in his stories about the Scythian Prince Anacharsis and the Scythian King Skyles who paid with their lives for their Greek sympathies. In time the Greek-Scythian mixed population increased considerably. The archaeological excavations along the Boh, Dnieper, Don, and Kuban rivers on the sites of settlements belonging to the fourth and third centuries B.C. show that there were many thriving settlements of mixed Greek and native population in those regions. The archaeological findings agree with the Olbian state decree in honour of the Protogenes of the third and second centuries which speaks of the fact that there were settlements near Olbia of Mixellenes who for some time had been even in alliance with the Olbians. In one fragment of a document from Olbia of the time, published by the author of this article, a tribe is mentioned which lived somewhere near Olbia in "a pastoral village" and which used to participate in the assemblies of the Olbians, with the right of vote.

The Germans who lived east and west of Dnieper from the first century B.C. to the first century A.D. left the ancient commercial routes and dealings intact. Prof. M. Rostovtsev, taking into consideration the list of settlements along the Dnieper as given by Ptolemy, the

geographer of the second century, states confidently that the Germans not only did not disturb Hellenized towns of the area, but, in fact, worked to their advantage, so that the number of these towns increased.

On the other hand, the King's Scythians, and later on the Sarmatians, as conquerors of many different tribes of the Black Sea region, began in the sixth century B.C. to export more and more slaves from the conquered tribes to Greece. These "Maeotians," "Scythians"³ and "Sarmatians," and others took active part in the development of the Greek culture in Greece itself, (at Athens, Epidaurus, Kos, Rhodes, etc.) We possess also information that some of the free men who came to Greece from the Black Sea region became very influential there.

Ukraino-Greek Relations in Legends

We turn now to different sources. From immemorial time the Greeks spoke in highly idealistic terms of the people of the ancient Black Sea region. Perhaps, they sometimes even exaggerated the cultural importance of some of them. According to one Greek legend, Heracles was taught how to shoot arrows from the bow by a Scythian slave at the home of Amphitryon. There might have been also some influence on the Greek religion exerted by the people from the Black Sea area. There is some indication to this effect in the legend about Iphigenia, the daughter of Agamemnon, who brought with her a statue of the goddess Artemis from the Taurians to Attica and founded there a cult of Artemis Tauropolos.

The cult of Artemis Tauropolos has some indications of long vanished human sacrifices but it is certain that the Taurians really prayed to some goddess. This cult was adopted by the neighbouring Chersonesans, and the Greeks might have tried to identify it with the cult of Artemis. It is quite evident that the cult of Artemis Tauropolos points to the close religious intercourse of Athens with the Black Sea region.

It is interesting to take a look at the Scythian philosopher Anacharsis. According to Herodotus, the Scythian Prince Anacharsis, having returned from a trip which took him mainly to Greece, tried to arrange the same kind of festival in honour of the mother of gods that he saw

³ According to Rostovtsev, it is safe to suppose that most of the slaves sold to the Greeks under the name of the Scythians really were not of the Iranian tribes, of the conquerors, but belonged to the pre-Scythian population of the Black Sea region. Let us remember that the Greeks had a special tendency to extend the name of the Scythians, and later on of the Sarmatians, to all the peoples of northeast Europe.

at Cyzikus. During the celebration he was shot and killed by an arrow of his brother Saulios, a Scythian king. Plato speaks of Anacharsis as a practical man who invented the potter's wheel, anchor, and blacksmith's bellows. Later the cynics idealized him as an unspoiled son of Nature. They counted him as one of the seven sages. According to them, Anacharsis arrived at Athens in 592 B.C., struck up a friendship with Solon, and took part in the contest of wits and participated in the banquets of the seven sages. Even some literary works were attributed to Anacharsis, on the Scythian and Greek customs, on simplicity of life, and on military customs. So there must be at least a grain of truth in the stories about Anacharsis.

Ukraino-Greek Relations in Documents

Now let us pass from legends to documents and to other reliable sources as to the cultural relations of the Black Sea region with Greece. Of course, we shall not talk here of the well-known facts of the *material culture*, such as the adoption by the people of Ukraine of the Greek ceramics, which they adapted to their own taste. We shall mention here only a few details about the participation of the people from the region of the Black Sea in the ceramic industry in Greece. Among the signatures of the ceramic painters at Attica in the second half of the sixth century B.C. we meet, among others, a name Scythian (for instance, "Scythian has painted this," "Scythian has painted and dedicated me.")⁴ On the vase signatures of the second and first century B.C. (from Rhodes, according to B. Grekov) there is the name of a potter Bosphoros.⁵ It is self evident that both painters, Scythian and Bosphoros, were the free men from the Black Sea region. The reason why the Greeks made use of the slaves from the Black Sea region especially in the ceramic industry was that those slaves were well acquainted with ceramics. (Let us remember here again the legend which regards the Scythian Anacharsis as the inventor of the potter's wheel.)

As to the spiritual culture, the north region of the Black Sea was the homeland of several well known philosophers and scholars. The people of Chersonese and of Bosphorus were interested in their past and took pains not to let it be lost in oblivion. The Black Sea

⁴ P. Kretschmer, *Die griechischen Vasenschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht*, 1894, p. 151. E. Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen*, pp. 289, 419, and 450.

⁵ *Annuario archeologico della R. Scuola di Atene e de la Missionè Orientale*, II, 1916, p. 124, N 268, 1-3 Parro.



FIGURES IN TERRA COTTA. GREEK ART IN UKRAINE B.C.
Former Khanenko Collection in Kiev

Greeks were fairly well acquainted with the political works of their Motherland and, in addition, had their own poets. There is a very interesting description of Isyllos, a son of Socrates, who lived at Bosphorus at the end of the fourth and at the beginning of the third centuries, a politician and a religious reformer at Epidaurus. We know about him from an inscribed paean in honour of Apollo and Asclepius,⁶ done by Isyllos himself. The paean tells how Isyllos, as a sickly youth, came from Bosphorus to Epidaurus, to Asclepius, the god of medicine. It was then that Isyllos foretold to the Lacedaemonians that Asclepius would deliver them from the invasion of the Macedonians. In time Isyllos gained so much influence in Epidaurus that he succeeded in persuading the Epidaurians to change their form of government from democracy to aristocracy and had enacted a law regulating the sacred procession of the aristocratic representatives in honour of Apollo and of his son Asclepius and another one as to a prayer for all the people.

In the third century B.C. the philosopher Bion was born at Olbia. According to the statement given by Diogenes (Laertios)⁷ Bion the Borysthenite said of himself that his father was a freed man and that he dealt in fish and that his mother, before her marriage, was just a woman of the streets. Bion's father was arrested for some misdeed during a tax collection. In consequence his father, with all his family, was sold into slavery. Bion himself was bought by a sophist. When the sophist died he left all his possessions to Bion. After tearing to shreds and burning the dead sophist's writings, Bion came to Athens and began whole-heartedly to study philosophy. At first Bion was a follower of the Academy. Later he joined the Cynics. Still later he listened attentively to the harangues of the atheist Theodoros. And he ended up as a follower of the peripatetic school of Theophrastos. Bion, according to Diogenes, left many notes and important sayings.

Sphairos, a younger contemporary of Bion, was, according to Plutarch, also a Borysthenite, and, according to Diogenes Laertios, he was a Bosphorian,⁸ a pupil of Zenon and of Cleanthos, living for a long time at the court of Ptolemy Philapator. He helped Cleomenes to work out plans for the restoration of ancient Sparta.

Suidas speaks of a historian by the name of Posidonios the Olbiopolite who left works on the ocean phenomena, on the Tyrian land,

⁶ *Inscriptiones Graecae*, IV, 2, 128.

⁷ IV, 7, 46-51.

⁸ *Plutarchus, Cleomenes II, XI, Diog. Laert. VII, VI.*

and also, if the story is still of the same person, on the history of Attica and Libya.⁹

A sophist writes to Apollonios of Rhodes (second century B.C.) that Diogenes of Olbia gives proof that the low and wide banks are called the running paths of Achilles. According to the story of Philostratos,¹⁰ a king of Bosphorus, with a very good education, once came to Smyrna in order to acquaint himself with the history of Ionia. He invited over to see him a prominent sophist of the second century B.C., one Polemon, for he wanted to have a talk with him. The sophist declined the king's invitation several times. Finally the king came over to see the sophist, and brought ten talents as a fee.

Even during the period of decline the Olbipolites fondly studied the works of Plato, enjoying his spontaneity of expression and his diction, so dignified, and yet so near to the diction of Homer. This feature of Plato made him dearly appreciated by the Olbipolites who showed so much adoration for Homer.

At Olbia Dion Chrysostos met a youth, by the name of Callistratos who was studying rhetoric and philosophy so seriously that he even expressed his wish to go together with Dion¹¹ to Greece.

However, the philosophers and scholars in the Greek Black Sea colonies had also much opportunity to apply their knowledge in their homeland. We learn from an inscription¹² that in the fourth and third centuries B.C. a philosopher by the name of Smikros used to teach at the crossroads. He strongly believed that righteousness spontaneously took root in his mind and that he was brought up by the muses. A Bosphorus epitaph of the first century A.D. says: "Cherishing your wisdom and a strange character, you died, Stratonikos, leaving in tears your sad father. My pious friend, you who were dear to your contemporaries, the future centuries will discover from your books your boundless and enjoyable wisdom." This statue was erected to the memory of Stratonikos, son of Zenon, by the free man, Socias.¹³

We learn from this epitaph that there lived in the first century A.D. at Bosphorus a philosopher by the name of Stratonikos, leaving behind him his philosophical works. A statue was raised in his memory by his master, who as we conclude from the text of the epitaph, was a

⁹ Mueller, *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* III, p. 172.

¹⁰ *Vitae Soph.* I, p. 25, IV.

¹¹ Dion Chrysostomos, *The Borystenite Speech.*

¹² *News of the Russian Academy of History of the Material Culture*, II, 1922, pp. 93, 94.

¹³ *News of the Imp. Archeological Commission*, LIV, p. 72, N 5.

well-read person. V. Latshev thinks that he played the same role to Stratonikos as Tyro to Cicero.

One of the inscriptions at Bosphorus of the first century A.D. reads: "Here lies under me a traveller, an eighteen-year-old lover of words, Heliodoros. To father from son of the same name."¹⁴ Whether

Heliodoros was just fond of elocution, of literature (*litterae*), or was a philologist in the sense of Fratothenes, Suetonius, and Seneca, that is, a scholar, who explains and criticizes the authors, it is hard to say.



GREEK ART IN UKRAINE
HEAD IN MARBLE, 3 CENTURY B.C.
Former Khanenko Collection in Kiev

There is one document perhaps from the second half of the third century, and not later than the second century B. C., giving evidence that there was a school of historiography at Chersonese, which commanded that Syriskos, son of Heraclides, be crowned with a wreath in gratitude for his painstaking descriptions and for his reading on the miraculous appearances of the goddess Parthenos, for writing of the relations of the people of Bosphorus to their kings, and for having made researches about the

former friendly relations to the cities.¹⁵

M. Rostotsey thinks that the Chersonesans, who had then continually to repel the attacks of the Scythians, who were threatening the territory of Chersonese itself, decided to honour the goddess, in gratitude for miraculous help from her in a skirmish with the Scythians, by publishing in form of a literary work the description of her last appearance, and everything else, as recorded in the temple chronicle.¹⁶ The story of the miraculous appearances gave a full military account

¹⁴ *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini*, II, 86.

¹⁵ *Tos* Pl. I, 2, 344.

¹⁶ "Syrisk"—Historian of the Tauridian Chersonese, *Journal of the People's Education*, April Department of the Classical Philology, pp. 151-176.

of Chersonese, as the Chersonesans strongly believed that the goddess Parthenos always helped in war her own city.¹⁷

In his researches into the help received from the goddess Parthenos in the wars with the barbarians, Syrikos learned about the relations between Chersonese, the kings of Bosphorus, and the free cities of Pontus, the natural allies of Chersonese in its struggle against the Scythians.

The chronicles of epiphanies (miraculous appearances) had great significance in the Greek communities. They saved for the future stories of the miraculous appearances. This was due to the local patriotism and to the temple traditions. Later the temple legends and folk legends were transformed into poems, into poetic historio-graphies and into prose versions like the one made by Syrisko.

Bosphorus, perhaps, had also its own local historians. One of the sources from which Strabo makes long quotations, knows well the history of Bosphorus from its earliest times, and especially the history of the so-called tyrants of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., for whom Strabo has a special sympathy. M. Rostovtsev thinks that most likely such a source was a local historical work or works which dealt with the history of the tyrants of Bosphorus.¹⁸

The Greeks of the Black Sea region liked music and poetry. Memnon, the well-known Greek confectioner, later on a war leader with the Persian King Darius III, during the war with a king of Bosphorus, Leucon, sent together with his poet Archibiades a well-known cithar-player of Olynthos, Aristonikos, so that the messenger could find out about the number of inhabitants. He knew that if the cithar-player played his instrument while the ship was approaching the shore the music-loving people would be rushing to the theatres.¹⁹ At Delphi in 268-266 B. C. a teacher of music from Bosphorus, by the name of Isvllos, son of Chrysolao, took part at the musical festival Soteria.²⁰

Furthermore, two Panathenaic vases have been found at Bosphorus, one with a picture of a flute-player and the other with a picture of a cithar-player, which the musicians of Bosphorus, evidently, received at the Panathenaic musical contest. Also hundreds of terracottas have been found there with pictures of musicians. If one of the vases

¹⁷ Comp. what is in the decree in honour of Diophantes (Tos PE 1, 2, 352, v. 23, 24)—
"Parthenos, who always protects the Chersonesans, was helping then Diophantes..."

¹⁸ "Strabon as a historian of the history of Bosphorus," *A Review of the Kharkov Association of History and Philology*, 1913.

¹⁹ Polyaeus, V, 44.

²⁰ Syll. inscr. Gr., 3, 424.

belonged to the sixth century B.C. and most of the statuettes to the Roman period, this may mean that music flourished at Bosphorus from its beginnings to its very end.

In one inscription from Panticapaeum of the second century A.D. it is said that the dead man's life was made sweet by the muses while he was yet living.²¹ A fragment of Chersonese document of the second century A. D., on the other hand, praises some one for the fact that he "gained renown and made his stay and behaviour with us well-ordered and suitable to his arts."²² It is most likely that this valedictory was made in honour of a visting sophist or a poet-chanter.

At Olbia, restored after its ruin at the hands of Gaets, according to the statement of Dion Chrysostemos, almost everybody knew the Iliad by heart. But the knowledge of the Olbionites of the Greek poetry went no further. Other poets were not known to them even by name. This is because, says Dion, the Olbionites are so blinded by Homer's renown that they do not even suppose that there could be any other poet. Homer's verses had to be learned and recited even by the pupils of the sculptors.

The Black Sea Greeks had their poets, too. From another fragmentary Chersonese inscription of the Roman period we learn that there was a contest at Chersonese for heralds, trumpeteers and poets. It tells that in one of such contests the winners were a poet who wrote epigrams, two poets who presented the best paean songs, and, perhaps, either one poet or one actor of comedies.

One Chersonese man of the Roman period, named Xanthos, who was called on his epitaph a man well-versed in the Muses, perhaps, also wrote verses.²⁴ A monument at Panticapaeum with a picture of a lyre and a book-box, perhaps, commemorates a poet.²⁵

Dion Chrysostomos bears witness that there were local poets at Olbia even in the period of its decline by saying: "It is true, their poets mention only Homer in their verses which they read on all kinds of occasions, and especially before the battle they rouse with their verses the people."

A considerable number of the Greek verses written by the people of the Black Sea region has reached us, some of them engraved on stone tablets or carved on the graphite ceramic works. Some of them

²¹ *Tos PE*, 11, 197.

²² *Tos PE*, 1, 2, 348.

²³ *Tos PE*, 1, 2, 433.

²⁴ *Tos PE*, 1, 2, 482.

²⁵ *Antiquités du Bosphore Cimmerien*, 1, p. 279.

one way or the other touch the subject of the community games (verses written in honour of the winners, a hymn of Chersonese of the second century A.D. in honour of Hermes, the patron of the games and palestras), others are dedications, epitaphs, etc.²⁶ In one inscription from Panticapaeum of 97 A.D. King Kotys I is praised for his discovery of a spring of water, etc.²⁷

In the verses of the ancient Black Sea region we find, especially in the verses of the Roman period, a great number of borrowings from Homer, Hesiod, Tyrtaeus, Euripides, etc. This fact points out how well the inhabitants of the Black Sea region were acquainted with the Greek poetry. One can notice some ideas in the Black Sea region poetry which are not mere imitations.

The facts that we have given above, though they do not exhaust the subject, demonstrate beyond doubt that Ukraine was the outpost of Western civilization, starting not in the ninth century A.D., but at least from the eighth century B.C. The people of the Black Sea region in ancient times were not only passive recipients of the classic Greek culture, but they also contributed their mite to the treasury of that culture.

Let us remind ourselves of the cult of Artemis Tauropolos at Athens, of the Scythian philosopher and inventor Anacharsis, of the potters from the Black Sea region in Greece, of such political reformers as Isyllos from Bosphorus in Eupidauris, of Sphairos the Borystenite, or of the Bosphorian in Sparta, etc. That is why there is nothing surprising in the fact that Ukraine, having joined, from times immemorial, the cultural system of the Western countries, remained in contact with the West during the Kievan period of the Ukrainian princes and during all the later periods. The interrelation between Ukraine and the West in the classical period and during the Middle Ages and the Modern Period became the basic feature of the Ukrainian people, a vital influence in historical and cultural progresses which were closed to the Russians geographically distant in the isolated North.

²⁶ Tos PE, 1, 2, 436.

²⁷ Tos PE, 11, 37.



THE ROLE OF UKRAINE IN THE PRESENT FIVE-YEAR PLAN

By V. MARCHENKO

In March 1946 the Supreme Soviet of the USSR passed a law for a new five year plan for the improvement and the development of national economy of the USSR for 1946-50. In this plan there is a chapter devoted to the national economy of Ukraine.

Every previous five year plan had a basic idea which ran through all its programs. The first five year plan (1928-32) was dedicated to the transformation of the USSR from an agrarian to an industrial country and to the implanting of the socialist way of life in both city and country. The second five year plan (1933-37) had as its goal the strengthening of the rural economy and an increase in consumption. The third (1938-42) was to be the beginning of the accomplishment of the "basic economy task of the USSR," i.e., the task of catching up with and overtaking all capitalistic countries economically (not only technically as it was claimed before), and surpassing the most advanced capitalistic countries in the per capita production of the most important goods. The leading idea of the present five year plan (1946-50) is the reconstruction of the ruined economy and a surpassing of the prewar production by 48%, as well as the continuation of the basic economic task.¹

1. Heavy industry in the current five year plan

As in the previous plans, the most important place in the present five year plan is given to heavy industry as the technical basis for the upbuilding of general industry, agriculture and transportation. The

¹There is no doubt that behind this official five year plan there is a secret plan for the upbuilding of the military potential of the USSR. Some American economists question even the truthfulness of the published data of this new plan, in which the increase in the production of the goods for general consumption is stressed and little is said about the needs of the military industry. (Editor)

following table shows the role of Ukraine in 1950 in the production of the most important items of heavy industry.²

TABLE 1. PRODUCTION OF SOME BASIC ITEMS OF HEAVY INDUSTRY IN THE USSR AND THE UKRAINIAN SSR ACCORDING TO THE NEW FIVE YEAR PLAN.

