
THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

VOL. II—NUMBER 3

A NATION FIGHTING FOR ITS EXISTENCE	<i>Editorial</i>
THE FUTURE OF EUROPEAN FREEDOM	<i>Watson Kirkconnell</i>
THE MOSES OF IVAN FRANKO	<i>Clarence A. Manning</i>
WHY I DO NOT WANT TO GO "HOME"	<i>Ivan Bahryany</i>
LESYA UKRAINKA	<i>Percival Cundy</i>
POWER POLICY AND DEPENDENT NATIONS	<i>Nicholas D. Czubatyj</i>
THE WORLD OF FREEDOM AND THE WORLD OF TYRANNY	<i>Lev E. Dobriansky</i>
THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM OF DISPLACED PERSONS	<i>Walter Dushnyck</i>
BOOK REVIEWS	

Published by UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

Edited by EDITORIAL BOARD
Editor-in-chief, NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ
Associate Editor, STEPHEN SHUMEYKO
Published by UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA
with the support of contributions of Americans of Ukrainian descent

CONTENTS

	PAGE
A Nation Fighting for Its Existence	205-209
<i>Editorial</i>	
The Future of European Freedom	210-226
<i>Prof. Watson Kirkconnell</i>	
The Moses of Ivan Franko	227-235
<i>Prof. Clarence A. Manning</i>	
Why I do Not Want to Go "Home"	236-251
<i>Ivan Bahryany</i>	
Lesya Ukrainka	252-264
<i>Percival Cundy</i>	
Power Policy and Dependent Nations	265-273
<i>Nicholas D. Czubatyj</i>	
The World of Freedom and the World of Tyranny	274-284
<i>Lev E. Dobriansky</i>	
The Importance of the Problem of Displaced Persons	285-288
<i>Walter Dushnyck</i>	
BOOK REVIEWS	
From a Political Diary; Russia, the Ukraine and America 1905-1945, by Arnold D. Margolin	289
<i>Lev E. Dobriansky</i>	
Russo-Polish Relations, by S. Konovalow	292
<i>Nicholas D. Czubatyj</i>	
The Great Globe Itself, A Preface to World Affairs, by William C. Bullitt	294
<i>Walter Dushnyck</i>	
Russia on the Way, by Harrison Salesbury	297
<i>Roman Olesnicki</i>	
The Peoples of the Soviet Union, by Corliss Lamont	297
<i>Roman Olesnicki</i>	

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

WATSON KIRKCONNELL, M.A., PH.D., LL.D., F.R.S.C., Author and Professor of English at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont., Canada. The authority on the problem of Communism.

CLARENCE A. MANNING, PH.D., Professor at Columbia University, Department of East European Languages. Specialist in Russian and Ukrainian Literatures. Author of "Ukrainian Literature" and others. Translator from Ukrainian.

IVAN BAHRYANY, Ukrainian writer. Founder and Executive Officer of the Association of Ukrainian Writers and Artists in Western Europe MUR.

PERCIVAL CUNDY, TH.D., Presbyterian minister and educator; translator into English of much of Ivan Franko's and Lesya Ukrainka's verse.

NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ, Historian, former Professor of Greek Catholic Theological Academy in Lviv, Western Ukraine, Author of several historical works, Editor of "The Ukrainian Quarterly," Contributor to American journals.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, Instructor of Economics, New York University.

WALTER DUSHNYCK, born in the Western Ukraine, is a graduate of the Universities of Louvain and of Columbia, and has done extensive work in the history of Eastern and Central Europe. Mr. Duchnyck served with the U.S. Armed Forces in Saipan, the Philippines, Okinawa and Japan. The last five months of his service he spent as interpreter on General MacArthur's Staff.

A NATION FIGHTING FOR ITS EXISTENCE

Editorial

WHENEVER you pick up any book on Russian history published in America, you do not find therein many facts about Ukraine. The national and racial relations of Eastern Europe are presented in such a misleading light that the reader is unable to comprehend the importance of Ukraine, the country that is now the key to the present-day political structure of Eastern Europe.

In 1713 Czar Peter the Great introduced the new name of Russia for his Muscovy with his plans of conquest and Russification of Ukraine. Two hundred years after in America he has attained his goal. Ukraine as a political unit and a nation does not figure in the majority of books on Russian history published in America.

But at the same time the American press does release reports about nationalist actions among the Ukrainian refugees in Germany which are a matter of worry and concern for the Kremlin. The Ukrainian DP's in Germany have shown their organizational and constructive abilities in cultural and social fields. They are also most bitter opponents of their repatriation to "independent" Ukraine, a member of the United Nations.

Fourteen months have passed since V-E Day. In Ukraine, however, the powerful Ukrainian Underground Army is still waging its relentless struggle against the Communist oppressors of Ukraine and their puppets in the Warsaw Government. It is small wonder that the American is given such fantastic and contradictory reports to read when history books themselves published in their country mention Ukraine so seldom and obscurely. Knowing nothing about Ukrainian aspirations for freedom, American reporters see the underground insurgents as "bandits," an epithet applied by the Soviets to all their political enemies. The well informed would write about them as idealistic patriots who, under the most adverse conditions, defend their people and their Church against the Communist totalitarian regime.

Reports about the powerful nationalist movement in Ukraine that threatens the foundations of the Kremlin oligarchy on the Black Sea, however, do appear in the American press. Recently, for example, the

headquarters of the Communist Party in Odessa was blown up, and Marshal Zhukov was hurriedly sent there to suppress rising revolts on the part of the Ukrainians.

Although Ukraine does not exist in history books, either American or Russian, it is only too real and does not let the *Politbureau* sleep peacefully in the Kremlin. Once the nature of the relationship between Ukraine and Soviet Russia is popularly understood, the question of Ukraine will be recognized as a serious political problem by American policy-makers.

For the time it is not so. In his last report about the Paris Conference of the Four Ministers, Secretary of State Byrnes revealed the contrary to be true. A part of Ukraine was the subject of a political bargain with Russia. It was sold to Stalin for \$11,500,000,000. This was revealed in connection with Russian demands for twenty billions dollars as a reparation settlement from Germany. The *New York World Telegram*, July 12, 1946, reports as follows:

"Mr. Byrnes admitted that there was no way of appraising the amount of reparation Russia has obtained from her zone of Germany. However, he noted that the Yalta agreement specified that most of Silesia would go to Poland *in compensation for the part of Poland east of the Curzon Line which went to Russia*. This Silesian area, Mr. Byrnes estimated, had taxable property of about \$11,500,000,000." (Italics added).

From this statement of the American Secretary of State we find out that the Western Ukraine and White Ruthenia were sold to Stalin for eleven and a half billion dollars, while Poland got Silesia which was estimated to be worth the same amount of money. Western Ukraine and White Ruthenia went to Stalin together with millions of the Ukrainians and White Ruthenians who were and are bitterly opposed to any Moscow domination of their country. Once Stalin bought this territory, he did not hesitate to enslave its inhabitants, deport them to the vast reaches of Siberia, destroy the Ukrainian Catholic Church and in its stead impose the new Soviet Orthodox Church according to the worst methods of *cuius regio, huius religio*. The most dynamic part of Ukraine was disposed of at the bargain counter despite the fact that Article 2 of the Atlantic Charter, signed and attested to by all three Yalta participants, proclaimed that only the people in question will be consulted as to their wishes. "They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned"—we read in the Atlantic Charter of August, 1941.

It should occasion small surprise, then, to read that the Ukrainians of Western Ukraine are taking up arms and waging a desperate struggle for their rights as free men and a free nation. It is, indeed, evident that such solutions of the basic problems of Europe will necessarily lead to a Third World War.

Up to date the Ukrainian DP's in Europe have been the concern of UNRRA and a subject for the Sub-Commission for Refugees under the United Nations. The Ukrainian question was treated purely from a humanitarian point of view. Soon there will gather a Peace Conference of twenty-one Allied Nations which fought together and achieved victory. These nations, as typified by H. Evatt, the Australian Foreign Minister, want their say in the establishment of the new order in the world. They also demand that certain decisions made secretly by the Big Three be revised so that all obstacles to permanent peace may be removed.

In this concept the Ukrainian question at once ceases to be merely a humanitarian problem. The Ukrainian question becomes one of the most important in the post-war world. The hundreds of thousands of the Ukrainians in Western Europe should be helped by civilized mankind because they are the victims of the totalitarian bargaining in human beings at Yalta. But these Ukrainian DP's are only the smoke of an internal fire. The Peace Conference must investigate and evaluate the cause. They must understand why hundreds of thousands of people flee their ancestral homes; they must understand the reasons for the widespread fighting. The "iron curtain" must be parted.

Ukraine has now become a member of the United Nations; Ukrainian lands have been united in one state. This would be extremely advantageous for the Ukrainians if those two conditions were not capitalized upon by Moscow for the destruction of the Ukrainian people. The *Politbureau*, realizing the Ukrainian nation to be a reality, knew that it would be far easier to attain Moscow's designs if Ukraine became a member of the United Nations, and was represented there by her trusted agent Dmitro Manuilsky, who would faithfully follow the Kremlin orders for the suppression of the Ukrainian people. The American press overlooks the paradox: Ukraine exists but her representative to the United Nations is her bitter enemy who is actively helping to suppress the Ukrainian people striving to overthrow the Russian yoke.

This representative of Ukraine to the United Nations is openly defending Stalin's persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and

his forceful imposition of the Orthodoxy of the Kremlin. Whether the United Nations is capable of correcting this anomaly and deprive the representative of the right to talk in the name of Ukraine, has a direct bearing on the possibility of a better post-war world.

The bulk of Ukrainian territory has been under Red Moscow's occupation for the past twenty years. For three years during the last war Ukraine was ravaged as a result of the Russians' "scorched earth" policy and by the representatives of the German "super race." "Ukraine has paid tremendously for the Second World War"—wrote Edgar Snow,—"because it was in reality the Ukrainian War." But what have the Ukrainian people received for their sacrifice in the defense of civilized mankind? They have received a new slavery, new oppression and a new dictatorship which exhaust their economic resources and do not let them live the democratic life of their forefathers. The Ukrainians remain pariahs in their own country; the real masters are the Russians.

The Ukrainian people are eager to see all their lands united in one sovereign state, but they do not want to be in that prison which today is the so-called Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. When the Soviet Ukraine becomes a country of the Ukrainian people and not a province of imperialistic Russia, then all Ukrainians will willingly go to their Kiev. But as long as Ukraine is ruled by the Communist Kremlin, the newly occupied Western and Northern Ukraine, Carpatho-Ukraine, Bukovina and Bessarabia should be under the jurisdiction of the United Nations, and the Four Freedoms should be introduced to the Ukrainian inhabitants of these territories.

So far there are no liberties of religion, press and speech in Ukraine under the Soviet rule. The Ukrainians are demanding that the Peace Conference reject the Russian occupation of Western Ukrainian territories; moreover, they do not want to go under any rule of Poland, or Czechoslovakia. Ukrainian territory should be placed under the protective jurisdiction of the United Nations in order to introduce order and freedom for all ethnical and religious groups.

At the Peace Conference in Paris which started July 29, 1946, there will be decided the future of Northern Bukovina, and of Bessarabia, which are coveted by the Soviet Union. Perhaps Carpatho-Ukraine and Western Ukraine will come under discussion. The Ukrainian people in these territories are enslaved by the Kremlin dictatorship and are not capable of raising their voice in self-defense.

The American Ukrainians, therefore, ought to consider it their duty to voice their protest against the terroristic policies pursued by the

Russians in regard to the Ukrainian people; they should also protest against the Yalta bargaining with Ukrainian lands by the Big Three.

Since the spiritual rebirth of the Ukrainian people with the appearance of the Ukrainian national prophet Shevchenko and the creation of the St. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood the first modern political Ukrainian organization (1846), the basic principle of the Ukrainian national politics has been: "We want our own, not alien, right!"

The Ukrainian people have no imperialistic designs against their neighbors. They want to be ruled by themselves and to be able to develop their talents and natural resources for the benefit of Ukraine and humanity itself.

The Ukrainian people covet nothing, but will also relinquish nothing of their own. Their modern struggle for national and political existence dates back to 1914. No decisions taken by international agreements or bargains made at the expense of the Ukrainian people will be recognized by them. They will continue to fight for their national existence until the ideals of free men and free nations in the world will be universally recognized.

THE FUTURE OF EUROPEAN FREEDOM

By PROF. WATSON KIRKCONNELL, M.A., PH.D., LL.D., F.R.S.C.
McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont., Canada

An address delivered in Massey Hall, Toronto, on June 5, 1946

THIRTEEN months have passed since the collapse of Adolf Hitler's evil regime set the bells ringing and the whistles blowing in jubilant assurance that freedom had been won in Europe. Peace had come again in that shattered Continent, and hopes ran high that a new era would rise from the ashes of the old. Some few fears and suspicions of our great Soviet Ally might still impede the coming of the millenium, but if some beneficent agency like the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization could only make the publications of Moscow universally available in cheap translations, we should come to know, and hence to appreciate, the Soviet point of view and magnanimously incorporate it into the solution of our world problems. Today, in June 1946, those fears and suspicions still unhappily persist, aggravated by the behaviour of Russia itself; but our professional optimists are still clamoring for "sweetness and light" in dealing with the Communist Empire, in order that we may sympathetically appreciate the "Soviet point of view."

The kindest assumption, in the face of such proposals, is that those who urge them have never read any books issuing from Soviet Russia and hence have not the slightest idea of what they are advocating. This is all the more curious, for no country in the world, during the past 30 years, has been more diligent than Russia in making its books available all over the world in cheap translations, without the aid of UNESCO; and a visit to Communist bookstores on this continent will find the shelves bulging with English versions of Soviet books.

One of the most important of these is Stalin's masterpiece, *Problems of Leninism*. This Bible of the world revolution, which has never been repudiated and which is still sold freely throughout the world today, sets down a program and policy of conquest no less explicit and ruthless than that proposed by Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Stalin may talk for propaganda purposes about "democracy" and of the im-

portance of co-operating with the United Nations (with a veto whenever Soviet issues come up), but in his official instructions to Communists throughout the world he speaks of "the impossibility of the complete final victory of Socialism in one country without the victory of the revolution in other countries", and he quotes with approval the following words of Lenin: "We are living not merely in a state but in a system of states; and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end, and before that end supervenes a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

Someone may interject that this is all surely out of date, because the Communist International was officially abolished in May 1943. On the contrary, this mendacious trick of Stalin's was the signal for an intensified campaign of revolutionary activity. For example, to my own knowledge, within a month of the announcement of the end of the Comintern, on the very evening when the National Council for Canadian-Soviet Friendship was being rapturously organized in Toronto, the military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Canada was busily conferring with the Communists of Ukrainian descent in Winnipeg; and the evidence brought out in the 1946 espionage trials has shown clearly, as Igor Gouzenko has also pointed out, that the Soviet Union has all along been planning "to stab Canada in the back".

The wider perspective of this conspiracy is revealed in the recent autobiography of the high Soviet official, Victor Kravchenko, entitled *I Chose Freedom* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons), a book that every Canadian and American ought to buy and read. Mr. Kravchenko says in part (pp. 426-427):

When the Communist International was ostensibly abolished, in May, 1943, . . . the explanations at closed meetings of important Communists were consistent with what men like Yudin and Potiomkin had told us. Only in the formal sense had the worldwide organization been ended, we were given to understand. In fact, the apparatus and personnel and integration of the International must be strengthened, now that it would have to operate underground. "Throughout the world, comrades, the forces of our revolution are preparing for struggle—and for victory."

In the fanfare around the supposed dissolution of the International, it was quite forgotten that Stalin's book, *PROBLEMS OF LENINISM*, remained the supreme guide in Communist doctrinal matters. And in that book Stalin leaves no doubt of his belief that the "victorious proletariat"—meaning the USSR—has not only a right but a sacred obligation to use force to achieve

revolution in other countries when the opportunity presents itself. The established revolutionary regime, Stalin declares, must provide help to the rest of the world, "acting when necessary even with military power against exploiting classes and their states."

And the official Stalinist HISTORY OF THE PARTY likewise remained in force and is in circulation today wherever Stalin's followers and fellow-travelers exist. It is explicit enough. "The All-Union Communist Party," the preamble to that book declares, "took and is now taking as its guide the revolutionary teaching of Marxism-Leninism . . . Studies of the history of the Party strengthen the belief in the ultimate victory of the great task of Lenin and Stalin, *the victory of Communism in the whole world.*" . . .

At the very time when the supposed dissolution of the Communist International was announced, bringing joy to the hearts of more naive capitalist allies, I happened to visit the cellar storehouse of "International Book," an organization publishing foreign-language propaganda. There I saw great stacks of freshly printed Party-line literature for distribution in the countries which the Red Army was about to enter. In theory the International was dead; in fact the Central Committee of the Party was being feverishly reorganized for the immense jobs ahead in Germany, France, Poland, Hungary, Italy, and all other countries.

The hoped-for conquest of Europe would be achieved by a potent mixture of faith and force. In an array of red buildings in the heart of Moscow, not far from the Kuznetsky Most, selected Chekists were being trained intensively for work abroad, in the liberated Soviet areas and non-Soviet countries as well. . . . They were being prepared for the historical task of "purging" the populations which had been under German occupation and influence—and in the NKVD lexicon "purge" is a word of terrifying import. . . . The same sort of "cleansing" took place, of course, in the non-Soviet lands which the Red Army penetrated.

I suggest, therefore, that a wide-spread circulation of really significant books from Soviet Russia would not result in sentimental sympathy for the fears and doubts of a great Ally. It would rather electrify Canadians into an appalled awareness that the Soviet answer to a "National Council for Canadian-Soviet Friendship" has been a conspiracy to destroy our country and our liberties along with those of the rest of the world.

The Communist Slave Empire

Granting, however, that Stalin's purpose is world revolution and world dictatorship, there are some who will nevertheless regard all this as the introduction of a system more just, free and democratic than our own. What then is the political character of the Soviet regime? Is Moscow a sun radiating light and liberty into all the

dark corners of the earth? Or is it an octopus stretching out foul tentacles to drag free nations down to an unspeakable fate? What has been the record of nearly thirty years of Communist rule in the Soviet Union?

No statement could be more candid than that of ex-Ambassador Joseph E. Davies, who ascribed to the Soviet system an "utter destruction of the liberty of thought and speech and the sanctity of the individual" (*Mission to Moscow*, p. 402). In the whole of the Soviet Union, not an opposition party nor an opposition newspaper can exist. Elections consist merely in concurring in a Communist-approved list, without any chance of an alternative vote. In the meretricious Constitution of 1935, all of its glittering promises are nullified by Article 126, which insists that every organization in the state must be controlled by the Communist Party. We have heard much in recent months of an "iron curtain" across Central Europe. The citizens of the U.S.S.R. have been living behind an iron curtain for nearly thirty years, drowned there in ceaseless propaganda which falsifies everything in the interests of the regime.

Laws typical of Communism in action are (i) that of August 7, 1932, which prescribed the death penalty for theft of state property—which in Russia means almost all property—and (ii) that of June 8, 1934 (published in *Izvestia* the next day), under which the dependents of any Soviet citizen who flees from the country shall, even if they can prove complete ignorance of his intention to escape, be punished with five years deportation "to the remote regions of Siberia." This principle of legal vengeance on a man's family is unknown in the legislation of any other country, and is a typical Soviet reversion to the terrorism of the primitive jungle.

Over and beyond the dictatorship of the Communist Party—itsself regularly purged from time to time—stands the horror of the political police, with their torture chambers, firing-squads and concentration camps. It is with these bloody men in mind that Boris Souvarine, former leader of the French Communist Party, talks bitterly in his book, *Stalin*:

When one thinks of the millions of exiles; of the innumerable ill-treated penal labour squads; of the concentration camps where a frightful mortality makes huge gaps; of the overflowing isolators and prisons; of the millions of abandoned children, of whom only a minute percentage manages to survive; of the executions and punitive expeditions; in short, of the multitude "mown down in large armfuls" by Stalin; one cannot be astonished at the immense

chapel-houses of this gigantic prison which with double irony is called a "Socialist Fatherland."

That this should be so becomes clearer when we realize that the whole Communist movement is based on a lie—a denial of all morality, a denial of all justice, a denial of all spiritual values, a denial of God Himself. "Law, morality, religion," said Marx, in the *Communist Manifesto*, "are to him (the proletarian) so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush so many bourgeois interests." Or in the book, *Morality and Class Standards*, written by Lenin's friend, E. Preobrazhensky, and ominously dedicated to the head of the political police, we may read: "The workers' State, surrounded as it is by hostile capitalist 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 petits bourgeois . . ." Still more eloquent is the grim comment of Lenin: "It would not matter a jot if three-quarters of the human race perished; the important thing is that the remaining quarter should be Communist." (Quoted in the *New Leader*, Dec. 1, 1945, p. 13). Having rejected God, justice and morality, nothing is left for the Communist but a naked struggle for power that crushes human life without mercy.

The Myth of "Economic Democracy"

One of the most extraordinary myths regarding Communist Russia is the assurance that while there may be a *political* dictatorship, the people enjoy "*economic* democracy". This curious delusion has been made popular by the London Socialist, Harold Laski, and has had wide currency in certain church and labour groups in the United States and Canada. The commonest claims made, in order to substantiate this idea, are (i) that Russia has the shortest working day and week in the world; (ii) that Russia has the best and freest trade unions; (iii) that Soviet workers control their own industries; (iv) that Soviet workers receive annual holidays with pay and all expenses paid to glorified resorts in the Black Sea area; (v) that old people are cared for in rest homes, absolutely free; (vi) that all Soviet workers receive free and generous sick benefits; (vii) that education is totally free at all levels; and (viii) that every Soviet worker is assured of congenial employment at a good living wage.

