
THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

VOL. IX. — NUMBER 1.



WINTER 1953

\$ 1.25 A COPY

Published by UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

Edited by EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-chief NICHOLAS D. CHUBATY
Associate Editor LEV E. DOBRIANSKY
Artistic Adviser SVIATOSLAV HORDYNSKY

Advisory Board:
BOHDAN KRAVCIV, LUKE MYSHUHA, MATTHEW STACHIW,
ROMAN SMAL STOCKI

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

Managing Office: THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY
50 Church Street, S 252, New York 7, N. Y.

Editorial Address: DR. NICHOLAS D. CHUBATY
250 Franklin Turnpike, Mahwah, New Jersey

Tel: CRagmere 8-3767-M

CONTENTS

Liberation Policy and Liberation Reality <i>Editorial</i>	5
Thirty Five Years of The Ukrainian Independence (1918-1953) <i>Matthew Stachiw</i>	14
The Death of Stalin <i>Clarence A. Manning</i>	19
The Veterinary Organization of Soviet Ukraine <i>Dr. Ivan Rozhin</i>	27
Why Jews Today? <i>Nicholas Prychodko</i>	36
Vasyl Krychevsky <i>Volodymyr Sichynsky</i>	44
The Success of a Mission and Its Eclipse <i>Lev E. Dobriansky</i>	48
The Bolshevik Freedom of Religion <i>Michael Nagurney</i>	62
I and the other "Enemies" of the Soviet People <i>Peter Kolymsky</i>	64
Depth of Soul or Doctrinaire Fanaticism <i>Nicholas Chubaty</i>	75
 BOOK REVIEWS:	
James Burnham, Containment or Liberation? <i>N. Chubaty</i>	79
Florian Znaniecki, Modern Nationalities <i>I. Vytanovlich</i>	81
Waldemar Gurian, Bolshevism <i>Jurij Fedynskyj</i>	82
Coates W. P. and Zeldia N., Soviets in Central Asia <i>Lev E. Dobriansky</i>	83
Walter Kolarz, Russia and Her Colonies <i>Myroslav Prokop</i>	85
William Reswick, I Dreamt Revolution <i>V. Vasyliv</i>	87
Russian Monarchists and the World Domination From " <i>Nasha Strana</i> "	89
UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PERIODICALS <i>L. E. D.</i>	94

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

- MATTHEW STACHIW, LLD**, Ukrainian sociologist and journalist. Editor "*Narodna Wola*" published in Scranton, Pa. Elected member of the *Shevchenko Scientific Society*.
- CLARENCE A. MANNING**, Professor of Russian and Ukrainian Languages and Literatures at Columbia University. Author of *The Story of Ukraine, Ukrainian Literature* and others.
- IVAN ROZHIN, Ph. D.**, Former Professor of veterinary in Soviet Ukraine, elected member of the *Shevchenko Scientific Society*. Now in this country.
- NICHOLAS PRYCHODKO**, author of "*One of the Fifteen Million*", Soviet engineer, now journalist living in Canada.
- VOLODYMYR SICHYNSKY, Ph. D.**, Ukrainian historian of Art and author of several works on history of art. Elected member of the *Shevchenko Scientific Society*.
- LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, Ph. D.**, Professor of Economics at Georgetown University and author. President of the *Ukrainian Congress Committee of America*.
- MICHAEL NAGURNEY**, Professor of *St. Basil College* in Stamford, Conn.
- PETER KOLYMSKY, (pseudo)**, a Ukrainian agriculturist from Soviet Ukraine. Now in this country.
- NICHOLAS CHUBATY, Ph. D., LLD**, Ukrainian historian and author. Former Professor of Ukrainian Universities, President of the *Shevchenko Scientific Society*. Editor of this publication.

LIBERATION POLICY AND LIBERATION REALITY

Editorial

The new Republican administration has taken a decisive step in American foreign policy. It has officially transferred to the archives the Policy of Containment, which was drawn up by George Kennan who has now gone into retirement. America has now officially adopted the Liberation Policy proclaimed by President Eisenhower in his speech on the State of the Union to the American Congress on February 2, 1953 in these words:

"Our policy, dedicated to making the free world secure, will envision all peaceful methods and devices — except breaking faith with our friends. We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves. I shall ask the Congress at a later date to join in an appropriate resolution making clear that this government recognizes no kind of commitment contained in secret understandings of the past with foreign governments which permit this kind of enslavement."