Name of product	Will be produced in 1950		Percentage of production in Ukrainian SSR
	in USSR	in Ukr. SSR	
Coal (mil. tons)	250.0	86.1	34.4
Petroleum (mil. tons)	35.4	0.3	0.9
Pig iron (mil. tons)	19.5	9.7	49.7
Steel (mil. tons)	25.4	8.8	34.6
Electrical energy			
hours (bil. kw.)	82.0	13.7	16.7
Coke (mil. tons)	30.0	15.5	51.7
Cement (mil tons)	10.5	2.1	20.0
Metallurgical equipment			
(thousand of items)	74.0	6.0	8.1
Automobiles (thous. of items)	500.0	25.0	5.0
Locomotives	2200.0	1000.0	45.5
RR freight cars (thousands)	146.0	55.5	38.0
Tractors (thousands)	112.0	25.0	22.3
Metallurgical plant equip.			
(thous. tons)	102.9	35.0	34.0
Soda calc.	800.0	448.0	56.0

Although because of the war and transfer of the centers of industry to the East, the percentage of Ukrainian production in heavy industry has diminished, still in the new five year plan the role of Ukraine in the production of the basic items remains great, and in some cases its percentage of the total production is more than twice as large as the percent of the population of Ukraine in the total population of the USSR.

According to the plan, the Ukrainian production in heavy industry must increase in all fields, but it will scarcely surpass the prewar level. (The data for comparison are available only for 1937). One has to take also into account the fact that the absolute production of Ukraine in 1950 is increased because of the addition of the West Ukrainian lands to the USSR.

²The data for the current five year plan, which are given here and later are taken from the pamphlet: "The law of the five year plan for the reconstruction of the economy of the USSR for the year 1946-50," Ukrainian Publishing House for Political Literature, Kiev, 1946.

TABLE 2. PRODUCTION OF SOME BASIC ITEMS OF HEAVY INDUSTRY IN UKRAINE IN 1937 AND ACCORDING TO THE NEW FIVE YEAR PLAN.

Name of product	Produced in Ukr. SSR in 1937	Planned for Ukr. SSR for 1950	Increase per cent
Coal (mil. tons)	69.0	86.1	24.8
Pig iron (mil. tons)	8.8	9.7	10.2
Steel (mil. tons)	8.4	8.8	4.8
Electrical energy (bil. k-w hrs.)	9.3	13.7	47.3
Locomotives	880	1000	13.6

If it were possible to compare the planned production with the actual production of Ukraine in the last prewar year (i.e.e 1940) which in the new five year plan is used as the basic year almost without exceptions then the increase in the production of pig iron and steel would have been smaller, or would have been wiped out possibly, without taking into account the increase of the population. A calculation of the per capita production will give the clearest picture under such conditions. For this computation we accept the population of the Soviet Ukraine in 1937 as 29.5 millions. (Starting from the fact that according to the census of Jan. 17, 1939, the population was 30,960,000 and the coefficient of the natural increase for 1938 was 2.20.) On the same ratio the population of 1950 will be some 40 millions in which is included the population of Western Ukraine (8 mil.).

Further data show that even with the more conservative calculations the per capita production of pig iron planned for 1950 at 55 kg and of steel at 65 kg is smaller than in 1937. Nevertheless the per capita level of production of some of the basic items of the heavy industry of Ukraine remains quite high, as is obvious from the following comparisons.³

TABLE 3. PER CAPITA PRODUCTION OF SOME ITEMS OF HEAVY INDUSTRY.

Name of product	Ukrainian SSR		USSR	
	1937	Plan 1950	1937	Plan 1950
Coal (kg)	2340	2153	757	1290
Pig iron	298	243	86	93
Steel	285	220	105	121
Electrical energy (k-w hrs.)	315	343	215	390

³The data are taken from the speech of V. M. Molotov at the 18th convention of the Communist Party of the USSR in March 1939. cf. Statistical Symposium "Socialistic Construction of the USSR (1933-1938). Gosplanizdat, M-L. 1939, p. 26. From this source all the data for 1937 are taken.

The population of USSR for 1950 is accepted as equal to 210 millions. This is secured by accepting the Soviet official estimate for 1940 (193.5 millions adding the natural increase which should bring it to 222.5 millions in 1950 and allowing for a loss of at least 10,000,000 during the war.)

Apparently the per capita production of coal, pig iron and steel in Ukraine is to be diminished in 1950 and the production of all four items for the entire USSR is to be increased. In spite of this Ukraine surpasses the per capital production of the USSR in coal, pig iron, and steel. In 1937 she also excelled Japan, France, Great Britain, Germany and in the production of pig iron even the United States of America. (298 kg per capita in Ukraine, 292 in the USA).

The plan proposes the reconstruction of the metallurgical plants of the Donbas and Dnieper territory, the Dnieper hydroelectric station and the coal industry of the Donbas. According to the current information the Dnieper dam was to be finished by the end of 1948, the locks repaired and the water communication by the Dnieper completely reopened.

During the five years there are to be built and put in operation in Ukraine thirty high furnaces with a total capacity of 9 mil. tons of pig iron annually; a number of steel mills with a total annual production of 77.5 mil. tons and also mines with a potential annual production of 77.5 mil. tons of coal. This signifies that the whole coal and metallurgical industry was ruined by the war and now is to be reconstructed.

It is planned to continue simultaneously the search for the useful minerals in Ukraine. The attempts to find profitable oil deposits in Ukraine will not be abandoned. Oil drilling was begun in 1934 near Romny. The industrial deposits of iron ore in Kryvy Rih also are to be investigated and are supposed to produce 450 mil. tons, the manganese mines 75 mil. tons, potassium salt 80 mil. tons, graphite 7.7 mil. tons, gypsum 7 mil. tons.

The coal mines are to be prepared for the potential production of 73 mil. tons. In the regions west of Dnieper exploration is planned for the opening of soft coal mines. The soft coal production is scheduled to reach 6 mil. tons in 1950. In the Azov-Black Sea and Drohobych regions it is planned to explore for natural gas. New drillings for oil are supposed to increase the production of petroleum also in the western regions.

It is further planned to reconstruct the chemical plants (soda, nitrogen, superphosphates) and bring the production of superphosphates to 860 thousand tons annually; to restore the potassium mines in the Stanislaviv and Drohobych regions, and it is also proposed to reconstruct the plants for machine building, especially for the coal, metallurgical and power industries; the plants for locomotives and railroad car construction, and also those supplying the electrical plants are planned to be increased in 1946-50 by 2.6 mil. kw.

The most prominent among the planned constructions are: the gas pipe Dashava-Kiev, a heavy truck factory with the yearly capacity of 60,000 trucks, two automobile assembly plants, a superphosphate plant, a plant for plastics, a great soda mine in the Donbas, and also a net of small hydroelectric stations with a capacity of 203 thous. kw. for the requirements of agriculture and local consumption. A new base for heavy machine construction is also to be built in the Donbas.

Special attention has to be given in the new plan to Western Ukraine, especially to the city of Lviv. The latter is to be changed into a great Ukrainian industrial center. In this city are planned an automobile assembly plant, plants for telephone and telegraph apparatus, iron works, a knitted goods factory, plants for food industry and an expansion of the city electrical plant. A chemical industry will be created in the Stanislaviv and Drohobych regions. Carpatho-Ukraine is to obtain help for the reconstruction of agriculture and agricultural industry.⁴

The pace of industrialization of the Soviet Union after the war became slower. In 1932 (the end of the first five year plan) the production was equal to 43.3 bil. rubles; in 1937 (the end of the second five year plan) it was 95.9 bil. rubles (i.e. an increase of 120% during five years). According to the third five year plan the production was to be amount to 180 bil. rubles in 1942. However, in reality it reached before the war (1940) only 138.5 bil. rubles and now in 1950 it is to rise to 205 bil. rubles (i.e. an increase of 48%, including the war years). This small increase is due to the impact of the war and the difficulties of the return of industry to peace conditions. One has to remember that Ukraine suffered the most from the ravages of war.

As in the plans of the prewar years, the new five year plan assumed the task of "further augmenting the defensive potential of the USSR

⁴ The iron curtain separating Western Ukraine from the West does not give us the possibility of ascertaining how much truth and how much propaganda there is in these plans. (Ed.)

and equipping the armed forces of the Soviet Union with the newest military weapons." However, there is no specific information on this subject in the Soviet publications.

2. Light industry in the current five year plan

The new five year plan has also the task of increasing the production of light industry, of supplying the needs of the population—i.e. the task of supplying in the country sufficient basic objects of consumption. In Ukraine the plan is specifically concerned with the food industry. The production in the latter field in 1950 is supposed to reach the value of 4.4 bil. rubles (in the stable prices of 1926-27). It is planned to recondition the old and to build a number of new sugar refineries, with the capacity of utilizing 67 mil. tons of sugar beets annually. The distilleries of alcohol, plants for vegetable oil and canned goods production will also be reconditioned and new ones constructed. It is planned to build 55 meat packing plants, 33 freezing plants, 97 chicken farms, 46 dairies and 100 butter and cheese factories.

As in the prewar years, in the new plan attention is paid to the development of medium and small industries of a republic and local character in order to utilize the local types of raw materials or the surpluses after the requirements of the large plants are satisfied. This tendency of helping the small industry, which seemingly is contrary to the well known thesis of Soviet socialism on the importance of large centralized industrial complexes was the result of the realization that there was an extraordinary lack of consumer goods. This was due to the almost complete absorption of the Soviet industrial potential by the requirements of the further industrialization and militarization. The local initiative in the limits of the strict Soviet realities, has the task, according to the Soviet economic policy, of relieving the hunger for consumer goods. The role of Ukraine in the production of some items of food is evident from table 4.

TABLE 4. PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN ITEMS OF THE FOOD INDUSTRY IN THE USSR AND UKRAINIAN SSR ACCORDING TO THE NEW PLAN.

Name of product	Will be produced in 1950		Part of the Ukrainian production in the total USSR per cent
	in USSR	in Ukr. SSR	
	in thousand tons		
Sugar	2400	1637	68.2
Meat	1300	245	18.8
Butter	275	40	14.5
Fish	2200	80	3.6

The relative importance of the Ukrainian sugar industry, according to the plan, will diminish in comparison with the prewar status. The reason for this lies in the results of the war and the gradual transfer of the industry to Kazakstan which had already started before the war. A large number of meat plants will be built in the Middle Asia—in localities rich in cattle. The development of fishing in the Pacific ocean is especially stressed.

If we assume that the population of Ukraine at the end of the five year plan will be 40 mil., then the per capita production of these food products will be: meat—6.1 kg, butter—1 kg, fish—2 kg. (corresponding numbers for the whole USSR: meat 6.2 kg, butter 1.3 kg, fish 10.5 kg.)

In the present five year plan there are no separate data on the production of clothing and footwear in Ukraine. From the data of the whole USSR it is obvious that the production will not satisfy the requirements of the Soviet population (Table 5).

TABLE 5. THE PRODUCTION OF TEXTILES AND FOOTWEAR IN THE SOVIET UNION.

Name of product	Produced		Will be produced in 1950
	in 1932	in 1937	
Cotton (mil. meters)	2,694.0	3,447.7	4,686.0
Wool (mil. meters)	98.7	108.3	159.4
Footwear (leather & rubber) (mil. pairs)	94.5	205.9	328.6
Stockings a. socks (mil. pairs)	208.0	409.1	580.0

When in 1937 there was 21 meters of cotton goods per capita, in 1950 there will be about 22.3 m. In 1937 there were 65 centimeters of woolen materials per person; in 1950 this quantity is supposed to be equal to 75 cm. There was 1.2 pairs of footwear per person in 1937, in 1950 this will increase to 1.5 pairs, including shoes, rubbers and sportswear. There will be only 2.5—2.7 pairs of socks or stockings per person.

The population of Ukraine will be provided, as one can suspect, with still lower quotas, due to the Soviet system of supplying first the large populated centers and industrial areas.

Furthermore the new cotton factories in Siberia and Central Asia are nearer to the source of supplies. The supplying of the population by means of imports is wholly exceptional.

It appears that the task of new plan "to provide an ample quan-

tivity of basic products of consumption" and "securing the material well-being of the people of the USSR" (and in Ukraine) is not met by any positive measures or values in the plan. The standard of living will be the same as in the previous years.

3. Agriculture in the current five year plan

In 1937 the proportion of the cultivated area of Ukraine was 18% of the whole of the USSR; the proportion of the area sown of grains was equal to 17.4%, that of wheat to 15.5%. Ukraine produced 22% of the total crops of wheat of the whole USSR, 66% of sugar beet and a considerable part of other industrial crops.

Unfortunately the new five year plan characterizes the role of Ukrainian agriculture in the agriculture of the USSR only by presenting the data of the sown areas, without any data on production. The total sown area proposed for Ukraine for 1950 will be 30.5 mil. ha (in 1937 there were 25.1 mil. ha and in 1928—24.9 mil. ha). From this area 19.6 mil. ha will be devoted to grain, or 64.2% of the total sown area. In 1937 this percentage was 72.5 and in 1928—78.8%. Thus the previous tendency of the Soviet agricultural policies in Ukraine, namely to diminish the area in grain and the utilization of the area thus freed for industrial and forage crops, is being continued in the new plan. The absolute area under forage crops (5.4 mil. ha) in 1950 will be equal to the combined areas of industrial (2.6 mil. ha) and truck crops (2.8 mil. ha). There is no mention in the new plan of rice and cotton on which the former plans laid stress. The area sown to sugar beet will be 830 thous. ha (in 1937—718 thous. ha), the area under sunflower—801 thous. ha. It is also planned to increase the area of vineyards of European varieties.

The percentage of total Ukrainian sown area to that of the entire USSR area in 1950 will increase to 19.2%, and in the area sown to grains to 18.5%. This increase, however, is due to great degree to the addition of the Western lands of the Ukrainian SSR in 1945.

In the neighborhood of the large cities, as Kharkiv, Kiev and the industrial centers of the Donbas, the reconstruction and enlargement of the potato, fruit and animal industries is planned. This is in order to provide these centers with potatoes, fruits and, to a great degree, with milk and meat of local production. The plan assumes a development of individual and collective horticultural, poultry and bee-keeping enterprises among the Soviet workers and officials. In this

respect the new five year plan continues the tendency which was shown already in 1937-38, after difficulties arose with a too centralized agriculture and supply.

Consequently the chief basic aim of the Soviet agricultural policy in Ukraine lies in the intensification of field crops, the adjustment of agriculture to the requirements of light industry and fodder industry.

Because of the absence in the five year plan of direct production data for Ukraine, one has turn to those given for the whole USSR. The grain crops and cotton production in the Soviet Union in 1950 is supposed to be 127 mil. tons obtained from 105.7 mil. ha with an average production of 12 double centners per ha. In 1937 the most productive year since the commencement of collectivization the total crops of these products in the USSR was 120.3 mil. tons from 104.4 mil. ha, with an average production of 11.5 double centners per ha. Table 6 gives the data for the recent period.

TABLE 6. TOTAL CROPS AND PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN CULTURES IN THE USSR.

Name of crop	Harvested (mil. tons)			Production in double centners per ha		
	1932	1937	plan for 1950	1932	1937	plan for 1950
Grains	69.9	120.3	127.0	7.0	11.7	12.0
Sugar beet	6.6	21.9	26.0	42.7	183.1	190.0
Raw cotton	1.3	2.9	3.1	6.9 ⁵	14.8	18.4
Flax fibre	0.5	0.6	0.8	1.6	4.6	
Sunflower			3.7	4.3	6.4	10.0

If we compare the proposed average production of grains in 1950 (12 double centners) with the actual average production in 1928-1932 and 1933-1937 (7.5 and 9.1 double centners respectively) and if we remember that the average production of grain in the whole world does not surpass 9.5-10.5 double centners one can easily see that the new plan imposes great and scarcely attainable objectives for the Kolhosp farmers.

If we estimate the population of the USSR in 1937 as 164 mil. then there were 730 kg of grain per capita at that time. In 1950 this will be reduced tot only 604.8 kg. per person. All these goals of the current five year plan are to be achieved principally through the

⁵ First number in irrigated fields.

improvement of agricultural technique, further mechanization of agriculture, building of new machine-tractor stations; secondly through the sharpening of the collectivistic spirit in agriculture and the raising of the labor discipline of the peasants in the Kolhosps.⁶

In the new plan the increase of animal production is compared with that of 1945—the year of the lowest ebb of the cattle raising (just after the end of the war). In 1950 the number of cattle in the USSR in comparison with 1945 will be increased as follows: horses by 46%, cattle by 39%, sheep and goats by 75%, hogs by 200%. The absolute numbers of 1950 are given only in the plans for the separate union republics. The totalling of other data gives the total for 1950, which is to be: horses 15.3 mil. heads, cattle 65.3 mil., sheep and goats 121 mil., hogs 31.3 mil.

It is a known fact that after collectivization of agriculture the number of farm animals in the Soviet Republic considerably diminished in spite of all the efforts of the state and party leadership, it has increased very slowly. At the beginning of 1939, at the last Congress of the Communist party, Stalin compared the contemporary (1938) status with that of 1916, i.e. of the third year of World War I, and stated that the number of some animals falls even below prerevolutionary numbers. The data for the whole period since 1916 are given in Table 7.

TABLE 7. NUMBER OF FARM ANIMALS IN THE USSR.

Type of animals	Number of heads (mil. heads)						Numbers	
	1916	1933	1938	Plan 1950		1938 ⁷	Plan 1950	
				Total	Without new Republics			
Horses	35.8	16.6	17.5	15.3	14.0	105	73	
Cattle	60.6	38.4	63.2	65.3	61.7	380	311	
Sheep and goats	121.2	50.2	102.5	121.5	118.2	615	580	
Hogs	20.9	12.1	30.6	31.3	28.7	183	149	

It is apparent that in 1950, if the plan is fulfilled, the USSR will have 57.3% less horses than it had in 1916 and 12% less than it had in 1938. The number of sheep and goats will scarcely reach the pre-revolutionary level. The number of heads of cattle in 1950 will be decreased 8% and the number of hogs will be 50% more than before

⁶In practice it means further exploitation of the Ukrainian peasants without giving them anything in return. (Editor)

⁷Population at the beginning of 1938 estimated at 166.6 million.

the revolution, but this is only 3.3% and 2.2% more than before the last war.

If for greater accuracy we exclude the new republics (Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Karelo-Finnish) but include Western Ukraine plus White Ruthenia, which cannot be separated in the plan, we observe that in 1950 the prewar (1938) level will be reached, except in the case of sheep and goats. The number of heads per 1000 population will be smaller in 1950 than in 1938.

Somewhat better results are shown in the plan for Ukraine (Table 8).

TABLE 8. NUMBER OF FARM ANIMALS IN THE UKRAINIAN SSR.