Let us consider these alluring statements one by one:

(i) On June 28, 1940, with Russia still at peace, the minimum working week for the U.S.S.R. was officially set at 56 hours. This is higher than in most countries.

(ii). Under Stalin, the trades unions have become mere tools of the Government, a vast company union of the most servile and corrupt sort, whose chief functions have been to help in programs of sweated labour and to spy on sick workers in order to make sure that no one is malingering. There is no collective bargaining. As *Pravda*, for December 29, 1935, explains: "The fixing of wage-scales must be left entirely in the hands of the heads of industry." Moreover, the right to strike has long since been abolished in Soviet Russia. Striking, or any attempt to incite strikes, is punishable by death.

(iii). It is obvious from all this that the workers are utterly without any share in the control of industry, far less than they had under the Czars.

(iv). Paid holidays at workers' health resorts have been reserved for a small group of shock brigaders and Party members. Some 91 per cent of the workers and all of the peasants never see the much publicized resorts.

(v). Unfortunately for the old people of Russia, the Soviet of National Economy, in an edict of April 10, 1934, reserved the rest homes for the husky young members of the shock brigades. The monthly old age pension in 1938, when a ruble was worth five cents, was 50 rubles, or a monthly total of two dollars and a half!

(vi). Then there is the claim that Stalin has furnished medical services for all, absolutely free. Actually, nothing is free, for under a universal check-off system a so-called "socialized wage" is diverted from each man's total wage to cover a wide range of social services. The deduction in 1927-28 was 27 per cent of the average individual wage. Moreover, even though the workers pay heavily for these services, the rank and file cannot be sure of getting them, for by an edict of April 10, 1934 (cf. *Trud* for April 11, 1934), they are reserved for the shock brigades. In other words, the benefits for which all pay heavily are conferred only on the fittest and fastest workers.

(vii). Whereas, in most Canadian provinces, free education goes up to Grade XII, free education in the Soviet Union ends with Grade VII. An edict of October 2, 1940, published next day in *Izvestia*, fixed the tuition fee for secondary schools at from 150 to 200 rubles

a year (or about the average monthly wage of an urban worker) and the fee for universities at from 300 to 500 rubles. As an immediate result of the new law, 600,000 children of poor parents, who could not pay the fee, had to leave school. Along with this went the forcible conscription of city and village children, aged 14 to 17, ostensibly for "industrial training" but actually for forced labour battalions. Victor Kravchenko, in his book *I Chose Freedom* (p. 407), estimates the total number of these young conscripts today at nine millions. Children of the wealthy—Communist Party members and the Soviet bureaucracy—are able to go on with their education, since boys and girls who can pay their fees are exempt from this vast dragnet of forced juvenile labour. It is the children of the workers and the farmers who are torn from their homes and denied further education.

(viii). Most macabre of all is the myth that Communism has happily solved the problem of unemployment, and that every Soviet citizen is sure of a congenial job at good wages. Certainly, there is no unemployment in the U.S.S.R. Neither is there any in Alcatraz. If wages are set low enough, or even abolished altogether, any country can employ all its population—by force. The climax to a long process of enslavement came on January 15, 1939, with the instituting of a system of "labour books" for all workers, a sort of labour passport chaining each man to his job. He could now no longer leave his job without an entry in his book authorizing him to do so. He could obtain no other work elsewhere without this clearance. The document also carried a complete cumulative record of all reprimands or punishments that he might have incurred for lateness, mistakes, or other "breaches of labour discipline". Moreover, the new law provided that anyone late for work by more than 20 minutes must automatically be denounced to the local Prosecutor. He must be tried within five days, and, if found guilty, sentenced to prison or to forced labour. Moreover, heavy penalties were prescribed for any judge or factory official who failed to report and to punish those thus criminally late. The only acceptable excuse for the culprit was death in the immediate family or his own serious illness certified to by the factory physician. The Soviet worker thus became a complete slave; he could not change his job, he could not stay away from his job, he could not be late for his job, or he promptly found himself in the lethal slave-camps of Siberia. To strike, or to try to instigate

a strike, for any amelioration of conditions, was punishable by death. To run away meant that his family was deported to Siberia. Wages, in terms of purchasing power, were 30 per cent lower than in Czarist times. Housing accommodation was appalling, with 94 per cent of the population of Moscow in 1935 living with at least one whole family (and often more than one family) to a single room (cf *Trud v SSSR*, 1936, p. 346). In 45 Soviet cities, at least 76 per cent of their families were living in one room or less. As for commodities other than food, an ordinary towel, in 1935, cost 10 rubles, or more than an average day's wages; while in 1936 a pair of third-rate boots cost 250 rubles, or more than an average month's wages.

The System Grows Ever Worse

Desperate apologists for the Soviet system will endeavour to explain all this away as a temporary phase, transitional to a free and happy classless society. The present generation, they will say, must suffer in order that a new world order of prosperity and justice may be ushered in.

In overwhelming contradiction to this claim is the fact that the brutality of the Communist regime has steadily increased for the past thirty years. Instead of moving steadily towards greater freedom, it has descended ever deeper and deeper into slavery:

(i) At the outset of the Soviet rule, much was made of complete good will and cultural freedom amongst the numerous ethnic groups within the Union. As the Ukrainians know to their cost, the sequel has been an ever-increasing program of murder and deportation of all leaders of culture and national life in each ethnic group. During the late War, Stalin destroyed five of the autonomous Soviet republics entirely, because of their mutiny against Communist tyranny.

(ii) In the early years of the Soviet regime, serious attempts were made to reclaim for society the "Besprizorni", the countless stray children left behind by war and revolution. Striking Soviet films then sent abroad, like "The Road to Life", indicated a real effort of social idealism. By 1935, however, all such efforts had been cynically abandoned, and a decree of April 7, 1935, prescribed the full rigours of adult law, including liability to death by shooting, for boys and girls, twelve years of age and up, found guilty of a variety of offenses including petty theft. Subsequent news items in the press prove that the law was actually carried out.

(iii) Up to 1932, a minimum of 65 per cent of the students in engineering colleges and technical schools had to be manual workers or their children, and all instruction was free. This principle of protection for the children of the poor was abandoned by a decree of Sept. 19, 1932; and by 1938 their proportion had dropped to 43.5 per cent. As already noted, a decree of October 2, 1940, made the fees prohibitive for workers' and farmers' children in all schools and colleges beyond Grade VII, and then proceeded to conscript children fourteen years of age and over into forced labor units.

(iv) Soviet labour has been steadily enslaved, from the earlier system of factory councils, through the limited trades unionism that died with Tomsky, down to the labour books of 1939 and the barbaric penalties for lateness, whereby a man might be deprived of food, ejected from his home, and consigned to a slave camp.

(v) Most significant of all is the trend towards ever vaster concentration camps, run by the NKVD. Mealy-mouthed apologists for the Soviets try to argue that these camps must be understood "in terms of change and historical perspective." The assumption, no doubt, is that there were concentration camps and forced labour in Russia before the Bolshevik Revolution, and that the present regime, while carrying on traditions of slavery to which the Russians are accustomed, is gradually mitigating the system. But let us get down to figures. In 1913, under the Czar, there were 32,757 prisoners undergoing penal servitude in Russia, and of these only 5,000 were political prisoners. In 1930, under the Soviets, there were about 650,000; in 1934-35, there were between five and six million; and today the estimates of this slave labour run as high as 18 million. Descriptions of conditions in these camps are to be found in David J. Dallin's *The Real Soviet Russia*, chapter xi, pp. 186-213. A few excerpts will suffice:

We had to work in our own clothing. After two or three weeks our suits were torn to pieces: the prisoners were half naked. . . . After twelve or thirteen hours of work in the snow-covered forests, we used to return to the barracks thoroughly drenched. In the same rags we went to sleep: there was nothing to cover ourselves with. . . . And after such nights we had to get up in the mornings in the same rags, cold, frozen, half dead. The prisoners could not wash. Men did not shave. There was no time for it; there was no need for it. We used to work without respite. Sunday was also a working day. Even May 1 was a working day. . . . A sad picture: slowly, almost invisibly the mass of silent, dirty men in torn clothing moves—going to work or returning from it. Every now and then someone in the crowd slips and falls in the snow

or into the mud. Nobody stretches out a hand to the fallen: you have got to save your own energy . . . How high the death rate is, is difficult to ascertain, but I know from a prisoner who was in my company that in his camp he belonged to a special group whose duties consisted only in digging graves.

Permit me to summarize the evidence thus far: We have seen that the explicit purpose of the present Soviet regime is not legitimate security against outside interference but a program of world conquest through armed force and murderous conspiracy. We have also seen that the Soviet Union is not only a political slave empire but an economic slave empire as well. The first victims of world Communism have been the peoples of the Soviet Union—the Russians, the Ukrainians, and the rest. Would it not be appropriate for some brave nation to complain to the United Nations Security Council that the regime of Stalin, ten thousand times more than that of Franco, constitutes, even by its domestic tyranny and the wholesale murder of its own citizens, a standing menace to the peace of the world? No discussion of European freedom is complete that omits the blackest slavery of all, the slavery of the peoples of the USSR. It is mere irresponsible quibbling to say that if the Russians (and Ukrainians) want a Communist government, their choice should be on their own heads and does not concern the rest of the world. The Russians and Ukrainians have never chosen Communism. It was inflicted on them in 1917 by the revolutionary violence of a small minority party; and it has been maintained for 29 years by the ever-increasing terrorism of a small minority party. It was because of that tyranny that on June 30, 1941, the Ukrainians declared the re-establishment of an independent Ukrainian state, and that for four years a Ukrainian Insurgent Army carried on bitter warfare against both the Nazis and the Soviet troops. It is by no accident that the Ukrainian Insurgent Army is still in existence in the Ukraine today, carrying on guerrilla warfare against the murder-and-deportation work of the NKVD. The first great fact to be grasped is that the USSR is a grim slave empire, and that the Russians and the Ukrainians have been its first and greatest victims.

The Further Conquest of Europe

That slave empire, however, has a program of world conquest, and is rapidly carrying it out. Since September 1939, Stalin has formally annexed, almost always in breach of solemn treaties, some

fourteen countries or territories, with a combined population of 24,355,000, or over twice that of Canada. He has also brought under terroristic control by his armies and political police some twelve further countries or territories, with a population of 165,000,000, or more than that of all North America.

Into the countries of Central Europe, as Victor Kravchenko had foreseen, the Red Armies and the Red Police, largely equipped and armed by Britain and the United States, came, in 1944-45, not to liberate but to substitute one tyranny for another. Everywhere there was the same evil record of liquidation of the leaders of the socialist and democratic parties, of the deportation to slow death in Siberian labour camps of the middle and upper classes and even of trades union leaders, and of the establishment of puppet regimes to do the will of Moscow.

Finnish Karelia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, part of East Prussia, Eastern Poland, Bukovina, Bessarabia, Moldavia and the Carpatho-Ukraine have all disappeared into the belly of the big Red Bear. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Jugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania, Finland and Eastern Germany are at present in his mouth and are being slowly chewed to pieces.

As Ukrainians on this continent know all too well, the same process of exterminating the martyrs of freedom has also been extended into the refugee and D.P. camps of the areas of Europe occupied by British and American troops. This was by virtue of a Satanic bargain made with the Communist dictator at Yalta. I have read hundreds of letters telling of the murderous deportations and kidnapping of refugees carried out, often with British and American connivance or assistance. As a sample, let me quote some excerpts from a letter that reached me only this week, a letter written by a young English officer, Mr. Francis Scott, who has just been released from the British Army:

At the end of the war I was stationed in Carinthia on the Yugoslav border, keeping an eye on Tito. Quite a variety of D.P.'s came over of various kinds and a good number of Tito agents trying to persuade the local Slovene population that Carinthia would be better under Jugoslavia than Austria. There were also a lot of Germans, but those who interested me most were the Chetniks. They have come back into the public eye with the trial of Mihailovitch. They are the remnants of the old Yugoslav national army who had gone on fighting the Germans with our support. In the middle of the war, as far as one can see under Russian pressure, we transferred our affections to Tito. From then on the Communist Partisans were much more numerous than the

Chetniks and better armed. They spent the greater part of their time rounding up and massacring the Chetniks, whom Britain had so recently supported, with British and Russian arms. This was still in full swing when we arrived. Of course, we were not allowed to cross the frontier, but large numbers of Chetnik soldiers were among the refugees who came over, and there is no doubt that the Tito troops shot any whom they could catch, saying that they had fought for the Germans.

Our orders were to disarm any Chetniks whom we caught crossing the frontier, to take great care that they were not told where they were going, and then to take them back to a different part of the frontier and hand them back unarmed to the Communists from whom they had just escaped. This hardly seemed to most of us to be in accord with the best British principles of fair play, but, as soldiers, we had to obey orders which we were told emanated from Whitehall. I had to interrogate some of the men in question if they spoke German or Italian, and, where possible, I reported that they had useful information and were worth further interrogation. I hoped in this way that there might be some chance of them not being sent back. They were all certain that they would be shot by the Communists if they were. Those who were handed back begged the British troops to shoot them rather than hand them over.

One well-educated officer told me that he had been a professor of Philosophy at Zagreb University and later a captain in the Army. He gave me accounts, some of which were later cross-checked (as true), of vast massacres of Chetniks and other Royalists by the Communist partisans after the war ended. He also said, though I never heard it checked, that minor members of King Peter's Government in London, who were flown back to Yugoslavia, were later shot.

Another case of a similar kind, with which I was never personally connected though it was going on only 30 miles away, was that of the Cossacks. There were some three divisions of Don Cossacks. . . . My division was responsible for disarming them and subsequently handing them over to the Russians. . . . They were all certain that death was the least awful fate that was likely to come their way. Many of them, like the Chetniks, especially the officers, begged our troops to shoot them rather than hand them over. Many of them just jumped off the bridge into the river that formed the demarcation line and committed suicide as our British lorries were taking them to hand over.

No doubt this handing-over was good "diplomacy" and seemed very plausible to statesmen at Yalta and in Whitehall, but it did not seem a very good advertisement for Christian Britain to us soldiers who had to take part in it.

The whole of South-Eastern Europe seems to be full of displaced persons, none of whom want to go home because their homes are in Russian hands, just like the Poles in Scotland. In Austria I sometimes came in contact with as many as fifteen different nationalities in a day, all "displaced."

I hope that I don't seem unduly biased, but my feelings over these things were shared by even the most socialist members of my squadron. . . .

What I felt most was the action taken by this country in handing over simple people who had acted as they felt was right in the war, some of them as our allies, to a sticky fate when we had a chance to save them.

I am afraid this is a very dull letter. Any views are entirely my own, and the facts merely as I saw them. . . . However, I hope that they may be of some interest, and as they are "Non-military" I don't mind who hears them.

Communists Murder Not Fascists But Democrats

So much for this letter from an honest young English officer, heartily ashamed of his share in the British Government's scandalous betrayal of thousands of innocent men into the hands of their Communist murderers. A few days ago I had the painful experience of listening to another young English officer, now the military columnist for a big provincial daily, who, by his arguments, was either hopelessly ignorant of political realities or else had been sent to this continent to do a propaganda job for the appeasement betrayal. According to this rude and cocksure "expert," all that the Red Army and the NKVD had been doing in Soviet-occupied Europe was to clean up on behalf of "democracy" by "eliminating fascists." Let us, however, define a "fascist," whether of the Right or of the Left, as a man who believes in one-party rule by terror and in the suppression of all human rights, and what must we conclude? First, that the Soviet Government itself is the most appalling fascist regime in the world today; and second, that it has consistently, in Soviet-occupied countries, collaborated with notorious fascists of the Right and has consistently suppressed those elements that stood for human freedom. A few examples will make the point clear:

1) In Bulgaria, Kimon Gheorghieff and Damien Valtcheff, the two fascist assassins of the democratic premier, Alexander Stambolisky, were installed by Russia as puppet Premier and Minister of War, while the real democrats—Mushanoff, Buroff and Chicheff—who had led the resistance movement against the Nazis were arrested by the NKVD as "war criminals."

2) In Yugoslavia, all democratic groups have been suppressed by Tito, while infamous lieutenants of Ante-Pavelitch, head of the Ustashi regime that collaborated with Hitler against Britain and massacred hundreds of thousands of Serbs, have been welcomed into the administration. The Klichanitch brothers, decorated by Pavelitch for their terrorism against the Serbs, are now generals in Tito's army; while the

head of Tito's air force is General Mesitch, who fought valiantly on the side of the Nazis at Stalingrad, under General von Paulus.

3) In Rumania, the peasant leader, Juliu Maniu, one of the staunchest fighters against Rumanian and Nazi fascism, has been suppressed by the present Communist dictatorship, while the Iron Guards have become welcome recruits of the Red rulers.

4) In Hungary, real liberals are being put down. Count Bethlen was apparently murdered by the Russians. In the meantime, the Nyilas-Arrow Cross group of Magyar fascists, who were hand in glove with Hitler, are being cheerfully accepted by the Communists.

5) In the Soviet zone of Germany, more and more leading Nazis are being enlisted in the Communist-front regime. Among the prominent recent recruits are Ernst Nikiach and Prof. Hotzsch, former director of the Ost Institut, both leading Nazi intellectuals. On the other hand, Dr. Herman Brill, former Social Democrat leader in Thuringia, who spent ten years in Buchenwald concentration camp for opposing Hitler, has been put back there by the Russians for refusing to join a Communist-front fusion.

In short, Communism is entirely without morals. As Communists are everywhere in a minority, they try to secure control of the masses by any means and to destroy the political parties that stand in their way. That is why all over Europe the doors of the Party are open to ruthless men of any stripe, and especially to fascists. Everywhere the Communists are trying to break or subjugate the Peasant, Socialist and Liberal parties; everywhere they are fighting against peaceful evolution and political freedom. In that evil undertaking, their most welcome allies are precisely the survivors of the fascist regimes that supported Hitler. Like the NKVD, they are already experts in destroying freedom.

Still Further Threats

The threat to freedom extends much farther still. In France, the army and police force are honeycombed with Communists, the provincial press is almost entirely Communist, and in politics, because of the suicidal indecision of the Socialists, who refuse to collaborate with the Right, the Communists exert a vast influence. There have been slight electoral setbacks, but there is very real danger of a Red *coup*

d'état, to be followed by the French-Soviet conquest of Spain and the surrender of Germany to Communism. To all of these risks the economic crisis is contributing immeasurably, as well as the Allied program that has turned Germany west of the Elbe into a starving and desperate economic slum.

At various points farther east there are other mobilizations of aggressive power. There is the threat to Trieste, intended to dominate the Adriatic; there is the gathering of Albanian, Yugoslav and Bulgarian armies to attack Greece; there is the impending Soviet attack on Turkey; the Kurdistan conspiracy; the projected drive through Iran to the Persian Gulf; and the fomenting of anti-British movements in Syria, Egypt, Palestine and India. All of this seeks to disintegrate and to destroy the power of Britain, the one European state that is still a potential check to the Soviet destruction of European freedom. On this side of the Atlantic, governments see the gathering storm with growing consternation but they are handicapped in any firmness of policy because for five years they have sanctioned a propaganda of lies in favour of the Soviet tyranny and hence public opinion is rotten through and through with Stalin-worshipping nonsense and sentimentality. Meanwhile, not only the freedom of Europe but the freedom of the whole world is threatened.

The Moral of Ukrainian Freedom

The moral of all this is that freedom, like peace, is indivisible. Nearly thirty years ago, a free Ukrainian state came into existence, calling into free statehood a Slavic nation almost as large as France. This Ukrainian National Republic was recognized *de facto* by Britain and France, and *de jure* by Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, Turkey, the Russian Socialist Federative Republic, Georgia and Poland. When the freedom of this Ukrainian republic was threatened by the Bolsheviks, it appealed in vain to the Western democracies and came again under the iron rule of Moscow. Again and again during the past quarter-century its advocates and martyrs have brought to the world's attention the character of the intruding despotism that has wiped out every phase of Ukrainian liberty, murdered its leaders, starved its peasants by the million, and deported millions of others to die in Siberia. To all of this story, the Western world has remained silent and indifferent. What concern of Britain, France, America or

Canada was the alleged subjugation of an almost unknown nation behind the iron curtain of Soviet censorship? But now the Black Death of Communist slavery has spread from these swamps of Ukrainian misery and is sweeping in a vast epidemic across Europe. More than a dozen nations are mortally afflicted; a dozen others are in the trembling fit of fever; and every other nation of the world, including Canada with its espionage convictions and its defiant Communists, sees the grim plague-spots spreading on its skin. Because we neglected Ukrainian freedom and refused to take it seriously, the freedom of the whole human race is now in danger.

What then can we do? Even at this late hour we can repair our criminal neglect of the past by recognizing that the Ukrainian desire for liberty is not high treason to Stalin but a natural and noble ideal on the part of one of the largest nationalities in Europe. In keeping with that recognition of fundamental truth, we can call for a termination of the evil bargain at Yalta whereby Ukrainian and other refugees west of the "iron curtain" were to be handed back to the hangmen and firing-squads of the Soviet tyrant. And we can urge our Government to extend to the utmost its provision of asylum in this country for genuine non-Communist refugees from Europe.

Most important of all, we Canadians as a people can cease from all flattering appeasement of the Ukraine's enslavers, for the Kremlin is deliberately plotting a like enslavement for us and spits in contempt on all our sentimental efforts to curry favour with it by Councils of Friendship, lying newspaper editorials, and proposals to spread its books abroad in cheap English translations. Let us be honest. Let us frankly face the facts. Let us admit that at this very moment the Soviet Communists and their agents are murdering and deporting innocent men and women all through Central Europe and that the slave camps of Siberia are filled with millions upon millions of hopeless, dying prisoners. And in the presence of that vast crucifixion of mankind, let us insist that our diplomats and politicians and radio men and newspaper editors stop kissing the Master Hangman. Even Judas Iscariot only kissed the victim.