Seconding these words of the President, the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, gave to the peoples enslaved by red Moscow these words of encouragement: *"The enslaved peoples should 'count on us.'"*

These declarations might seem to define very clearly the new American foreign policy. But nevertheless this policy is not completely clear, if we examine the voices of authoritative American statesmen.

WHAT IS THE POLICY OF LIBERATION?

In and outside of America some have understood the new American policy simply as a war policy and have simplified the word "liberation" to mean a crusade against Moscow. In the first days after the proclamation of the new American policy, this was the interpretation given by the American allies in Europe and it created there almost a panic. It is obvious that this interpretation was incorrect, and that the American government was not intending to send on the day after the State of the Union message an ultimatum to Stalin who was still alive.

Some governmental members of the Republican Party prominent in the formation of American policy in Congress took the opposite opinion

that the declaration of the President actually changed nothing. In their conception the difference between the foreign policy of the Democratic and Republican administrations was merely that the Democratic administration considered the "Containment Policy" as the final goal of our political strategy or a goal in itself, while the Republican administration regarded the "Containment Policy" as a starting point for American policy, from which to develop a systematic equally peace-loving Policy of Liberation.

In other words the Democrats saw the final goal of American policy in the stopping of further Soviet conquests, while the Republicans saw it as a point of departure for the expulsion of the Soviets from their already widened influences. The Democratic policy was defensive, while the Republican is offensive. Yet both constantly emphasize that all these political goals must be achieved without war.

HOW CAN THE ENSLAVED BE LIBERATED WITHOUT WAR?

The new American Policy of Liberation is confronted with two new and difficult problems which will certainly test its permanent value. First, how will it be possible to liberate any one from Soviet control without war and secondly what does the Republican administration understand by peoples enslaved by the Soviets?

It is at present the general opinion of the best experts on the Soviets that under the present Soviet order there is no hope for the downfall of the government from within. The modern technical armament in the hands of a ruler allows even a small percentage of the population in an organized clique to control the unarmed millions of the enslaved masses.

We must also take into account the fact that the resistance of the masses, whether of the nationally and religiously ardent anti-Communist Poles, Ukrainians and Moslem Turkestanians or of the dynamic Hungarians, Bulgarians and Caucasians, or the traditionally democratic Czechs, which was strong in the early years grows weaker with every year, as they see the hopelessness of liberation.

The Bolsheviks are applying in all these countries the methods that they have found successful during three decades and are gambling upon the young people. They are very attentively rearing the very poor, proletarian youth in luxury, tearing it away from control by its parents and are indoctrinating it so intensively in the Communist spirit.

It is natural that the work of the Bolsheviks, no matter how it is carried on, will not be able to win over all the young people, or to root out quickly the national feelings and ambitions of these people to secure in-

dependence as some of the American journalists have naively imagined,¹ since they do not understand the dynamic force of the modern nationalisms. The example of Ukraine, where after twenty years of Bolshevik domination the spark of Ukrainian independence flared up during World War II after the withdrawal of the Red Army, shows that it is not so easy to root out these national convictions, although it is possible to weaken them and more important, deprive them of leadership. In any case, any internal revolutions either in the different territories of the Soviet Union or its satellites will be possible only in case of an international crisis, either on the outbreak of a war with red Moscow or with the calculation on rapid and successful assistance from America.

The hopes for the appearance of a new Tito either in the satellite states or in China are equally illusory. At the time of the death of Stalin many American "specialists" on Soviet and Chinese affairs predicted an almost certain rift between the Kremlin and Peking and emphasized that the ambitious theoretician of Chinese Communism, Mao Tsu Tsing, who ranked in the Communist world only second to Stalin, would certainly not be willing to recognize the primacy of the new leader Malenkov. To the great disillusionment of these political prophets, on the day after the proclamation of Malenkov as the heir to Stalin, Mao Tsu Tsing declared the unbroken solidarity of Moscow and Peking and thus the acknowledgement by the Chinese dictator of the supremacy of the new dictator of Moscow.

It proved equally foolish to reckon on a palace revolution in the Bolshevik empire and on a struggle among the leaders of the Russian Communists which would be transferred to the streets of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tiflis or Tashkent and could put an end to the Soviet system and the Soviet Union as a whole. That was still possible after the death of Lenin, when the individual views of the idealistic Communists were first forming the new state experiment — a Communist government. Now this government has been made bureaucratic, guarded by the prosperity of the social upper stratum and the risk of all hanging on the gallows in case of disagreement. The clique of Communists in the Kremlin and its direct supporters has showed itself very realistically thinking and solid. Upon Stalin's death the government passed more smoothly into the hands of a new dictator than any one had ventured to suspect.