Type of animals	Absolute numbers (mil. heads)			Heads of animals		Comparison (1937-1950) per cent
	1932	1937	Plan 1950	Per. 1000 pop. 1937	Plan 1950	
Horses	2.4	2.9	2.6	98	65	-33.7
Cattle	4.0	7.8	12.2	264	305	-15.5
Sheep and goats	1.5	3.3	6.8	112	170	+52.0
Hogs	2.7	7.7	9.6	261	240	+8.1

Because of the great total increase of the number of heads of cattle in Ukraine the relative quantity per 1000 population will be equal to that of the whole USSR. The number of sheep and goats will increase absolutely and relatively. Although the number of hogs will relatively decrease by 8%, it still will be considerably higher than the average level for the whole USSR. Consequently the value of Ukraine in the cattle production of the whole USSR will be equal to 18.7% and in the hog production to 30.8%.

4. Other aspects of the plan

The new five year plan estimates the extent of the capital works for 1941-1950 in the USSR to amount to 250.3 bil. rubles and in Ukraine to 49.5 bil. rubles (according to prices of 1945). The sum of 5.5 bil. rub. taken from the Ukrainian treasury is also included in the latter number. Therefore the part which Ukraine plays in the total expenditures of the USSR is equal to 19.8%. When we take into account the almost complete destruction of property in Ukraine, we cannot consider the amount of the expenditures assigned to Ukraine as adequate. This indicates that the Soviet government from political

reasons does not want to achieve the full reconstruction of ruined Ukraine.

An other portion of the plan is concerned with the railroad, water and truck transportation. After the five years the capacity of transportation on the old roads is to be equal to the prewar level; that on the new roads listed in the plan must increase still further. Many of the roads listed in the plan traverse the whole Ukraine (such as Donbas-Kryvy Rih, Moscow-Kiev-Lviv and others). The highways Moscow-Kharkiv and those connecting Ukrainian cities with the cities of Northern Caucasus and Crimea are to be reconstructed. The problem of adaption of the smaller Ukrainian rivers for the local transportation, the production of electricity, water-works, fisheries etc., which for a long time attracted the attention of the planning organs of Ukraine are scarcely mentioned in the new plan.

According to the new plan, the ruined cities and towns of Ukraine, such as Kiev, Kharkiv, Chernyhiv, Dnipropetrovsk and others are to be reconstructed during the five years of the plan. Kiev will have a television center. Regional stations, machine-tractor stations, radhosps, etc., will be completely supplied with telephones.⁸

The economic Potential of Ukraine at present

Even before the World War II there was a tendency in the Soviet Union to transport the heavy industry to the Central Asiatic regions of the USSR, to the regions less vulnerable to the attack of modern weapons. During the war this tendency became still stronger. Not only many plants from Ukraine were transported to the Urals, Siberia and Kazakstan, but with the help of the allies new plants were built. Many of the evacuated Ukrainian plants were not returned to the original places.

As a result there was a considerable weakening of the economic potential of Ukraine and a diminishing of the economic value of Ukraine in the whole USSR, in spite of the fact that the Ukrainian territories were increased through the addition of the Western Ukrainian lands, formerly under Poland, Czechoslovakia and Rumania.

⁸ There is a special sum of 34 bil. rubles in the expenditure of the USSR for the reconstruction of those regions of the Russian USSR which were under enemy occupation. But there are no analogous sums mentioned in the plan of the reconstruction of the regions of the Ukrainian, White Ruthenian and other Soviet republics which suffered destruction during the war. It is a known fact that only a small portion of the Russian SSR was under enemy occupation, while the entire republics of Ukraine and White Ruthenia were occupied by the enemy and experienced a most severe devastation. The reason for this is obvious. (Editor)

This is obvious from the relative value of Ukraine in the economy of the USSR before the war (1937) and in the new five year plan (Table 9).

TABLE 9. PRODUCTION OF UKRAINE IN RELATION TO THE WHOLE USSR.

Name of product	Production (per cent)	
	1937	1950
Coal	60.6	34.4
Pig iron	60.8	49.7
Steel	47.8	34.6
Electrical energy	25.7	16.7
Sugar	78.0	68.2
Cattle	15.2	18.7
Hogs	30.0	30.7

The production of grain remains on the same level, as well as that of cattle and hogs. In other words, the Soviet Government gradually is moving industry from Ukraine to the East, and leaving Ukraine as a predominantly agricultural country. The reconstruction of the Soviet industry is proceeding outside the boundaries of Ukraine. Thus Russia is becoming economically self-sufficient. There is no doubt that there are political reasons behind this action of the Kremlin.



UKRAINIAN CULTURE AND MOSCOW IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

By CLARENCE A. MANNING

THE seventeenth century was an important period in Ukrainian history. The inertia and quietism that had hung over the land and the people since the loss of Kievan independence had begun to break late in the sixteenth century and a new spirit of enterprise had started not only by the development of the Zaporozhian Kozaks and their raids even on the suburbs of Constantinople but by the foundation of various schools by some of the Orthodox nobles and the brotherhoods of the various cities.

To the modern mind this cultural revival was limited, for it failed to take into account much of the new knowledge that was already being accumulated in the countries of Western Europe. It was severely religious in its content but this was the period of the religious wars in the West when Catholic and Protestant were arrayed against each other in a bloody and ruthless series of conflicts which continued until the end of the Thirty Years War in 1648. Ukrainian cultural movement proceeded and developed under the two poles—of Polish Catholic culture and the dependence upon Orthodox Constantinople and Mount Athos. It is this two influences that gave the seventeenth century Ukrainian culture its chief guidance and created its limitations.

From the time when Christianity appeared in Kiev, the Byzantine influence had been strong. The Byzantine Church, whether directly or through the Balkan Slavic peoples and clergy, had been the pattern on which Kievan Christian culture had been founded. Now Constantinople was in the hands of the Turks who were riding roughshod over all the Christian prejudices. The Patriarch of Constantinople was almost helpless. He was dependent upon the Sultan for his post and during the seventeenth century there were fifty five Patriarchs, some of whom had held the dangerous post five or six times. Under such conditions, the Patriarchate was too busy with the task of preserving the lives of its own members to have the time, energy or resources to furnish to the resurgent Ukrainian culture wise and trained teachers. Far too often the representatives of the Patriarch arrived in Ukraine merely to collect funds and were all too ready to swing their influence in what seemed to them the most profitable way. At home they were

busy seeking a proper course between the influences of the Catholic and Protestant ambassadors at the court of the Sultan and in maintaining a precarious existence. It is small wonder that influential groups of Ukrainians lost all hope that the Patriarch would be able to help them in their problems.

The contact with Constantinople was an important factor and it turned the Ukrainian eyes to the south. It emphasized the importance of the intervening states, Moldavia and Wallachia, which were in a vague way vassal states of Turkey. For this entire area Kiev was the most important city and this fact gave the post of Hetman of Ukraine a rank and a dignity that cannot be overlooked. It was only natural therefore that Khmelnytsky should have sought to marry his son to a Moldavian princess to facilitate the task of building up a great Orthodox state which might eventually include the oppressed Christians of the Ottoman Empire.

But the Western culture was equally attractive. In Poland it was antiquated, if judged by the Western standards of the day. Polish education at the time was largely in the hands of the Jesuits and while they had done a great work in checking the advance of Protestantism without bloodshed or war, their colleges were still following a late mediaeval form of scholasticism with many Renaissance features that had long been abandoned in the Catholic countries of the West. The instruction in the schools was largely in Latin. The students were trained in artificial eulogies, in stereotyped miracle plays and school dramas, in long winded oratory, and in the creation of syllabic poetry based on French models and more or less adapted to the Polish language. Both Polish culture and the Polish political system were in a condition of decline, as the Polish nobles lost their sense of patriotic responsibility and contributed to a growing anarchy.

It was under these conditions that Peter Mohyla as Metropolitan of Kiev developed his famous College which was destined to be the leading Orthodox educational institution during the seventeenth century. Mohyla himself was typical of this dualism that confronted the Ukrainian revival. He was by origin a Moldavian but closely connected with Ukrainian life. He was well educated and had some knowledge of the West. His great work was the creation of a special form of Orthodox Scholasticism which spread rapidly throughout the entire Orthodox world. By the time of his death in 1647 he was easily one of the imposing figures of the Orthodox church and his writings were accepted as standard works by the Eastern Patriarchs. He had sought

a balance between the two influences and it was his choice that had stamped the reviving Ukrainian culture with its definite mark.

It will be noticed that here was no influence exerted from Moscow upon Kievan culture. Muscovite Orthodoxy consisted largely of grandiloquent claims that Moscow and its tsar was the centre of the Christian world, the Third Rome, which was to be obeyed rather than questioned. The Patriarch of Moscow was far more interested in securing recognition as the acknowledged head of Orthodoxy, since he was the supreme ecclesiastic in the one independent Orthodox country, than he was in any form of Christian thought or study. The tsar was only interested in extending his dominion to the West and rescuing the people along his western border from the "pagan" (non-Muscovite) rule of his neighbors. The occupation of the Kremlin by the Poles and Kozaks in the early years of the century had shown to a few of the leaders the need for a remodeling of the country but the vast majority of the Muscovites could not understand this. They had no use for the Greeks, they despised the Kievan scholars, and they hated the Poles. They were no more inclined to progress than they had been a century earlier when the clergy and people of Moscow had forced Ivan the Terrible to give up his attempt to establish a printing press in Moscow. They realized the defects of their Church books but they were determined that these would be corrected by correct books already existing in Moscow rather than by any contact with the outside world. It was unsafe for a foreigner of any nationality to wear foreign clothes in the Russian capital and he was forbidden by imperial edict to wear native costume, lest he be mistaken for a Muscovite and receive some unwitting blessing from a Muscovite ecclesiastic.

Life in Moscow was a sealed book as far as the average Ukrainian or other Westerner was concerned. There were few visitors to the capital and fewer of these returned with any happy picture of conditions there. There were few Muscovites who went abroad, for they did not wish nor were they allowed to travel lest they corrupt their Orthodoxy by contact with sinful foreigners. In a word there was then as now an iron curtain over the Muscovite lands, which was chiefly pierced by travelers from further East rather than from the West.

This very air of mystery which hung over their eastern neighbor was able to impress some of the more unthinking and fanatical people. They realized that the military power of Moscow was increasing and that the country under the rule of the early Romanovs had recovered in large part from the chaos into which it had fallen in the early part

of the century. They knew too that Moscow was fanatically Orthodox and with growing ill feeling between the Ukrainians and the Poles, it seemed as if they could find some support in their religious complications in the Russian capital.

It was this combination of military power and Orthodox faith that served as the one allurements for the Ukrainians in the troubled situation in which they found themselves. It was an allurements that impressed some of the ignorant Kozaks and it appealed likewise to the more narrow minded among the monks. It held small attraction for the more scholarly and more politically minded among both the Kozaks and the clergy. The former were well aware that Moscow had no place for those liberties to which they attached so much importance in their struggle with the Poles. The latter realized that the system of Moscow was applied as well to the clergy as to the boyars and that all those privileges of clerical autonomy, of writing and of publishing which were held by the higher clergy of Kiev and the other dioceses were entirely preempted by the Patriarch who governed the Church and the clergy exactly as the tsar governed the state.

It was probably no more coincidence that the first definite influence of the Muscovite group that desired further contact with the West was exerted at the time of the revolt of Khmelnytsky. In the very year when it commenced (1648) there was published in Moscow an edition of the Grammar of Melety Smotrytsky which had appeared in Ukraine in 1619. It was changed somewhat to flatter the Muscovite feelings but fundamentally it was the same book which had been used in the Kievan schools for nearly thirty years.

Then after Khmelnytsky had won triumph after triumph over the Poles, he returned to Kiev and among the distinguished visitors who came to greet him was Paisios, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who was making a journey to Moscow to collect alms for his needy flock and it was Paisios who seems to have encouraged the Hetman to include Moscow in his range of possible allies.

The visit of Paisios to Moscow was still more fruitful of results. There he not only came into contact with Tsar Alexis but also with the rising young leader of the broader minded Muscovites, Nikon, later to be the greatest and strongest and most independent of all Moscow Patriarchs. At this time he consecrated Nikon as Archbishop of Novgorod, the one sec in the Muscovite realm which almost inevitably had contact with the Western world.

At the same time Paisios undoubtedly said a good word for the

Kievan scholars, for in the same year (1649) for the first time a special invitation was sent to Kiev for two monks to visit Moscow and work on the correction of the Church book. The men thus asked were Arseny Satanovsky and Damaskin Ptitsky. The latter did not go at once but in his stead Epifany Slavinetsky made the journey and remained in Moscow the rest of his life.

This was the cultural turning point in the cultural relations of Moscow and Kiev. In the beginning Slavinetsky and his associate were received very definitely as foreigners and for many years they were able to do little but to act as ecclesiastical translators and to prepare extracts from the Bible and the Church Fathers and also to compile short introductions to the works which they had translated. Moscow would not allow them to do anything more.

Still as Nikon rose to power and after he became Patriarch, in 1652 he broadened the scope of their activities and he dared to face popular disapproval by adding to the number of the Kievan scholars whom he consulted at least one man who had even been in Rome. Popular discontent rose rapidly at such intolerable levity on the part of the Patriarch but Nikon had the backing of Tsar Alexis and he persevered in his work. In a few years there was a continuous procession of Kievan scholars going to Moscow and they secured almost complete control of Russian theological education. The students of the Academy of Mohyla in Kiev still speaking and writing Church Slavic in the Ukrainian and not in the Great Russian manner came to be the arbiters of Muscovite theological thought and later when it desired to start a school in Moscow, the curriculum of the Academy of Kiev was transferred to the Slav-Latin-Greek School of Moscow. As in Kiev, all instruction was in Latin. As in Kiev, the Orthodox Scholasticism of Peter Mohyla became the standard of the new Muscovite theological thought and the old Muscovite ideas were confined to the reactionary groups of the Old Believers who called Nikon Antichrist and increased their fanaticism and their isolationism as they were forced out of leading posts in the church service.

Tsar Alexis in this movement was moved not only by religious and intellectual motives. It had a shrewd political side, for it won adherents for Moscow among some of the more educated of the Kievan clergy who had previously looked askance at the severe nationalistic Orthodoxy of the Russians. The failure of the Kievan school to develop a vernacular literature was now painfully evident in the fact that these men were able with the tsar's protection to feel themselves at home in

the Russian capital and could slur over in their own work the differences between their native Ukrainian and their adopted Muscovite speech.

They added a new influence which was able to grow continuously stronger after the treaty of alliance between Khmelnytsky and the Kozaks with the Tsar in 1654. They thus unwittingly and often innocently served as the agents of Moscow in penetrating into Ukraine, for the enlarged opportunities for work which they found in the Russian capital encouraged more and more of the graduates of the Kiev Academy to seek opportunities for leaving their own country.

It was not long before the Kievan influence in Moscow began to spread to other cultural fields. In 1664 Simeon Polotsky, a White Ruthenian educated in Kiev, went to the capital to become the tutor of the tsar's children. It was not long before he broadened his conceptions and he made himself the first court poet of Moscow.

By the end of the seventeenth century, the entire apparatus of the Kievan revived culture had been transplanted to Moscow. Long before the reforms of Peter the Great began, the Kievan scholars had secured for themselves commanding roles in all fields of cultural work. It proved disastrous for Ukraine. The division of the country between Russia and Poland which took place in 1667 created an abnormal situation and this was further increased when finally the tsars were able to put pressure upon the Patriarch of Constantinople to place the Metropolitan of Kiev under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Moscow. This was carried through against the wishes of the Orthodox clergy of Ukraine by the efforts of the Hetman Samoylovich who was himself helpless before the Russian demands. It meant the end of the independent work of the Kiev Academy which was now deprived of most of its special privileges and left dependent upon the will of the capital. It was soon forbidden to publish any books without the approval of Moscow and this added to the power of the tsars to drain off from Ukraine its leading scholars and thinkers. The process was only accelerated when both Poland and Moscow combined to strengthen the boundary which they set up along the banks of the Dnieper River and divide the unfortunate country into two halves.

It was not only in the field of literature but in the field of art as well that this imitation of Kiev by Moscow took place. The last of the great Hetmans, Ivan Mazepa, used his enormous wealth for a great period of architectural development in Ukraine. Fully conscious of the Ukrainian relationship to the West, he set himself to restore the

old churches of the mediaeval period and to build new ones and for this his architects employed a style of Ukrainian Baroque which was borrowed from the West again through Poland. Under his regime as never before or since there had come a combination of the contemporary European as well as Ukrainian styles of art. Engravers, painters, and other masters flocked to his court at Baturyn.

That was enough for the Russian overlords and in the course of the same half century which saw the flowering of the Ukrainian Baroque, this too was transplanted to the neighborhood of Moscow. The boyar families that were interested in the Westernization of the country and were willing to protect and encourage the Ukrainian scholars applied the same zeal to the acclimation of all other forms of art that had been developed in Ukraine.

This wholesale acceptance of Ukrainian culture by the progressive circles of Moscow was an important phase in the opening of the Great Russians to western influences for its Orthodox religious character rendered it more palatable to the Muscovite prejudices than the more frankly Western culture of the German Suburb in which at the time all foreigners were gathered. The ideas and works of Smotrytsky, of Mohyla and of Simeon Polotsky remained the fundamental sources for Great Russian practice until the middle of the eighteenth century when Lomonosov undertook the task of placing Russian grammar and literature on a definitely Western and German basis. In the meantime the Russian schools taught Russian out of Ukrainian grammars (or rather Ukrainian Church Slavic grammars) and still later the same material was used for the early instruction and revival of the Balkan Slavs. There was something that approximated the grotesque in this situation for it came at a period when the Russians were beginning to accept the theory that there was no such thing as a Ukrainian people or language and to emphasize their old belief that Moscow and later St. Petersburg was the sole source of knowledge and of culture.

Their refusal to recognize the contributions of Kiev which they were daily using was still more intensified by their apprehensions following the joining of Mazepa and Ukraine with Charles XII of Sweden in an effort to secure liberty from Muscovite rule. As a consequence of the Kozak uprising under the Hetman, Peter the Great ruthlessly ordered that his name and services should be summarily blotted out. The inscriptions which he had placed upon the churches that he had restored or built were destroyed and everything possible was done to blacken his memory and that of his people. Russian

scholars who had previously condemned the introduction of Kievan ideas because they were foreign now strove to support these ideas because they were native to Moscow and were only in some mysterious way domiciled in Kiev, if they were ever free.

The new Muscovite fashion was the equally thorough acceptance of the ideas of Western Europe and especially of Holland, France and Germany. The role of Ukraine and of Poland was derided and Peter with his efforts to secularize the whole of Russian civilization had no further use for the Patriarch of Constantinople. With the help of Theophan Prokopovich, at one time the head of the Mohyla Academy, he turned his back not only on the ideas of the old Moscow but of the revived Kiev from which Moscow had already learned so much. He sought now to make Russia a model of Western life and of Western learning but he took care at the same time not to relax a particle of that old Muscovite autocracy which had been so entirely lacking in the Kiev of a century before. His restrictions and regulations put an end to the intellectual development of Ukraine and completed the debacle which had been started when Ukraine was divided between Moscow and Poland.

As a result the Ukrainian cultural revival was unable to continue its progress. The institutions of the Hetman state were ignored or abolished and Ukraine entered the eighteenth century under a far more hopeless oppression than it had been under the Polish rule at the beginning of the sixteenth century with nothing but the disappointed hopes of the past to maintain its life for nearly a century. Then with the publication of the *Eneida* of Kotlyarevsky in the vernacular, the way was open for the Ukrainian revival to commence again, partly along the lines of Kiev and partly with the ideas of the late eighteenth century.