Such craven abasement is not necessary. The Anglo-Saxon nations are vastly stronger than the Soviet slave empire. Their industrial potential and their scientific potential are incomparably superior. Even in the past war, according to an Associated Press despatch from

Berlin, dated May 18, 1946, some 60 per cent of the German casualties were suffered on the Western front, at the hands of the British and the Americans, and only about 40 per cent on the Eastern front, where the Soviet share of the victory was largely won with British and American equipment. Danger to the future lies not in our taking a firm stand for liberty but in such weak foreign policies as will encourage Moscow into aggressive adventures that can only end in war. Our safest course is the course of courage and honesty. We shall gain and not lose by a bold affirmation of the cause of human freedom.



THE MOSES OF IVAN FRANKO

by PROF. CLARENCE A. MANNING
Columbia University, New York

(Quotations from translation by Wladimir Semenyina, New York, 1938)

ALMOST from the very day of its publication, Ukrainian critics have regarded the long narrative poem of Ivan Franko, *Moses*, as one of the outstanding masterpieces of Ukrainian literature. It ranks high as poetry but its poetic merits are responsible only for one part of its universal acclaim, for Franko revealed in it more fully than perhaps anywhere else his own personal views as to the future of his people and also with rare feeling outlined his own conception of the type of leader whom his people needed and he gave a severe criticism of and apology for his own activities.

To understand the poem, we need to remember and understand the role of Franko in the Ukrainian movement, especially in Western Ukraine. He was born in 1856 as a poor boy in the little village of Nahuyevichi. Despite financial obstacles, he succeeded in securing an education and in taking the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Vienna. An active and prolific journalist, he was the foremost Ukrainian publicist working in Western Ukraine. He took for some years an active part in the political life of the province and made himself the acknowledged spokesman of progressive thought. He had his difficulties with the Austro-Hungarian authorities, with the Polish landlords and radicals who controlled the province under the old system of administration, and not less, with the Ukrainians old and young, who were satisfied with the old order in the name of conservatism or who were eager to find a new millenium by being false to their political traditions and culture. One of the first Ukrainian thinkers to grasp the possibilities of a united Ukraine, he fought as bitterly against those people who formed the Russophile party as he did those who favored subservience to the Poles or the ruling classes of the Empire. Now in 1905 as the acknowledged leader of Ukrainian thought in Western Ukraine, and nearing the end of his career, he summarized in poetic form all of his thoughts and ex-

periences in this account of the last days of Moses, leading the children of Israel out of slavery in Egypt to the promised land.

Western Ukraine had passed into the possession of the Hapsburg Emperors at the time of the dismemberment of Poland in the eighteenth century. At times, when there seemed signs of Polish discontent, the Ukrainians were favored by the government of Vienna but the political and economic control of the province of Eastern Galicia as it was called, remained quite consistently in the hands of the Polish gentry. Serfdom was abolished but the newer industrialism and the economic development of the country largely passed by the Ukrainian population or left them even more helpless than they had been under the old order.

Culturally their lot was bad. Many of the more conservative desired to continue the use of the Church Slavonic language and to produce a purely clerical culture. To those who saw that this was inadequate for modern life, the Russian empire presented an alluring ideal of a great state which would remedy their most pressing ills. It made no difference to these people that the Ukrainians under Russian rule had even fewer rights than did those in Western Ukraine and that their culture received even less recognition. They cheerfully accepted Russian claims that their speech was only a peasant form of Russian and opposed all those groups and persons who dared to speak of the past glories and the future possibilities of an independent Ukraine.

This was the situation when Ivan Franko commenced his work and it continued to be the iron wall at which he was compelled to batter all his life. His success could be measured in the improved well being of the Ukrainians in the early years of the twentieth century, in the growing national consciousness of the people which was to express itself in the declaration of independence of the Republic of Western Ukraine at the end of the First World War, in the increasing number of Ukrainians in the Parliament at Vienna and in many other ways. Yet all these achievements seemed so pitifully small in comparison with the great needs of the people. They seemed so insignificant in comparison with the herculean efforts put forth by Franko and so far inferior to the dreams that he had for his people that it is not surprising that at times even his indomitable spirit lost hope and that he gave way to fits of depression and despair. That is the connection between him and Moses who likewise was not allowed

to lead the children of Israel into the promised land and it explains the theme of the poem.

The prologue sets the theme of Ukraine and Franko's confidence in the future of his people. The publisher had asked for a prologue and almost over night Franko dashed off these few lines which summarize the Ukrainian situation, the sacrifices that the people have made in the past and will be called upon to make in the future, and the poet's confidence that at a future date they will be free from the Caucasus to the Carpathians and will play a noble and distinguished part in the history of the future as they had done in the past. At the same time with his mind on the struggles of the past and his own doubts as to his own abilities, he could not suppress the fear that he was not to be the destined leader to take them out of their misery, and the apparently hopeless present. These two themes form the content of the nineteen chapters of the poem.

The choice of subject was itself significant. The powerful denunciations of social evil by the prophets of the Old Testament made a strong appeal to the conscience of the Ukrainians, whether Uniat or Orthodox. Again and again Taras Shevchenko had interpreted these in terms of the Ukrainian situation. In his earlier years, Franko had drawn upon the book of Genesis for his *Death of Cain* and now in *Moses* he uses the first books of the Old Testament to project his view of his people.

His use of the Bible is on the whole reverent and devout and follows with considerable closeness the Biblical accounts of the revolts of the Israelites against Moses and Jehovah. As befits a man inclined to rationalism, he avoids the miracle of the swallowing up of Dathan and Abiram by the earth and places their revolt later in the life of Moses than is perhaps implied in the Old Testament, but these are minor changes which can be explained by the purpose of Franko rather than by any desire for innovation.

The story can be read as it is but from the prologue with its deliberate and moving appeal to the Ukrainian people, we can see a certain symbolism which extends into many of the changes in the story. Thus we do not find the theme of the return to Egypt, the desire of the people to return to the life of slaves which they had been living. It would conflict with the allegory, for a return would imply the maintenance of the present unsatisfactory position under Austria-Hungary or a return to a restored Poland, both of which ideas were

repugnant to Franko. On the other hand Dathan and Abiram who in the Old Testament objected to the predominance of Moses now represent the Russophile leaders with their constant appeal to the Ukrainians to turn to the east.

“Our destination’s eastward! To the land
Where the sun shows his morning face,
And westward to your promised Canaan
We will not take a single pace.”

They hold forth the promise that if the Ukrainians will cease to be themselves and will accept the theories of the pro-Russian party, all will be well.

On the other hand, Dathan’s attack on Moses as an Egyptian alludes to the attacks that had been made on Franko as unpatriotic, because he had not joined those old fashioned groups which contented themselves with indiscriminate adoration of everything Ukrainian including the various abuses from which the peasants suffered. These had no desire to bring about better and more humane living conditions but they put up the plea that Franko was false to his people because in his journalistic writings and especially in his article on his own life and works in 1897, he had avowed frankly that he could not love the people as did the patented patriots of the conservative camps. He emphasized his duty to help his people but he declared with bitter sarcasm his insistence that he had to help them and instruct them without that romantic sentimentality that so pleased certain groups.

The poem opens at the period when the Israelites have reached the lowest point of discouragement. They realize how desperate their situation is. There is no fodder for their flocks and herds. They have to move but they are so despondent that they have listened to the advice of Dathan and Abiram and adopted a resolution to stone any one who speaks to them of God, of ideals, and of a promised land. Only the children still play at war-like and optimistic games, for it is they alone who have continued to listen to Moses, the old leader, worn and broken by old age but still indefatigably urging them on to better things.

Despite the stern decree, Moses comes out to address them and tells the story of how the black-thorn alone of all the trees is willing to take the rule over the trees for their own good as a covering crop, while the cedar of Lebanon, the oak, the palm, the rose and the birch

all refuse for their own interests. Then he explains the parable. It is not the proud and the haughty, the rich, the beautiful, the artistic and the pampered that can serve mankind but the common people. The speech is in line with the whole spirit of Ukrainian literature from its revival and it emphasizes that spirit of democratic progressive idealism that had always characterized Franko.

Moses fails in his efforts and endeavors to seek the promised land alone and so he goes off into the deepening twilight. It was the mood of Franko, who had in a way withdrawn from public life after he had been illegally refused the chair of Ukrainian literature at the University of Lviv, after he had been cheated out of an election to the Austrian Parliament and after he had been bitterly attacked by the conservative, pseudo-religious and pseudo-patriotic parties for his efforts to reorganize the Ukrainian political and social life in Western Ukraine at the end of the nineties. Moses' confidence that he was right and that he was performing the will of Jehovah sustained him through these trying moments and similarly Franko was able to stand all the trials that came upon him including the mental illness of his wife.

Yet once he had left the camp to the terror even of those people who had attacked him, Moses did not find peace. The solitude of the mountain forced him to self-examination and here the tempter Azazel has the advantage. In a tone that sounds like pity but is really scorn, the evil angel now is able to suggest that all those charges brought by Dathan and Abiram are really true. He convinces Moses for a moment that he has been trying to remodel the people to his own ideas because he was ashamed of them as they were and he points out the endless warring and bloodshed that would follow had Moses succeeded. He shows him a picture of the future history of Palestine under the Jewish king and later, and asks if that is worth the struggle. Again for a moment he convinces the aged prophet and the latter cries out, "Jehovah has fooled us like a herd."

It is then Jehovah speaks. He rebukes Moses for giving way to dreams of mere material success and of disregard for the greater value of the feeding of men's souls. In a speech that outlines the most noble and exalted view of the human personality, he points out to Moses where he has really failed and utters the stern warning that since he has once doubted, he can never enter the promised land. It was almost like a prophecy, for Franko who had hardly dared to dream of a free Ukraine died in 1916 just three years before his people had their first taste of

freedom in centuries. Moses has failed but he has met with greater success than he dared to hope for. He has no sooner vanished than his closest follower Joshua sounds the call for the advance and the Israelites, roused from their despair, press onward to enter the promised land.

We can see the close parallel between the fate of the Ukrainians, as Franko dreamed it, and the Jews. It is only the tempter Azazel who holds forth the future contempt which the Jews shall meet, and it is Jehovah in His final speech that appeals to Moses and the people to hold on to their ideals which offer the only index to human progress on earth. This was very typical for Franko who in his *Jewish Melodies* had been one of the first of the Ukrainian authors to study the true condition of the Jews in Western Ukraine and who in other works showed clearly that the roots of the Jewish problem lay far deeper than in any superficial consideration of the difficulties caused by the concentration of the Jews in certain particular trades and businesses.

What then is the message that Franko holds out for the future of his people? Dathan and Abiram are willing to lose their identity in a great Russia. Azazel the tempter, pointing out the sorrows and misfortunes of the people through the ages when they are proud of their small state and think only of the material sides of their existence, can declare that the future is not worth the price and like Dathan and Abiram in the camp scorns Moses for his unceasing efforts for the welfare of the people. Moses has been too concerned with their material well being, even though he has grasped the truth of human dignity and value in the parable of the thorn.

Jehovah emphasizes the essential thing in human life. It is the constant struggle for human improvement, for the feeding of the human soul. Franko does not decry well being. He is too well aware of the importance of food, of shelter, of liberty to fall into any of the pitfalls which tempt man to acquiesce in evil and the status quo in a futile service to vain ideals. He comes perhaps closer to the idea of Thoreau than to those of Tolstoy, for Thoreau with all of his self abnegation and his ideas that man should live a simple life, still held up the goal of noble and refined thinking and study. He did not share in the Tolstoyan attitude that the common people who had nothing were therefore more on the path of righteousness because they were poor and had nothing. Franko feels the same way. He knows that Moses has been attacked because he was educated at the court of Pharaoh. Jehovah has not one word to say in criticism of this. What is his theme?

Whoever wins the riches of the earth
And cherishes them above all,
Will find himself their servant and their slave—
Will lose all treasures of the soul.

The master of his riches and their slave—
Paid for with blood and with disgrace,
In order to increase them he, himself,
In time will undermine their base.

Whoever feeds you only with some bread
Will with that bread himself decay;
But he who satisfies your hungry souls
Will always be my protegee!

That is where you will find your promised land:
The soil of boundless glory, pride;
So, as the people's leader, you have been
A very narrow-sighted guide.

That is where the glory of your future lies—
Of all the realms the finest part;
This Palestine is nothing but a gift
With which to offer you a start."

Perhaps there is here at least a partial answer to some of the Ukrainian leaders in Western Ukraine who refused to look to the welfare of their brothers in great Ukraine and dreamed only of a millennium to be established in the one province that was then under Austria-Hungary. It certainly rejects what might be called even a pan-Ukrainian isolationism which would view the country solely as a unit and not think of its relations to the other nations of the world.

Through the whole poem runs that plea for social and ethical reform that Franko always preached. The rich are not to trust only in their riches, the wise in their wisdom. It is the spirit of humanity that counts. It is the things of the spirit that are the most important. Franko, often reproached for his criticism of religion, makes it clear that "man doth not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." He is as far from that widespread Communist point of view that religion is the opium of the people and that material well being is the all-important thing and that the mind of man is to be standardized and mechanized for this result as he is from the point of

view that conditions should continue as they have been in the past. The Israelites in leaving Egypt had started on a new path as free men and they must continue on it without counting the cost, until they have reached the goal of justice and of liberty for themselves and all.

And what of the leader? There is not a word of censure for Moses from Jehovah for starting on the new path. He has travelled too far and too fast. His boundless energy and his powerful will have led him to a point where he has been unable to carry the people with him and he has wandered off alone to be faced with the consequences of his own high vision. It is often the story of the lost leader, who fails because he has lost touch with those whom he would persuade and has tried to drive them instead. It is the duty of the leader to hold the vision and yet to guide his actions so that he can always bring his followers along with him. The departure of Moses was a grand and useless gesture. It made him hesitate and doubt. He could not understand that already the seed that he had sown was sprouting in the souls of Joshua and of hundreds of thousands of other people. He could not believe that within a few days and hours that people whom he had scorned would turn on their ill-advised leaders and swarm across the Jordan into Palestine while he, himself, for his distrust of Jehovah and of them, would be compelled to remain outside. There were moments when Ivan Franko felt himself guilty of the same defect. There were times when he became impatient of the ill-success of his efforts and when he could easily identify himself with Moses. Yet the fact that he could see clearly where he had made the mistakes which were so costly to him is the best proof that at heart he had never yielded to the temptation. In 1913, eight years after the appearance of Moses, the Ukrainians from all parts of Ukraine and abroad met at Lviv to honor the fortieth anniversary of his literary activity. There was hardly a disapproving voice raised and the whole celebration was a striking proof that Ivan Franko was living up to his duties as a spiritual and progressive leader of the Ukrainian people.

So he was and in this poem, perhaps more than anywhere else, he outlined on a broad scale under the guise of the fate of the children of Israel the path that Ukraine should take to attain its well-being, its freedom and its world position. He holds up that development which the oppressed people had to take, if they would purge their own body politic of the evils that has held it back. He expressed his confidence in the youth of his country. He sets forth those ideals which will be the mark of success, the symbol of real progress, the sign of the growth

of justice, of brotherhood and of democracy. He sharply dissociates the role of Ukraine and of the Ukrainian leader from all those philosophies which were already sowing in Europe the germs of the future omnipotent führers and dukes, and commissars and generalissimos.

As a result *Moses* is not a poem for Ukraine but for the world. The lessons which Franko gives his people are as valid for all others as for the Ukrainians. The warning against a blatant materialism and a frenzied nationalism are applicable to all other states. The call to idealism and to the fulfillment of the highest ideals of justice, liberty, and democracy needs to-day to be heard and marked by every country in the world. The time is past, if it ever was, when disregard of human rights can bring prosperity and well-being. It may bring peace but that peace is the peace of the tempter Azazel, who desires nothing better than to see men fall from the heights and land ultimately in new misfortunes which they are unprepared to bear.

It is remarkable that the two great spokesmen of the Ukrainian people in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Shevchenko and Franko, have spoken so frankly and so clearly of the value of human personality and of human freedom. It is a tragedy that a world in anguish and misery have not heard them and it is still more tragic that in the name of peace and of brotherhood the United Nations have closed their eyes and ears to them and to their people and have listened to the voice of foreign conquerors as the voice of Ukraine. It is not too late to hope that the softly pitying but contemptuously scornful words of Azazel may yet be resisted and that the voice of the real Ukraine as heard through its democratic leaders and prophets may again be able to sound forth and that Ukraine with its noble spirit may take its place along the lines marked out by Franko in ushering in a new era for humanity.



WHY I DO NOT WANT TO GO "HOME"

By IVAN BAHRYANY

[Ivan Bahryany is one of the outstanding Ukrainian writers of the younger generation. He was born in Soviet Ukraine and educated in the Soviet schools. He has spent many years in Soviet prisons and concentration camps for his Ukrainian connections. Now as a political refugee in Germany, he is Executive Officer of the Association of Ukrainian Writers and Artists in Western Europe and one of the leaders of the Ukrainian Artistic Movement (*Mystetsky Ukrainsky Rukh—MUR*). —EDITOR.]

I AM one of those hundreds of thousands of the Ukrainian people who do not want to go home under Bolshevism and so startle the whole world.

I am a Ukrainian, 35 years old, born in the region of Poltava of laboring parents and now I am living with no fixed residence, in constant want, wandering like a homeless cur around Europe—hiding from the repatriation committees of the USSR, who want to send me "home."

I do not want to go "home." There are hundreds of thousands of us who do not want to. They can come for us with loaded rifles, but we will put up a desperate resistance—for we prefer to die in a foreign land rather than go back to that "home." I put that word in quotation marks, for it is filled for us with horror, for it shows the unparalleled cynicism of the Soviet propaganda directed against us: the Bolsheviks have made for 100 nationalities one "Soviet home" and by that term they are building the terrible "prison of peoples," the so-called USSR.

They call it a "home" and complain about us to the whole world so as to take us back on a halter to that "home." At the mere thought that they can catch me and take me back, my hair turns white and I always carry with me a dose of cyanide as the last method of self-defence against Stalinist socialism, against that "home."

For Europeans and citizens of all parts of the world (except the USSR), it is strange and incomprehensible how a person can flee from his native land and not want to return to it. Perhaps it is because he is a desperate criminal who is afraid of punishment for his major crimes against his native land. Perhaps they accuse us of such.

It is natural that those should wander, to whom the world "native land" has a holy meaning. What can be dearer than one's own native

land, the land where he was born and played as a child, where there are the bones of his ancestors, the grave of his mother?

For us the word "native land" is filled with the same holy meaning, perhaps more than for any one else. But it is not the Stalin "home." I dream at night of my native land. My native land is Ukraine, one of the republics with "equal rights" in the federation called the USSR. I am not only a criminal against my native land, but—to help it, I have spent one third of my life even before the War in Soviet prisons and concentration camps.

I dream of it every night and yet I do not want now to go back to it.

Why?

Bolshevism is there.

The civilized world does not know what that means and cannot believe it. The person who listens to us must pay attention. We have spent there a quarter of a century and in telling now the horrible truth about that world, we do it with the full knowledge that we are placing under the threat of death, terror and prison, all our friends and relatives, because they are still there and because Stalin will take out on them his boundless spite and his bloody hate against us Ukrainians.

But this does not stop us from trying to tell the world only a small part of that terrible truth, which follows us every day in want, cold and hunger and drives us on like a horrible nightmare,—that truth about that "home," about the extreme Stalinist socialism and about our Ukrainian tragedy under it.

And so:

I

Pick up the Small Soviet Encyclopedia, edition 1940, open it and under the letter "U" read what is written in the article "UkSSR."

It is a document and there you will see in black and white, although in fine print, that Soviet Ukraine according to the census of 1927 had a population of 32 million and in 1939 (twelve years later) . . . 28 million.

Only 28 million? What happened to 4 million people after 1927? Where is the natural increase which in 12 years should have been at least 6-7 million?

That means more than 10 million? What happened to those 10 million of the Ukrainian population? What happened to them in the "land of flourishing socialism"?

That is why I do not want to go back under Bolshevism.

I walked over the whole road to Calvary with my people and I was a living witness of what happened to those millions. I cannot tell it in detail in a short article, but at least I want to give a short summary.

I want to emphasize in this that I am the son of a workman (a proletarian), that is, a member of the ruling class in the USSR, in the name of which Stalin and his party operate their so-called "proletarian dictatorship." But I am the son of a *Ukrainian* proletarian and also my mother is of peasant origin, the daughter of the peasant farmer Ivan Krivusha of the village of Kuzemeny in the region of Poltava—and that is the misfortune of my whole life in the ultra-democratic USSR.

Through the fact I have been not only a witness of what happened to those 10 millions of the Ukrainian population but also a part of those other millions who with them were murdered and impoverished systematically through all the years of Bolshevism.

II

I was a little boy, only ten years old, when Bolshevism impressed itself upon me like a bloody nightmare and the murderer of my people. That was in 1920. I was living with my grandfather in the village among the bee-hives. Grandfather was 92 years old and had only one arm but he made his living by looking after the hives. He reminded me of Saints Zosima and Savvaty whose ikons were hanging on an old linden tree among the hives.