That means that the Bolshevik system now established on the territory of almost one third of the world and over 800 million people cannot be overthrown without war. Every thinking person naturally has no hope in the fall of the Bolshevik system and that is the first real fact for the

¹ See "Policy of Liberation Tough One to Execute", by Drew Middleton, *New York Times*, March 1, 1953.

American Policy of Liberation. Thus arises the situation before our eyes that the Bolshevik government is being consolidated on the territory under Soviet influence and the opposition to it in the territory of the Soviet Union, China and the satellite states is weakening.

We must also take into account the *economic growth of the Soviet bloc*. The further industrialization of the Soviet Union is increasing its war potential with every day, the standard of living in the Soviet Union and especially on the territory of the real Russia, is greatly rising and thus is removing the cause of social and economic discontent. This rise of the standard of living in Moscow has been reported by foreign diplomats, returning to their home countries, especially those who knew the old Russia and the early years of the Soviet Union.² The last to make similar statement was the Minister of Israel to the Soviets, Dr. Schmueel Elyashiv³.

The spreading and introduction of industrialization in China in the next years will make the Soviet bloc stronger, if not unconquerable. Yet we must never forget that the Communist world is working by plan with one center in Moscow and with the help of under-paid compulsory work by a population which is accustomed to dictatorship and to a very low standard of living. In other words time is working against us. The bloc of free nations with American support also is growing stronger before our eyes but we do not know whether it is at a more rapid pace than the Communist bloc.

TO WHOM IS THE AMERICAN POLICY OF LIBERATION APPLIED

This is the second question to which the world has no answer. Does the American Policy of Liberation apply only to the satellite states or to all the territories dominated by Moscow, i. e. the territory of the Soviet Union? Even the active collaborators in this present Policy of Liberation, including President Eisenhower himself and Secretary of State Dulles, have not yet stated clearly to whom the new American policy is to

² The Russian people "never had it so good" and any talk that they're discontented is "not only misleading but downright dangerous," according to the Moscow correspondent of the *London Sunday Times*.

Writing in the current issue of *Look* magazine, Cyril Ray, who returned to London this year after 18 months in Moscow, says the Soviet regime has provided the Russians "with luxuries their fathers never knew," including ample food.

For this, he writes, the Russians have a great sense of loyalty to their country and gratitude to the regime. *New York World Telegram and Sun*, Nov. 22, 1952.

³ In a conversation with reporters in Stockholm he declared: "As for any shortcomings in the regime 'that Moscow might be trying to cover up,' Dr. Elyashiv said: "I was never in a position to check reports about production snarls, administrative corruption and rank-and-file dissatisfaction. Some of these reports appear contradicted by the noticeable rise in the standard of living between 1949 when I first visited Moscow and to day." — *New York Times*, February 23, 1953.

be applied. If it concerns also the peoples of the Soviet Union, it raises the further very crucial question for America and the American-Russian policy, whether America is thinking only of overthrowing the government of the Soviets and establishing a new non-Communist government in the Kremlin over the territory of the present Soviet Union or whether America wants break up the Soviet Union and bring a real national liberation to all the peoples of the old Russian and the new Soviet empire.

From the declarations of many influential American statesmen, it would seem that the Policy of Liberation applies only to the satellite states. The efforts of America (concerning the Soviet Union) to maintain a position of international legalism with the preservation of agreements made with the Soviets by the former administration would make it seem that America in its new Policy of Liberation includes only the satellite states, keeping for the Soviet Union the *status quo* — established in Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. The establishment of Communist governments in the satellite states was obviously only a breach of these agreements between Washington and Moscow. By this position the territorial additions of the Soviet Union in the last war are treated almost as legal gains.

IS THE LIBERATION OF THE SATELLITE NATIONS ALONE POSSIBLE?

Many Americans think that the liberation of the satellite states is possible without war with the Soviets and without destroying the boundaries of the Soviet Union. Yet this is only a pious hope which can hardly be carried out. That this view exists in important American circles is apparent from the fact that the majority of American statesmen do not like to talk about the liberation of the peoples of the Soviet Union so as not to increase "the troubles of America" but wish to confine the talk to the border belt of the satellite states.

In fact the hope in the liberation of the satellite states alone is vain. Moscow will never agree and cannot agree to the liberation of its satellites. Why is this? The liberation of the satellites would mean the flight of Communism from territory which it had conquered. This would mean the breaking of the power of Moscow and the authority of the Kremlin in the eyes of the 800 million people whom it has mastered. A democratically established government could stand this but not a dictatorship. Therefore all emphasis upon a special liberation of the satellite states is a pious wish of American pacifists and a self-deceit of the interested peoples in the possibility that they can secure liberty without the destruction of Moscow's power itself.