It was a brilliant and a depressing century and we can only wonder what would have been the tangible effects, if in the early seventeenth century the Ukrainians had had the insight to base their work not on the old Church Slavic system of writing but on the language of the people. It would have brought together more closely the literate classes and the masses and would have made for a more unified national sentiment which could not have been so easily split up to suit the enemies of the land. That was not to be at the time and Ukraine was compelled to pay a heavy price for this omission.

Yet this movement was not a failure any more than the heroic struggles of the various Hetmans to build up an independent state.

It had not produced any outstanding works of literature. It had been largely the work of scholars and monks and only the Brotherhoods had taken a prominent part in supplying the necessary funds. But it had revived the spirit of the tradition of ancient Kiev and restored the self respect of the Ukrainian people. It had created again a consciousness of their national identity and of their national solidarity. It had turned them away from a tacit acceptance of the role picked out for them by Poland. All this work which seemed to be lost and forgotten was the material out of which the modern Ukrainian movement started and to-day, as never before, we can see that it had taken a far firmer root than was believed even by the men who had worked in it, for it had furnished that transitional period which was necessary to bridge the gap of centuries between the days of the old Kievan state and the present time. In their own way and often without their thought the scholars of the Mohyla Academy were playing their part as well as the Hetmans and the Kozaks and with all their limitations they will hold an honorable place in the history of a restored and free Ukraine. They are the living proof of the falsity of the Russian claims to cultural supremacy and originality and as such they must not be forgotten at a time when Moscow is once again asserting its utter superiority to all persons at all times. They are the living proof that just as Moscow took its European concepts from Kiev in the ancient period, even though it sacked the city in 1169, so the modern Russian Empire found in Kiev those European ideas that started its superficial adaptation to the modern, western European culture. When the world recognizes this fact, it can begin to see again the Ukrainian question in its true perspective and can estimate properly the importance to a free world of a free Ukraine.



THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

By ROMAN SMAL STOCKY

I. What is Genocide?

THE General Assembly of the UN in Paris last December accepted the Convention on Genocide. The President of the Assembly, Dr. Evatt, the representative of Australia, described it as an "epoch making event." But in the rather long negotiations of the Legal Commission of the General Assembly, which drafted the Convention, an active and vociferous participant was the Soviet delegate, Platon D. Morozov. That should be sufficient cause for the non-Russian nations, the victims of Soviet Moscow, to analyze this new international convention in order to discover the real reason why Stalin again signed an international treaty.

What is genocide? This new word, a mixture of Greek and Latin, is the newest legal term in International Law. It was originated by Prof. R. Lemkin, a noted scholar and international lawyer, in his book "*Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*," published by the Carnegie Endowment of International Law, Washington, 1944 (pages 79-95). One of the experts serving with the American judges at the Nuremberg trial, he had his legal concept included in the indictment and acted upon in the verdict. Of course, Soviet "judges" also participated in the proceedings on the side of the righteous, but the *Report* of Robert H. Jackson, United States representative to the Conference on Military Trials, is convincing proof that American and Soviet judges could not establish a common definition even for the term "murder"—the Soviets insisted it be limited to Nazi-crimes only.¹

In brief genocide means "race-murder" or "nation-murder." The Convention defines it as an act which is committed "with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, *as such*." (Please note the very important "as such.") Its operative clauses are short. Five acts constitute genocide: (1) killing members of the group; (2) causing them serious bodily or mental harm; (3) deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about their physical destruction; (4) taking measures to prevent birth

¹ Washington, D. C., United States Government Printing Office, 1949.

within the group; and (5) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

The Convention then says that persons committing any of these acts of genocide are to be punished, not only if they are public officials, but even if they are state rulers; that they are to be tried either by some "competent tribunal of the territory in which the act is committed," or alternatively by an international penal tribunal. Furthermore, genocide is not to be treated as a "political" crime (common usage forbids persons accused of political crimes to be extradited for trial in another state). Each contracting nation is to enact domestic legislation giving effect to the Convention. Any party, under the Charter, is to be able to call on the UN to take appropriate action against genocide. There is at present no international tribunal with penal jurisdiction, but the Assembly has asked the new International Law Commission of the UN to consider the desirability and possibility of establishing one.

This brief summary of the Genocide Convention requires the following remarks:

a) The enumeration of acts constituting genocide is based entirely on atrocities committed by the Nazis before and during the last war.

(b) Soviet atrocities—past and present—are completely disregarded.

(c) The words "as such," to which we have drawn attention, in our opinion, seem, from the juridical point of view, clearly intended to limit the law, to exclude from the new legal concept many Soviet crimes committed currently against non-Russian nationalities. Prof. J. L. Brearly, an English authority on international law, believes that the "as such" would probably also exclude from the concept of genocide most of the famous massacres and persecutions of history.² In every instance the Soviet Communist dictatorship has tried in the Convention to "legalize" its genocides, saying they are intended not "to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such," but to punish "rebels," "bandits," "saboteurs," etc.

(d) Therefore the non-Russian nationalities should beware of deluding themselves into thinking international law has taken a great step toward perfecting the protection of a nation or a community against genocide. In reality nothing has been changed. The Assembly of the UN produced a document which gave Soviet Moscow an oppor-

² *The Listener*, March 10, 1949.

tunity to evade international responsibility while realizing the aims of Soviet propaganda.

II. History of Soviet Genocide

We must confess that the need for the term "genocide" in international law compels every thinking person to deep and sad reflection on the level of contemporary civilization with its aeroplanes and atomic energy. *Quo vadis*, human race? Nearly 2000 years after Jesus Christ and the Prophets of Old Testament the simple term "murder" has become insufficient because our "progress" has developed "race-murder." And the President, the members of the Assembly, felt neither the shame nor the tragedy of the spiritual and intellectual bankruptcy of our generation implicit in the "epoch making event", the adoption of the Genocide Convention . . .

What is more, not one of the delegates of the democratic powers realized that behind the loud voice and the humanitarian declarations of the Soviet delegates lay hidden the bad conscience of the Soviet dictatorship, whose cruelty and brutality toward opposing national, ethnical, racial, and religious groups represents a unique, an unsurpassed, peak in modern history. Not one was aware of the propaganda intended by the Soviet Union in participating in the Genocide Convention.

Not one of the non-Communist delegates had the moral courage to question the Soviet delegates about recent events in the Soviet Union. They were passive spectators at a macabre show in which the representative of the greatest murderer of nations in history appeared as a teacher of justice and morality, as a defender of humanity, before the forum of the Western democratic world.

Therefore we present for the kind attention and consideration of the United Nations a short survey of Soviet genocide, its roots and its development.

Race-murder is an old Muscovite speciality often practiced by the Tsars. In spite of the unconditional surrender of Novgorod the Tsar ordered the population to be murdered, drowned, or transferred to the suburbs of Moscow. These methods succeeded in killing the nucleus of the fourth Eastern Slavic nation, the Novgorodians, who by their language, their Hanscatic mentality, differed completely from the Muscovites. The famous Oprichnina of Ivan the Terrible, a model for Hitler's S-S organization, liquidated the whole aristocracy opposed to

Tsarist tyranny. Well known also are later Tsarist persecutions of the Old Believers, the Raskolniki, a part of whom even sought refuge in Bukovina in Catholic Austria. Peter I ordered the murder of the whole population, including women and children, of Baturyn, the capital of the Ukrainian Hetman Ivan Mazepa. Catherine II ordered ten thousand Crimean Tatars to be expelled and drowned in the Black Sea. Nor is it necessary to describe the methods and the brutalities of Nicholas I and his Field Marshal, Suvorov, in liquidating the Polish revolutionaries, or exterminating the Ukrainian Catholics in the Kholmland.

The Russian Communist Party, soon after establishing its dictatorship, began to glorify Ivan the Terrible and Peter I, ordering novels to be written and, later, producing special movies about them. During the last war Stalin climaxed this trend by establishing the Suvorov decoration as the highest military award. Thus the past and present of Muscovy and its political methods are inseparably connected. Against these methods the truly great leaders of the Russian nation have fought and protested in vain.³

The Russian Communists began very early to use genocide as a political weapon. Let us survey the victims, and prove that the Soviet Union is not only the prison of nations, but also the cemetery.

(1) The Ingrian nation was mercilessly liquidated, 1921-1923. The Ingrians, numbering nearly 400,000, occupied Ingermanland, the hinterland of what is now Leningrad. They were a sister-nation to the Estonians and the Finns, and thus united the Finno-Ugrian ethnographical territory into one whole. Through this territory Peter I drove his "window" to the Baltic Sea. The Ingrians, a highly civilized people with Scandinavian culture and a well-educated Protestant ministry, became the object of an early Communist attack intended to complete the Russification of the Leningrad-hinterland. Mass-terror and forced emigration to the North annihilated the Ingrians. Only those few who escaped to Finland still survive.

(2) The annihilation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church with the Metropolitan Lypkivsky, the clergy and many church

³ After the establishment of the Communist dictatorship, when wholesale slaughter became the order of the day, M. Gorky wrote a tragic warning: "The revolution has overthrown the monarchy. But perhaps it has only forced the external malady deeper into the organism. Evidently killing is easier than persuasion and this very simple method is very easy for people who have been brought up amongst massacres and educated by massacres. All you Russians are still savages, corrupted by your former masters, you in whom they infused their terrible defects and their insane despotism." That are prophetic words and a prophetic vision of the great Russian writer of the coming era of Soviet-genocide . . .

leaders from the laity. The Church was completely wiped out between 1926 and 1932.

(3) The annihilation of the Ukrainian farmer-class. During the NEP policy the Ukrainian peasantry became the driving force behind the Ukrainian national idea.

By forcing the famous "collectivization" on the farming class Stalin in 1932 and 1933 deliberately provoked a famine in the bread-basket of Europe, a famine which brought death by starvation to at least four or five million peasants. By mass exiles to Siberia and the famous trials developed for the "Union for the liberation of the Ukraine", Soviet Moscow murdered a large part of the Ukrainian peasantry and intelligentsia.⁴ Leading Ukrainian Communists Lubchenko, then Prime Minister of Soviet Ukraine, Skrypnyk, Minister of Education and an old friend of Lenin, committed suicide to protest Stalin's policy of extermination.

(4) The annihilation, between 1928 and 30, of the Cossacks of the Don and Kuban, who considered themselves separate national groups, was affected by most brutal methods. Their officers' corps—their intelligentsia—were systematically killed or deported, and every trace of their old democratic self-government and republican tradition erased.

(5) The annihilation of the Greek population of the Kerch Peninsula. The Communists in order to Russify this strategically important territory, exterminated the entire ethnic group. Some 5000-8000 men, women, and children were deported to a forced labor camp in the Arctic.

(6) During World War II Stalin perpetrated the greatest single mass murder known to the civilized world when he exterminated, in the forest of Katyn, more than 10,000 Polish prisoners of war, officially under the protection of the International Red Cross Convention. These included not only professional soldiers, but also officers of the reserve, among them a considerable number of university professors, high school teachers, eminent doctors, judges, lawyers, engineers, and technicians, who had been mobilized to fight Hitler. This extermination was an integral part of that "social engineering" designed to deprive a non-Communist nation of its leading intelligentsia for the future.

(7) Before and during World War II, Stalin applied the same

⁴ About this tragedy there is a large literature in America. Cf. the publications of W. M. Chamberlin, Eugene Lyons, W. C. Krivitsky, etc.

method of mass murder to the Ukrainian intelligentsia in Vinnitsa, Lviv, Stanyslaviv and Kolomyja, where mass graves of nearly 10,000 victims of the N.K.V.D. have been discovered. All the leading personalities of the democratic parties of Western Ukraine, including the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Socialist Party, were liquidated by murder or by deportation to slave-labor camps.

(8) The Soviet Government during World War II admitted having committed the following cases of genocide:

- (a) the annihilation of the Volga German Republic, abolished in 1940, when the population of about 800,000 was deported to the Asiatic Arctic;
- (b) the annihilation of the Crimean Tartar Republic in 1944 with the deportation of 800,000 people to the Asiatic Arctic;
- (c) the annihilation of the Chechen-Republic of the Caucasus in 1945 when its population of 600,000 was deported to Soviet Asia.
- (d) the annihilation of the "Autonomous Region" of Karachev, abolished 1945, when the population was scattered in the Asiatic Arctic.⁵

(9) The annihilation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western and Carpathian Ukraine. The whole hierarchy was imprisoned and deported. Two bishops died in prison. The M.V.D. forced a part of the clergy to recognize the Patriarch of Moscow, the opposing part is partly murdered, partly imprisoned.

(10) The Soviet Government is now committing the crime of genocide in three forcibly annexed Baltic Republics:

- (a) Lithuania: nearly 60% of the intelligentsia has been either exterminated or deported to Asia;
- (b) Latvia: nearly 50% of the intelligentsia has been either exterminated or deported to Asia;
- (c) Esthonia: nearly 50% of the intelligentsia has been deported or murdered.

The farmer-population of 5,000,000 in these Baltic Republics has for two years been systematically deprived of its intelligentsia. The Soviet Government has already begun the mass-expulsion of these peasants from their mother countries.⁶

⁵ Official statement by P. V. Bachmurov, Secretary to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the R.S.F.S.R., June 25, 1946.

⁶ Albert Kalma in *Soviets Blodstad i Baltikum*, Stockholm, 1948, has provided a deeply moving description, authenticated by scores of photostatic proofs.

(11) This survey does not include Soviet Moscow's persecutions in White Ruthenia, and in Caucasus and Turkestan. The list is surely not yet complete. All information from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary proves that the preparation for persecution of the churches, intelligentsia, and peasantry—the necessary lists of leaders, the infiltration into non-Communist organizations—is complete, and the terror is in full swing.⁷

The best picture of what is going on behind the Iron Curtain is given in a letter by the former Romanian Prime Minister N. Radescu, published in the *New York Times*⁷ under the headline "Genocide in Rumania," in which is reported the extermination of entire social groups:

"In the case of Rumania, the denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms has reached a point where the right to live is itself being denied to entire sections of the population.

"I refer first of all to over two hundred thousand victims of political persecution, tortured or dying of starvation in prisons, concentration and labor camps. The purges effected in the state administration, in the teaching staffs, the clergy and the army, the strangling of free professions, the nationalization of enterprises, the excessive taxation of real property—which amounts to plain confiscation—have deprived several other hundreds of thousands of their livelihood.

Liquidation of Peasants

"The latest victims of this policy of extermination are the group of farmers who owned the top figure of 110 acres of land. The properties of over 17,000 families in this category were recently confiscated by a simple decree. They were evicted with their families from their homes in the middle of the night and transported to distant localities, being allowed to take only the personal belongings which they could carry in their hands. The ferocity of this measure is reflected in its concluding paragraph, which provides the penalty of three to fifteen years in prison against the officials who failed to enforce it properly.

"The letters from Rumania which secretly reach us describe the utter despair of the population. . . . No one from the outside can imagine, however well informed he is, the extent of our misery. . . . It is seldom that one finds a family without a member or relative in prison, tortured or disappeared. . . . Many of those who are still 'free' commit suicide, die of cold or starvation, of contagious diseases or become insane."

"These facts go a long way to explain why the Soviet representatives strenuously opposed the inclusion in the list of genocide crimes the physical annihilation of entire racial groups for political and economic motives."

⁷ *The N. Y. Times*, Apr. 24, 1949.

III. The Ideological Basis of Soviet Genocide, Its Purpose, Methods, and Results

The Soviet Government and its Communist Party have a "logical," well-developed "ideology" regarding genocide, or in Communist lingo, the "liquidation of the enemies of the people." Let us discover its roots:

(1) The Russian Communist Party is the only organization among the governments of the world, which in its ideology considers terror not only morally admissible but the only effective method of action against the opposition. After 1917 Lenin explicitly approved terror as a weapon against political dissenters and opponents. This principle distinguishes the Soviet Government from any other political organization.

(2) Therefore terror in the Soviet Union is *legalized* for the use of the state by the ruling Communist Party. Terror, open and conspiratorial, is the very foundation of the Soviet Government, the basis of the "dictatorship of the proletariat." The Communist Party knows that terror alone can keep a small but armed minority in power over a vast but disarmed majority. Therefore constant terror against persons, groups, nations are normal expressions of Communist activity. To the Communist terror means "stern measures." The declaration of the People's Commissar of Justice, is instructive: "In the opinion of liberals and opportunists of all kinds the stronger the country is, the more lenient it can be to its opponent . . . No, and again no! The stronger the country is, the mightier it is, the more justified are we in taking stern measures against those who disturb our socialist construction."⁸

Last but not least, we should like to introduce into this inquiry an indisputably authoritative witness—Joseph Stalin, himself. In 1931, when Lady Astor met Stalin, she asked him rather quickly: "How long are you going to continue killing people?" Taken off guard, Stalin answered, "As long as it is necessary."⁹

(3) This legalization of the use of terror is based on the teaching of Marx ("Law, morality, religion are to him [the proletarian] so many bourgeois prejudices behind which lurk in ambush so many bourgeois interest," (*Communist Manifesto*) and Lenin ("For us, morality is subordinated to the interests of the proletarian class struggle," Lenin, in Arnold Lunn's *Communism and Socialism*).

⁸ *Izvestia*, Official Organ of the Soviet Government, No. 37, 1936.

⁹ Fulton J. Sheen, *Communism*, p. 35.

(4) The use of terror also justifies Lenin's concept of "party," a concept so different from the idea of western political parties. Lenin developed the concept after a careful study of von Clausewitz, *On War*, and nobody until now has had the courage to state that his "concept of the party" is a transfer of the basic ideas of Prussian Militarism into political party-life. The Party is a "General Staff, and Officers' Corps" of professional revolutionaries, who command the rank and file, but the rank and file are not permitted to influence the decisions of the Staff and the Commander-in-Chief. Military discipline and blind obedience is the basis of the ideological army which the Communist calls "party." What happens to traitors or opponents of a real army during war? They are shot. In the Communist ideological army they are "liquidated." And liquidation is practiced not only inside the Soviet Union, but outside its barriers as well: Petlura, Ramishvili, Kutieпов, Miller, Oskilko—leaders of the opposition of other nations, were murdered and so were the Communist "traitors," I. Reiss in Switzerland, Paul Maslov in Cuba, L. Trotzky in Mexico, W. G. Krivitsky in Washington, etc. Lenin teaches: "We have never rejected terror on principle nor can we ever do so. Terror is a form of military operation that may be usefully applied, or may even be essential in certain moments of the battle."¹⁰

(5) And here is the last Communist justification of terror: According to Communist ideology the party is actually at war—not a "cold" war, but a "shooting" war! According to Communism history is the record of class war. The Soviet Union is now in a Communist World War against the Democratic World. It is engaged in a constant and gigantic battle conducted by Commander-in-Chief Stalin. How can an army during battle refuse to punish with death all "traitors", all persons or groups, who disobey battle orders? The death penalty for persons and groups, from the Communist point of view, is therefore justified since it is necessary for the ultimate victory of Communism.

To sum up: The use of genocide against opposing groups and nations is lawful because to the Soviet there is no "peace-time." Until the total victory of the Communist World Revolution, for the Soviet government, inside and outside the Soviet Union, there is "war-time."