One day towards evening a band of armed men appeared, speaking a strange language and before my eyes and the eyes of my cousins and despite our yells and cries, they murdered grandfather and one of his sons (an uncle of mine). They stuck them again and again with their bayonets and to be sure of their success they shot at the bloody bodies on the ground with their pistols and laughed. The sound was awful. Under the old linden among the beehives, around the ikon of Saints Zosima and Savvaty, the ground was all sprinkled with blood. That was St. Bartholomew's Eve in our village. There had been many such nights in Ukraine and small as I was, I had heard of them but I had never seen them. Then I did. That night there were murdered in our village all substantial farmers and the priest and Bolshevism was organized that night (as only one of many such) in the form of a representative of the Cheka and a Bolshevik murder gang.

I did not know then that it was a prelude to my whole life under

the Soviets and a symbol of the fate prepared by Bolshevism for my whole nation. They tortured my grandfather to death because he was a rich Ukrainian farmer (he had 80 acres of land) and he was against the "commune," and my uncle, because he had been during the national struggle for independence in 1917-1918 a soldier of the national army of the Ukrainian People's Republic, that is, he had fought for the freedom and independence of Ukrainian people.

My other uncle who had hidden and escaped death was later arrested and without trial sent to Solovki for ten years, then for ten years additional and he died there. Later I and my entire family went on the same road.

That is the way I first observed Bolshevism at first hand. At the beginning of my life and the origin of the UkSSR, I saw Ukraine crushed under the Soviet regime and colonized by the Red Moscow imperialism. Later I saw that all life there was as bloody and cruel.

III

Having mastered Ukraine, Bolshevism set as its goal the task of denationalizing it, destroying it spiritually and nationally by proceeding to make of the multi-national USSR a single Red Empire. Since Ukraine was the richest republic of the USSR and the second in size after Russia, Bolshevism decided to subdue it at any cost. Since the population would not consent to this, Moscow Bolshevism entered upon the path of provocation, terror and the physical annihilation of whole masses of the people, a policy which it has followed during the entire period of its domination and which it is still continuing. This annihilation was carried on a grandiose scale, as befits a people dominated by the mania of greatness.

In the years 1929-1932, Bolshevism declared war against the entire wealthy farming class with the slogan of "the annihilation of the kulak as a class." In reality this meant the annihilation of a colossal mass of people, the hard-working dirt farmers. That means the annihilation of the Ukrainian country population. The annihilation of the "kulak as a class" was in reality for us the annihilation of Ukraine as a nation, for the Ukrainians were 70% agricultural. Through this slogan of physical annihilation there were destroyed literally millions of Ukrainians, not only of the so-called "kulaks" but of the poor people, intellectuals and workmen.

In Ukraine the annihilation was carried out not on the social

plane but on the political and national. The "kulaks" were destroyed, because they were rich, because they were "kulaks." The poor, the intellectuals, and the workmen were destroyed, because they sympathized with the "kulaks," and that meant that they were "little kulaks." In this category was placed every one who opposed the Soviet government and collectivization.

All these masses of people destined to death, were sent to the snows of Siberia and the far north and they died of hunger, cold, and disease, and were deprived of all rights, even the most elementary.

They sent them far away with all their families and tore them up by the roots—along with the old people and young children. And as they drove them throughout the whole USSR as prisoners, they pursued them in every way possible—with the spoken word and in the press. When they had taken them to the grim Pechora or Murmansk, they threw them out at liberty. Whoever had not died on the journey, perished there. Mothers had no way of burying little children who died on the road but had to throw them out in the snow without priests or graves—and then not long after they lay down themselves with the same fate.

With the bones of these Ukrainian children and mothers, Stalin has paved all the roads and wilderness of the "unconquered home."

That is how many of my relatives perished. But it made life no easier for any one in Ukraine.

That is why I hate Bolshevism and do not want to go "home."

IV

In 1933 the Bolsheviks artificially organized a famine in Ukraine. Before the eyes of the whole world the Ukrainian village population died out in whole villages and regions. More than 5 million Ukrainian village people died that terrible death by famine at that time. No one in the Kremlin raised a finger to save this unfortunate people. On the contrary; Stalin refused the assistance which was organized in Western Ukraine under the leadership of Metropolitan Sheptitsky, brotherly assistance from that part of the Ukrainian people, which was living outside the boundaries of the USSR in Poland, and he even made no statement about the perishing Ukrainians in the USSR. Why? It was dangerous, for it showed that national solidarity so feared by Bolshevism. Stalin doomed the Ukrainian agricultural population to death by famine deliberately to compel it to obey and be reconciled to the Kolkhoz slavery which he had introduced.

Elevators in the whole USSR were bursting with Ukrainian grain, grown by the Ukrainian people and with the produce of that people the Bolsheviks were depressing the world markets by dumping, and they were using it to support the Chinese revolution, etc. At that same time, when the dying Ukrainian farmers went to the capital to beg for alms on the streets, the red gendarmerie, called the "workmen's and peasants' militia," tracked them down and threw them outside the city to perish along the roads.

In that terrible tragedy the Ukrainian people were forced to cannibalism. Mothers, insane from hunger, ate their own children.

You mothers of the entire world! Can you visualize a position and a regime under which you would be forced to eat your own child?

No.

You cannot conceive it or believe it.

It happened in Ukraine in 1933.

Perhaps you think that our mothers, our wives, our sisters are savages or Bushmen or like the other wild tribes of Africa?

No, our mothers and sisters are of eastern Europe and of the same race as the Grand Princess Olga who introduced Christianity at the dawn of European civilization.

Our mothers and sisters are of one of the most noble Slavonic tribes, of Ukraine and are as noble and beautiful as the wives and maidens of Italy, France, or England. But . . . they were brought to this tragic situation by Bolshevism. To the most extreme condition of human tragedy which takes away the functioning of the normal mind. They were placed before the ghastly alternative of dying a terrible death by famine, or . . . and this "or" was the result of the insanity of the dying. And death just the same stood behind this second "or." Bolshevism put it there, and was the symbol of it. Cannibalism is its origin and essence and is the symbol of it. It is possible to collect a whole mass of facts and materials and living witnesses who can well illuminate this terrible page in our history.

It is for those who are interested. But no one in the whole world is interested and in that is the greatest tragedy of us, the Ukrainian people. This artificially prepared famine demanded colossal sacrifices from a people who wished for nothing but freedom and independence. That is why I hate Bolshevism and do not want to go "home."

V

In the years 1932-1939, the Bolsheviks annihilated the entire Ukrainian intellectual class: scholars, writers, artists, military men, political workers and thousands and tens of thousands of thinking people, who formed the highest stratum of the people. Many of them were Communists who had fought heroically in the October Revolution, for its slogans of liberty and justice, equality and brotherhood, and who had during the entire time been true to these slogans.

Stalin, trampling upon all these slogans with his anti-national policy, destroyed those people who remained true to them to the end.

Bolshevism annihilated them to rid the Ukrainian people of its spiritual elite, who were aiding them toward freedom and social justice. It annihilated them, after first subjecting them to a terrible inquisition and such tortures as were only known in the Middle Ages, and then shot them or sent them to prison in distant Kolima, Solovki, Franz Joseph Land, etc.

Thus perished many of my friends and comrades: Thus perished the writers, Hrihori Kosynka, D. Falkivsky, B. Antonenko-Davydovych, E. Pluzhnyk, B. Teneta, D. Zahul, M. Yohansyn, M. Kulish, S. Pylpenko, O. Slisarenko, Brasyuk, Dray-Khmara, M. Ivchenko, H. Shkurupi, Yu. Shpol, Hr. Epik, Pidmohylny, M. Vorony, M. Zerov, and others . . .

Artists: I. Padalka, Sedlyar, Vrona, and others.

Army officers: Yakir, Dubovy, Tyutyunyk, etc.

Thus perished the professors: Hermayze, S. Efremov, Doroshkevych, etc.

This list is as long and endless as is our tragedy. Many active Ukrainian Communists ended their lives by suicide as the narkom (People's Commissar) Skrypnyk, the Communist writer Khvylovy, the head of the Council of People's Commissars of the UkSSR, Lyubchenko, etc.

Among all these tortured leaders of the Ukrainian art, literature and science, there were many great names and men of undoubted talents, known and honored not only in Ukraine.

Many of them were my companions and friends and I can certify that they were not "enemies of the people," but on the contrary were ardent patriots, highly intellectual and honorable sons of workmen and peasants and inflexibly honorable people. That is why they were annihilated.

With them I passed over the thorny path of Bolshevik prisons and concentration camps. With many I sat in one cell where I was beaten and tortured with them.

I call upon all the Ukrainians in America to mark my words, and especially the Ukrainian Communists: thus perished among others your well-known Communist author, M. Irchan, thus perished all the Galician Ukrainian Communists, who had believed Stalin and had come to the USSR to build Soviet Ukraine in a "brotherly union" with red Moscow. They were annihilated because they were Ukrainian Communists and believed in the hypocritical Bolshevik talk about the right of the nations to "freedom" . . . even to "separation," and hoped to carry that "right" into practice. Many living witnesses can say where the bones are lying of such men as Hritsay, Badan, Krushelnytsky, etc.

And if the American Ukrainian Communists to-day come out against us, Ukrainian fugitives from Bolshevism, and try to send us back, they are carrying out the role of Cain. Let them go themselves to that "Stalin's paradise" and stay there a few years. Then, if they wish, let them speak.

Besides the prominent and well-known members of the higher intellectual class, there were murdered during these same years a mass of unknown intellectuals. And all because they were Ukrainian and because by some mere word spoken perhaps 20 years before, they had expressed their dislike for the occupying regime of Moscow. For that they were declared "enemies of the people" and were murdered in such a manner that even Hitler could admire and copy. The terrors of Dachau and Buchenwald do not surpass the horrors of countless NKVD torture chambers and concentration camps of those years.

As a consequence of all this vivisection of the Ukrainian people, there perished even by Soviet statistics, about which we have spoken, between the years 1927 and 1939 more than 10 million of the population.

But Soviet statistics do not merit confidence. The census at the end of the thirties was made twice. Once in 1937. After it was finished, it was destroyed and it was planned to make a new census but to postpone it for a longer time, for the results of the census were too terrible.

After the postponement hurried measures were taken to correct the tragic number of the population in the various republics and in Ukraine. Laws were hurriedly passed, forbidding abortions and granting rewards for large families, to increase the growth of the population.

Then there was undertaken the census of 1939 and in this they even listed people condemned to death but whose sentences were postponed until the completion of the census. Even so in Ukraine there was a drop of several million in comparison with 1927, even on the basis of this so-called "census."

That is why I do not want to return under Bolshevism and will never be taken alive, for Stalin's satraps to take me back to the "Soviet home."

VI

I passed through that "home" from Kiev to Kamchatka, to Bering Strait and back. I passed through it under the protection of the oprichnicks of the GPU-NKVD, and I underwent in succession all the martyrdoms, until I escaped to Europe. It lasted for 8 years. Half of my adult life has been spent in the prisons and concentration camps of Bolshevia. My whole youth has been buried there. The rest of my life has been passed in that great concentration camps, the name of which is the USSR, where a whole category of people (the category of the politically unreliable) are deprived of the right of speech and are doomed to an eternal condition of moral depression, without mentioning the fact that it is often deprived of work and means of livelihood and constantly threatened with new arrests and imprisonments.

It is not for nothing that there has been developed there that type of person so widely spread—a person terrified, suspicious, silent and fatalistic.

A European or an American, hearing that his author has passed 8 years in prison in the land of "socialism," thinks that he is at least a confirmed murderer, an abuser of young children, or a bandit on the high roads, to deserve such a punishment.

No, the author is a Ukrainian artist with high education and has never killed even a chicken. His whole misfortune has been that in that land of "Stalinist socialism" and of the "widest democracy in the world," he dared to say a word of protest and that was concealed in the form of a fable. For that he passed his youth in prisons and hard labor, envying even the bandits, for they had a lighter regime and had privileges, but artists had no privileges, as "political criminals," because they were patriots on behalf of their people and their native land.

That is the paradox.

VII

I do not want to return to my native land, because I love my native land. And love for one's native land, for one's people, that is, national patriotism in the USSR is the greatest crime. It was so 25 years ago, it is so now. This crime is called in Bolshevik language—in the language of red Moscow fascism—"local nationalism."

Why is it regarded as the greatest crime?

The USSR, as is known, is a federation of republics with equal rights, of peoples with equal rights, who "according to the constitution of Stalin" have the right to national freedom, even to separation from the USSR. That means, each representative of each nation has the right to his own patriotism and to love for his own people.

But this is only in theory.

In fact, if any republic wished to leave the federation, it would be crushed with fire and sword by its ally with "equal rights"—Bolshevik Russia. It has always been held down and dominated by terror in this "free" alliance. Bolshevism is striving to create one totalitarian red empire, with one administration, one language, one culture, one ideology and politics.

The slightest demonstration of its own will by any of the nations "with equal rights" in the USSR (except Russia) is suppressed by a terrible moral and physical terror.

By the use of that terror the Russian red fascism (Bolshevism) is striving to refashion 100 nationalities into the so-called "one Soviet people"—that is actually into the Russian people.

Therefore local patriotism, that is, the patriotism of each of the 100 nationalities,—striving for national freedom and independence, is regarded as the greatest crime and is heavily punished accordingly.

Therefore love for one's people and one's native land (not for the USSR, the prison of nations, but let us say for Georgia, for Ukraine, for White Russia, etc.) is regarded as the greatest evil. Therefore they give no peace to the Ukrainians even beyond the borders of the USSR, and strive by force and provocations to drag them back and destroy them.

Then in order that the world may not be aroused but may rather assist Bolshevism in its work, Bolshevism tries to prove to every one that the Ukrainians are war criminals, enemies of Bolshevism.

Yes, the Ukrainians are enemies of Bolshevism but they are not war criminals. They fought alike against Hitler and against Stalin.

They fought against both before this war and they fought against both in the war.

Many of us after the prisons and concentration camps of Stalin passed through the concentration camps of the Gestapo—through Dachau, Belsen, Buchenwald, Auschwitz, and others. More were hung and tortured by Hitler, the ally of Stalin in 1939. Bolshevism knows it. But it is trying to blacken us in the most shameful manner so that no one in the world will sympathize with us and help us.

Why?

Because we are a danger to it—we are the bearers of that truth, which the world does not know and must learn—That is what Bolshevism fears.

VIII

I do not want to go back to the Stalin "home," because the baseness, cynicism and cruelty of the Bolsheviks know no bounds. The party slogan which is expressed by the proverb, "the end justifies all means," actually does not overlook any means. Since the goal of the Bolsheviks has changed several times during the years of its domination (from the goal of building socialism with the cult of Karl Marx to the goal of building a Russian fascist empire with the cult of Tsar Peter I, or from the goal of atheism to the goal of supporting the Russian Orthodox Church, etc.), it is not hard to show what utterly contradictory and utterly surprising means the Bolsheviks have adopted. Now to build this goal, now to destroy it; now to root out religion as "the opium of the people" by shooting priests and ruining churches, now to restore the Russian Church by shooting the unbelievers (as Yaroslavsky) and sending to prison at hard labor representatives of other religious denominations.

Now punishing for opposition to Ezhov and "Ezhovshchina," and now for support of that same Ezhov and "Ezhovshchina," etc. etc.

And all this has been done with open cynicism and cold cruelty and all on a "grandiose" scale.

A man under this regime is deprived of human dignity and the most elementary human rights. When the NKVD arrests a citizen (without regard to his age, status, or services to the people), no one can intercede for him or defend him. The true institution of defenders in court actually does not exist. There have not been open trials for political prisoners. Millions of people have been put to death, when they did not know what they had done.

The responsibility for the father (and that not only if he has been a real criminal, but if he has only been arrested) is laid at once upon the children and the family, and they are subjected to persecution and terror.

As an example:

When they arrest a father (and they have arrested all where formerly they broke their ribs and tortured them in their inquisitions, and then have shown—sometimes after two years—the order for their arrest and the charges brought with no date, to carry on the case legally; it has happened that they have shot a person and then have determined that there was no reason to shoot him, for they were seeking another person with the same family name), so when they arrest the father of a family and do not name the charges, they throw his family out on the street, term them "enemies of the people," organize persecutions of them in society, deprive them of work and means of livelihood.

That is the way my children perished just like the children of many of my friends in prison.

Or they have laid on the children all the crimes of their fathers and even of their grandfathers, by not admitting them to the higher schools or to work, only because a grandfather was a kulak, or an officer, or even a private in the army of the Ukrainian National Republic, or of another.

That is the style of life under Soviet rule.

That is what I endured for a long while.

It is the same in relation to mothers. A mother can die at the doors of the NKVD, praying for news about her son, but they will tell her nothing, give her no information, and will increase the wound in her heart with dirty insinuations and threats. They will ask the unfortunate mother to tell them with whom her son was acquainted. And they will terrify the uneducated illiterate, old woman and drive her out of this life. That is the way my mother perished.

After crippling the prisoner in the torture and racking him in the cell, they give him no medical assistance. The physician of the NKVD puts to his victim who is half insane from torture: "Confess everything that you know and then I will help you, or die." And then you must take into consideration the fact that this victim is guilty of no crime.

IX

I do not want to go to the USSR, because a human being there is not worth as much as an insect. In destroying people for nothing and

for trifles, for a spoken word, an anecdote, a complaint at the hardness of life and in doing it with open cynicism, the Bolsheviks put forward this formula:

"In the USSR there are enough people and there is no need to be fussy" and "it is better to break the ribs of one hundred innocent people rather than allow one guilty person to escape."

It is not surprising then that in the prisons and camps in the USSR in the years 1936-1939 there were about 11 million people. The prisons were so overcrowded that in individual rooms (with space for one person) there were 25-30 and they sat—or rather stood—that way for 10 months and more "under investigation"—that is before the explanation of what crime they had actually committed. It entered the head of no one, that these people were perishing alive. Besides each of them was murdered in the investigations.

All this was done according to a definite plan and the instructions from the Kremlin. That was the so-called "five year plan for the reconstruction" of "man." That was the way they reconstructed him. But when the process was carried to an absurdity, when there was no family in the USSR, which was not seized with terror, because there had been discovered in it an "enemy of the people," when the sea of petitions and written prayers of the children and mothers of the imprisoned and condemned "enemies of the people" flooded the Kremlin and especially N. Krupskaya (the wife of the late Lenin), then Stalin, to quiet the thoughts of the citizens, proclaimed at the 18th meeting of the Party that "The enemies of the people had penetrated into the NKVD, had mastered the honorable 'party and non-party' Bolsheviks" and had beaten them for so many years and on such a gigantic scale . . . And having said this, he ordered Ezhov to be removed and sent into retirement.

What can be greater cynicism and mockery over a human being? Mockery over millions of people . . . And the provocative murder of Kirov?—Is it a second "burning of the Reichstag?" Inspired to direct further terror against all opportunists and all the dissatisfied. A certain right opportunist Nikolayev killed Kirov. Is he only Van der Lubbe No 2?

In vengeance for Kirov they shot people of the "right," the "left" and all others in masses and not only party opportunists but many (and most) people who had no relation to the party or to the opposition. Thus they shot the Ukrainian artists and writers. The wave of mass

executions rolled from Odesa to Vladivostok and the number of those shot was so great that it would have been a high return not only for Kirov but also for Stalin. And they did not count those sent to prison at hard labor.

Examples of such mockery, cynicism, falsity, provocations, sadism and totally unjustified cruelty, mark the whole practice of Bolshevism for 27 years. They are not examples of "a spot on the sun." They are the very pattern of Bolshevism, its nature. That is why I do not want to go to the "socialistic home" of Bolshevism.

X

I do not want to go back under Bolshevism, because I have been in prison with priests of various religious denominations and I have seen how they were beaten and murdered. At the order of Stalin they were destroyed in the USSR and the churches were ruined. For the whole of 25 years they beat out of human souls the slightest signs of the Christian religion and in a brutal, loathesome manner.

Then in 1943 Bolshevism yielded to religion and began to appear in the role of defender of the Orthodox Church. Europe and the whole world could not believe that Stalin was actually supporting Christianity, and his party had returned sincerely to religion. And we do not believe it. The ghosts of the tortured priests still stand before our eyes, and their bones have not yet turned to dust.

The Biblical King Herod could more easily return to Christianity than his representative in the 20th century. Stalin has made of religion a tool for his political machinations and that is all. If religion was rooted out in the USSR, it is and will be rooted out.

XI

I do not want to go back to the USSR, because the Stalinist "socialistic" USSR is a social concentration camp of the enslaved people of 100 nationalities—people without rights, terrorized, frightened, hungry, poor.

After a quarter of a century under Bolshevism they have obtained nothing except prisons, rivers of blood and tears . . . And they will obtain nothing, so long as Bolshevism continues to exist.

Bolshevism is violence to the human being, it is slave labor, it is

modern serfdom, it is physical and spiritual terror, it is poverty, it is famine, it is war.

XII

I do not want to go back to my native land, so long as Bolshevism reigns there, because Stalin destroyed Ukraine in alliance with Hitler. Stalin was the ally of Hitler in 1939. But for us, Ukrainians, he was the ally of Hitler from the earliest times. Hitler had as his goal our annihilation in the name of the rule of fascist Germany over our land. Stalin destroyed and is destroying us in the name of the rule of his party, the Russian red fascism over our land and the whole world in the name of the so-called "Marxist-Leninist doctrine."

Stalin helped Hitler and murdered us in Siberia and in the barracks. Hitler helped Stalin by murdering us in Dachau and in harsh captivity.

We have not laid down our arms in the struggle against our attackers and we will not lay them down, even though our 40 million Ukrainian people be wiped from the face of the earth.

That is why I and hundreds of thousands of us do not want to go home to the "land of socialism."