NATURAL ALLIES AND ENEMIES OF BOTH KREMLIN AND FREE WORLD

Standing in the face of the naked reality that the liberation of the satellite states cannot be won without an international crisis in which

the entire territory of the Soviet Union and China will be involved, America faces equally the second question how it is possible to defeat its serious foe. America can triumph, if it mobilizes all the technical and moral resources of its friends on both sides of the iron curtain and throws them against the Kremlin, the centre of the strength of the Communist world.

But who are our friends and who are our enemies? In this connection the American Containment Policy as well as the Policy of Liberation are in darkness thanks to the Russian and the Russophile influences in this country. We leave on the side the technical superiority of America. It is now undoubted and in this sector America has an overwhelming superiority. But technical strength is not enough. In the struggle of America with red Moscow there are two moral powers on the side of Moscow — international Communism and Russian imperialistic nationalism. On the other hand against the Communist world in this decisive struggle as natural allies of America and of the Western World are again two moral forces — religious zealotism and nationalisms of subjugated peoples. We have in mind the Christian and the Moslem worlds in the understanding of those millions for whom religion is not a formality but a life value of superhuman transcendental importance. Further against the Communist world are the nationalisms of the entire world, for whom the world crisis will bring for some the continuation of their national life from the fetters of enslavement by Moscow. They are the natural allies and enemies of the Kremlin respectively the natural allies and enemies of America.

WHO IN THE SOVIET UNION WILL RISE AGAINST RED MOSCOW?

This is really the central question on which in the near future will depend the very existence of America, the question which unclearly handled becomes directly a threat to our national life. Only recently the Russians and the American Russophiles have planned and carried out American foreign policy with the idea of preserving the Russian Empire and of continuing the enslavement of the majority of the population of the Soviet Union, i. e. the non-Russian peoples. Since the last Russian Revolution, i. e. since 1917 those peoples have been struggling for their liberation and have been making millions of sacrifices. It is absolutely obvious that these non-Russian peoples are the Achilles' heel of Moscow and the natural allies of America behind the iron curtain. Our policy carried by pinkish Russophiles has brought our country to the critical position in which it now is.

Now it is the fashion for the Russian and the American Russophiles to be of other colors but they are still exerting a great influence on American policy *to deceive the American people and government by holding out the bait that the Russian people will rise against the Communist Kremlin,*

but only on the condition that America will aid in the preservation of the Russian Empire, i. e. will aid the Russians to maintain the Russian prison of nations. Let us suppose that America does not wish to become the assistant guardian of the Russian jail. The anti-Communist Russians do not conceal the fact that they could not in that case side with America.

Two years ago the Russian socialist Abramovich in the *Socialist News (Sotsiyalistichesky Vestnik)* definitely wrote that Stalin could not be enemy Number One among the foes of Russia, for he had the merit of not dividing the empire of the tsars but of preserving it, i. e. kept the non-Russian peoples in slavery to the Russian people. If America demands the liberation of the peoples of the Soviet Union, it will be a type of enemy Number One in the opinion of the Russians even outside the borders of the Soviet Union. Prof. James Burnham put this question to them: "Whose side such Russians will be on when a showdown comes."⁴

In our opinion the attitude of the Russian masses towards Kremlin is in no way regulated by the American Policy of Liberation. The Russian masses are not interested in the preservation of Russian empire. Only the upper Russian strata red or white is interested in this. Once it is seen, it becomes absurd that America with such a hopeless conflict with Russia (whether white or red) should carry on its American policy toward the Soviet Union with such active and obvious support of Russian emigrants. We do not doubt their democracy but knowing the Russian intelligentsia we know their Russian patriotism which is constantly connected with the preservation of the Russian empire. Abramovich is not an exception among the Russians who put the preservation of the wholeness of the Russian empire above the overthrowing of the Bolshevik government.

It is also obvious that at present the Russian emigrants are a negligible factor in the affairs of the Russian people. The emigration does not now command the heart of the Russian people nor reflect its present soul, for it is the Kremlin that dominates the souls of the Russian people. And the Russian masses are obedient to their leader. The fact is that the overwhelming majority of the Russians now are for the Soviet government because Russian Communism has deep roots in the history and spirituality of the Russian people. P. Struve, a Russian historian, in his last book definitely says that the socialist revolution in Russia came from deep, native elements of the Russian people.⁵ The Russian philosopher Berdyaev was of the same opinion. Prof. Wetter collected a great deal of material on this in his valuable book on *Dialectical Materialism in the Soviet Union*.⁶

⁴ *Containment or Liberation*, by James Burnham, New York 1953, p. 236.