This explains the ideological basis of the decades-long practice of genocide against the national and religious groups opposing the Soviet Union. From the viewpoint of materialism and the doctrines

¹⁰ *Collected Works*, Vol. IV, Part 1.

of Marx and Lenin, there is an iron logic in this way of thought, a logic which western diplomats, unschooled in Communist "sciences", cannot grasp.

Thus, inside and outside the Soviet Union, unceasing terror is an essential part of Communism and its very atmosphere. Terror is the basis of the dictatorship. Communism can never, never renounce terror, for that would bring the Thermidor to the World Revolution, the dissolution of the Soviet Union! What does terror mean? It means, and do not forget it, the systematic murder of leading persons and of entire national and religious groups—or what is now in international law called "genocide."

What are the methods of Soviet genocide? Communism has also developed a "scientific method" of genocide. Let us review it briefly.

The method progresses through four stages: (a) the first attack is directed against the intelligentsia, the nation's leaders and distinguished personalities, its brains. A terroristic mass-blow on the head, on the brain, paralyzes the whole body of the victim-nation; (b) the second stage—often a part of the first—is against the nation's churches. Christianity as a religion, its hierarchy and priests are considered forces most dangerous to Communism, and their "elimination" from the "battle front" by terroristic measures is necessary before the brain is fully unconscious. This is the attack on the soul of the nation; (c) the third attack uproots the farmers of the nation, the bearers of its traditions, of its folk music and folk literature, of its distinct language. Thus the ethnographical territory of a nation is disrupted, and the way is prepared for the (d) fourth and last stage: the settlement of Russians or Asiatic tribes in order to mix up the nationality in question and create a mixed territory.

An operative instrument for the first three stages of Soviet-genocide are the slave labor camps administered by the MVD in the Soviet Union. Their task, before the doomed group dies of starvation, exhaustion from overwork, or by murder, is to squeeze from it all its physical resources for the benefit of the Soviet economy.

The aim of this "social engineering" is to manufacture and create a new "Communist Soviet Nation," the "Sovietsky Narod," formed from all the subjugated nationalities in the Soviet Union, a new "amalgam" whose members no longer remember their original religion, tradition, politics, aims or language.

But this "international" aim includes as well a purely nationalistic aim. Soviet genocide is put to the service of the Russification (in party

lingo, "sovietization") of territories geopolitically important to Soviet Moscow. The action is being carried out according to the principles of the "geopolicy" of General Haushofer, Hitler's famous adviser. The following are its main directions:

(a) The Baltic States, to achieve Haushofer's *Zange*-principle. One end of the pair of tongs is Leningrad, the other Koenigberg, already completely Russified including its hinterland. A Russian corridor has thus been cut through Lithuania and White Ruthenia, and the victimations are already "embraced" by the Russians.

(b) Ukraine, with the Russian colonization of the Don and Kuban Cossack territories and Crimea, is only half-embraced. Crimea, dominating the mouth of the Dnieper, fills the geopolitical role of *Stuetspenkt*, key-position, for Russia in relation to the Ukraine. Hence the Crimean Tatars have been liquidated. But Russia did not succeed in "embracing" Ukraine (Russia's "India" and the springboard to the Dardanelles, Balkans, and Central Europe), and so Russia had to make satellites of Ukraine's western neighbors: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania. They constitute the western "line of defense."

(c) The third direction is the Volga-Caucasus. With the annihilation of the Volga-Germans, the Don and Kuban Cossacks, and the Chechens, Russia achieved substantial gains.

(d) Siberia is not only the geopolitical basis for the domination of Asia, but also a springboard over to Alaska. It is therefore being forcefully developed as a reservoir of manpower and industry. Here under Russian leadership a "Soviet Nation," formed from the unhappy deported groups of all Russian-controlled nations, is in process of creation.

(e) Russification is supported by a mighty propaganda in behalf of Russian as the "world language of the international proletariat" in all spheres of Soviet Russian influence. D. Zaslavsky writes of the Russian language: "The Russian language has become a world language. It has won the recognition of the world's common people. They want to learn more about the building of socialism and the sources of our country's might. The succession of languages runs through the ages. Latin was the language of the ancient world, French of the feudal epoch, English of capitalism. Russian is the world-language of socialism. French is the fancy language of courtiers, and the English, the jargon of traders. They were the tongues of ruling classes and of snobish intellectuals. The English language corrupted people in foreign lands. Russian is the first language of internationalism. No one can call him-

self a scholar if he does not know Russian. Russians unquestionably occupy first place in the social sciences. All future progress in these sciences has been determined by the genius of Lenin and Stalin."¹¹ Propaganda for the "language of internationalism" and "international Soviet genocide" complement and supplement one another. Russian nationalistic and international communistic aims, together with the messianistic master-race emotions are closely merged in the large scale movement toward the Baltic States, Ukraine, Caucasus, Siberia, and the whole "sphere of influence."

The results of Soviet genocide are tragic, not only for the non-Russian nationalities of the Soviet Union, but also for the Soviet Union, itself, as a state. The best demonstration of this fact are: the Soviet statistics. The directors of the 1937 census were "liquidated", and its results have never been published. And two years ago, having declared statistics to be "state top secrets," the Soviet government forbade all foreigners to attempt any kind of statistical research in the USSR, calling it espionage punishable by law.

Why has Soviet Moscow for more than a decade maintained a statistical iron curtain? It hides from the civilized world the results of Soviet-genocide!

According to all careful scholars of population problems in the Soviet Union, including D. V. Dallin, the following approximate figures are true:

In the year 1914 the Russian Empire (with Finland, Bukhara and Khiva) had a population of about 170,000,000. A quarter of a century later, in 1939, the figure remained 170 millions. In 1947 the population within the prewar borders was less than 170 millions, and, adding the 25 millions in newly acquired provinces, the total population is only 190 millions. If the normal development of pre-World War I Tsaristic Russia had continued, the Soviet Union would today have a population of over 290 to 300 million people.¹²

About 300 millions in theory and 190 millions in present day reality! This deficiency of over 100 millions is due, of course, in part to the losses of two World Wars and the Civil War of 1918-20—but by far the largest portion is the result of Soviet genocide. Soviet genocide produced as well two more results peculiar to the present-day Soviet Union: an acute man-power shortage and an excess of nearly 10,000,000 women over men, an unprecedented development for any country.

¹¹ *Literaturnaya Gazeta* for February.

¹² *The Real Soviet Russia*, 1947.

IV. An Appeal to the Democratic Christian States, Signatories of the Genocide Convention

Think of these questions: What have been the aims of the Soviet Government in participating in this work of the UN? What are the reasons for all the pathetic declamations of the Soviet delegates, during the meeting of the Commission, about the protection of national, racial, ethnical and religious groups in the Soviet Union? Why have the Soviets been so eager to sign "solemnly" the Genocide Convention when they have treated with contempt and boycott the other Commissions and Organizations of the UN?

In our opinion there are three reasons which are worthy of careful analysis for the understanding of Soviet policy and its role in the UN.

(1) The Communist dictatorship with its mystic, Byzantine-like Stalin-worship needs new "prestige-successes" (cf. the policy of Hitler and Mussolini). It needs them badly (a) for interior policy; there is unrest in Ukraine—the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) is still fighting, there is unrest in the Baltic countries, unrest among the demobilized soldiers who saw "capitalistic Europe," unrest in the rank and file of the party, unrest which has necessitated new purges in all spheres. But (b) the Communist dictatorship also needs "successes" badly for its foreign relations to keep its "prestige" and "victorious face" before the Communist parties outside the Soviet Union during the current "cold war." Stalin's infallible majesty requires a new deep bow from the democratic, Christian powers; he wishes it to be clear, in black and white, that he is an honest, respected man and partner, regarded as an "equal" even by democrats and Christians. And the Genocide Convention implies:

- (a) the recognition of the Soviet regime as an equal partner with equal moral standards by the democratic, Christian powers;
 - (b) the recognition that this regime has standards for the protection of national, ethnical, racial, and religious groups equal to those of democratic, Christian powers;
 - (c) the recognition that the justice and courts of this regime have standards equal to those of the democratic, Christian powers;
 - (d) the recognition in the words "as such" that all former and current acts of genocide committed by the Soviet regime against national, racial, ethnical and religious groups are legal.
- (2) Stalin needs this new "prestige", too, until by his order Tito

"will meet Trotsky." Tito challenged the "wisdom" and the methods of Stalin in order to protect the nations of Yugoslavia from the penetration of the M.V.D. and Soviet genocide. He stated publicly that "truth is above Stalin's authority" and denounced the doctrine of "the end justifies the means." Tito said openly, "No matter how much each of us loves the land of Socialism (the Soviet Union), you cannot ask us to love our own country less!" Here is a rebel against Stalin's national policy, who publicly condemns Stalin's methods. And to refute Tito, Stalin wanted to show the nations of Yugoslavia that he has been slandered, that even the Democratic powers have confirmed that he loves and protects all nations and races as "equal" and "as such."

(3) Above all, the signing of the Genocide Convention is Stalin's reply to the emigration of Displaced Persons, who are growing in numbers because anyone who can get away by foot, car, or aeroplane, tries to escape from the Soviet Union and from behind the iron curtain. This mass political emigration from the Soviet Union is the most terrible of the accusations against Stalin and his regime. Living witnesses of his atrocities—prisoners from slave labor camps, bishops and priests, members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, University professors, intelligentsia, peasants and workers—in the tongue of all victimations, name Stalin and his party, murderers! Murderers of bishops and priests, of Christians, Jews and Mohammedans, murderers of nations. Greatest mass murderers of all times, of all epochs, of all peoples.

The signing of the Genocide Convention was intended only to realize these propagandistic "defense" and "prestige" aims, and neither Stalin nor the Soviet regime intends to change in the least degree their policy of genocide. Therefore the signing of the Genocide Convention is the newest fraud with which Stalin has deceived his gullible Democratic Christian "enemies." And Stalin's cynical attitude toward the democratic powers is, from the point of view of his principles, fully justified and moral: "The workers' state, surrounded as it is on all sides by hostile capitalistic countries, finds lying very necessary and useful in its foreign policy. Therefore the attitude of the working class and the Communist Party to the open recognition of the right to lie is quite different from that of the Western European Socialists, those God-fearing petit bourgeois, who are systematically deceived and treated as fools by the representatives of capital."¹³

¹³ E. Probrzhensky, "Morality and Class Standards," in *ABC of Communism*, also in Rene Fullop-Miller's *Lenin and Gandhi*.

Stalin is an honest man, a man of principle—and we do not accuse the Communist of having signed the Convention in order to deceive his enemies. But we do accuse these democratic, God-fearing delegates from the Western powers of again letting Stalin make fools of them, of again betraying the moral principles of the Democratic, Christian World, and of having stabbed in the back the DP emigrants with whom they are supposedly united in a common front against Stalin.

Have the Democratic powers heard nothing of how Stalin respected his obligations under the League of Nations (Geneva) Statutes, under the Briand-Kellogg pact, under the non-aggression treaties with Poland, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Esthonia?

Have the Democratic powers learned nothing from their own experience of the last five years, from Stalin's "solemn" signatures on the Atlantic Charter, the Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam obligations, and especially the Statutes of the UN, not one principle of which has remained unviolated by the Soviet government?

Do not the Democratic powers know the fact—clear as the sun—that terror, murder, genocide, have existed from the beginning of the Communist rule in the Soviet Union and that they constitute an integral part of the Communist dictatorship?

How could the Democratic powers accept on the Genocide Convention the signature representing a regime which considers terror—meaning the murder of persons and groups—legal?

Do not the Democratic powers understand that the legalization of terror and murder in the smallest degree by a state disqualifies it from participation in a Covenant to prevent the murder of national and religious groups?

Do not the Democratic powers realize the basic moral difference between them and Stalin's party, whose creed teaches that in promoting the Communist World Revolution, to murder, steal, perjure, kill, or dispossess their fellow-human beings, is justified?

Have not the Democratic powers heard of the fate of the Ingrians, the Volga-Germans, the Chechens, Kalmuks, the Crimea-Tartars? About the persecutions of the Ukrainians, the nations of the Caucasus and Turkestan? Have they not studied the materials in the archives of the League of Nations in Geneva about this question?

How can the Democratic powers accept as co-signer of the Convention for the protection of nations from genocide, the Communist regime, which in its program openly dooms all (non-Russian) nations in the Soviet Union, (which recognizes no national values, rejects

national feelings as "bourgeois prejudices") and aims at the "liquidation of these nations" in manufacturing the "Soviet Nation?"

Do not Democratic powers know Stalin's personal view about nations: "national autonomy is contrary to the whole development of nations, national cultural autonomy is unsuitable."¹⁴ Or his declaration at the sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party: "We Communists are the propagators of the amalgamation of the national cultures into one culture with one common language?"

Do not the Democratic powers know that on Stalin's order, Marr developed his linguistic theory which attempts to speed up the "fusion" of all non-Russian languages with Russian? That even under the Tsars there was never a program of Russification such as this, in which the Communist dictatorship by systematic "language murder" (linguicide) is hastening the creation of the "Soviet-nation?"

Do not the Democratic powers know that in reality Soviet Moscow only reapplied the old Muscovite genocide and that by this methods the Soviet-regime is realizing the monstrous official program of the Communist "Soviet Nation", a program which implies the "liquidation" of the subjugated nations in the Soviet Union?

Do not the Democratic powers know that the official program of Stalin's party includes the annihilation of religion as "the opiate of the people," that no Communist in any country is allowed to be a professing Christian, Jew or Mohammedan?

How can the Democratic-Christian powers recognize the terror-regime of the Communist party which officially practices atheism, which in Stalin's constitution does not grant "the freedom of religious propaganda," but only "the freedom of anti-religious propaganda"— how can they recognize this open persecutor of all religions, as a protector of religious groups? How can they do it against the background of the present pogrom of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine?

How can the Democratic powers accept the point in the Convention which states that acts of genocide are to be tried by a "competent tribunal of the territory in which the act is committed?" Do they not know that in the Soviet dictatorship there is no division of power, there is no independent justice or independent courts? Are all of Stalin's famous monstrous processes for the liquidation of his opponents already forgotten? Has the western world already dismissed

¹⁴ Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question*, pp. 55-61.

the report of the Dewey Commission, sitting under the chairmanship of Professor Dewey of Columbia University, to consider the Trotsky-case with Vishinsky as public prosecutor?

How can the Democratic powers permit the juridical monstrosity that allows a "genocide murder-trial" in the Soviet Union to be conducted by a court appointed by the Communist murderers themselves, a court staffed exclusively by the same Communist murderers?

How can the Democratic powers recognize justice under Communist terror as equal to the independent and impartial justice of the Western civilized world? Have they heard nothing of the principle of "ideological complicity", under which thousands of completely innocent human beings were punished, often by liquidation? Have they never heard of the families held hostage for one of their members? Have they heard nothing of the decree which provides that in case of an individual's flight from the Soviet Union even those members of his family who had no knowledge of his act were to be "deported for five years to the remote regions of Siberia?" And that these sentences are served in slave labor camps and are renewable by administrative decision? Or of the decree published April 7, 1935, with the signatures of Kalinin, Molotov, and Akulov, introducing death as a penalty for children over 12 years old, a decree abolished only after this war? Aren't the "trials" now being conducted by the Communist dictatorships in Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, and especially the Mindszenty case in Hungary, sufficiently convincing evidence of the Soviet Union's special kind of justice?

Isn't it a brutal mockery of the very idea of justice to recognize the competence of Soviet justice in a genocide trial? And an insult to reason?

Is not the stipulation "as such" a mockery of justice, since it enables the Soviet government to deny that the separate stages of its scientific method directed against (1) the intelligentsia, (2) the church, (3) the peasantry are acts of genocide, when the separate stages taken together constitute the murder of a nation?

Do not the Democratic powers realize the heavy blow they have administered to the authority and the prestige of the UN and the idea of democracy and international law in signing the Genocide Convention with Stalin?

When will they at last understand that without common moral values and common good will all treaties with Soviet Moscow are mere scraps of paper?

To sum up: Signing the Genocide Convention was another moral capitulation of the democracies before Stalin and his Communist terror-regime. In spite of the present ideological war between the East and West, in which the D-P emigrants of all nations oppressed by the Soviet Union participate, the Democratic and Christian powers have again publicly confirmed that "good old Joe" is an honest man and a respected partner. A terror-regime which has developed the "scientific method of genocide," a "genocider" par excellence, has been declared the "protector" of nations and races "as such." Stalin, today's crucifier of Christ, perpetrator of the most brutal religious persecutions of all time, is now "protector" of religions. And Communist terrorists have become the "judges" of those who sin against national, ethnical, racial, and religious groups. Stalin's terroristic totalitarianism, Stalin's police-spy and stool-pidgeon terror-state has again received from the Democratic, Christian powers a place of honor in the family of civilized nations! Congratulations to both sides!

This Convention is an insult to the human dignity of all nations oppressed by the Soviet Union and an outrage against human decency and common sense. Stalin is an honest Communist, he never betrays his principles. Can anyone deny that the basic principles of our Democratic, Christian world, have been surrendered by the Convention's stipulations in regard to the oppressed nationalities and religions in the Soviet Union?

What should the Democratic powers have done before signing the Genocide Convention?

The common front of the Democratic powers should have established conditions for the participation of the Soviet Union in this international Convention.

These conditions should have been: (a) the liquidation of the M.V.D. and a solemn renunciation of terror and murder in interior and foreign policy by the Soviet regime, (b) the establishment of an independent judicial system, (c) the immediate opening of all slave labor camps to investigation by the UN, and the establishment of responsibility for their atrocities by a competent international tribunal, (d) the liquidation of the dictatorship of the Communist party.

By accepting these conditions the Soviet regime would have demonstrated its good will and its readiness to participate in an International Genocide Convention. By declining them, the Soviet Union would have granted the Western powers a great moral victory and would have appeared before the world, self-accused and self-condemned.

Without these conditions, the Genocide Convention has become another trick of Soviet propaganda, another lost opportunity for the democratic powers to support democratic ideas behind the Iron Curtain and in the Soviet Union.

The Democratic powers have been morally defeated in consequence of a lack of vision and a lack of courage in defending the basis of the UN by revolutionary democratic ideas against Communist terrorism.

But—if the Democratic powers grasp the realities of Soviet policy, and think more of their moral responsibility for the ideas of the Western World, and repudiate their cowardice, they can yet turn the defeat into a victory.

Therefore we appeal to the Democratic powers now, after signing the Genocide Convention, to test, at once, the good will of the Soviet Union by demanding under the Charter,

(a) an immediate investigation by an International Commission of the attempt, now under way, to liquidate the Catholic Church in Western Ukraine, and the production of Metropolitan Slipy and Bishop Charnecky before the Commission;

(b) an immediate investigation by an International Commission of the genocide now in progress in the Baltic States;

(c) an immediate investigation of the Slave Labor Camps, the paramount instrument of Soviet genocide and immediate hearings by the Commission of D-P witnesses;

(d) an immediate investigation of the reasons why the UPA is warring against the Soviet government, and immediate hearings, before the Commission, of witnesses from the UPA.

We limit ourselves to these four cases of genocide, which are being committed now, because the Soviet Government on the basis of juridical reasons the Convention provides, will refuse to answer questions about its pre-Convention crimes. We believe it is the moral duty of the democratic powers to put these questions to Stalin.