XIII

I will return to my native land with millions of my brothers and sisters, who are here in Europe and there in concentration camps in Siberia, when the totalitarian bloody Bolshevik system is wiped out like that of Hitler. When the NKVD follows the Gestapo, when the red Russian fascism disappears as German fascism has disappeared. When we, the Ukrainian people, have restored to us the right to freedom and independence in the name of Christianity and justice.



It is hard for a person who has grown up in normal human conditions, to believe all that has been done there in a sixth part of the world, behind a Chinese wall.

The world cannot believe us. Well.

Let them try us. Let the Bolsheviks try us, but in Europe, before the eyes of the whole world. Let them accuse us of what they wish and

let Stalin and his oprichniks judge us, but in Europe, before the eyes of the whole world and with the participation of representatives of the civilized world.

All the hundreds of thousands of us, fugitives from Bolshevism, will sit on the bench of the accused.

Let the court pronounce judgement upon us.

But Stalin will not come to that trial.

We do not fear the trial but he fears it, he, "the father of nations," "the wisest of the wise," "the most democratic of democrats" fears such a trial, for it would be a trial of him and all his Bolshevism, it would be the most unprecedented and most interesting scandal in history.

Stalin knows it and is hastening to wipe us out as rapidly as possible, now employing methods of kidnapping and the physical annihilation of individuals in the ruins of the Hitler Reich.

The devil is evil and such are his methods.

P. S. TO THE EDITOR:

In sending this to the publications of the world, I am well aware of the fact that when this letter appears in the press, the Bolsheviks through the hands of the NKVD will murder the rest of my family, if any are still alive. But I ask you to print it and sign it with my full name.

All that I have to lose, I have lost, and what is left is entirely doomed to destruction.



LESYA UKRAINKA

By PERCIVAL CUNDY, TH.D.
West Collingswood, New Jersey

NO NATIONAL literature has ever had to struggle against greater odds to survive and win recognition than has the Ukrainian. Literature is the expression of life, but when a nation's life is cramped, cabined, and confined, it takes heroic efforts for its literature to persist and break the shackles which fetter its manifestation and development. Ukrainian literature possesses some names of universal significance, but compared to Russian writers who are well known through translation, Ukrainian authors are practically unknown to American readers. "When we read the work of such men as Shevchenko and Franko, we realize that we are dealing with real spiritual and intellectual leaders with a real faith in democracy, and that these men have a message not only for their own people but for the whole world."^{*}

To these two names must be added a third, that of a woman, Lesya Ukrainka, a poetess of rare erudition, with an expert knowledge of poetic technique, familiar with the languages and literatures of Western Europe (including English), with an unbounded imagination, keen psychological insight, and an emotional power and vigor of expression not surpassed by any poetess who has made a name for herself in any modern literature. Surpassing Franko, she is inferior only to Shevchenko in poetical achievement. This is not fulsome praise, but sober fact; hence she is worthy of study by all who take an interest in the literary accomplishments of another race, especially when its literature manifests in general a keen sense of the values of personal and social justice with an invincible faith in freedom and democracy as does the Ukrainian.

After reading some of her work, one would easily imagine the poetess to have been a strong and robust person physically as well as spiritually and intellectually. Actually nothing could be farther from the truth. She was a small, frail woman, delicate as a child, and from the age of twelve or thirteen until her death thirty years later,

^{*} Manning, "Ukrainian Literature," p. 1.

she was a hopeless invalid, doomed to spend months at a time in bed and compelled for the greater part of her life to live away from her beloved homeland, travelling from one health resort to another in search of health with comparatively brief periods of ordinary activity. Unlike other writers who could turn out a regular daily stint, she was only able to write spasmodically, often in great pain and with a high fever which left her physically and mentally exhausted from the strain of work. Yet these circumstances are rarely reflected in her work. The attentive reader can occasionally perceive the effects of her illness in what she wrote, but in reality, few have ever won so great a triumph of the spirit over physical disability as did Lesya Ukrainka. In a review of the first two volumes of her early poems by Ivan Franko in 1898, there is a passage which has become a classic quotation in estimating her work. "Since Shevchenko's 'Bury me and then arise, break your chains asunder,' Ukraine has not heard so strong and vibrant a message as comes from the lips of this fragile, invalid girl. It is true that the successors of Shevchenko have many a time 'broken the chains' and heralded coming liberation, but their verses were generally mere phrase-making, a re-mastication not so much of the thought as of the tropes and images of the great Kobzar . . ." Then after a detailed analysis of her work to that point, he continued: "I repeat, after reading the spineless and flabby compositions of our contemporary young Ukrainian poets and comparing them with these bold and vigorous, and at the same time so simple and straightforward messages of Lesya Ukrainka, one cannot resist the thought that this fragile, invalid girl is almost the only man in all our present-day Ukraine."

Lesya Ukrainka was not the poetess' real name but the one by which she is universally known. She was born Larysa Petrivna Kosacheva, February 26, 1871, in the province of Volhynia, Russian Ukraine, into a family which provided a most favorable environment for the development of a nationally-conscious poetic talent. Her father, Petro Antonych Kosach, a fairly well-to-do landowner, was a man of culture and prominent in local and provincial public affairs. While not a native Ukrainian, being of White Russian stock, he was a staunch supporter of Ukrainian independence. As a young man in his university years, he became a close friend of Mykhaylo Drahomaniv, the great Ukrainian scholar and democrat, and married the latter's sister, Olha Petrivna, who was one of the leaders in Ukrainian literary life of the past generation up to World War I. While the

father's influence is not clearly discernable, that of the mother is written large in her daughter's literary career. It was she who discovered the child's literary bent, carefully cultivated her talent, and sent her daughter's first suitable efforts to be printed in the Ukrainian press in Galicia beyond the Russian border. Lesya's first printed poem appeared when she was twelve years of age. It was written under the deep impression made on her by the news of her Aunt Lesyna's banishment to Siberia for "subversive activity." She untitled it *Hope*.

No more can I call liberty my own,
 There's naught remains to me but hope alone,
 The hope to see once more my loved Ukraine,
 To come back to my native land again,
 To gaze once more on Dnieper's azure wave,—
 I care not if alive or in the grave,—
 To view the steppe, its ancient funeral mounds,
 To sense the ardent power which there abounds . . .
 No more can I call liberty my own,
 There's naught remains to me but hope alone.

As the poem could not be signed with the author's true name owing to conditions then, the mother invented the pen-name, "Lesya", a diminutive of Larysa, and "Ukrainka," a designation of her origin. The daughter ever after used the same name and is universally known by it.

Another person who greatly influenced her literary development was her uncle, Mykhaylo Drahomaniv. Although he had to leave Russia to continue his activity abroad when Lesya was only five years old, his personality and activity were kept very much alive in the family, and when Lesya was a few years older, a correspondence between uncle and niece began which lasted until his death in 1895 at Sofia in Bulgaria while Lesya was making her first and only visit to him. In his letters Drahomaniv wrote to her about political conditions in Galician Ukraine, discussed plans for future publications, sent her volume of the latest in European literatures,—in short, he helped to widen her intellectual horizon and imbued her with his democratic ideals. His passing was a heavy blow to Lesya, but all her life she remained his faithful disciple and the propagandist of his progressive and "westernizing" ideas.

The child's environment was favorable for the development of a talent of the first rank, namely: a quiet, small provincial town in the

lovely woodlands of Volhynia, a cultured home, the wise guidance of a mother who was herself a distinguished authoress, discussions of the elders in which the children themselves took part and by which they became acquainted with Ukrainian history, ideals, and aspirations. In addition, Lesya studied other languages and their literatures so that by the time she reached maturity she had an excellent knowledge of Russian, German, French, and English, as well as a familiarity with Latin and Greek. All this gave her exceptional advantages from the point of view of a wide erudition compared to other Ukrainian poets, who, generally speaking, enjoyed no such intellectual equipment.

However, this idyllic picture was soon clouded by the onset of an implacable disease, tuberculosis, which never left her until it laid her in the grave. The remaining thirty years of her life are largely a chronology of the various places abroad to which she was sent to recover her health, if possible. In 1897 she underwent an operation in Berlin which halted the progress of the disease for the time being, but it soon reappeared in another part of her body. In 1907, in a period of comparative relief from suffering she married Klyment B. Kvitka, but shortly thereafter she had to go south again. Another trip to Berlin frustrated all hopes of improvement by an operation. All the specialists could do was to advise residence in Egypt with its mild winters as the only recourse for prolonging life. It is manifest that such a life imposed intolerable conditions upon her as a writer. "Many a time she used to say," wrote a friend in her reminiscences of Lesya Ukrainka, "that she no longer had the strength to live the life of a hothouse plant torn away from its native soil, and yet though living far away from her home and family, her thoughts were continually flying back to her country." When one takes into account that every thought to which she managed to give expression was only accomplished by a mighty effort of will and at the expense of a small stock of physical strength, one can rightly estimate the heroic note which rings in so much of her poetry, as in this, for example, with its personal reference to her own state, but with a larger and pointed application to the weakness of so many of her too-yielding fellow-countrymen:

Yet none the less my thoughts fly back to thee,
My sorely tried, despoiled, and hapless land!
Grief gets the upper hand
And fills my soul with tears and misery.

In many a land I've witnessed violence,
 Yet ne'er have seen a lot that's worse than thine.
 I'd weep that fate malign,
 But shame on tears which flow from impotence.

We've wept and shed such tears in copious flood;
 The land entire could sink and in them drown.
 Enough have trickled down—
 What use are tears where there's so little blood?

It was during the final years of her "sanguinary struggle with death," that she produced some of the finest of her dramatic poems, notably *The Noble Woman*, *Forest Song*, *Martianus the Lawyer*, and *The Stone Host*. How much these splendid productions cost the writer none will ever know although there are a few details extant which show under what desperate conditions they were put on paper. They were mainly accomplished in spasms of supreme creative activity followed by periods of visible mental and physical prostration. Some things that she wrote comparatively smoothly, and were composed at one stretch in a single night or in the space of two, three, or four consecutive days. Others demanded many periods of work with lengthy intermissions. After a month of feverish literary activity would follow months of exhaustion and inertia, "dead days," which harassed the poetess with nightmares of the possible complete failure of her creative powers. In a letter to a close friend in 1912, she gave instructions what to do with her papers in such an eventuality. She wrote: "Who can tell how long my powers may still serve me? I am burning myself out bit by bit. Someday I must go out for good—no candle lasts for ever, but let my friends continue to cherish the illusion that there is no end to this candle." The inevitable end came, however. Not long after her last return from Egypt to attend a public assembly in Kiev, Lesya Ukrainka died, August 1, 1913, at Surama, a health resort near Tiflis in the Caucasus. Within a week her body was interred in a cemetery in Kiev, and all that remained were the throbbing memories of her relatives and friends and her vibrant lyrics, her splendid dramatic poems, and some fine prose stories, novelettes, and sketches.

In marked contrast to the vicissitudes of her physical life, the artistic life of Lesya Ukrainka was one of steady and constant advance and development. From her earliest years she was fully conscious of her vocation as a creative writer; she followed this goal all through

her life and literally died with pen in hand. It is clear from the testimony of her friends and from her correspondence that, as few other writers have been, she was convinced from childhood of her calling as a poetess and, under her mother's guidance, diligently studied to perfect herself in the art of poetic expression. Her productiveness increased in growing power and skill with very few lapses or deviations. The first influences exercised upon her were those of Shevchenko and his successors, such as Kulish and Starytsky. This was followed by a study of Russian poetry and next by that of various European poets. Of the latter she clearly shows the influence of Heine, but more and more she worked out her own independent and original style. However, Heine with his radical romanticism and sardonic irony seems to have been most congenial to her cast of mind. She studied and translated his *Buch der Lieder* and in so doing achieved a similar mastery of aphoristic irony so frequently met with in her work and of which the following lines are a good example:

The peasant's hut stands on damp earth,
The master's house is built on stones.
'Tis doubtless true, as people say,
The gentry have the whiter bones.

The peasant's hands are hard and black,
The lady's have a softer hue.
'Tis doubtless true, as people say,
The gentry's blood indeed is blue.

The peasant, curious to learn if
Those bones are white in every part,
To see if that blue blood would show,
Might stab the master to the heart!

She began by writing lyrics and at the age of twenty published a first collection of them, *On Wings of Song*, 1892, followed by *Thoughts and Dreams*, 1896, and *Echoes*, 1902, each marking an advance in imaginative power and technical strength. An analysis of these volumes containing 180 pieces in all, shows that her themes can be classified in six main categories; love, nature, personal experience, the poet's consciousness and mission, love of country, and social and humanitarian problems. The theme of love occupies the smallest place among these divisions. Her circumstances probably shut her

out from many experiences in this field that could be reflected in poetry, but in any case she was very reserved in expressing her private feelings. Among those dealing with nature there is one poem, *Autumn*, which is strikingly original and forceful. As to her poetic consciousness, there are several places in which Lesya expresses a sense of the physical weakness which made her feel inadequate to the task laid upon her, as for example, in the lines:

O speech, thou art my only armament,
 And both of us should not be vainly spent,
 Perhaps in other hands unknown, who knows,
 Thou'lt be a better sword 'gainst brutal foes.

Love of country is a theme which runs more or less through all her poetry, dramatic as well as lyrical. But the expression of this love is mingled with pain, first because of separation from her homeland, and second, because in returning to it from a freer atmosphere in other lands she felt all the more the weight of the oppression exercised by the Tsarist government which was determined to blot out her people's national consciousness, and furthermore because so many were ready to yield to the pressure. It was feelings such as these which inspired the biting lines in her *Reminder to a Friend*:

Yes, we are slaves, none worse are there on earth!
 The Fellahs, pariahs, know no fate so dire,
 For they have common sense, keep their thoughts close,
 While in us burns unquenched the Titans' fire.

Yes, we are paralytics with bright eyes,
 In spirit rich, but in strength there's a dearth,
 Behind our shoulders we feel eagle's wings,
 But still our feet are fettered to the earth.

Because of the large place that social-humanitarian themes occupy in her lyrics, some have vainly tried to represent Lesya Ukrainka as an active Marxian revolutionary. This is absurd on the face of it. She does indeed raise a vigorous cry on behalf of the oppressed toiling class, coupled with the challenge to arise and wreak vengeance on the tyrant and promises of coming liberation. In one of her poems, the poetess is looking at the pictured record on an Egyptian monarch's tomb detailing the Pharaoh's glories achieved at the cost of thousands of the common people's lives. The king's name, however, has been

erased by some means so that none can now tell who he was. The poem concludes:

The king with tyrant's face is long since dead;
He left behind him what? A name erased.

O poets, waste no dreams! O scholars, make no search
To learn who was that king and what his name!
Of his huge tomb just destiny has made
A people's monument—Let Pharaoh die!

It is certainly part of the poet's task in general to trumpet forth the evils in the social structure of our common humanity. As such, Lesya Ukrainka felt deeply the historic wrongs wreaked upon the common people and voiced her indignation in winged words. This was simply the natural cry of protest, encouragement, and prophecy which came from a generous soul which hated all evil and injustice and needed no motivation from Communistic or other special ideology.

Great, however, as was Lesya Ukrainka's originality in the field of the Ukrainian lyric, her greatest achievements were in the form of "dramatic poems," a genre which she developed herself and used almost exclusively from about 1902 onwards. The transition between the two may perhaps be indicated by a series of lyrical-epic poems, such as *Robert Bruce, King of Scotland, Isolda of the White Hands* and the like, all of which contain a considerable element of the dramatic. Yet this dramatism was not entirely new in Lesya's work, for even among her lyrics we find monologues, dialogues, and single dramatic scenes, such as, for example, *Iphigenia in Tauris* in *Thoughts and Dreams* already mentioned. Her bent toward the drama had been fostered in early years by her acquaintance in Kiev with the Starytsky family who were well known for their interest in the theatre. Her first attempt in this line was a prose drama, *The Blue Rose*, produced on the stage in 1896, but which failed to success for various reasons, not the least of which was the failure of the actors to cope with the material provided. This discouraged her for some time in pursuing this species of composition. However, two years later, she began work on a dramatic poem in several scenes and then laid it aside for nearly ten years before completing it. It is called *In the Woods*. The action takes place in North America during the Puritan period. The sculptor, Richard Ayron, is a believer in art for art's sake, while

his fellows, the severe Puritans, demand that his art must be applied to practical ends; hence the conflict which forms the subject of the piece. It is quite probable that Lesya here was symbolizing the conflict of attitude with which she had to contend on the part of much of her own public. She was often criticized for choosing exotic themes instead of using domestic Ukrainian subjects by those who could not or would not understand her aims as an artist. Some said her work was "laudable but unreadable." On one occasion she said, "What people want is what they must not have." And again, "The Muse must never do what it should, but only what it yearns to do." The first dramatic poem to appear was *The Possessed*, 1901, composed in four scenes. The action is laid in Palestine in the time of Christ. Mariam cannot accept Christ's doctrine of love for all, even for one's enemies and asserts that hate can be justified and that it is impossible to love one's enemies:

What? Only he can know no hate,
Who all his life has never loved!

Two more of these dramatic poems followed, *Babylonian Captivity* and *On the Ruins* in 1902. Both are based on Hebrew history and the Bible. Beneath the surface is a manifest symbolization of Ukrainian conditions in Russian bondage and it is clear that the writer intended that her readers should perceive her meaning and apply its lessons to themselves.

Still others came out with increasing power. *Cassandra* was begun in 1902, but only completed in 1907. Here the action is placed in ancient Troy just before its fall. Cassandra, the queen, is the only one who perceives the signs of decay in Troy's social order which will bring about its fall. She prophesies what will come to pass, but no one believes her sufficiently to take steps to avert the disaster. *Three Moments*, 1905 is called a "dialogue," by the author, but it is far more than that. It shows the conflict in principles between a Girondist idealist and a Montagnard realist during the stormy days of the French Revolution. *Rufinus and Priscilla*, begun 1906, completed 1909, was one of her works which Lesya considered among her best and for which she had a special affection. The first two acts were written at one stretch with scarcely a correction or emendation, but the remainder cost her much labor and a good deal of special reading. The action is laid in Rome in early Christian times. The conflict lies in the soul of Rufinus who cannot accept the doctrines of Christianity but who

is devotedly attached to his wife who is an enthusiastic Christian. When Priscilla is arrested and condemned to death, rather than be separated from her, Rufinus voluntarily shares her fate, although he has no conviction as to the heavenly rewards for a martyr's death. Three other dramatic poems, *In the Catacombs*, *The Field of Blood*, and *Johanna, Wife of Chusa* are connected by their subjects which are similarly drawn from Early Christianity.

Somewhat apart from the rest of these dramatic poems in regard to subject and location stands *The Noble Woman* which was written in Egypt in the space of three days in 1910. It is one of the few works in which Lesya Ukrainka openly dealt with Ukrainian questions and used a Ukrainian subject, although the material here is not contemporary, but historical. The Kozak maiden, Oksana, marries Stepan, a Ukrainian by birth but who has been living in Muscovy and there has entered the Tsar's service. Oksana goes with her husband to Moscow, but it is hard for her to get used to the Asiatic customs of Muscovite life compared to the freedom which women enjoyed in Ukraine. The situation becomes tragic when she discovers that her husband has completely broken with Ukraine and has become "Muscovized." Stepan finally awakens to a realization of the ties which still bind him to Ukraine, but by then it is too late. At the end he says:

'Tis fate that's dealt with us so bitterly
That God must certainly forgive our sins.
Some wipe the blood from wounds, we from our hearts.
Some are exiled and some in prisons pent,
But we bear chains that are invisible.

It is probable that Lesya chose this subject because of the not infrequent reproaches that she disdained to choose Ukrainian subjects in her poetry. The comparative absence of such material may be accounted for by her long absences from the homeland and her consequent lack of opportunity of observing Ukrainian life at first hand. However, a better explanation is that she deliberately chose the subjects of her dramatic works from non-Ukrainian sources, turning instead to the life of the ancient Babylonians, Hebrews, early Christians, Greeks, Romans, medieval Spaniards, North American Puritans, and Frenchmen of the Revolutionary era in order to gain freedom in treating the matters about which she wished to write. After all, such things were merely external, and she no doubt wished to get away from the details of contemporary life so as to direct attention

to the working out of the psychological conflicts in the souls of her heroes. And it is precisely in this field that Lesya Ukrainka was most truly contemporary, analyzing thus the most pressing problems in Ukrainian society of her time.

As has been pointed out, her work increased in brilliancy during the closing and most trying years of her life. In 1911, in the space of three days she produced her masterpiece *Forest Song* after having written it over three times in order to shorten it. All Ukrainian critics grow lyrical in praise of this "fairy drama in three acts" and with justice. To quote just one: "In truth this is a symbolic drama of profound psychological interest, of an extraordinarily deep and tender lyricism, the language of which, full of the rich treasures of popular folklore, is most harmonious and musical. Without exaggeration, one can say that it is an outstanding work, not only of Ukrainian, but of world literature. It has already been compared with the work of Hauptmann and Maeterlinck and has emerged with honor from the comparison. The pity is that it is almost untranslatable; the finest translation must perforce destroy two-thirds of the marvellous aroma of its poetry."