⁵ Struve, *Social and Economic History of Russia*, Paris, 1952, p. 7.

⁶ I. Wetter, *Der Dialektische Materialismus*, Vienna, 1952, p. 93-110.

There is now no doubt that for Stalin and his successor are millions of Russians reared both as Communists and non-Communists whose national pride is exalted by the propaganda of the present power of the Russian empire, even if hidden under the name of the Soviet Union. On the side of the Soviet Union is the firm support of the Russian Orthodox Church, the largest mass organization of the non-Communist Russians in the Soviet Union.⁷ The growth of Russian nationalism which is oppressing more and more the non-Russian peoples is hastening this natural evolution so that the Russian people excited by official propaganda in its mass is against America while the souls of the peoples enslaved by Russia look toward America with longing as their only liberator. *The American people and government must learn this realistic fact and give up the illusion that we can count upon the Russians en masse as our allies.*

The touching scenes on the streets of Moscow described by American reporters on the occasion of the death of Stalin give undeniable proof of the mood of the Russians in the Soviet Union.⁸ It will be a misfortune for America if it does not learn from this fact that it has a serious conflict not with the clique in the Kremlin as the American Russians love to argue but also with Russia.⁹ Only the breaking of Russian or Soviet Empire, (for they are for all purposes the same), will bring the liberation of the world and remove the plague which threatens to make America also part of the Communist world guided from Moscow. The liberation of the non-Russian peoples is not directed against the Russian masses but against the creators and preservers of Russian empire.

⁷ After the succumb of Stalin was announced "hundreds upon thousands of Russians in Moscow and in other cities and villages thronged to churches to offer prayers for Mr. Stalin's recovery. ... In Russian Orthodox churches prayers were offered up following a proclamation by Patriarch Alexei of Moscow and all the Russians" — reports the *New York Times* by its Moscow representative Harrison E. Salisbury. — *New York Times*, March 6, 1953.

"Many believers and worshippers of the Russian Orthodox faith hurried to churches... and sank to their knees in prayers for the recovery of Premier Stalin... for the man who to them personifies their very country... *The New York Times*, March 5, 1953. Report from Moscow.

⁸"It is not easy to convey in words this special feeling that the Russians have had for their leader, but it is a tangible thing and something that has not always been understood by foreign observers who are quick to categorize all Russian traits and seek to fit them into some Western European or American conception of feeling or emotion." Report from Moscow, *New York Times*, March 5, 1953.

"No man knew how many mourners would pass through the chandelier-hung funeral rooms during the period of (Stalin's) lying in state. But it was evident that the total would be numbered in the millions — two or three". Report from Moscow. *New York Times*, March 8, 1953.

⁹The same opinion is expressed by the columnist George Sokolsky in his column "Appraisal of our Enemy". *New York Journal American*, Feb. 13, 1953.

**THE AMERICAN CHINESE POLICY AND THE POLICY TOWARD UKRAINE
AND THE OTHER NON-RUSSIAN PEOPLES**

Recently in a Ukrainian press organ there appeared an unusually correct characterization of the American policy toward Russia and the non-Russian peoples.¹⁰

In China the American government did not act in its own interests in favoring the Communists who were already allies of Moscow, in saying that the Chinese Communists were not like the Bolsheviks but were only democratic „agrarians”. So now we must not have illusions that at this critical moment in eastern Europe a mass of any pro-American Russians will rise against the Kremlin. The Russians will always be Russians and as Russian patriots they will certainly be on the side of their national government — the Soviet regime. Only the nations interested vitally in the overthrow of the strength of Moscow, i. e. the non-Russian peoples will rise. If America repulses these as she did Chiang Kai Shek by a new „Chinese” policy, on the territory of the USSR, they will not go with America but they will become at least neutral in the struggle between Moscow and America and by their passivity, as they did in the last World War concerning Hitler, the Kremlin can emerge victorious. In undertaking the fight with Kremlin and planning the preservation of the Russian empire America will be carrying on a war in which these peoples will not be at all interested. It would be a repetition of “Chinese Policy.”