If Stalin refuses to answer—denounce this document, which is nothing but a trap of Soviet propaganda! Do not permit Stalin to use the Genocide Convention as a smoke-screen for Soviet genocide! Revoke your participation, in a public declaration explaining that legalized terror in the Soviet Union over national, ethnical, racial, and religious groups makes the honest application of the Convention impossible! Revoke your signature in order that Stalin may not use

the Genocide Convention as a justification of his crimes against nations and religions!

Therefore we appeal: Act! Only by courageous action can the Democratic powers help the democratic underground movements of the oppressed nations and religions within the Soviet Union and behind the Iron Curtain! Only by this action can the Atlantic Pact gain the moral support of Stalin's victims! Only by this action can you also defend yourselves in your own states, in which Communist conspirators already are preparing to use Soviet terror and genocide against you, the signatories of the Genocide Convention, against your nations and your religions! Leninism-Stalinism is already strangling your own throat! Don't forget Chambers and the confession of Budenz . . .

American friends, have the courage in this gigantic world struggle—in which only the stars are neutral—to proclaim as the historic mission of the nation of Washington and Lincoln the abolition of slavery, tyranny and genocide—according to the statutes of the UN—for us the victims of Stalin. And this will be the “real epoch-making event” for the progress of humanity. And do not fear the “genocider” in the Kremlin. “Rebellion against tyrants in obedience to God,” said Benjamin Franklin. And that is true in foreign policy, too.



THE REVIVED MYTH OF UKRAINIAN ANTI-SEMITISM

By LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

Late last Spring, in one of our many friendly conversations, Dr. Sidney Hook, the eminent American philosopher of the New York University, made a remark that stirred me deeply. While commenting favorably upon the nature and quality of recent Ukrainian publications, he expressed himself rather strongly on the inclusion of any reference to General Simon Petlura, military leader of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1918-1919. With manifestly good intention Dr. Hook felt that this would only serve to harm and needlessly detract from what he adjudged to be a valuable source of information. Petlura, in his eyes and doubtless those of many others, is presumed to have been, to use the recalled phrase of the astute doctor, "an unsavory character," specifically because of his alleged anti-Semitic leanings and consequent ostensible responsibility for the inhuman pogroms that were staged in Ukraine during that period.

This mischaracterization based on the cited grounds of accusation was supposed to have been settled some twenty years ago, but when one hears it from the responsible lips of so fair-minded a person as Dr. Hook, one cannot help but wonder as to where and in whose minds the issue has resolved.

In point of fact, it was my original intention to concentrate exclusively on this Petlura affair in a more or less academic treatment of a series of tumultuous events that occurred some thirty years ago, but, as the very title of this article suggests, this was necessarily altered by the ugly reappearance last Fall of substantially the same smear campaign that had been employed earlier against Petlura and the newly-founded independent Ukrainian state, except that in this instance it is being systematically waged against the Ukrainian DP's in Western Europe. It was commenced in the articles written by David Nussbaum for *The New York Post* (November 19 and 21, 1948) and in the anti-DP memorandum prepared by Abraham G. Duker who through the accomodating efforts of Congressman Klein of New York, one of those Democrats with unflinching American Labor Party support, managed to have it introduced into the Congressional Record.

A. The Earlier Petlura Situation

IT will be agreed, I am sure, that a fair and honest judgment on the truth of any such serious accusation as the one directed against General Petlura must necessarily be dependent upon (1) an understanding of the general conditions prevailing in Ukraine at the time, (2) the disclosure of any signs of criminal negligence or positive support on the part of his government toward the anti-Jewish demonstrations and pogroms, and (3) the testimony of authoritative and

acceptable witnesses and parties responsibly concerned with the affair. To simply argue, as in substance our anti-DP writers do within the context of the other situation, that, as matters of undeniable fact, pogroms were staged in Ukraine in 1918-19, Petlura was at the head of the Ukrainian government during the time, and therefore, Petlura is criminally responsible for this outrage is essentially tantamount to saying that lynchings occurred in the United States during the 30's, Mr. Roosevelt was the executive head of the American government then, and therefore, Mr. Roosevelt is to blame. The validity of the analogy and the absurdity of such slipshot reasoning are shown by a rational consideration of the pertinent facts in the strict light of the above criteria.

The first general fact to be appreciated is, of course, that the territory of Ukraine during those years was no rose-bed of political law and order, but rather a ghastly scene of war, devastation, confusion, pillage and revolutionary disorder. It was in this tragic setting, as the Ukrainian Jewish writer, Dr. Margolin, authoritatively portrays it, that the sole democratic force in Eastern Europe at the time, the Ukrainian National Republic, had to struggle alone for its preservation against the overwhelming forces of German intrigue, Trotsky's Red Army, Poland's military legions, Denikin's reactionary gangs, and even marauding Ukrainian bandit units.² Ironically enough, it was the democratic West in the depth of its ignorance that contributed heavily toward the asphyxiation of this genuine liberal force through its blind support of the imperialist-minded Poles and the White Russian Denikin. It is perfectly obvious that this general chaos was a fertile breeding ground for all sorts of excesses, barbarities, and massacres, of Jews and others, and one must fairly admit that the difficulties confronting the Ukrainian government in any endeavor to prevent such bestialities in the interests of a quick restoration of order and justice were clearly insuperable.

We must appreciate this situation to have a valid understanding and evaluation of the additional data which we must consider. First, the military position of the young national government which was being attacked from all sides, was continually shifting with the result that the de facto jurisdiction of the government was perforce a constantly changing one. The crucial significance of this lies in the time and locality sequence of the pogroms. They went on chiefly during

²"From a Political Diary, Russia, the Ukraine and America," 1905-1945, Columbia University Press.

the Fall and Winter of 1918 and the Spring months of 1919 in Eastern Ukraine, but the events of the period reveal that after December, 1918 the national government no longer exercised any effective control over this region. By February, 1919, only portions of Podolia and Volhynia were actually under its control, and by the end of March the bulk of its army, retreating before the sweep of the Red forces, had already entered Western Ukraine where, it is significant, no such outrages were reported at this time.

Secondly, an objective examination of this period discloses the following factors at work in the pogroms. For decades, it must be remembered, the Tsarist regime systematically spread the infection of anti-Semitism throughout its Empire and as late as 1905 succeeded in disseminating the rumor that the revolution of that year was instigated by the Jewish members of the Cadet Party. To be sure, the pogroms of that year, as those of 1881, fall within the life-span of that regime, but who would be foolish enough to believe that this spiritual disease vanished with the fall of that regime in 1917? On the contrary, its virulence was strengthened among the polluted sectors of the population in the post-1917 period by the remaining symbols of Tsardom, the imperialist forces of Denikin and Kolchak. Ably supported by the anti-Ukrainian and anti-Jewish "Black Hundred," consisting of former Russian officer-monarchists or landowners and which was originated under Tsarist auspices to organize pogroms in Southern Ukraine, Denikin's army in holocaust massacred not only Jews, but also the so-called "separatist" Ukrainians, Georgians and other national groups. As a representative of North Caucasia wrote, "It is thanks to his devastating work that thousands of Ukrainians and Jews have been massacred in cold blood in Ukraine. . . ."³ The North Caucasian Parliament repeatedly sought aid from Colonel Haskell, representing the bewildered Allies in Caucasia, to prevent the atrocities perpetrated by the Denikin and Kolchak gangs.⁴ The most hideous event, which doubtlessly gratified Denikin's comrade-in-arms, Purishkevich, the chief of the Black Hundred, was the pogrom that took place in Kiev in 1919, and resulted in the death of some 10,000 Jews.⁵

The Russian Bolshevist armies contributed to this gory spectacle. The ludicrous accusation that all Jews are Bolsheviks was common in

³ A. Meker, "The Restoration of a Holy Russia, One and Indivisible," *The Eastern Europe Review*, No. 6, Paris, November, 1919.

⁴ e.g., the official protest of President Tzalikoff, *The Eastern Europe Review*, Paris, No. 5, November, 1919.

⁵ "Echo de Kiev," Paris, October 5, 1919.

Eastern Europe even prior to 1917, but those who continued to drink in such nonsense neither understood the ideology of the atheist Bolsheviks who were of Jewish descent nor knew of the pogroms carried on by the Red Army in Ukraine. The entire record of the Bolshevik regime since then has been a bloody one as concerns the traditional Jew and no political facade of a Jewish Republic in far-off Siberia can screen it. The recent testimonies of Drs. Julius Margolin and Altberg, Polish Jews who were sympathetic to the Soviet Union and its "momentous experiment" until they tasted it, are sufficiently conclusive.⁶ When the former asserts that "*The Soviet camps have swallowed more people, have exacted more victims, than all other camps—Hitler's and others—*" . . . and that "*An entire generation of Zionists has died in Soviet prisons, camps, and exile,*" the simple fact cited above, of the "world-liberating" proletarian army staging pogroms, appears hardly startling. Of essential importance is the fact that the notorious, pogrom-instigating Machno and Grigoriev played at various times their macabre roles in the Bolshevik ranks. The latter, who revolted against the Ukrainian government because of its stern opposition to his activities, found ready welcome in the Bolshevik army and was appointed Bolshevik commander in South Ukraine.

The remaining factors that spurred on the pogroms at the time included the marauding Ukrainian bandit units, Polish attempts to discredit the Ukrainian government, and the pro-Russian or Polish sentiments and support expressed by some self-seeking bourgeois Jews. The first, who were even dressed in Ukrainian military uniforms, constituted an embarrassing difficulty for the government which it was nevertheless able to meet through the infliction of the death penalty. The second, however, proved somewhat more troublesome as the Polish government, operating through a semi-official news agency, and other Polish interests endeavored to justify in the Western mind Poland's imperialist claim to Ukrainian territory as far east as Kiev by accusing Petura of being a Bolshevik and his government of responsibility for the pogroms and an inability to rule—this, curiously enough, at a time when anti-Jewish excesses were occurring in all parts of the Polish territory proper.⁷ As for the last, it can be readily under-

⁶ David J. Dallin and B. Nicolsevsky, "Forced Labor in Soviet Russia," 1947, Yale University Press.

⁷ For this design, see the "Times," London, No. 20064, August 5, 1919.

stood why this relatively unimportant factor had incited under the prevailing anarchic conditions some quasi-pogromic acts.

(2) With this understanding of the complex situation that actually existed in Ukraine during those turbulent war years, one can more objectively assess the steps taken by the Ukrainian government to meet this problem. In addition to its fundamental moral aspects, the problem of the pogroms was in large measure created as a medium of disorganization and civil disruption aimed at undermining the very foundations of the Ukrainian government. As the representative testimonies of Jewish leaders will amply corroborate below, the majority of Jews in Ukraine recognized the valiant attempts on the part of the Petlura government to eliminate these excesses and restore just relations and order. Their various Parties—the “Bund,” the “Unified,” the “Poalei-Zion,” and the “Folks Party”—supported the cause for an independent Ukraine. For example, on September 20, 1919 the “Bund” at a conference in Kamenets—Podolsk demanded the recognition of the independence of Ukraine by foreign powers. Also, a declaration signed by Jacques Kraise, chief of the Israelite worker’s group of Kamenets, concisely states in part: *“The oppression and the exploitation of Ukraina by the different imperialisms affected the labouring masses of the Jewish population as much as it did the Ukrainians . . . it (the Israelite people) will fight side by side with the Ukrainian people to ensure the triumph of the cause of the Popular Independent Ukrainian Republic.”*⁸

A fair investigation in this subject will reveal that the Petlura government did all that was humanly possible to prevent and atone for the abominations that occurred. Upon the overthrow of the Hetman government in December 1918, the Petlura administration immediately restored the laws passed by the Central Rada of the first Ukrainian government guaranteeing the autonomy of minorities, although, as Dr. Arnold Margolin candidly observed, the engendered rights were not *in fact* affected by the Hetman regime.⁹ Moreover, in the course of its ephemeral existence the Petlura government issued edict upon edict, proclamation after proclamation to its armies and the general populace, prohibiting anti-Jewish demonstrations under even the penalty of death as was decided upon by the Ukrainian Council of

⁸ Documents, *The Eastern Europe Review*, Paris, No. 6, November, 1919. See also the extensive documentation in “Documents sur les Pogromes en Ukraine et L’Assassinat de Simon Petlura a Paris,” Librairie du Trident, 1927.

⁹ Interview in the “*Jewish Chronicle*” of London, *The Jewish Pogroms in Ukraine*, Friends of Ukraine, Washington, 1919.

Ministers in 1919. One of Petlura's own orders, number 131 of August 26, 1919, reads in part as follows: "*I expressly order you to drive away with your arms all who incite you to pogroms and bring them before the courts as enemies of the state. And the tribunal will judge them for their acts and the most severe penalties of the law will be inflicted on all those found guilty.*"¹⁰ Thousands of murderers and Tsarist or Bolshevik agents-provocateurs were punished and executed.

For the relief of Jewish victims the Ukrainian government under Petlura made frequent financial allocations, at one time amounting to two million grivni (a grivna being equivalent to a shilling) . and administered by the Minister of Jewish Affairs, M. Pinkhos Krasny, a Jew himself.¹¹ Properties were restored and other forms of compensation made use of. Further, because its hands were clean the government publicly invited prominent Jewish leaders to form an Extraordinary Commission of Inquiry and investigate the pogroms in Ukraine. Unlike the Bolsheviks who either refuse outright to allow such commissions to operate within their domain, as e.g., the Soviet annihilation of 12,000 Polish officers in Katyn forest, or, where practicable, prepare the scene for an inquiring outside group, e.g., the forced labor camps in the timber regions of north Russia, the Ukrainian government welcomed such men as Achad Haam, the famous Jewish author, M. Ussishkin, well-known Zionist leader, Dr. D. Jockelman, chairman of the Territorial Organization, Mr. Goldstein, head of the Ukrainian Zionist Organization, and Israel Zangwill, the noted Jewish writer, to determine the validity of the slanderous charges issuing from the evil designs of its enemies. The chances for "preparing the scene of inquiry" were, in view of the general state of affairs then, practically nil.

The final significant fact is that there was never a Ukrainian government during this period of time without Jewish representation and, strikingly enough, in the Petlura directory it was the broadest. The Minister of Jewish Affairs, M. Krasny of the Jewish Social Democratic Party, the Undersecretaries of Labor, M. Goldelmann of Poale Zion and M. Breitmann of the Bund, and the Undersecretary of Public Economy, M. Solodar, formed this representation, not to mention the many in the economic and political commissions sent abroad by the Petlura government. These men were, what I referred to above, tradi-

¹⁰ Documents, *The Eastern Europe Review*, Paris, No. 5, November, 1919.

¹¹ "The Ukraine," *Weekly Bulletin*, The Ukrainian Press Bureau in London, Sept. 13, 1919.

tional Jews who participated in a government dedicated to the preservation of time-honored Jewish customs and ritual, the Hebrew language and religious belief, and the opportunities for cultivating Jewish talents and culture. Toward these ends, for example, a chair was established for Jewish culture at the Ukrainian University in Kamenez-Podolsk, for which a professor was appointed by the Minister of Jewish Affairs who, it should be mentioned, was also responsible for the foundation of Jewish schools throughout the territory of the Ukrainian Republic.

(3) These several illustrations of the position assumed by Petlura and his government toward the comparatively heavy Jewish population in Ukraine receive substantial verification from the testimonies of outstanding Jewish leaders who possessed some knowledge of what was transpiring in Eastern Europe. It is unfortunate that space forbids the presentation of all these testimonies or even the full reproduction of those cited here, but the following excerpts, abstracted with guarded respect for their individual contexts, are adequately convincing. Israel Zangwill, for instance, in a letter replying to the invitation extended to him by the Ukrainian government to join the aforementioned commission of inquiry, expressed himself as follows: *"I take the opportunity of saying . . . that it needed not this step, nor even your honest admission of the deplorable facts as regards the towns, to convince me that your Government is working hard, if not perhaps its hardest, to stop massacres for which the unsettled state of Russia is largely responsible. The national rights you have given to the Jews are a manifestation of true statesmanship and in shining contrast with the Jewish policy of Poland, and I can only hope that your Republic will be preserved to give the rest of the world an example of the strength and the exalted patriotism that comes from the cordial cooperation . . . of all the varied racial and religious elements that make up a modern state."*¹²

In his able comments upon the guarantees given to minorities by the Ukrainian government and the manner by which it literally solved the Jewish question, Dr. Mark Vishnitzer, Jewish historian and editor of the "Jewish Encyclopedia" and the "History of the Jewish People," elaborated further by saying, *"during the two years the independent Ukrainian State has existed, public Jewish life has been able to develop freely. The Jews in Ukraine have the most extended national*

¹² Letter to the President of the Delegation of the Ukrainian Republic, October 20, 1919, *Eastern Europe Review*, No. 5, November, 1919.

rights. . . . *The Jews in Ukraine will lose much if the imperialistic aspirations of the Poles, Russians and Roumanians for Ukrainian land should become a reality.*"¹³ Much the same was expressed by Dr. S. Zarchi, Counselor of the Ukrainian Delegation to the Peace Conference and a Jewish physician, in a lecture on "Ukraine and the Jews" at the Jewish Institute (Beth Hamidrash) in London on November 29, 1919. Most significant was the parallel he drew between the Ukrainian movement for independence and Jewish aspirations for a free Palestine.

In the interview mentioned previously, Dr. Arnold Margolin, makes statements identical with those above and adds to them the following important observation: "*Nearly all Jewish parties and organizations were united on the question of the right of the Ukrainian people to determine their ultimate political destiny on popular lines.*"¹⁴ Referring to the Central Representative Parliament sponsored by the Petlura regime, he avers, "*This Parliamentary body showed its willingness to grant more concessions to Jews than had any other constituent assembly in history.*" Concerning the pogroms, he declares, "*They were instigated by criminals, Black Hundreds and Bolsheviks who wished to discredit the Ukrainian Government . . . there is no anti-Semitic tendency in the Ukraine Government, which differs in this respect, very notably, from that prevailing in Poland.*"

To this testimony given by enlightened Jews themselves much more can be added—telling the same story.¹⁵ Yet the weight of the false propaganda circulated by Petlura's enemies in the ignorant West proved to be overpowering for him, his government, and the Ukrainian people. The injustice done to the man followed him to his assassination in 1926 by a Samuel Schwartzbard. Many maintain that the assassin was an OGPU agent, which certainly is plausible. Others claim that he was trying to avenge his relatives who had been allegedly murdered by some of Petlura's soldiers, something which is equally plausible when one considers again the conditions of the time. Some Russian Tsarist elements managed to infiltrate his army at certain times and places. However, definite proof is lacking for either theory, but whichever may be true, it still remains intrinsically unrelated to the acts of the man himself and his government toward the Jews.

¹³ Article in "The Jewish Pogroms in Ukraine," Friends of Ukraine, Washington, D.C., 1919.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁵ e.g., Goldelman, Salomon, "Juden und Ukrainer," Hamojn, Judischer Verlag in der Ukraine, 1921.

In the light of the factual evidence provided here and what has transpired in Eastern Europe since 1920, the essential significance of Petlura, his democratic government, and an independent Ukraine for the maintained ideal of democracy itself, for hundreds of thousand Jews in the Soviet Union, yes, and even for the peace that might have prevailed in Europe, could well be pondered.