Three other great poetic dramas followed, which, if not in the exceptional class of *Forest Song*, in no way fell behind it, simply dealing with other subjects. *Martianus, the Lawyer*, 1911, takes us again to the period of Early Christianity, the scene being laid in Puteoli, near Naples, about 300 A.D. *Martianus* is a secret Christian because it is so ordered for the best interests of the Church. This gives rise to the conflict between *Martianus'* obedience as a Christian and his wife and children, the result being that the latter are alienated from him. The tragic role that *Martianus* is compelled to play is a severe test to his human feelings but he plays it manfully to the end. In *The Stone Host*, 1912, *Lesya Ukrainka* took another unexpected step in working on the theme of *Don Juan*, already treated by many writers of world importance. Here again she managed to give the subject a new and brilliant symbolical significance applicable to Ukrainian conditions. The last of her great symbolical dramatic poems was *Orgy*, 1913. The action takes place in Corinth during the period of the Roman domination of Greece, the conflict arising from the oppression of the old Greek culture by the younger military might of Rome. *Anteus*, the poet-singer, can in no way reconcile himself to the prostitution of Greek art for the delectation of the Romans,

and when his wife dances for some of them, he kills her and then strangles himself with the strings of his own lyre. The poetess manifestly intended her readers to substitute Russia for Rome, and Ukraine for Corinth in order to perceive their situation at the present time. On this gloomy and pessimistic note Lesya Ukrainka was compelled by death to break off her creative work in the midst of its finest flowering.

Apart from the intrinsic value of her work, the chief merit of Lesya Ukrainka in regard to Ukrainian poetry was that she was a beneficent innovator both as to form and ideas. Emerging from the influence of the post-Shevchenko tradition, she labored consciously to lead Ukrainian literature out of its provincial preoccupation with domestic themes. With the clear conviction that every national literature must needs have its own distinctive coloring, she saw that it must also profit by conforming to universal standards and developing within its framework the ideas common to all humanity. This outlook of hers can be seen even in her childhood and adolescent lyrics with titles such as *Sappho*, *Mary Stuart's Last Song*, *To My Piano*, *Dante's Wife*, and many others. Such themes were a novelty in the tradition of Ukrainian poetry. At the same time she experimented successfully with European poetical forms hitherto unused by Ukrainian poets. These characteristics of an innovator dissatisfied with the current forms and ideas derived from tradition made her a new and vitalizing force in Ukrainian literature. Sensing that society had entered on a new phase of development, and feeling that the people were sufficiently awakened to a knowledge of and interest in the nation's past, she felt that it was necessary for the younger generation to create a literature which should run in the general current of world ideas. She also introduced a new psychological attitude into her people's literature, not one of looking backwards and sighing over a glorious if somber past, nor of weeping helpless tears over what was irretrievably gone,—which was indeed a prevailing mood with the successors of Shevchenko,—but a psychological attitude of faith in the innate strength of the nation and a recognition of the compelling necessity of battling on with a firm conviction of ultimate victory. True, there is sometimes in her verses a melancholy note even in such bold assertions, but it is not always possible for the rugged in health to maintain a mood of calm and constant assurance in the future. In any case—not to look backwards, never to lose heart, incessantly to fight and never to doubt of ultimate

victory—this is the main ideological content of Lesya Ukrainka's poetry.

Lesya Ukrainka began to enjoy an ever-growing appreciation of her contribution to Ukrainian literature only after her death, but this is usually the case with most innovators, particularly in the intellectual and artistic fields. Her heroic tone and the neo-romanticism of her dramatic poems based on hitherto unfamiliar themes did not meet with a large response at first from the general public, but that response is growing as the years go by. It is now realized that she possessed a remarkably strong poetical ideology, universalism in the choice of themes, a profound penetration of the varieties of human psychology, together with a style highly lyrical and at the same time charged with vital energy. She had a vast amount of energy, but unfortunately, little physical strength to supply its output. In her soul she cherished an ideal of harmonious life from which all that defiles was to be swept aside by human hands; to achieve this future harmoniousness she was ready to battle as much as lay in her power, if not with her hands, then at least with her words. The pity was that she who had the soul of a fighter was precluded by physical weakness from entering more actively and personally into the great conflict.



POWER POLICY AND DEPENDENT NATIONS

By NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ

THE FUTURE historian is bound to come to the conclusion that the Big Three conference held in Moscow in 1943 was the turning point in the progress of democracy. Attended by Hull, Churchill and Molotov, the conference laid plans for a post-war world with an utter disregard of the virtual abandonment of the principle of national self-determination.

Strangely enough, American public opinion reacted to this startling development in an indifferent manner. On the other hand, free European opinion reacted in a manner that showed that the people there realized that a great setback had been suffered by human progress as a result of this abandonment of democratic processes in international relations and the substitution in their place of power politics.

Undoubtedly, a future American historian will regard this event with anything but satisfaction, particularly since it meant the abandonment by America of a highly moral principle propounded by one of its greatest men, Pres. Woodrow Wilson, and, secondly, because it signified the virtual American repudiation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, proclaimed just two years previously by another great American, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as the basis of the post-war world order.

As a result of this negation of national self-determination by the Moscow Conference, it will now be not the majority of a people who will decide their national fate but only the stark force of the foreign victorious nations. Even if that majority attains the proportions of 95% of the population, the people may still find themselves forced into the orbit of hated foreign misrule.

This becomes all the more inevitable by reason of the outright Moscow Conference repudiation of the principle of the Atlantic Charter that there shall be no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned, and the virtual repudiation of the charter's principle guaranteeing the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live. Today

a government can be and is being imposed upon peoples by a victorious power as Soviet Russia.

By now everyone knows that these international violations of democratic principles at the Moscow Conference were a result of the overpowering demands made by the Soviets, who thereby desired to strengthen their grip upon Western Ukraine, as well as upon Western White Ruthenia and the Baltic states, all of which were seized by them in contravention of national self determination and the Atlantic Charter. Aside from this, however, the fact remains that the 1943 Moscow Conference projected a crisis into international morality by substituting dictatorial power politics for democratic processes.

Naturally, the arbitrary decisions of the Big Three at Moscow have been unable to swerve the course of the dynamic centuries-old liberation movements of Russian-enslaved peoples. All the ethnical groups which in the development of their self-consciousness have become real nations, immediately recognized the threat to their national existence buried in the Moscow declarations and reacted accordingly.

To Americans the title of this article with its phrase of "dependent nations" may appear contrary to the American conception of a "nation"; yet to European peoples enslaved by power policies it is very understandable. Although they have lost their independence, none of them have ceased to regard themselves as nations. That in itself naturally implies that none of them will abandon their right to struggle for the attainment of the status of a sovereign nation.

Another aspect of the Moscow conference as well as of several succeeding conferences of the Big Three is that they have opened a new chapter in the 150-year-old saga of modern liberation movements of enslaved European peoples. That period appeared to have come to a successful culmination with the pronouncement by Wilson of the principle of national self-determination. That principle made such a profound impression on everyone then, that it is quite unlikely that there were many statesmen or scholars then who believed that the principle of self-determination would ever be overthrown by anyone or that it would cease to be a veritable bulwark of democratic international relations. It seemed absurd then to think that there could ever be a return to the pre-1919 times of forcible imposition of foreign rule upon a people. Likewise it was absurd even to conceive such things as a new wave of religious persecution, or forced repatriation, or the denial by any nation of the traditional right of political asylum. Still

all that has happened within recent times, stemming from the Moscow Conference.

The modern revolutionary period of oppressed nations struggling for their liberation, starting, let us say, from the French Revolution, offers a kaleidoscopic picture of its various phases. Thus there is the heroic period of the Italian Resorgimento, when year after year sons of Italy sacrificed their lives in its cause while new cadres took their place with the rallying cry of "We shall start anew," and kept struggling until they realized their ideal of a united and free Italy.

Then there was the well-nigh century-old effort of German democracy to unite the German people in one single Germanic state. Besides, there was also the heroic struggle of the Poles, partitioned among three nations, to regain their former independence, and this finally was crowned with success through the emergence of Wilson's famous principle.

The Polish struggle to attain its "nationhood," it is worth noting, was but one chapter in the national revival of the Slavonic peoples and their ultimate transformation into real nations. In the course of that revival and despite Russian oppression and denationalization the Ukrainian nation, too, was reborn. Already in 1846 the chief protagonists of the Ukrainian national rebirth, Shevchenko, Kostomariv, Kulish, and others, united in the political Sts. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood, were envisioning not only a free, unified and democratic Ukraine but also a Slavonic Eastern Europe founded on that very principle which a great American President, Woodrow Wilson, recommended some 70 years later as the basis of international morality. On the altar of that principle numberless Ukrainian lives were laid down, until it was attained, to a degree, in 1917, with the rise of the democratic Ukrainian National Republic. With the fall of that republic these sacrifices have been redoubled.

Simultaneous with the Ukrainian revival was the revival to national consciousness of the Czechs, Croatians, Slovenes, Bulgarians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, White Ruthenians, and other peoples. The general revival stirred into being national aspirations even among such peoples as the Catalonians and the Basques of the Iberian Peninsula, as well as the aspirations of the Turkic peoples of Russia.

Wilson's self-determination principle was the apex of this 150 year old revival of hitherto dormant European nations, while its definition as a basis of international order was indicative not only of constructive American esprit but also of the political acumen of its author. He was

able thus to create out of the mosaic of European peoples a synthesis of international democratic and moral law.

Nonetheless, the Moscow Conference closed its eyes to this turbulent 150 year period and reverted in effect to the power policies of the Vienna Congress (1815) which set up three big powers, "the Holy Alliance," as "guardians of backward peoples," to be governed in accordance with the precepts of the Holy Gospel.

Considered in this light, it was only natural for certain American commentators to wax rhapsodical over the 1943 Moscow Conference as the start of the new epoch. Concurrently they began to deride Wilson's principle of self-determination for having failed, in their opinion, to solve the problem of peaceful and harmonious relations among the peoples of the world. Wilson became to them a professor-theoretician out of his element in the international arena. All the world ills following the First World War, including the causes of the Second World War, were assigned by some of these critics to the attempt to set up a world order on Wilson's principle of self-determination. As the brain-child of Wilson, the League of Nations also came in for its share of blame by these international experts. What is more, some of them went even further. They began to urge that the current post-war world be patterned after the European order following the Vienna Congress. That Congress, they said, brought about order and peace in Europe for many years; ergo, the present European order should be set up on a similar standard, that is domination by the Big Three.

In making such a recommendation, such deluded individuals appear to forget that the reign of the Holy Alliance, composed of Russia, Austria and Prussia, marked one of the blackest and most reactionary periods in European history. The Russian Tsar's rule by the knout and Metternich's rule by police were veritable symbols of it. The prisons for political offenders of Kufstein and Spielberg in Austria, for example, were as notorious then as were the recent prison camps of German Dachau and Buchenwald and as are the Russian Solovki Islands today.

No, the causes of the recent war do not lie in Wilson's principle of national self-determination or in the League of Nations, but rather in the fact that that principle was but partially applied, that is only some peoples were permitted to partake of its benefits; others were refused where it was convenient for the war victors to apply them.

The chief sufferers here were the Ukrainian people, who seizing the opportunity offered by the downfall of Tsarist Russia (1917) and of the

Austria-Hungarian Monarchy (1918), declared their national independence and set up their united Ukrainian Democratic Republic. Until the coming into power of the Bolsheviks, this republic managed despite the chaotic conditions at that time in Eastern Europe to introduce law and order throughout the land. France and England even extended a "de facto" recognition to it, as they saw that it was clearly founded on Wilson's principles and included strictly Ukrainian ethnographic territories.

It is clear that because they had fully accepted Wilson's doctrine as a basis for post-war settlement, the victorious powers were ipso facto duty-bound to support the young democratic Ukrainian Republic of some 50 million people. Yet they refused to do that, simply because their leaders, particularly those of France, used that doctrine merely as a useful and ornate window dressing behind which they were able to conduct their selfish and imperialistic trafficking and power politics. In this manner the instigators of the post-Versailles order partitioned Western Ukraine among Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania.

As for Eastern (Great) Ukraine, which was then engaged in a bloody struggle against the Bolshevik hordes, the Allies dispatched there expeditionary armies of White (Tsarist not to be confused with the ethnical White Ruthenians, i.e. Bielo-Russians) Russians, led by Denikin and Wrangel, who were committed to the restoration of reactionary Tsarist Russia. As could have been expected, such representatives of "democracy," no matter how fully supported by Anglo-French aid, finally were routed, but still they were sufficiently strong to give the Bolsheviks a hand in bringing about the collapse of the Ukrainian republic and the forcible absorption of it within the Kremlin-ruled USSR.

The very fact that so extremely little has appeared in the Anglo-American press about the dramatic struggle of the Ukrainian people on all fronts with the Poles, the Bolsheviks and White Russians is in itself a classic example of how the right of national self-determination was trampled upon at the very outset by those very same powers which held it out to enslaved peoples. Consequently, it was not Wilson's principle that was in the wrong, but rather it was the deliberate failure of the Allies to put it into practice that was in the wrong.

Allied support of the democratic Ukrainian National Republic of some fifty million population which was in the process of crystallization

in 1919, at a time when the Paris Peace Conference was drawing the outlines of the post-war world, would have resulted in an order vastly different from the one evolved, and one which might have protected the world from another war and, what is more, from the Red flood now engulfing vast areas of it as a result of the war.

Ill-gotten gains rarely remain permanent. Thus, as was to have been expected, in the end Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania lost their Ukrainian possessions. They did not lose them, however, to their rightful owners, the Ukrainians, but to imperialistic Soviet Russia. Moreover, these three countries have today become mere satellites of their powerful "neighbor." Quite a different story from what it might have been, were all of them today free and independent and true neighbors of a sovereign Ukrainian Republic.

A free Ukraine would have meant a free White Ruthenia, as well as free Caucasians and free Turks. Russia today would have been confined to her ethnographic boundaries, with no access to the Black Sea, the boundaries of Iran or those of Turkey. In a word, Russia would still have been a great country, yet not powerful enough to endanger world peace. It is quite possible, too, that there would have been some sort of a federation of the East European states, as in the course of the Russian Revolution all of them manifested a desire toward that end.

But today we are faced with the reality of the present situation in Eastern Europe, a direct result of the failure to apply the Wilsonian self-determination principle to Ukraine.

Although the victorious Allies of the First World War abused that principle in reference to Ukraine, yet where their interests were involved they applied it in a manner to satisfy those interests. Thus in contradiction to it, they assigned to Italy the bordering area of Venezia Giulia, which today is once again an international problem. Similarly, Czechoslovakia gained Sudetenland, while Austria was forbidden to unite with the other Germanic states. The latter cut athwart the natural movement of the Germanic peoples to form a national union, which began after the Vienna Congress and became the ideal of all German democratic elements. In spite of all this, however, exactly twenty years later, at Munich, the very same Allies surrendered Sudetenland to Germany and agreed to the "anschluss" of Austria. And yet, to what sort of a Germany? To a totalitarian Nazi Germany, the rise of which was considerably due to the German discontent over the Versailles

provisions which the unprincipled adventurer Hitler was quick to seize advantage of. So just as it happened in Eastern Europe, the failure to apply the Wilsonian principles in Central Europe led directly to the rise of a brutal totalitarian state which turned out to be a calamity to world peace. Now on the other side of Europe there is taking shape another such terrible calamity.

Ukrainian discontent with Russian and Polish rule following the First World War led to a state of permanent revolution against the tyrannical regimes, which the latter combatted by various barbaric measures, such as the Soviet man-made famine in Eastern Ukraine and the Polish "pacifications" in Western Ukraine. This situation was, colloquially speaking, a natural for a predatory power which thought that it could exploit it for its own ends. Hitler believed he could do it and thereby gain *Lebensraum* for the Reich, and overlooked the hard fact that the Ukrainians are against all foreign rule, be it German, Russian or Polish. Had Ukraine been free, it is quite unlikely that Hitler or someone else would have looked upon it as a vacuum to be filled.

Exactly in the same manner the failure of the League of Nations did not lie in its structure but only in the international immorality which found its nest in this creation of Wilson, as has been well pointed out by Carl A. Berendsen of New Zealand, a former League delegate of many years and now Minister to the United States. Had there been international morality in Geneva, the League would have had a moral force strong enough to halt the rearmament of Germany, the Japanese occupation of Manchuria, the Italian occupation of Ethiopia, or any other of the well known international transgressions of human rights.

Among the very first to suffer from this immorality of the League of Nations were the Ukrainians. This occurred when Soviet Russia was accepted as a League member, notwithstanding the fact that by reason of its internal as well as its external policies it did not measure up to even the most elementary prerequisites of League membership. Another blow to the Ukrainians, as the chief victims of Soviet policies, was American recognition of the USSR, particularly at a time when Moscow was engaged in deliberately starving to death millions of Ukrainians in order to make Ukraine submissive to its rule.

International immorality will ever remain as such, no matter who is its chief perpetrator, be he a Nazi Hitler, a Fascist Mussolini, or a Communist Stalin. Once it takes possession of any international peace

body, that body will soon collapse just as did the League of Nations.

A clear illustration of this is already assuming shape, in the form of the present United Nations Organization. Founded in essence on the dictates of the Big Three, it already has shown itself less capable of settling international problems than even the League of Nations. The unnatural power of veto by a single power is undoubtedly the biggest stumbling block to such solutions, particularly since it is being used by a power, Soviet Russia, which by nature is callous to all moral considerations and which on that account alone is bound to bring UNO to a speedy end.

The UNO was originally intended to implement the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms. Actually, and simply because of Soviet participation in it, the UNO is rapidly becoming an instrument for the negation of these principles. On the one hand, whole nations, such as the Ukrainians, White Ruthenians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, are groaning beneath the Soviet yoke. On the other, such states as Poland, Finland, Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, have actually lost their independent status and have become mere satellites of Russia. All this UNO calmly accepts, and yet at the same time it permits itself to serve as sounding board for artificially inspired demands to make autonomous some distant colonial peoples. Far better it would be for it to concern itself with the plight of the European "colonial people," who have attained nationhood long ago and have enjoyed independent statehood at one time or another.

As the situation stands today, terrorism and violence are raging on the recently occupied Soviet territories. Yet this fact does not at all detract from the powerful influence which the Soviets are wielding in the shaping of the current post-war world supposedly founded on the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms.

Throughout Western Ukraine there is also raging unchecked a religious persecution of Ukrainian people, reminiscent of the persecution of the early Christians. The entire episcopate has been imprisoned. Meanwhile the Soviet government is attempting to impose upon millions of Western Ukrainians against their will a faith alien to them and controlled directly by Moscow itself. Thousands of Ukrainian clergy have been arrested. Recent reports have it that the Soviet authorities are preparing fantastic charges against Archbishop Slipiy,

metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, that he "poisoned his predecessor, Metropolitan Andrew Sheptitsky," the late prelate whom the present incumbent well-nigh worships. Such is the state of political immorality and power politics of the Soviet State.

Power politics are evident today also in the drawing up of new international treaties. Neither human beings nor the will of those being bartered about are the prime consideration of these treaties, but only the selfish interests of big powers and their territorial ambitions.

Still, as ye shall sow, so shall ye reap. The new order now being made will yet provoke another world war. The attempt to keep peace in Europe at any price and with all required force, is actually the start of a new period of human oppression and, at the same time, a new period in the heroic struggle of oppressed nations to win their national freedom. That is exactly what happen following the Vienna Congress. And the same is bound to happen again, until there shall again arrive, as then, the Springtime of Nations which will sound the death knell to power politics. In any event, we today are confronted by the unpleasant fact that humanity has retrogressed some 150 years.



THE WORLD OF FREEDOM AND THE WORLD OF TYRANNY

By LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

Western Freedom versus Eastern Despotism

IN the article "Ominous Features of Divided World"¹ the thesis advanced and developed was that the great dichotomy progressively emerging and landing itself to clearer perception and identification today in the relations between Soviet dominated bloc of nations and the substantially western group represented by Anglo-American nations was long existent, to be sure by comparison only embryonically, in the narrower field of Russo-Ukrainian relations. The paramount conclusion reached in that analysis, significantly valid in itself because of its treatment of the two numerically largest and distinct national units in Eastern Europe, was that the political, economic, and cultural techniques and apparatus currently employed in non-Russian areas, both in Europe and Asia, by the masterful Kremlin craftsmen were largely effected, fashioned, moulded, and applied originally on the testing-ground of Ukraine, also a non-Russian region. Inferentially, therefore, it was maintained that the foreign policies of the more or less free countries of the world would have to be quickly oriented to these historical facts if a realistic framework of international negotiations and enterprise is to be established for the conservation of the degree of freedom to which a part of humanity has achieved, the extension of such freedom to that part which has not attained it but ardently desires to secure it and the further improvements of the methods of human intercourse throughout a technologically more unified world.

The projection of the previous analysis in this article must consequently be grounded in the necessities for a clear recognition of the essentially irreconcilable differences of values between what we may with obviously sufficiently empirical verification call the Soviet world and the Western world and for a clear outlining of the principles and media of policy by which the latter may contend with the challenge offered by the former. All of this requires definition, which is ordinarily and unashamedly overlooked by disputants in such matters,

¹ *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. II, No. 2, pp. 142-153.

both in the press and in forums, and a logical setting forth of details of public policy, both foreign and domestic, resulting from the given definitions. Without this mode of basically scientific procedure any discussions, and there are many of them degenerate into a meaningless exchange of isolated thoughts, aired in the void of an indispensable context,³ and in the end heavily tintured with senseless and irresponsible slogans or unspeakable discourtesies.