The American Policy of Liberation must be extended to all peoples enslaved by Kremlin today. It must mobilize all natural allies of the Western world behind the Iron Curtain. A slogan of universal national liberation must be proclaimed to all peoples under the Kremlin heel. The peoples now under Russian Communist domination must know and indeed they should “count upon America” as John Foster Dulles recently expressed.

¹⁰ Press Service of the Central Executive Committee of ODWU, No. 3. February 1, 1953.

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS OF THE UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

(1918-1953)

By MATTHEW STACHIW

The Russian February Revolution was a combined work of the Russians and non-Russian peoples of the Tzarist Empire. It was a social and nationalities revolution by its character. The victory of the Petrograd workers in their "bread riots" in March 1917 was made possible only by the favorable attitude of the Petrograd garrison, especially of the Ukrainian Wolynian garde-regiment, which immediately sided with the workers. This made the revolt successful.

THE UKRAINIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC WAS BORN DURING THE STORM OF REVOLUTION

The Ukrainians participated in the Revolution in the hope that the Russian democracy would adhere to the basic democratic principle so well formulated in the American Declaration of Independence: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Self-determination of peoples is the backbone of democracy. Without this it can easily be turned into an anti-democratic regime. Therefore the democratic parties of the Ukrainian people demanded from the Russian Provisional Government a reorganization of the former Russian Empire into a federation of free nations in which Ukraine would have an autonomous status. However the Russian democrats in power rejected the slightest form of self-government for Ukraine. In this, the social-revolutionary party of Alexander Kerensky, the social-democrats of Mr. Martov and the liberals (Constitutional Democrats) of Prof. Milyukov did not differ from the rightist parties. Because of this, the Ukrainian revolutionary parliament — The Central Rada — consisting of the representatives of all Ukrainian political groups and professional organizations deemed it necessary to disregard the attitude of the Russian Provisional Government of Mr. Kerensky and create autonomy for Ukraine. Since the *Rada* had at its disposal certain military forces and was backed by public opinion in Ukraine, the Provisional Government saw itself compelled to "consent", at least for the time being, to a moderate autonomy. It was, however, prepared to revoke even this consent for a limited autonomy, as soon as

it had strengthened its own position in Russia. This was clearly shown in September 1917 when the *Rada* notified the Provisional Government that it was going to hold an election for a Ukrainian Constitutional Assembly.

The Provisional Government of Mr. Kerensky emphatically rejected this idea although it was in accordance with the democratic principles to which Mr. Kerensky's Government and the political parties backing it subscribed. When in spite of this the *Rada* continued to defend the idea of a Ukrainian Constitutional Assembly, the government of Mr. Kerensky decided to remove the *Rada* by force, and, thus kill the idea. This was in the closing days of October 1917. However, the plan could not be carried out, because on the eve of November 7th, the Government of Mr. Kerensky was overthrown by the Russian Bolsheviks headed by Lenin and Trotsky.

The Russian Bolsheviks knew that the *Rada* and its Government were very popular among the Ukrainian people. Therefore, in Ukraine they did not dare to try an immediate *coup d'etat* as they did in Russia. Instead, as they needed more time, they decided to create a fifth column out of Russian minority in Ukraine. Therefore the open attack did not come until December 1917. In the meantime, on Nov. 20, 1919, the *Rada* took another step toward full Ukrainian independence by changing its autonomous status and proclaiming the Ukrainian Democratic Republic — a free national state.

The Ukrainian Government began to mobilize defense forces because it was aware that the Russian Bolsheviks would soon take aggressive action to reconquer Ukraine for the Russians. At the same time they worked hard to establish internal order which the Bolsheviks were trying to undermine through their fifth column.

This was increased by sovietized soldiers of the Tsarist Russian Army who had deserted the Western front against the Central Powers and were returning home in masses through Ukrainian territory, creating disorder and looting the Ukrainian villages and towns.

Under these circumstances, the *Rada* passed the *Election Act* and fixed the day of the election to the Ukrainian Constitutional Assembly for January 9, 1918. It is worth mentioning that the Russian, Jewish and Polish minorities which had been granted broad cultural autonomy in Ukraine, had their proportional representation in the *Rada*.

The Russian Bolsheviks were determined to prevent the election of the Ukrainian Constitutional Assembly which would legalize Ukrainian independence by the formal expression of the popular will. They tried to do this by a combination of military aggression and an uprising of their fifth column.