B. The Current Ukrainian D.P. Situation

The myth that was viciously created to becloud the preceding situation is today being revived with the apparent purpose of destroying our whole D. P. legislation and the harmonious relations existing between the Jewish and non-Jewish agencies in America that are occupied with this problem. The anti-D.P. memorandum prepared by Mr. Duker, which has been tactically circulated almost exclusively among Jewish organizations and upon which the articles of Mr. Nussbaum are evidently based, is calculated to achieve these sinister ends. It bears fundamentally on the anti-Semitic issue, charging the non-Jewish D.P.'s in Western Europe, especially the Balts and Ukrainians, with the perpetration of pogroms and murder. The obvious aim of this familiar and serious accusation is to incite the Jewish organizations, with the prospect of a larger Jewish immigration held out to bait, to propagandize and fight against the entry of the large majority of non-Jewish D.P.'s on the basis of this substantially groundless charge. The net result unquestionably would be a prolonged struggle between the existing interested agencies here, which would exasperate Americans generally with the final consequence of a severe limitation placed upon both Jewish and non-Jewish D.P. immigration into the United States.

This deceptive memorandum is a masterpiece of camouflage, slanderous and unfounded general assertions, and calculated omissions of pertinent facts. Examples of each of these characteristics will suffice to indicate the distortions committed by the author to misguide the gullible and naive reader into lending support to his objectives which are suspiciously identical with those expressed by the Soviet regime.

To take the first point, the memorandum is heavily studded with documentary excerpts drawn from the United States' publication, "Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression," containing the evidence given at the Nuremberg Trials. The immediate impression conveyed is that

the author's generalizations and assertions are based upon authoritative material. The camouflage is quickly disclosed, however, when any one with even a superficial knowledge of the events that occurred in Eastern Europe during World War II begins to assess the author's deliberate misuse of them. Excerpt after excerpt is cited, notably that from Hans Frank's memo of 1943, to show that the Ukrainians, Balts and others voluntarily took up arms during the German advance to fight against the Soviets and the "gallant partisans." The inference drawn by Mr. Duker for an ignorant audience is that they therefore "collaborated" with the Nazis, were fascist themselves, and consequently were anti-Semitic. He then shrewdly intermixes with this evidence further memoranda to show the pogroms staged by Balt, Ukrainian and other S. S. troops. The stunt fails when one realizes as one honestly must and which Mr. Duker purposely does not, that the nationalist Ukrainians saw in the German advance their opportunity to fight for their long-sought independence from the Soviet tyranny and then tried to sustain it against German domination. Like Soviet spokesmen, he particularly attacks Bandera, Melnik, and other Ukrainian nationalists as "fascist bandits," but avoids the contradiction of explaining why they fought the Germans as strenuously as they are now combatting the Red dictatorship.¹⁶

Consider also some of his many slanderous and irresponsible assertions. He speaks, not unlike the villifiers of the earlier situation, of the "historic hatred of Jews by Ukrainians." He asserts that the American authorities in Germany "have never bothered to check their identity (that of the D.P.'s) too closely," this despite the fact that, as shown by Mr. David Martin of the Refugee Defense Committee, since UNRRA days may have been screened more than thirty times. He contends that "no mention has been made of the presence among the D.P.'s of Nazi collaborationists of many nations," which is patently false. Moreover, it was easy to detect the relatively few S. S. men because of their body identifications incurred upon their admission into the corps. The peak of his falsification is reached, however, in his explanation of why so many of the earlier D.P.'s returned home. Simply the impulse to go back home—the implication being that those who remained fear for their supposed crimes. He fails to mention that those who were captured in German uniforms were immediately sent back by our

¹⁶ See "Limits of Terror" by Joseph Guttman, *Modern Review*, April, 1947. This former Czech journalist, now with the Yiddish Scientific Institute bases his article on German documents assembled by the Institute, which Mr. Duker cautiously failed to incorporate in his tortuous memo.

authorities. He omits the marauding activities of Soviet units sent into the Western sectors with the benighted consent of our authorities to forcibly round up thousands of D.P.'s for shipment back "home." Above all, the existence of Communist tyranny "back home" is of no import to him. Is Mr. Duker seeking Nazis among D.P. Ukrainians because of their well-known hatred for communism as Albert Kahn did during the war among Americans of Ukrainian descent here? Mr. Kahn, who wrote his articles for the *New York Post* as has Mr. Nussbaum recently, was eventually revealed by official Washington to be the head of a Jewish Communist organization.¹⁷

From a moral point of view, to accuse a person or group of anti-Semitism without sufficient cause is as reprehensible as any intent to practice it. The injustices and inhumanities that flow from both are morally equivalent. The false accusations made against Petlura and his government played no small role in precipitating the disastrous consequences that befell the Ukrainian people. This cannot be undone. The current accusations, as embodied in the Duker memorandum and the Nussbaum articles, and to which Congressmen Klein and Cellar have given their stamp of approval, can produce similar results. This can be properly created. It is difficult to believe that leading Jewish representatives who rightly insist upon the maintenance of just relations to the benefit of their and all peoples would let pass these notorious writings. Fair play, as the saintly Rabbi Lazaron has always insisted upon, is not unilateral.

¹⁷ Recently Mr. Kahn showed his hand at the Kravchenko suit in Paris with his pernicious lies attributing the publication of Kravchenko's book, "I Chose Freedom" to some mythical "fascist" propaganda agency formed among "the enormous Ukrainian group in the United States." (*New York Times*, Feb. 3, 1949.)



CURRENT UKRAINIAN CHRONICLE

DECLARATION OF THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE UPA

In order to offset efforts of various Ukrainian political groups abroad claiming a preferred status in the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, General Taras Chuprynka has issued a declaration, published in the February, 1949, issue of *Surma*, in which he emphasizes that the UPA is not associated with any political party, although the group headed by Stepan Bandera was most active in its formation. Chuprynka declared that the soldiers of the UPA were soldiers only, and were fighting for the abolition of foreign rule over the Ukrainians.

The political arm of the UPA is the *Ukrainska Holovna Vyzvolna Rada* (Supreme Ukrainian Council of Liberation), which has a membership of varied political directions.

25th ANNIVERSARY OF BISHOP BOHACHEVSKY

August, 1949, marks twenty-five years in office for Constantine Bohachevsky, spiritual leader and bishop of the Ukrainian Catholics in the United States. Under his leadership a network of Ukrainian schools was established in America, and seminaries founded in Stamford, Connecticut, and Washington, D. C.

CONVENTION OF SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY

The Shevchenko Scientific Society, now in its seventy-fifth year, held its second post-war convention abroad on May 9, 1949, in Munich, Germany. Zenon Kuzelia, formerly vice-president of the society, assumed the presidency after the death of Ivan Rakovsky in the United States. The historical section accepted 23 new members, eight were admitted to the philology and literature section, and twelve to the natural science section. Most of the new members are from Soviet Ukraine and worked there between the two World Wars.

The society is planning to transfer its headquarters to New York City, and the new board of officers was chosen with that possibility in view. Officers elected are as follows: Zenon Kuzelia, president; Nicholas Chubatyy and Victor Petrov, vice-presidents; Volodymyr Kubivych, secretary. The board of directors consists of Roman Smal-

Stocky of Marquette University, Alexander Kulchytsky, Lev Okinshevich, Yaroslav Padokh, and Mykola Shlemkevych, Ivan Mirchuk and Ivan Rozhin represent the various sections.

INTERVIEW WITH MEMBERS OF THE UPA

Lendrum Bolling, New York Post correspondent in Germany, gave an account of an interview with four soldiers of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army who penetrated into the American Zone of Germany. The report appeared in his paper on May 15, 1949.

The captain of the group is a Ukrainian Jew who carries marks of confinement in the notorious Nazi camp at Oswiecim. One of the four is a young girl educated in Soviet schools. She declared that "we in Ukraine do not desire that Moscow rule over us, regardless as to who sits in the Kremlin—the tsar or Stalin."

UKRAINIANS PROTEST AGAINST SOVIET OPPRESSION

The New York Times and *The New York Herald Tribune* of April 11, 1949, carried front-page dispatches on the anti-Soviet manifestations of the Ukrainians in Munich, Germany, in protest against the oppression of the Ukrainian people by Soviet Russia. In these demonstrations, some 2,500 to 10,000 Ukrainians, Balts and other peoples whose countries are languishing in Soviet slavery, took part.

On April 3, 1949, the Ukrainians in Belgium staged a similar anti-Soviet protest in Liege, Charlerois, Mons and Hasselt, where several thousands of Ukrainian displaced persons have been resettled.

That the most active element in anti-communist manifestations are Ukrainians is neither new or surprising. It is the Ukrainians after all, who have been the chief victims of the Soviet Union's oppressive policies since 1920. When the Western world was not as yet aware of what communism is, the Ukrainians already were bled white from its destructive and tyrannical hand.

FORMER UKRAINIAN DIPLOMAT DIES

Dr. Mykola Stakhovsky, at one time minister of the independent Ukrainian Republic in London, England, died under harassing conditions in Czechoslovakia recently. A physician and graduate of the Sorbonne in Paris, Stakhovsky was active in the Ukrainian Social-Democratic Workers Party and was sent to London during the troubled

days of the Ukrainian state after the downfall of tsardom. He lived in Czechoslovakia, and following the growth of Soviet influence in that country, was deprived of the right to practice.

MALTREATMENT OF METROPOLITAN SLIPY

According to the Paris daily *La Croix* of May 18, 1949, the Ukrainian Catholic Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, who was arrested in Lviv and exiled to Siberia by the Soviets, is being subjected to extreme torture treatments in a forced labor camp in Siberia. Physical beatings have resulted in the breaking of several of the archbishop's ribs and his arms, according to reports of eyewitnesses that have escaped from the camp.

NEW UKRAINIAN NEWSPAPER

A new publication has been founded in London, England. Entitled *Vpered* (Forward), it is the tribune of Ukrainian socialists, and the dominant voice is that of refugees from Soviet Ukraine who are seeking to champion social reform and national rights of the Ukrainian people.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL COUNCIL PUBLISHES INFORMATION BULLETIN

The press department of the Ukrainian National Council, the highest authority among Ukrainians living abroad, has released the second number of its *Bulletin*, which brings information regarding the life and activities of the Ukrainian people.



BOOK REVIEWS

1. LA GESTE du PRINCE IGOR. Text établi, traduit et commenté sous la direction d'Henri Grégoire, de Roman Jakobson et de Mark Szeftel, assistés de J. A. Joffe. Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves. New York, 1948.

This book is an answer to the French Slavonic scholar A. Mazon, who published a work in 1940-44, in which he denies the authenticity of the "Tale of Prince Ihor's Campaign," and claims it to be a falsification, dating from the XVIII century. A part of this work was known to Ukrainian scholars before the war, and from the first days it did not make a serious impression upon them. Mazon's finished book, however, was published in Paris during the war and was therefore not available to the Ukrainian students. This made it impossible for them to reply to it immediately. This was the answer given by a group of French and Russian Slavonic scholars, attached to the University of Brussels, and as a result their work is published in the French language.

R. Jakobson in his excellent article on the authenticity of the epic, has disproved all the arguments of Mazon, and pointed out his incompetence in many respects. Using simultaneously all the available material, the authors of this collective work have established a new version of the text. Although some of the explanations need further scientific confirmation, the work is abundant in many fortunate discoveries, such as for example, the explanation of the "seventh age" or the name Troyan. But there are also hypotheses completely unfounded, and even fantastic. In some places the editors simply did not comprehend the true meaning of the text. For instance: the editors in the superb Lament of Yaroslavna change the word "*Dunay*" (Danube) to *Don*, reasoning that it was impossible for Yaroslavna to fly as the cuckoo bird to the river Danube, while Prince Ihor was on the Don. But they did not take into consideration the fact that in Ukrainian folk songs the cuckoo bird—a symbol of a forsaken woman or a widow—always flies to the Dunay, and that the author of the Tale took not only the symbol of the bird from the folk song, but in this part of his Lament very faithfully copied even its rhythm. The tradition of the Dunay in Ukrainian folk poetry reaches far back into the migration of the Slavonic nations to the Balkans (IV-VII centuries), and with time,

in Ukrainian and south Slavonic poetry it became a mythical river. Endeavoring to define its geographical situation would be the same as trying to locate on the map the Styx and Lethe. Dunay means a river in general, and very often in ethnographic notes it is not even written with the capital letter.

There are many places in the new version that will become the subject of controversy. For example, Jakobson wishes to see in the "embers in a flaming horn" a funeral rite. In the new version the embers are thrown by the Ruthenian women, and not as in the earlier texts, by the symbolic figure of a Weeper. As a proof he cites a XV century miniature, where a similar scene seems to be represented. However in this miniature, depicting the funeral of Khan Tuhorkan, there are no "flaming horns," but ordinary torches, which prove at the most that the funeral took place at night. On the whole one must treat with careful and cautious consideration those miniatures, which represent the events of the XI-XII centuries through the eyes of the XV century. Such anachronisms, as cannon in the XII century are frequent in these miniatures.

The book is supplemented by four translations: French—by Henri Grégoire; English—by S. H. Cross; Russian—by R. Jakobson (the new version of the primary text is likewise his work) and Polish—by J. Tuwim. The last translation is in verse, and it is a somewhat altered edition from the early thirties, published in Lviv, by the "Biblioteka Narodowa." The translation of S. H. Cross is particularly good, and can be regarded as the best so far in the English language. It is interesting to see how different authors overcome the difficulties of translation. Some of the ancient Ukrainian words can be translated into foreign languages only by two or three words, and in one passage (verse 124) Grégoire was compelled to use as many as eight French words, to convey the meaning of one Ukrainian. Often the elusive nuances of Ukrainian words are not rendered faithfully in any translation. For example: "to tsvilyty the Polovtsian land with swords," is translated in English "to harry"; in French "jeter la terreur" (as "sow terror"); in Russian "krushit'" (as "to crush or break"); in Polish "gromic'" (as "to shatter")—however in his rhymed translation Tuwim has more privileges in choosing the mode of expression. In the Ukrainian language this word means to slash, to cut, to whip, as for instance: "rain slashes or cuts the face." Tsvilyty, therefore, as used by the author of the epic, conveys rapid and frequent blows with swords.

But these many-sided nuances remain uninterpreted by the translators.

"The Tale of Prince Ihor's Campaign" is full of words used in the living Ukrainian language, and although it is written in the Church Slavonic orthography and grammatical forms, it is not a work of ecclesiastic literature. Therefore Jakobson's attempts to transcribe old Ukrainian words in Latin letters according to the Church Slavonic pronunciation, are rather doubtful. For example, instead of "na Kayali ritsi" he writes "na Kayalye ryetsye." The living Ukrainian language is many centuries older than the Church Slavonic, and there is no reason to force it into the official linguistic forms, transplanted from Bulgaria.

Although the authors of the book know and often quote Ukrainian sources, nevertheless they consistently suggest that the epic is a work of Russian literature. They regard the most important element in the whole work, namely its unmistakably Ukrainian character, as something secondary, and a minor attachment to the nonexistent Pan-Russian whole. Long ago the leading Russian critic V. Belinsky (1841) ridiculed the attempts of some of his contemporaries to prove the connection or the influence of the Tale on Pushkin, and particularly pointed out the Ukrainian character of the types, the language and the poetic forms of the epic. But in those days the Ukrainian question was not yet politically important. Today this work, the heritage of a brilliant era of culture, is worthy of a struggle. In this case, as in others, with the further growth of the political significance of the Ukrainian problem, many illusions, which today still are scientific convictions, will be dispersed. Notwithstanding the real values of this book, which, no doubt, will remain a remarkable scientific work in the literature treating the "Tale of Prince Ihor's Campaign," it tends to create and sustain such illusions.

S. HORDYNSKY

A. M. Ammann, S. J. *STORIA DELLA CHIESA RUSSA E DEI PAESI LIMITROFI*. Torino, 1948. 630 pages.

"THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE NEIGHBORING COUNTRIES" was written by Father A. M. Ammann, Professor of Slav Church History in the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome. As is obvious from the title, the work includes not only the history of the Russian Church but also the history of the

other Eastern Slav Churches, among them that of the Ukrainian Church, which explains our interest in it.

We wish therefore to make a few critical remarks regarding the explanation of these events, limiting them primarily to those connected with Ukraine and the Ukrainian Church.

1. The very title of the treatise hardly, or for that matter, faithfully, grasps the dynamics of church life of Eastern Europe, since it takes the Russian Empire, and not the church life of the peoples of Eastern Europe, as the focal point. To our way of thinking, a more appropriate title would be, "The History of the Church of the Eastern Slavic nations."

2. Though the author from the beginning of historical times uses one and the same term to denote the church of the Russian (Muscovite) or Polish people, he uses such a varied number of terms for the Ukrainian people and their church, that one not acquainted with the religious and national relations of Eastern Europe finds himself at a loss. Here is a list of the names used by the author to denote the Ukrainian language, people, nation or church: Rus, Russia, Russian, Western Russia, Eastern-Slav, Lithuanian, Ruthenian, Greek, Rusino, Rusini, Slav-Greek, Byzantine-Slav, South-Russian, Polish-Lithuanian, Lithuanian-Russian, Orthodox Poles, the Local Slavs, Little Russia, Ruthenian-Ukrainian, Uniate, Uniates Greek-Uniate, Greek Catholic, Ukrainian. The author also states that the concept of "*Ukraine, as a name, which refers to the territory situated to the east of Volyn, to that on both banks of the Dnieper and to that touching the boundaries of Muscovy and Poland-Lithuania, was at that time (end of 16th century) still in formation . . . On the land that was called "Rus" by ancient tradition, that is, Galicia and Volyn, (the name Ukraine) was accepted much later only.*" (p. 202).

Without doubt the name "Ukraine," which first appeared in the 12th century was widely used in the 17th century to designate the Ukrainian people, alternately with the old name of the Ukrainian people, "Rus." The name "Russia," with which the author refers to the Muscovite nation, became its political name from the time of Peter the Great (18th century) only. Why does the author use this name to refer to the Muscovites already in the 10th century, when the Russian people were still not in existence?

The author sets the date for the modern Ukrainian national movement from the time of the Ukrainian Catholic Cardinal, Sylvester Sembratovich (1882) which is completely without basis.

3. It can be seen clearly that the author places himself on a Pan-Russian plane. He makes this stand openly when he says that his book "is based, by its unfolding, on the original unity, separation, and final reunion of the Slavic peoples."¹ Beginning the chapter on the history of the Russian Church of the 19th century, he emphasizes the fact, that at the end of this period "all Eastern-Slav tribes returned to the original unity which they formed one thousand years before."² At the very end of the book, he states again, that this one thousand years forms, as if it were, a huge cycle, which "begins with the community life of the different populations in the one state of Kievan Rus under St. Vladimir and his immediate successors. In the course of centuries this state is divided into autonomous territories, until, after the trials of centuries, they again merge into a single great national entity, first the Pan-Russian Empire, later the unitarian Soviet state."³

These quotations point out the theme of Ammann's book. To us this idea is invalidated by the very premises themselves. In the first place, Kievan Rus was not a Russian but the old Ukrainian state. The Russian state does not begin in Kiev, but at the tributaries of the upper Volga. Its capital, at first, was Suzdal, and later Moscow (14th century). The Ukrainian and Russian people are two separate peoples. The former always yearned for the West and western culture, and for union with the Catholic Church. The latter on the other hand, had a complete aversion for the West—for that matter the author states so himself—and they formed only at the time of the Tartar invasions, taking their characteristic traits from the Tartars and the native Ugro-Finnic tribes of the North. Though the author brings this out many times, he does not draw the proper conclusions, and does not wish to declare that we are dealing with two different peoples here, with two different histories, cultures and churches.