The Reality of Western Freedom

Despite the nebulous complexity of modern life with its countless ramifications, there nevertheless persists through this intellectually unencompassible mass of specialized preoccupations and diversity a suffusing and pervasive tenor of public ideals and attitudes, an institutional pre-disposition and inclination, that furnishes an underlying unity to this prodigious structure of seeming differences and as a consequence provides a distinguishable context of total human life. In this connection it is of prime significance that in the endless flow of talk and print on culture, values, freedom and so forth in the modern world, little has been said about the distinction between unity and uniformity, an item that curiously received exhaustive consideration from medieval thinkers. Yet it is indispensably pertinent to contemporary discourse in such matters, especially in its usefulness in resolving decisively the tortuous ambiguities and confusion so profusely shed on the comparative Soviet and Western conceptions of democracy. Indeed, Western conceptions of democracy and freedom owe in large measure their existence to the fruitful contributions of medieval thinking on this matter. In a few words then, genuine unity, reflective of the determination of numberless human wills nurtured and conditioned by diverse conditions of livelihood, is not necessarily synonymous with uniformity of action which can be obtained through the concomitant suppression of individual human wills and the dictation by a comparatively few wills. Uniformity, based on postulates of enforced expression, apparently smacks of an over-all unity which if we are to regard as identical, must be considered to be unfree and lacking in objectivity. Such an enforced unity, literally confused with uniformity, will last only so long as the principle of rigorous enforcement persists and the apparatus for its effectuation

³ See Mr. Ehrenburg's farewell article for a typically skillful employment of this technique. *N. Y. Herald Tribune*, June 26, 1946.

remains intact. Genuine or free unity, on the other hand, though initiating popularly certain uniformities of political or economic action where they become reasonably necessary due to the exigencies of changing technology, rests basically on a conformation to the movements of popular will and allows as a result for more diverse and freer action on the part of the populace. This fundamental distinction, which someone should discuss at greater length in its wide application to the contemporary world scene, will be applied in certain glaring respects in our contrast between Soviet "democracy" and the Western type. But first how does democracy in the Western sense effectuate this unity and give a wide latitude for diverse individual freedom?

The concept of democracy in the Western environment has itself undergone certain changes in line with the cultural and technologic transformations of an essentially dynamic society. The earlier "town-meeting" type of direct democratic control necessarily gave way to representative democracy whereby representatives elected by the people were delegated to execute the opinions of their respective constituencies on individual questions of public policy. But as economic changes in this century have precipitated more extensive governmental activity and function, not only the sheer number but also the technical character of political and economic issues have tended to render it impossible for the constituents to develop rational opinions on every question of public policy. In fact the range of issues has so expanded that even the representatives are physically incapable of dealing adequately with all the questions, so that further specialization in legislative function has become necessary. Consequently, by the sheer compulsion of technologic change in our era the institutional arrangement of the democratic process has become one where "the rule of the people" is necessarily restricted simply to the opportunity of electing or defeating men who *compete* with one another for power to decide on public issues. The vote of the electorate will decide on the men: the men will decide on the issues.

Obviously this democratic process does not operate in a vacuum, but rather depends for its practical efficiency on the existence of certain necessary conditions. For one, the vast majority of people must be sufficiently educated to appreciate and value positively the treasures of relatively free culture and as a result be willing to abide by the rules of the democratic process, striving unceasingly toward the spiritual and material betterment of the community at large. This demands

popular education in the tortuous history of man's century-old struggle for freedom,³ and in the religious and moral bases of this attainment of vigilant tolerance, respect for the priceless dignity of the human personality and body, and the governance of moral law in order to instill a real sense of responsibility in individuals toward the community at large. The relative neglect of these requisites in secular education has grown to appalling proportions even among the democracies of the world, and has thereby enhanced somewhat susceptibility toward the deceptive offerings of crooks and cranks. Secondly, the men acquiring power to decide on issues must be of sufficiently high calibre and devoted to the cause of democratic freedom. And lastly, a well-organized and smoothly-functioning bureaucracy, consisting of trained men of unquestioned democratic character, is required to operate administratively and to advise the elected representatives. Obviously in varying degrees all three conditions exist in the democracies, but as always, where finite human nature is involved, there is still much room for liberal improvement.

Western democracy, then, founded culturally on Hebraic, Greek, and Christian conceptions of the intrinsic sanctity of the human person, created in the image of God as regards his finite possession of reason and will, on the institutional primacy of the family, on the superiority of moral law ingrained and apprehended in the natural order, on the equality of all men before the law, on the potency of human reason and responsible will, and on the moral and legal recognition of the basic human rights of speech, worship, occupation, choice, and earned possession, is a method most conducive to the determination of detailed political decisions is achieved through the vesting of decision-making powers by the electorate in men, the would-be leaders, competitively striving for its vote. This political institutional framework allows us to enjoy a historically unexcelled measure of freedom and guarantees the conservation of past gains and the provision for the maximum opportunity for future, peaceable, material and spiritual progress. Above all, its continued fructification demands adherence of all to the belief, grounded in the rational bases of democratic procedure as cited partially above, in strict conformity with an old Catholic prescription—"In essential things, unity; in less essential, liberty; in all things, charity."

³ See Lord Acton's, "History of Freedom."

The Reality of Eastern Despotism

Dr. Oscar Lange, the present Polish ambassador to the United States, in his more scholarly moments, when he was not concerned with the prestige and requirements of political position, accurately characterized the Soviet Union as a representative of "industrial serfdom."⁴ The combination of the economic and industrial machinery taken over from the advanced Western nations and the intensified abrogation of human rights and decencies in the Union are well summarized in this apt phrase. Concerning the latter part of this combination, especially in view of the racial type of leadership at the Kremlin, one might ask with Mr. Edgar Snow, "Is not the Soviet an Asiatic regime . . . suited to Asiatics but not to Europeans?" The thread of Eastern despotism, characteristically engendering personal oligarchical rule, substantial cultural uniformity, extensive police control, elaborate state apparatus for simple civil enforcement, the purposeful suppression of competitive political opposition, the inquisitorial succession of purges and the like can be easily traced throughout Russian history to render a meaningful continuity in the transition from Tsarist times to the Soviet present. For our purposes it will suffice to trace part of this serflike tradition in Russia since the beginning of this century.

It is well known to every careful student of Karl Marx and his true successors that Lenin, a product of Russia, a country without democratic tradition, polluted the reservoir of Marxist thought with his despotic actionism that prepared the way for extreme Soviet totalitarianism which in numerous respects is more comprehensive and menacing to the world at large than German Nazism could have been. The present state of Soviet politics is a far cry from Marx's conception of freedom, wherein "Freedom consists in the transformation of the state from an organ dominant over society into an organ subordinate to society. And today, too, the various existing forms of state are free or not free in the measure in which they circumscribe the freedom of the state." This Marxian test of freedom's essence in itself should serve to measure the validity of Soviet "democracy" and "freedom," in addition to scotching the Soviet notion of the "dictatorship of the proletariat." As shown in a previous article,⁵ the conditions for socialism which were presumed to emerge in the growing democratic

⁴ *The Call*, April 13, 1940.

⁵ *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, vol. I, No. 4, pp. 330-341.

atmosphere of advanced industrial nations are convergently several in Marxian theory and by sheer necessity materially serve to catapult the vast majority of proletarians into political power so that a "dictatorship of the proletariat" is established on the majority principle of the democratic process, despite the requirement of revolutionary terrorism which Marx saw probably necessary in the police states of continental Europe. Crucial to this analysis is the stubborn fact that most of these conditions were non-existent in Russia and that the usurpation of political power by the Lenin-led Bolsheviks by means of a coup d'état constituted simply a brutal arrogation of power by a characteristically compact minority. The Soviet "dictatorship of the proletariat" consequently rests on no objective identification of the majority will and the government: rather it is based, as indeed it was originated, on the enforced subservience of the former to the latter.

In line of development this transition to Soviet oligarchical dictatorship, so well typified by the Politbureau, was in essence the projection of the dictatorial, regimented principle of organization and execution that Lenin foisted upon the Marxist party in Russia prior to the Revolution. In one of his writings, Lenin proclaims: "Bureaucratism against democracy—that must be the organizational principle of the revolutionary Social-Democracy against the organizational principle of the opportunists."⁶ When the Revolution of 1917 occurred, mainly due to the breakdown of the Tsarist military machine, if so it may be called, efforts were still made by many sincere Marxists to organize a government of all socialist parties. As Theodore Dan writes in his continuation of Martov's "History of the Russian Social Democracy" (p. 307): "At this time Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Rjazanov, Lozowski and other prominent Bolsheviks demanded the formation of a Socialist government composed of all socialist parties. They declared that formation of a purely Bolshevik government would lead to a regime of terror and to the destruction of the revolution and the country." When the elections to the Constituent Assembly gave the Bolshevik Party only one-fourth of the membership, the majority going to the Socialist Revolutionaries, Lenin staged his blow with the aid of, among others, degraded Russian sailors. The very origin of the Soviet government is therefore one of ruthless force. Little wonder, especially in view of what has transpired during nearly these past three decades in the Soviet incarceration-box,

⁶ *One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward*, p. 51.

that Rosa Luxemburg, who was quite close to the Bolsheviks, was frank to say in her "Russian Revolution": "To be sure, every democratic institution has its faults and limitations, which it has in common with all human institutions. But the remedy discovered by Lenin and Trotsky, the abolition of democracy, is worse than the evil it is supposed to cure for it shuts off the lifespring from which can come the cure for all the inadequacies of social institutions". As the great English liberal, Lord Acton, put it, "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely . . . Where unlimited, unbridled governmental power exists, the conditions for extreme mass violence also are the ripest. Paradoxically enough, Lenin himself, who was mainly instrumental in erecting such conditions for official abuse and tyranny, was quite worried about Stalin when he uttered, "Comrade Stalin, having become General Secretary (of the Communist Party), has concentrated an enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure that he always knows how to use that power with sufficient discretion". The least one can say is that Comrade Stalin proved to be quite discreet in his eventual liquidation of the more democratically-minded Bolsheviks as Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov and others.

It is needless to recount here the wide range of abuses promulgated by Soviet authoritarianism inasmuch as that has been shown in my previous article and, more so, has been recently magnificently portrayed by Victor Kravchenko whose "I Chose Freedom" will undoubtedly prove to be a monumental biographical testimonial to the blatant excrescences of Soviet autocracy as it presently serves as a mirror of the stupidities of some prominent Americans irresponsibly spouting forth their seasoned ignorance of Soviet affairs. The periodical purges, the horrible collectivization of the peasantry, the vast economically parasitic bureaucracy, the mock trials where protection by law is rapaciously flouted by personal dictates, the sham Constitutions, the arbitrary dissolution and mass extermination of families, the huge slave labor system, the easy fabrication of lies for those within as well as those without in the field of history as well as journalism, all these phenomena startling and incredible as they may seem to a democratically-nurtured citizenry are expertly treated by Kravchenko from valid personal experience and cannot be said to be logically incompatible with unlimited governmental power. In a democracy they would be, thus accounting for the overzealous skepticism of Westerners. In a dictatorship, especially of an

Asiatic brand, unlimited barbarity is both compatible and correlative. History abounds with such types of government, despite the accidental differences between one and the other. Soviet dictatorship is typical of the same barbaric despotism as the autocracies of Ivan the Terrible, Peter I, Catherine the Great, Nero and the like, despite its glorified profession of the cause of the common man and its feats of industrialization. When one penetrates more sharply the content of this elaborate facade and begins to consider the Soviet economy as a whole, its unwieldy maze of bureaucratic regulations, its fixing costs through hypothetical estimation, the vast population of economic parasites in the notorious NKVD, the Red Army, the overlapping and over-expanded governmental agencies, each established to check on the other, which contribute nothing to the material efficiency of technologic workmanship, the relative absence of consumers' choice, the differential advantages of Party affiliation and lackey status, and the wretched existence of approximately 20 million slave laborers,⁷ the "Great Experiment" begins to differ only accidentally from those of the Pharaohs of Egypt, the despots of Babylonia and India, and the Roman Caesars who likewise glorified themselves in the tremendous works, reservoirs, dams, fine roads, canals and so on which they sponsored with an institutional apparatus in significant respects not unlike the barbaric regime of the Soviets. It would do well for many historically untutored Westerners to consider these parallels before unrealistically jumping to conclusions based upon a Soviet announcement of its pig iron production for a given year. The question remains always, "At what real cost?"

Considerations of Western Policy Toward the Soviets

The chasm in the values of life and the appropriate techniques of governmental function between the democracies of the West and the autocracy of the East is clearly unbridgeable. The sooner this is realized, the sooner will a proper mode of operation be assumed by the Western governments toward the Soviet Union. With this premise, resting on the definitional distinctions drawn above to conform with fact, certain considerations can be regarded as practical points of deliberation for a saner and more realistic orientation of the Western democracies toward the USSR, upon which a genuine peace, if that is possible, can be secured. They present themselves as follows:

⁷ Kravchenko, V., "I Choose Freedom," p. 404.

1. A re-examination of the cultural heritage of our democracy is necessary in our colleges and schools to provide our growing citizenry with an appreciative knowledge and feeling of the valiant struggle that man has had to achieve those measures of freedom which we are disposed to take lightly and thoughtlessly. Historical fact will thus provide the authoritative groundwork for our cherished beliefs and vigilant adherence to democratic living and a sure release from the cultural myopism by which many minds have been ensnared.

2. There must be ready publication of facts under governmental auspices of the untruths and lies emanating from the very antithesis of our culture. When so reputable an analyst as J. F. Dulles speaks of the tolerance of the Soviets to ethnic differences between the inhabitants of the Soviet Union,⁸ a paucity of factual information is the basis for his usually well-meaning assertions. The experiences of Ukrainians with such "tolerance," in regard to linguistic restrictions in schools of higher learning, the suppressed teaching of true Ukrainian history, the suppression of their own national Church and the like reduce such factless statements to waste paper. Or when Mr. Dulles in the same article speaks of the considerable freedom there to disagree and argue about science, astronomy, biology etc., again a more internal acquaintance with actualities would show him and others that such "freedom" is restricted by Marxist orientation so that position taken on Mendelian eugenics, pure science, Freudian psychoanalysis and so on would automatically smack of heresy. Countless other distortions must be exposed if a sincerely comprehensive understanding is desired. The plight of the Jews in Russia,⁹ the Soviet satellite governments in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, the Soviet rape of Finland and the Baltic countries, the long Ukrainian experience with Soviet tyranny, the Soviet maneuvers to prevent the economic organization of Europe, all these phenomena should be openly publicized if a proper opinion is to be developed. The classic example of falsehood that has been permitted to spread in the United States is that the Russians lost most heavily in the past war and are consequently deserving of much Allied gratitude. Here is what a reliable war correspondent who visited the Eastern area has to say:¹⁰

"It was not till I came here (Kiev) on this sobering journey into the twilight of war that I quite realized the price which Ukrainians paid for

⁸ *Life* magazine, June 3, 1946, p. 123.

⁹ Rabbi Benjamin Schultz's letter to *N. Y. Times*, June 13, 1946.

¹⁰ Edgar Snow, *Saturday Evening Post*, January 27, 1945.

Soviet victory. This whole titanic struggle, which some are apt to dismiss as the 'Russian glory' has, in all truth and in many costly ways, been first of all a *Ukrainian war*. No fewer than 10,000,000 people, I was told by a high official here, have been 'lost' to the Ukraine since the beginning of the war. That figure excludes men and women mobilized for the armed forces."

3. There must be the adoption of a strict rule of reciprocity by the democracies. If the Soviets, as they profess to be, are sincerely interested in peace, then no objection should be forthcoming to our efforts to understand them better. As Bernard Pares, a sympathetic person toward the Union, states: "It is useless for Soviet officials to complain that the Soviet Union is so very ill understood in the world outside if we cannot have the first condition for knowing and understanding her." Soviet correspondents are free to travel and report in the United States: we should demand the same privilege. They are allowed to inspect our plants here: we should ask for the same. If we seek disarmament, they should willingly join. All this presupposes their interest in peace. This fair rule of reciprocity serves as a good test for verbal profession.

4. Foreign-sponsored and oriented political organizations, such as the Communist Party must be made illegal. This at first view may seem contradictory to democratic tenet. But upon further consideration it will be understood that the democratic principle demands responsibility as well as liberty, the two ingredients of freedom. To have absolute liberty means to facilitate license, not freedom. Where an organization such as the Communist Party in the United States, as those elsewhere, follows a "Party line" established in Moscow, as can be abundantly shown, it demonstrates a complete lack of responsibility toward the communal interests of the American people and consequently disqualifies itself for the benefits of the American democratic freedom of political action—all this, despite its campaigns ranging from milk for babies to the fight against inflation. Such a disguise for Party infiltration into American sentiment and ultimately into positions of power, as witnessed in war-torn Europe today, should fool no intelligent American. Here is just one example of Party orientation denying absolutely the American environment and stated by a leading functionary of the American Communist Party:¹¹

"Under the dictatorship, all the capitalist parties—Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist—would be liquidated, the Com-

¹¹ William Z. Foster, 7th Moscow Congress of 3rd Int'l.—1935.

munist Party functioning alone as the Party of the toiling masses.”

5. There must be positive promulgation of Western freedom through the media of economic aid to liberal countries, the re-settlement of war refugees in the democratic world, the concentrated abolition of any vestige of Western imperialism, the rehabilitation of vanquished nations, and the further humanization of the economic order. In a word, a belated implementation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The more this is done, the cleaner will our hand appear; the blacker relatively, by sheer contrast, will despotic hands become.

6. Lastly, demonstrating forthrightly that we mean to preserve our freedom and the opportunity to further develop it in an environment of international peace, through the application of such considerations as advanced here, the democratic powers should courageously, and now, specify the areas of the world which they are intended to protect against any further overt Soviet military relations. For in the nature of the problem confronting the world today, as here interpreted, there are no three ways of meeting it—only two. Submission through endless appeasement or preservation through the forthright propagation of the democratic principle.



THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM OF DISPLACED PERSONS

By WALTER DUSHNYCK

TO date the problem of the millions of displaced persons in Europe has proved to be far more than the mere matter of the mechanics involved in sustaining such a large group until transportation becomes available. Hundreds of thousands have injected a moral and political note into the problem by their fearful unwillingness to be repatriated, an unwillingness expressed in some cases by suicide. The question of this large subgroup has been examined principally in the light of fundamental human rights. There remains the evaluation of the political aspect of this problem. The political significance is produced by their unwillingness and fear.

It has been pointed out by enthusiasts of the Soviet way of life that the neuroses resulting from economic insecurity are unknown in the Soviet Union. In their ardor, however, they have overlooked an agent indigenous to the Soviet Union that has made for a substitute fear, namely, the NKVD or secret police.

To appreciate the scope of this fear, one needs but note that virtually every citizen of the Soviet Union may be regarded as a potential criminal. This follows from the concept of the crime against the state or the political crime, a concept that has been broadened to a degree that is inconceivable in the Western democracies. The slightest deviation from approved policy constitutes treason. Necessarily, then, the NKVD has developed extraordinary powers to cope effectively with these offenders or "enemies of the state." In a system where the uncompromising philosophy of the ends justifying the means is fanatically pursued, it is not surprising to find that rehabilitation of such offenders against their society—state is expressed in capital punishment or long imprisonment. It is interesting to note in this connection that the Soviet Union has further adopted a policy of "collective responsibility," which holds that the family and associates of the particular offender are equally guilty. To repeat, the austerity of the Soviet mentality and the severity of its methods have long been manifest. To gain its ends, the Soviet Union has not stopped at depriving itself of its leaders, as

indicated by the treason trials of 1937-38; it has not been dismayed by sheer numbers, as born out by the mass starvation imposed upon Ukraine in 1932-34, nor has it hesitated to sacrifice world prestige, as evident by its attack on Finland and its non-aggression pact with Hitler in 1939. This is the backdrop against which we must examine the fears of the displaced persons.

The large subgroup unwilling to return home can be broken down into five broad categories. Of these five, the one composed of Russians and non-Russians who have always been avowed enemies of communism probably face the greatest danger. Among these are numbered the thousands who fled Russia at the time of the Bolshevik Revolution, during the Lenin-Trotsky period, 1924-1929, during the forced collectivization policy, 1929-34, and lastly, at the time of the assassination of Kirov. Most of these have carried the Nansen passports issued by the League of Nations. Under a secret provision of the Yalta Agreement, the refugees after 1929 have become subject to recall by the Soviet Union.

In another category falls a large part of those thousands of refugees from Eastern Europe who were never Russian citizens, Soviet or Czarist. These Poles, Ukrainians, Hungarians, Slovaks, Rumanians, Croats, Finns and other Baltic nationals, fearing persecution for their democratic and anti-communistic beliefs, are unwilling to return to what are now Soviet satellite states.

Another segment is composed of the "volunteers," men who were forcibly conscripted into the German Army. These are mainly Asiatics, such as Kalmuks, Turkmens, Tartars and the like. According to interrogation by U. S. Army intelligence, they were pressed into service upon threat of death by the Gestapo and SS troops. Despite the readiness with which these bewildered "volunteers" surrendered to Allied troops, they fear Soviet reprisal for their participation. In the same category may be placed those refugees whose countries were annexed by the Soviet Union, yet who did not feel obligated to fight with the Soviet armies.

In another category are slave laborers of various nationalities who refuse to return because of previous or newly-discovered antipathy toward the Soviet way of life and who are uneasy about having been part of the German economic machine.

Finally there are Red Army soldiers taken prisoner by the Germans

who balk at repatriation. In view of Stalin's proclamation that no Red Army man would surrender to the Germans, a fear of punitive measures prevails among some four million prisoners, particularly marked in those who escaped from Stalags but had remained in Germany.

That the Soviet Union has been meting out its version of justice has been attested to by reports filtering through the "iron curtain." The early mass deportations from the Baltic States and the Western Ukraine are indicative of the fate confronting all "enemies" in Soviet-controlled territory. It is estimated on the basis of Lithuanian Red Cross reports that some 200,000 people have been lost to the Baltic countries during the Soviet occupation. These people have simply disappeared. The details of the deportation proceedings were meticulously worked out in the *Serov Instruction*, originating with the Commissariat of State Security, Moscow (*Lithuanian Bulletin*, January 1946). This official document was prefaced by the proposition that "the deportation of anti-Soviet elements from the Baltic states is a task of great political importance." According to plan, these "enemies of the Soviet people" were removed at pistol-point "without noise and panic" to designated points where families were separated from their heads and thence taken to the interior of the Soviet Union.