In the manifesto of November 20, 1917 in which the Ukrainian statehood was established the *Rada* expressed its willingness to enter into a federation with Russia and other nations of the former Tsarist Empire provided that Russia agreed to the creation of a truly federal democratic Government based upon the equality of all nations and cease interference in the internal affairs of the federated republics. Both the Soviet Government and the non-Bolshevik Russian parties found this proposal unacceptable. Moreover, the latter welcomed the aggression of the Red Russians against Ukraine because they preferred any Russia, if only the Empire was preserved undivided.

Therefore, by its act of January 22nd 1918 the Ukrainian Central Rada abandoned its previous program of federation and formally proclaimed the Ukrainian Democratic Republic as a sovereign nation. This day has become the national holiday of the Ukrainians and has been observed solemnly ever since.

THE UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE WAS SANCTIONED BY THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE IN A DEMOCRATIC MANNER

At present the opponents of Ukrainian independence argue that a plebiscite or some other popular vote would be required to ascertain if the Ukrainian people really desire their national independence. It is implied that the Ukrainian people might choose some kind of a dependency upon Russia; this argument is being advanced not only by the Russian imperialists but unfortunately, also by some Americans. To disprove such wrong ideas let us examine the records of history:

In the period 1917—1919 there were three elections in Ukraine; so the Ukrainian people had an opportunity to express their will in a democratic manner concerning their independence: *In the election of the All-Russian Constitutional Assembly in December 1917, which also was held in Ukraine.* Three quarters of the Ukrainian votes were cast for the Ukrainian political parties which formed the coalition Government of the *Ukrainian Central Rada*. The rest, 25%, went to the non-Bolshevik, Jewish and Russian parties and to the Bolsheviks. When the "*All-Russian Constitutional Assembly*" was convened in January 1918 not a single Ukrainian deputy participated in it. They took the position that first the Ukrainian Constitutional Assembly would have to clarify the relations of Ukraine to Russia and the other nations of the former Empire.

On January 9, 1918 another general election was held in Ukraine — to the Ukrainian Constitutional Assembly. The result of this election was even more significant. The Bolshevik opposition fighting the *Rada* and its Government won only 15 percent of the seats. The Jewish, non-Com-

munist minority 1.2 percent. The Ukrainian parties won more than 80 percent of the whole. It was the representatives of these parties who on January 22, 1918 proclaimed full Ukrainian independence. There can be no doubt that this was a democratic expression of the will of the Ukrainian people.

The third election in the Ukrainian Democratic Republic was held on January 5, 1919, to the Ukrainian Congress of Toiling People (Ukrainian Trudovy Kongres).

Even more convincing than the ballots were the heroic efforts of the Ukrainian Army which for three years defended Ukrainian independence against the encroachments of the red and white Russian imperialists. It did not surrender, it never lost the will to fight, it was broken by the lack of munitions and medical supplies. Even when the regular Ukrainian Army ceased to exist, the Ukrainian fight for independence against the Soviet Russian occupation continued. According to impartial observers, the Ukrainian resistance is active even now.

This resistance of a defeated nation has been so impressive that many Ukrainian Communists who had joined forces with the invader and became members of the Soviet Communist Party have come under its spell. Since the twenties we have witnessed continuous purges, trials and executions in the local party organizations in Ukraine — the charges being not deviations from the Lenin-Stalinist "orthodoxy," but "Ukrainian nationalism." (It must be remembered that in Soviet semantics the term "nationalists" is applied to every non-Communist — be he Socialist, Liberal etc.—unless he is a fellow-traveler). The famine in Ukraine of 1932-1933 caused by the Soviet Russian Government and designed politically to weaken the Ukrainian population was another indication of the unbroken will of the Ukrainian people for freedom. On November 20, 1920, the duly established Ukrainian Government finally was forced to leave its soil and go into exile.

However the Ukrainian state still exists, for there are present three basic elements of regular statehood — territory, people and government. The fact that the legal Ukrainian Government had to leave its territory does not justify to an assertion that this state has ceased to exist. It has existed continuously and is represented by the Government-in-Exile of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic.

This continuity of Ukrainian statehood is confirmed even by the Soviet regime existing in Ukraine, as the Russian Soviet Government recognizes a separate Ukrainian statehood, although in Soviet form. This Ukrainian state is represented in the United Nations which means that all members of the UN including Moscow and Washington recognize the existence of the Ukrainian state. The fact that the UN recognizes in

Ukraine another regime and not that of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic is of no legal importance in the evaluation of the Ukrainian rights to independence. The Ukrainian case is not different from that of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, etc., where the existing Communist regimes have been imposed by Soviet Russian forces of occupation. Because of this their right to independence has not been denied, but on the contrary, in the UN they are regarded as independent nations.