Concerning the statement of the author about the reunion of the Eastern Slavs (after the period of separation that followed the downfall of Kievan Rus) first in the Pan-Russian State and later in the Soviet State, here again it is necessary to declare clearly that this is by no

¹ Libro che "per la sua esposizione è basato sulla unità primitiva, sulla separazione e riunione finale della popolazioni slave." (p. 129.)

² "Tutte le stirpi slavo-orientali ritornarono all'unità originaria che essi formavano un millennio prima." (p. 389.)

³ "... comincia con la convivenza delle varie popolazioni in un solo regno, quello dei Rus di Kiev sotto Vladimiro il Santo e i suoi immediati successori; ma nel corso dei secoli questo si frazionava in vari territori autonomi, finché con nuovo secolare lavoro essi tornarono a fondersi in una grande unità statale, dapprima nell'Impero panrusso, poi nello stato unitario sovietico . . ." (p. 589.)

means an *organic reunion* of the Ukrainian, White Ruthenian, Caucasian and other peoples with the Russian, but a *forced subjugation* of Ukraine, as well as of the other peoples under the Russian and later the Communist yoke. Neither the Ukrainian people, nor the Ukrainian Catholic or Orthodox Church were ever reconciled to this, for they always fought against the white or red Russian Imperialism and Nationalism. This cultural and armed struggle of Ukraine and the other peoples enslaved by Moscow exists today. Therefore this tragic blind affirmation of the professor of Slav Church History in the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome of the final reunion (we should understand the term "reunion" to mean only voluntary and *organic* unification!) of the Slavic peoples is cruelly ironic and a mockery of the millions of human sacrifices of lives and the martyrs (with the present Ukrainian Catholic bishops and faithful included) which in the course of history, Ukraine offered and is still offering in the defense of its western way of life and in defense of the Holy Union of the Ukrainian Church with the Holy See of St. Peter.

4. The Eastern Churches, especially the Christian Churches of Eastern Europe have this common characteristic trait, that their life is intimately interwoven with the life of their peoples, and the Church becomes the most important factor of their cultural life. Therefore in studying the history of the Church in such countries it is absolutely necessary to have a thorough knowledge of the national problems of Eastern Europe. However, this is the weakest point of the book, thus making impossible to formulate right conclusions which would be instructive for knowledge of Catholicism in Eastern Europe. For the author evidently is without importance the other idea cherished by millions of Ukrainians and White Ruthenians, the idea of Pope Urban VIII: "Per vos mei Rutheni Orientem convertendum esse spero," (Through you, my Ruthenians,⁴ I hope the East to be converted). But the author, on the contrary, concludes his history of *all* the Eastern European Churches with the hope that the "*Russian soul will reach new heights so that it would again find a richer and purer source of inspiration in Christianity, as well as a more integral solution of its aspirations.*" (p. 587).⁵ Therefore the thought forces itself upon the reader: does the Ukrainian soul, White Ruthenian, Rumanian soul,

⁴ Common name of Ukrainians and White Rutheniens in Vatican documents, especially of 16-18th century.

⁵ "... l'anima russa raggiungerà nuove vette per ritrovare nel cristianesimo la fonte d'ispirazione più ricca e più pura, non meno che la risposta più integrale alle sue aspirazioni."

especially that of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, have any interest at all for the author? Does this Church not have its proper place in the Universal Church? Did the Ukrainian Catholic Church and its mission in the East terminate already with the forced Stalinistic liquidation? Is nothing left but the Russian soul and nation?

5. Despite the above defects the "History" of Father Ammann is an important contribution to historical church literature. It contains a rich material from which one can study the Church history in Russia and Ukraine. As for the history of the Ukrainian Church this is the first manual of this type of the last decades which treats it from the earliest times to the present day. The history of Bishop J. Pelesh is outdated, the one of Prof. S. Tomashivsky, unfortunately, extends to the 12th century only.

Another positive note of the book is the emphasis of the negative stand of the Poles, mainly of the Polish Latin clergy, towards the Ukrainian Uniates and their clergy, which until now scarcely emphasized in the Polish and Russian historical literature. This stand—writes the author—arose from the "*feeling of superiority of many Poles, not the laymen but the Latin clergymen. They were not satisfied with pretenses of precedence in rank (praevalentia) of their rite above the Ruthenian, but considered it one of the domination (dominans) in the state. The union became merely a tolerated institution, and the transfer of Uniates to the Latin Rite was looked upon with favor under every respect. It seems, that these clergymen forgot that the Ruthenian Rite was absolutely as Catholic as the Latin.*" (p. 369). The Uniate Church had to defend itself against these attacks of the Poles. "*Precisely, because of this, it became the main adversary of the Polonization that was surging on in the awareness of its strength.*" (p. 284). The author also criticized the Polish Jesuits (this must be duly noted since he is himself a Jesuit) mainly for their part in the actions influencing the Ukrainians to change Rites, consequently their nationality. Truly, the Pope, as early as 1624, forbade the Uniates to change to the Latin Rite without the express permission of the Holy See, but the Poles did not heed this restriction. Another such prohibition was then issued from Rome through the Constitution "*Allatae sunt*" in 1756. Even this did not have much influence.

The author properly emphasizes the ruthless despotism of the white and red Russian lords resulting in a terrible and bloody persecution of the Union. The fact has also been underlined that Russian Orthodoxy is closely bound with Russian Imperialism and with the

spirit of the Russian people, and that the Russian people always had an aversion for the West and Rome.

In conclusion, we might say that the author of "THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE NEIGHBORING NATIONS" gathered a great mass of material for the history of the church life of Eastern European peoples with Benedictine precision and patience. However, this book could hardly serve as a guide for the future missionaries to Eastern Europe.

DR. BOHDAN Y. LONGZYNA

ANALECTA ORDINIS S. BASILII MAGNI, Series II, Sectio II,
Vol. I. (VII), Fasc. I. Rome, 1949, pp. 208.

From 1924 to 1939, the Basilian Fathers of Western Ukraine published their "Proceedings of Basilian Fathers," edited by Father J. Skruten. During its 15-year existence, the publication took a prominent place in the Ukrainian scientific literature. "The Proceedings" was interested chiefly in the history of the Ukrainian Church, and it gathered quite a considerable number of Ukrainian scholars as its contributors. The Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine and the destruction of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church, including the Basilian Order, brought an end to the publication. Only now a new volume of the "Proceedings" was published in Rome.

The new volume of the "Proceedings" has somehow narrowed its scope of interests, as almost all the articles are dedicated to the history of the Basilian Fathers.

Father Welykyj's article deals with the case of the renowned Uniate Metropolitan of Kiev, Veliamyn Rutskyj, his hesitations between the Latin and Greek rites that finally made him the "Atlas Unionis" and principal reformer of the Uniate Church of Ukraine and of the Basilian order. Prof. Papp discloses the existence of the Basilian order in Hungary as early as 13th century. Father Welykyj informs us about the first representatives of the Basilian Fathers at the Holy See. The volume ends with biographies of some of the leading Basilian Fathers of our day and many book reviews.

The publication brings a lot of new material pertaining to the Ukrainian church life.

N. CHUBATY

SOVIET-RUSSIAN IDEOLOGY OF TODAY IN ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

THE PATTERN OF SOVIET DEMOCRACY, by G. F. Aleksandrov.

Issued in co-operation with the Russian Translation Program of the American Council of Learned Societies. Public affairs Press. Washington, D. C. 1948. 35 pp.

Complaining that "various foreign bourgeois writers are more and more confusing the question of democracy," the author resolves to tell us what is real democracy. He considers himself fully competent to enlighten us in this matter because he stands on the ground of Leninism. And "only Leninism provides truly scientific solutions to the vital problems of modern times." "Until materialism appeared, scholars, as is known, did not possess a genuine scientific knowledge of society and the laws of its development."

Soviet democracy is a superior type of democracy.

The author admits that the pattern of bourgeois democracy constitutes progress as compared with feudal times. However, many problems remained unsolved, such like freeing the toilers from all kinds of exploitation and oppression, real participation by all the people in administration of the government, and relations between nationalities within the boundaries of a single state.

The author asserts that all these questions have been solved better by Soviet democracy than by bourgeois democracy.

It would be useless to discuss his arguments in support of the Soviet one-party system or Soviet freedom of press. It is a special type of the Soviet semantics.

IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICTS IN SOVIET RUSSIA, by S. Kovalyov.

Issued in cooperation with the Russian Translation Program of the American Council of Learned Societies. Public Affairs Press. Washington, D. C. 1948. 20 pp.

This is a translation of an article published in the March 1947 issue of "Bolshevik," which represents a study of the "capitalist survivals" in the popular consciousness of Soviet workers and official attitudes.

The main evils are un-socialist attitude toward work, un-socialist attitude toward community property, bureaucracy, nationalism, religious prejudices and anti-scientific idealistic ideologies. These capital-

ist survivals will not disappear of their own accord; they must be removed by increased marxist ideological work.

One must fight those elements, glorify the greatness of the Soviet system and show the decadence of Western civilization. The pamphlet tells us nothing new. It is an old story, told once again, after so many purges among scientists, writers and artists.

THE ROLE OF THE SOVIET COURT, by Professor I. T. Golyakov.

Issued in cooperation with the Russian Translation Program of the American Council of Learned Societies. Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C. 1948. 20 pp.

Taking this pamphlet into his hands, the reader could expect to find a scholarly objective lecture on the role of the Soviet court. After all, the lecture was delivered by a competent author, Professor Golyakov, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union. Instead, we find here a fanatical, hollow glorification of the Soviet judicial system based on completely distorted facts, without any trace of scientific objective approach. It is another example proving that the Soviet scholar is obliged to be faithful to the Party's doctrine, and not to science.

Comparing some of the principles on which the judicial systems of democratic countries and that of the Soviet Union have been built, the author makes the following statements and conclusions (to mention only a few of them):

Candidates for judgeship in democratic countries are "elaborately selected. The appointed or elected court of the bourgeois state is completely dependent upon the dominant class." (p. 8). The reader cannot also understand the author's conclusion that elaborately selected judges must be dependent upon the dominant class.

"Judges (in the Soviet Union) are independent and are subordinate only to the law . . ." "The independence of the Soviet court and its subordination only to the law has a real and not an illusory character" (sic!).

Crime is a product of the socio-economic order of the capitalist countries, asserts the author. What about millions of prisoners in the Soviet Union?

There must be something rotten about the judicial system in the Soviet Union if such a prominent author must resort to such acrobatic speculations and such distortion of facts.

DR. W. DUDRA

UKRAINICA IN AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PERIODICALS

"The Pattern of Aggression," by Crane Brinton. *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, Spring, 1949, The University of Virginia, Virginia.

"Yet, despite all sorts of stories from all sorts of sources about Ukrainian discontent, the Ukraine has as yet proved no Ireland," writes this author. In his appraisal of the numerous factors for and against the possible success of Soviet world ambitions, Mr. Brinton shows an obvious smattering with the realities of Eastern Europe that serves only to render superficial many of his judgments, as witness the one above. In many respects one can rightly parallel the history of Ukraine with that of Ireland, but the one great differentiating element between them, which, much to the reader's surprise, the author ignores wholly, is the early presence of democracy in England, which played a determinative role in the furtherance of Irish aspirations, and the almost total absence of it in the case of Russia, which accounts in basic measure for the tyrannical obstruction of Ukraine's freedom. Were the author acquainted with merely the contemporary history of Ukraine, say from 1917 to the present, he rationally could not have made such an assertion.

Furthermore, his academically objective idea of suspending judgment on the Russian experiment in federal union because "we have no good information" is accurate—*solely* as concerns himself. In the face of this overall judgment our analyst, nevertheless, in the very next breath, decides that "Corliss Lamont's 'The Peoples of the Soviet Union' arcuses suspicion." He justifies this by regarding as significant the Soviet elimination of several "autonomous" republics in 1945. One cannot help but wonder how he would uphold his primary idea were he even moderately aware of the arbitrary origin of the U.S.S.R., the many indisputable acts of Soviet cultural repression in Ukraine and elsewhere during the late 20s and the 30s, the extensive purges of "bourgeois nationalists," the legal preclusion to withdrawal as implied in the Soviet Constitution and affirmed by the criminal codes, the many salty pronouncements by Stalin on this issue, and the mass desertions from the Red Army in Ukraine during the past conflagration.

"The Russian Population Enigma," by Eugene M. Kulischer. *Foreign Affairs, An American Quarterly Review*, April, 1949, New York.

At best, in the light of purposeful Soviet withholding of vital statistics, analysts concerned with these demographical and statistical problems can only engage in logical "guesstimation." In his criticism of the various estimates made on Soviet population the author sees the estimate of 193,000,000 as the least exaggerated after due regard for the numbers in the concentration camps and the war losses. Relevant to the latter, mention is made of a Ukrainian government estimate obtained by an UNRRA representative of 7 to 9 million civilian loss. Others have registered it as six million. Needless to say, whatever the actual figure, when individuals speak generally of Russia's colossal human losses, they are really referring mainly to the Ukrainian losses for, as the author rightly points out, "the bulk of civilian losses occurred in German-occupied territory." That territory was Ukraine.

"Russia's Unknown Civil War," by Eugene Lyons. *Catholic Digest*, April, 1949, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Mr. Lyons is unquestionably one of the best informed American writers on the Soviet Union. Yet it is difficult to understand why in his innumerable fine works he stubbornly persists in his literal confusion of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples, both simply and inaccurately referred to as "Russians." Morally and intellectually enlightened Russians recognize the Ukrainian nation. The Soviet government has at least nominally recognized the same. Our government, through its representatives at U.N., does likewise. But the adamant Mr. Lyons remains, for some a priori reason, unmoved.

As a consequence, his factually justified contention that civil war, first in its military form and now largely political, has existed in the Soviet Union since its conception is not as instructive as it could be. Of the events he cites to support his argument, the man-made famine was largely a Ukrainian phenomenon, the mass desertions from the Red Army during the war were mainly in Ukraine. He emphasizes the Vlassov movement, but ignores the Ukrainian Insurgent Army which significantly has continued its operations against Soviet communism down to this very day. It is to be hoped that not only Ukraine but truth in its entirety will soon win a powerful friend.

"The Earliest Russian Moves Against Constantinople," by A. E. R. Boak. *Queen's Quarterly*, A Canadian Review, Autumn, 1948, Ontario, Canada.

With increasing sources of historical information and criticism available today, it is patently inexcusable for a University of Michigan Professor of Ancient History to rely almost completely on a monograph written by a certain Professor A. A. Vasiliev and entitled "The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860" to sponsor further the dissemination of fairy-tales concocted back in the historical propaganda era of the Tsarist regime. In his noble desire to familiarize the Western reader with the earliest "Russian" pressures toward Constantinople this uncritical author, who apparently missed some of the American Historical Association conventions where the information supplied by this publication has been used, lends his academic name to what is in essence historical propaganda.

Just a few samples are required to substantiate this point. At the very outset he writes, "The original Russians were Varangians, i.e., Northmen, from Scandinavia." There were undoubtedly many Scandinavian names in the retinue of Kiev princes, as chronicles and official documents show, but there were also distinctly Slavic names, too. Also, the author consistently employ the term "Russian" throughout his imitative exposition with evident naive unawareness that it was not until the 18th century that Peter the Great shrewdly concocted it to designate his Empire. The monograph apparently had not conveyed to our desperate author the data on the early use of the term Rus in the territory he is considering, followed later by that of Ukraine as shown in the Kievan Chronicle of 1187 A.D. Thus, without a consideration of his numerous other elementary inaccuracies, what in essence the author is portraying is early Ukrainian history, although, unfortunately, without knowing it. But as time heals wounds, it unravels the truth, too.

"Political Expediency and Soviet Russian Military Operations," by John A. Lukacs. *Journal of Central European Affairs*, January, 1949, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado,

The chief argument of this interesting article is that the Red Army is, ideologically as well as politically, nearer to the Kremlin today than it was twenty-five years ago. What appears to impress the author most in his account of the factors supporting this argument is the zealous

execution of orders from above by the Red Army. The subject is doubtlessly a hazardously speculative one. One can agree with the author that the appeal of Soviet propoganda for other peoples is rapidly vanishing and giving way to the all-determining force of the military machine. Still in every country victimized by the Bolsheviks the brute force of the military was the final determinant. He is, furthermore, correct in saying that post-war Red Army desertions have been relatively small as compared with those during the war, but if adequate allowance were made for the possibility of easy and ready reception by the Western occupying powers of Soviet deserters, the situation would be markedly different.

In his account of the conditions prevalent after the first World War the author speaks only a half-truth when he declares that the Poles stopped the "Legions of World Revolution" before the gates of Warsaw. A combination of Polish and Ukrainian military might achieved this feat. Moreover, in his account of the Sianki incident of 1939, which indicated the prearranged plan for the division of Poland by the Germans and Russians, he could have honestly explained the motives behind the Ukrainian harassment of the Polish units fleeing before the combined German-Russian force. Instead, the unsuspecting American reader is left to associate these "Ukrainian bands" with the German-Russian invaders.

"The Soviet Concept of Satellite States," by Sergius Yakobson.
The Review of Politics, April, 1949, The University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.

This soberly written article provides a sound analysis of the concept nurtured by the Kremlin masters toward the satellite states. The author, a staff member of the Library of Congress, debunks the whole Soviet pretension of being a genuine protector of the idea of state or popular sovereignty. He demonstrates conclusively the utterly nominal character of Article 17 of the Soviet Constitution, which recognizes the right of withdrawal of a constituent republic from the Union. Bearing upon the dicta expressed by the Soviet academician, Trainin, he discloses the whole Soviet detestation of the idea of Balkan federation and its deliberate policy of regarding the "people's democracies" as merely a transtion step toward the establishment of model Soviet states. As the many formerly independent states in what is now the Soviet Union experienced earlier, there can be only one direction

of development for these newly communist-dominated nations—absolute subservience to the almighty Kremlin.

“The Maneuver Snapped Shut on Mr. Manuilsky,” editorial. *United Nations World*, January, 1949, New York, N. Y.

Citing the fact that the views now expounded by Mr. Vyshinsky were long advanced by the Ukrainian puppet representative, Manuilsky, although failing to note the common source of dictation underlying the verbal activities of both, the editors of this international magazine point to the latter's chagrin on being appointed Foreign Minister of Soviet Ukraine. As they accurately state, “what appeared at the time to be merely a purely opportunistic move to gain another vote for the Soviet bloc has left Manuilsky stuck with his Ukrainian representation, constantly playing second fiddle to whoever heads the Russian UN delegation, and scarcely outranking the comparative neophytes who head the other Soviet delegations”—not to mention, too the Polish, Czech and other Soviet lackeys. The chagrined Mr. Manuilsky might find some solace in the thought that it is better to shed colorless tears now rather than possibly to be forced to shed red blood sometime in his later days.