Instances of forced repatriation have come to light, such as the incident at Camp Mannheim, Germany, where American soldiers assisted Soviet agents in rounding up refugees in the American Zone (*Zealandia*, Auckland, Dec. 27, 1945). Despite an order issued by General Eisenhower (*AP*, Oct. 4, 1945) that forced repatriation of persons unwilling to return will be stopped by the local administrative officers, complaints of such have persisted, of which the one of Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, Secretary for the Congregation of the Oriental Church in Rome, is most notable. According to the *N. Y. Times*, March 26, 1946, the Cardinal declared: "Many thousands of persons hostile to the present regime in the Soviet Union are being forcibly sent back by the Americans and the British under the Yalta Agreement." He charged the kidnapping of anti-Soviet refugees from a camp of displaced persons at Cine Città, at the outskirts of Rome. Most of these refugees were Catholic Ukrainians from Western and Carpatho-Ukraine. A formal protest took form in the United Nations resolution of February in London that *bona fide* refugees would not be returned to their native countries against their will, a resolution that was vigorously opposed

by the Soviets and their satellite delegates. A *New York Times* dispatch of April 13, 1946, however, reports that a movement to repatriate 40,000 Ukrainian refugees from Carpatho-Ukraine to the Soviet Union has begun.

It is, of course, impossible to arrive at an estimate of the number of persons who have been deported. It is significant, nonetheless, that some 25 millions have come under Soviet hegemony since the fall of Germany. Besides an outright occupation of the Baltic States, Western and Carpatho-Ukraine, Bukovina, Bessarabia, White Ruthenia, and parts of Germany and Austria, it controls Finland, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Albania through the NKVD.

The political significance of the problem of displaced persons now becomes apparent. The Soviet Union has been given an opportunity unique in its history to liquidate its enemies, active and potential, not only within its borders but in the whole of Eastern and Central Europe. Inasmuch as such enemies are, broadly, the politically active elements, the professionals and the administrators of the respective old regimes, the final result will be a political climate especially favorable for the implantation of the Soviet way of life.

BOOK REVIEWS

FROM A POLITICAL DIARY, Russia, the Ukraine, and America 1905-1945, by Arnold D. Margolin, New York, Columbia University Press, 1946, 250 pp.

Dr. Margolin has at long last accomplished in this memorable work what has long been needed in the field of Western, especially American, orientation toward the actualities of Eastern Europe, notably those of Ukraine. His purpose is clear and unequivocal—to fill in the wide gaps of Western knowledge and therefore understanding of Eastern Europe; his message is sincere and forthright—to awaken Americans particularly to their historic mission in the advancement of democracy throughout the civilized world as the only insurance of peace and true economic progress: his equipment is genuinely solid and in large measure obtained at first hand, mainly through the assemblies and councils of Russia, Ukraine, and foreign official gatherings. In a word, the author, in this diary-like examination of important international problems and issues, speaks fundamentally from personal experience, provided with careful documentation, rather than, as is commonly the case among our American “experts” on Eastern Europe, from variously preconceived patchworks of analysis drawn from poorly evaluated and questionable second-hand material.

Chief among the gaps in Western knowledge concerning Eastern Europe to which Dr. Margolin, a learned American lawyer of Jewish Ukrainian nativity, devotes himself is the vital role and active setting of the Ukrainian liberation movement in Eastern European politics. Reflecting a wide breadth of objective historical knowledge and an astute ability for critical selection and judgement, his analysis contains many vital points of information and consequently validly established interpretations over which many a department of state in the democratic countries might do well to ponder, and which simultaneously serve to rectify some of the current misconceptions about Eastern Europe harbored in the public mind. First is the supposedly close resemblance between “Russia” (USSR) and the United States, an assumed psychological fallacy capable of producing considerable poli-

tical misguidance. Foremost among the differences specified by the author is the ineradicable multi-national complexion of the Soviet Union, grounded in centuries-long tradition of substantially distinct communal psychology, history, language, customs and institutions, as against the national unity of the United States in which even foreign-born immigrants participate willingly upon arrival as signified by their desirous intentions to become "real Americans." "Even the Czars, who tried their best to centralize the government, used the term 'peoples of Russia' in addressing manifestoes to the public" (p. 2). The incongruity of the similar governmental address, "peoples of the United States," with our institutional orientation is at once obvious. The state of Western, notably American, knowledge can be readily estimated when this elementary fact has not even yet been fully understood.

A second point of vital interest concerns the Ukrainian people, their movement for democratic freedom, their course in the past and present. Of singular importance is their perennial resistance to any form of subserviency, as shown in the incompatibility of serfdom, which thrived in Russia and Poland, with the democratic institutions of Ukraine, the second largest Slav nation. "Thus, like the Czechs, the Ukrainians are a genuinely democratic nation, without any remnant of aristocratic or feudal psychology. In this they are akin to Americans" (p. 24). The vicious fabrications of Russian imperialists under the Czars and after, seeking to discredit Ukrainian aspirations by denying its linguistic status or imputing German sponsorship of the Ukrainian movement, receive an authentic repudiation in this analysis, "As a matter of historic fact, the Ukrainian Duchy of Kiev existed as an independent state as early as the ninth century" (p. 26). In point of fact, as concerns this vile association between the pure Ukrainian democratic motives and German opportunism, which was even shamelessly revived during this past war by chronically unscrupulous enemies of democracy, the author shows with ample verification that the Ukrainian Central Rada, which was composed of Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, and Jewish political parties and which "displayed remarkable liberalism in regard to the cultural rights of Russian, Jewish, Polish, and other minorities" (p. 31), received *de facto* recognition from England and France and *de jure* recognition from Soviet Russia before the German-sponsored Brest-Litovsk treaty. "If France and England had been willing and able to save the Ukraine from the threat of invasion and subjugation by Germany or Soviet Russia, the representatives of the

Ukrainian Central Rada would never have become party to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk" (p. 28). The whole course of the Ukrainian movement has been consistently democratic, steering toward federation with Russia and other states on the principle of equality before the onsurge of Bolshevism, toward complete independence after the establishment of red totalitarianism in Russia.

The third point of consideration revolves about the attitude of Western diplomacy toward Ukraine, Russia, and Poland immediately after World War I, a war fought ostensibly for democracy. As Margolin shows so well, the main deterrent to proper relations between the Western democracies and Ukraine was a fateful combination of alarming ignorance on the part of the former and the little real interest which the democracies displayed toward the establishment of democracies elsewhere. With respect to the first point, the author's negotiations, for example, with the American Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, and with Mr. Selby, in charge of Russian affairs in the British Foreign Office, reveal the profound ignorance of these officials, at least candidly admitted by the latter, of Ukraine. Concerning the second part of the combination, instead of offering help to the one movement which was democratic, as democratic affinity demanded, the Western democracies fumbled into the morass of power politics whereby the United States, misguided by Russian aristocratic emigrés, favored Kolchak's reactionary forces; France, under Clemenceau, backed General Haller's imperialist Polish forces, and Britain, those of Denikin. It is significant that what each represented, sooner or later collapsed. Left unheeded was the desperate need for a free agreement among the nationalities of the Russian Empire upon a democratic federation, such as the late Russian Prof. Miliukov, one of the very few genuine Russian democrats, advocated. Today, how much longer can the democracies afford to leave it this way?

The further experiences of the author, as a private citizen in the United States, with American officials on East European affairs are both interesting and instructive. His foresight concerning the trends in European politics during the 30's is well substantiated. The manner in which the Roosevelt administrations facilitated German and Japanese designs through essential inertness is clearly shown, as would appeasement of the Soviet Union in its designs do today. Despite certain minor criticisms that can be offered, such, as the author's somewhat weak acceptance of the 1936 Soviet Constitution as pertains to civil

liberties, especially in the light of the recent disclosures of Victor Kravchenko, his glaring oversight of the numerous parallels to be drawn between the former Nazi regime and the Soviet dictatorship, points which motivate his additional suggestion that the democracies strive to "persuade" the present Soviet rulers to democratize the Union, the author's judgements on the Yalta and Potsdam agreements as gross violations of the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration of the United Nations, analogous to the dispositions of the Vienna Congress and the Holy Alliance in the 19th century, on the veto power in the Security Council as an equivalent of the old Polish "Liberum Veto" which was aptly characterized as "the vice of parliamentary life in Poland," and on the necessary limitation of national sovereignty everywhere by the prerequisites of the democratic form of government and the guarantee of fundamental human rights, are the inevitable products of democratically-motivated reasoning. The climax of this admirable, gap-filling work which is indispensable for American readers is reached when Margolin truthfully states:

"As long, however, as the Soviet government refrains from legalizing all democratic political parties within its own confines, the world will not be 'safe for democracy' . . . By long and bitter experience mankind should now have learned that the tendency toward aggressive wars exists in the totalitarian countries in infinitely larger measure than in a democracy."

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

RUSO-POLISH RELATIONS, by S. Konovalow, Princeton University Press, 1946, 102 pp.

The Russo-Polish border dispute has caused the appearance of numerous articles and books, which naturally, try to explain this confusing problem from the Soviet or Polish point of view. But in the last analysis this question is yet to be explained satisfactorily because neither the Polish nor the Soviet presentation takes into consideration the plain fact that there can not be a Russo-Polish border dispute inasmuch as Russia and Poland have no common frontier. Poland is contiguous in the east upon Ukraine and White Ruthenia; therefore, the Russo-Polish dispute is a matter of the old antagonisms of Polish and Russian imperialism with regard to the territories of the Ukrainian and White Ruthenian peoples.

But the Soviets are in a more advantageous position because they are trying at least formally to defend those or other borders of the "allied" republics of Ukraine and White Ruthenia, although actually neither Ukraine nor White Ruthenia is independent or even autonomous.

When, in addition to this, an author writing in English freely substitutes "Soviet" for "Russia," then one is confronted with a confusing problem which makes it impossible to arrive at any comprehensive understanding of Eastern European relations.

The late Sir John Maynard set himself the task of explaining the Russo-Polish problem in a book which he decided to write by invitation of the "Anglo-Soviet Public Relations Association" in London. In the course of his work Sir John died and his book was finished by Professor Konovalow.

Mr. Konovalow's book is a short outline which gives the most important events in the history of Poland, Russia, Ukraine and White Ruthenia. The selected data collected in the book speak highly of its author and his historical erudition. The presentation of these facts is impartial and objective. The author underscores the cultural and political assets of Poles and Russians; moreover, he also stresses the separate existence of the Ukrainian culture. But he does not give the reader any statement of the aspirations of the Ukrainian people for liberation from the Poles and Russian. In Professor Konovalow's book the Ukrainians are presented as a separate ethnic unit, but he fails to point out that they have been fighting for their political emancipation for centuries. Had the author included all the facts about their political struggle, then the Russo-Polish border dispute would have been brought to the reader in a far more revealing light.

In the past Poland and Russia, as multi-national state organisms, had common borders only in the time between the Union of Brest and the partitions of Poland (1569-1795), yet even at that time the political aspirations of the Ukrainians and also those of the White Russians, often hidden under the Lithuanian name, were a constant factor in Russo-Polish relations. It is a history of two imperialisms, Polish and Russian, that met in Ukraine and White Ruthenia. To underline this is to give the real nature of the Polish-Russian dispute, a thing which unfortunately the author has neglected to do.

But Professor Konovalow is markedly different from other Russian

historians because he recognizes the existence of the Ukrainian people as such, and therefore throws more light on the conditions of Eastern Europe. Even he, however, does not follow this consistently throughout his work. Besides the names of Ukraine and Ukrainians we find others such as "Russians", "Little Russians" and "Ruthenians" which result in further confusion in the reader's mind.

The first part of the book gives a historical outline of facts, the second is an appendix of historical documents well selected.

On the whole, the book of Professor Konovalow is the most impartial in the field and indicates the way for a truly accurate and comprehensive appraisal of the question.

NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ

THE GREAT GLOBE ITSELF, A Preface to World Affairs, by William C. Bullitt, 310 pp., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.75.

It is almost impossible to be an "impartial" judge of the Soviet Union, as is attested to by two of our Ambassadors to the Soviet Union. Mr. Joseph E. Davies' *Mission to Moscow* won him the reputation of being an extremely irresponsible writer because he outdid the Russians themselves in propagandizing their Communistic and totalitarian policies. He was ridiculed by such people as the author of *I Chose Freedom*, Mr. V. Kravchenko, who asserted that his book was being afar from true picture of Soviet life. Another American Ambassador Mr. Bullitt seems to be a better judge than Mr. Davies, for his book *The Great Globe Itself*, gives us a full and intelligent explanation of the present-day policies of Mr. Stalin.

Mr. Bullitt was our first Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1933-36. For years he was friendly with the New Russia, had close and intimate relations with its revolutionary and dynamic leaders, and it was his enthusiasm for the Soviet Union that caused the late President Roosevelt to appoint him Ambassador to the Kremlin. His book presents a thorough *expose* of Soviet internal and foreign policies. Mr. Bullitt contends that our world is seriously menaced by Soviet imperialistic Communism the ultimate goal of which is the conquest of the globe. He points out that the United States is the only power on earth in a position to stop Mr. Stalin's expansion. While the democracies are on the defensive before the rising Soviet imperialism, it is not

because the Soviet Union is materially so strong, but rather because the Western Powers are tragically impotent and indecisive. He thinks that Mr. Roosevelt's 'great design' was doomed to a complete failure because he gambled that Stalin could be persuaded to cooperate freely and openly for democratic peace. But the very essence of the Soviet Union is its militant Communistic imperialism the aims of which is the world conquest. "In the eyes of the Soviet government," writes Mr. Bullitt, "the Soviet Union is always engaged in warfare, open or concealed, with non-Communist states . . . That is why, for our own self-preservation, we must face the fact that Stalin . . . will not stop but can only be stopped . . ."

The policy of appeasement, writes Mr. Bullitt, was definite a one-way proposition, and our foreign policy-makers are in reality responsible for the present-day Soviet expansionist policy. At Yalta Roosevelt and Churchill gave in completely to Stalin and thus paved the road for Soviet aggression and conquest. Large territorial conquests were given to the Soviets: the Kurile Island, half of Sakhalin, the Chinese ports of Dairen and Port Arthur; moreover, the Soviet Union was given actually full control over the countries of Eastern and Central Europe. In addition to this the Soviet Ukraine and White Russia were recognized and admitted to the United Nations as "free and independent states," although it is common knowledge that those countries are merely held in subjection by the Russian Communists.

The author asserts that it is useless to believe that there will be a *modus vivendi* between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union, because their philosophies of life are diametrically opposed. The Soviet masses deprived of political and economic liberties since Ivan the Terrible have been trained to believe that the only life in the world is the life under the totalitarian *knout*, and that Moscow is destined to rule and guide humanity itself. Recent Soviet victories (which, incidentally, the Soviet propaganda ascribes to the Soviet Union alone!) have considerably increased this Soviet urge for the world conquest. Mr. Bullitt states that with its population constantly growing and with those of the Western Allies declining, the Soviet Union is the only predatory and imperialistic power that threatens the ravaged world with a new war. The immediate objectives of Soviet foreign policy are a close consolidation of its territorial conquest in

Europe and Asia and the gaining of the secrets of atomic bomb. If our appeasement policy continues, the Soviet Union will soon have under its eegis three continents and then it will feel fully prepared to attack the United States, the bulwark of the despised "capitalism" and "international reaction."

Mr. Bullitt believes in the necessity of an international body like the United Nations. But he warns the reader that as long as the Charter provides a veto clause, the Soviet Union can and will stall any peace attempts.

His advice to our government is: to adopt a scrupulously frank and firm policy toward the Soviet Union, to keep the atomic bomb, to help all the freedom-loving peoples in Asia and Europe to form a Federation of Democratic States as a counter-measure against the aggressive imperialism of the Soviet Union.

The author gives a long list of charges and particulars of violation by the Soviet Union of international treaties, agreements and assurances, collated with the similar charges of major German war criminals now on trial at Nuremberg. The Soviet violations exceed those of the Nazis.

Mr. Bullitt's book, however, is not complete from the point of view of those students of Soviet internal affairs who know the many difficulties of Stalin's empire. The problem of the different nationalities of the Soviet Union is completely overlooked and creates the impression upon the American readers that the subjugated peoples are reconciled with their miserable lot. This is far from being so. Ukraine has always been against Russian domination, Czarist or Soviet, as have been Armenia, Georgia and White Ruthenia, to mention only the most important. During the German occupation of Ukraine a vast Ukrainian Underground Army of insurgents fought both Nazis and Bolsheviks alike. Today, fourteen months after V-E Day, the Soviet Union is still at war with millions of its "citizens" who were brought into it by force. The Ukrainian Underground, for example, is so well organized that entire regions in the Carpathian Mountains, Bukovina and Volhynia, are under its jurisdiction, while Soviet authority can be represented only through entire regiments or divisions of the Red Army.

The Soviet Union, however, remains a formidable threat. The voice of Mr. Bullitt is calm but incisive.

WALTER DUSHNYCK

"RUSSIA ON THE WAY," by Harrison Salisbury, The Macmillan Company, New York, 425 pp.

This book probably breaks all records for superficiality of treatment of its subject. Even the most enthusiastic apologists for Russia have by now developed a tendency to acknowledge the existence of other nationalities in the Soviet Union. Not so Mr. Salisbury; to him the USSR is Russia, holy Mother Russia, the Russia of song, samovars, snowdrifts, burning logs in the fireplace and other such quaint trivia.

Since the book is so shallow, there is no danger that it will make a deep impression on anyone reading it.

ROMAN OLESNICKI

"THE PEOPLES OF THE SOVIET UNION," by Corliss Lamont, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 229+viii pp. \$3.00.

The Lamonts tend to serve the mightiest individuals of each generation. Thirty odd years ago, when untrammelled capitalism was the religion of the western world and J. P. Morgan its high priest, Thomas Lamont was his chief of propaganda and almost succeeded in muzzling the American press in favor of the House of Morgan. Persons, issues and ideologies have changed in this generation, but not the Lamonts in propagandizing one-man rulers of the world. This time Thomas Lamont's son Corliss is trying to have the world accept Communism as a political religion capable of rectifying all the ills of democracy and Stalin as its high priest and most benevolent "democratic" autocrat the world has yet seen.

This method of ideological approach to Soviet problems enables Mr. Corliss Lamont to discover a unique "ethnic democracy" worthy of imitation which is allegedly practiced in the Soviet Union.

Speaking specifically, "The Peoples of the Soviet Union" is a hodge-podge of official Soviet propaganda including pictures of happy people in the blessed Soviet Fatherland obligingly supplied by "Sovfoto," thrown insultingly into the face of the American public by Mr. Lamont as if he were trying to say: "take this, you Americans; your methods having failed, let Stalin solve your Negro-Catholic-Jewish and other problems!" Of course no one will dispute the point that the Soviets have brought a higher standard of living, some degree of literacy

and rudiments of hygiene to a few million of the most backward people on earth, the Siberian and Central Asiatic tribes, some of whom were still living almost in the stone age. But Mr. Lamont in framing this achievement of the Soviets fails to notice that in the process of creating an equality of civilization among people in various stages of development, those on the higher plane were brought down to the now prevailing level. Mr. Lamont may call it "ethnic democracy" and other high sounding names, but to a person with any sense of justice it appears to be a crime against humanity and civilization to retard the development of large nations as Ukraine, Byeloruthenia, Armenia and others, just in order to give an alphabet to a few nomadic tribes of Eskimos beyond the Arctic Circle, who were and would continue to be just as happy as they were without a written language.

Although by now any writer even remotely acquainted with the history of Western Europe knows that any cultural development of Muscovy was through the medium of Ukraine, to Mr. Lamont, Ukraine is worth only a little under four pages in his book, while the Uzbeks have earned seven pages.

Mr. Lamont tries to ignore the problems of Ukraine in the Soviet Union simply by not referring to their existence, since this is the official Russian way of coping with this question. They simply starve 2-3 million Ukrainians, deport twice that number to happy Siberian republics and without even saying a word about it, simply continue to proclaim that everything is as it was during Leo Tolstoy's time, with "the rivers flowing brighter than ever."

A few slips unintentionally made by Mr. Lamont reveal the true nature of "ethnic democracy" as applied to Ukraine and prove without any doubt the degree to which Ukraine has been set back by her Russian conquerors.

Thus quoting official Soviet statistics on the development of literacy in various Asiatic Soviet Republics, Mr. Lamont gives his statistics on all republics, including the Ukrainian. It is quite revealing to find out that while the number of books published in the Uzbek SSR was 56 in 1913, 740 in 1928 and 792 in 1938, with similar percentages of growth for other Asiatic SSR, in Ukraine there were 5,283 books published during the Tsarist oppression in 1913 and only 4,147 during Stalin's year of freedom 1938. Similarly the number of pupils in elementary schools in Ukraine was 1,492,878 in 1914-15 and 985,598 in

1938-39. What happened to an annual half million school children in Ukraine, the land with the highest birthrate in the world?

Do not look to Mr. Lamont for a direct answer, but we can find the answer tucked away in statements about the growth of the Asiatic Republics. The high increase of literacy within the Uzbek, Kazakh, Tadzhik and other Asiatic SSR was not caused by the fact that all the Turkmens took to books overnight, but to the fact that millions of highly civilized Ukrainians were for "nationalist deviations" deported to Asiatic lands, there to lift the cultural level by their mere presence, and in reality to serve as fertilizer in the development of Stalin's Asiatic empire.

ROMAN OLESNICKI

~