Still the most convincing Ukrainian argument on behalf of their right to independence without any plebiscites, is the resistance of the Ukrainian people against foreign occupation and their will for independent statehood. All Ukrainians agree that an election of the Ukrainian Constitutional Assembly should be held. However, they reject the suggestion that such an Assembly should be convened to consider the question imposed by some outsiders of whether there should be a Ukrainian state or not. The Ukrainians believe that the purpose of convening the Ukrainian Constitutional Assembly must be to establish the organs of the State and to determine its future political and social order in accordance with democratic principles.



THE DEATH OF STALIN

CLARENCE A. MANNING

On March 5, 1953, Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, the dominant force of the Soviet Union, passed away. The Communist dictator who had risen to power by unprecedented intrigues, crimes, and murders, who had almost literally waded through oceans of blood, died peacefully in his bed, while the vast majority of his associates, his old friends, his comrades in arms lie in the unmarked graves to which he consigned them. The passing of such a man can only mark the ending of an epoch in the Soviet Union and the lands behind the Iron Curtain, in the entire Eurasian landmass and perhaps in the world as a whole.

It will be a long time, if ever, when the world will have an adequate picture of Stalin's real character, for there are few people alive who are in position to speak. Yet the main features are so evident that they can hardly be disputed. Stalin was in sense the direct antithesis of Hitler. The German Fuehrer was excitable, neurotic and doctrinaire to the last degree. An excellent rabble-rouser in every sense of the word, he craved publicity intermingled with periods of seclusion. He seemed to avoid indulgence in most of the normal habits and vices of society.

Stalin was the reverse. His very pseudonym Stalin, the man of steel, testified to his lack of nerves, his utter coldness and his ruthlessness. Yet the few glimpses of his private life and his contacts with foreigners have almost universally revealed him as a man who enjoyed good living and who in seclusion lived a more or less normal family life. Still at bottom he was a spider who preferred in solitude to spin his plots and ensnare the unsuspecting rather than to appear as the open actor. From his secret quarters in the Kremlin or the no less guarded home in the Caucasus, he spoke rarely and his willing slaves spread the rumor that he was the man-god of all times and ages.

His pictures as published abroad show him a stern and unrelenting figure and yet his success at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam was due to the charm which he was able to exert. Other foreigners who saw him (and they were not all idealists or sentimentalists) said that he had, when he wished, one of the kindest faces in the world. Yet what did that mean? Was it a real, if passing, feeling which never influenced

his actions or his decisions or was it an example of that tendency that has been so often in Asiatic conquerors to have a personal feeling for an individual immediately before him along with an absolute disbelief in the right of humanity or a group of individuals to possess any human dignity? We must never forget Tsar Ivan the Terrible could be so charming that even his victims were willing to thank him for his death sentence or of execution at his noble hand.

And his ability? We have every right to believe that he was not the universal genius that he was painted at home but in some degree he was not the mediocrity that Trotsky and other victims tried to paint him. They found an easy ear in the West. In 1917 and 1918, before the Communist state became a world menace, there were far too many intellectuals and even ordinary people who believed firmly that because the teachings of the new government did not conform to the traditional ideas of the Western world, its leaders were fools who would inevitably fall from their own stupidity. They equated ability and morals, knowledge and kindness and decided that a ruthless regime could not be guided by men of high intellectual and political intelligence. They have been proved sadly wrong with disastrous consequences to millions of people.

Stalin is dead and his death closed an era during which he had made himself, a poor Georgian revolutionist, the mouthpiece of the Great Russian people and had raised the land of the Great Russians to a position which none of the tsars had been able to conceive. He remains a mystery and still more unfortunately his position remains after him. The Communist Party with its doctrines, its fanaticism, its secret police and its armed forces, its satellites and its slave camps remains too. So does the Iron Curtain and the inveterate hostility to the Western world and to the principles of Western Christian civilization. If we knew the real motives and the real characteristics of Stalin, we could more easily hazard a guess as to the kind of men to whom he would be apt to pass the mantle of power. Without that knowledge our impressions of the still more unknown individuals who are now in high places become still more dark and confused.

There were indeed optimists who believed that the death of the leader would be the signal for some kind of popular movement or of clashes between the Communist leaders. That view has been carefully fostered by many Russian emigres who have deceived the world by talking of the anti-Stalinist mood of the Russian people and who have never hesitated to extol the greatness of Stalin for not dividing the Russian Empire into national states but for increasing the Russian power.

The wish has been father to the thought but it could have no basis in reality.

Let us look again at the course of events. Stalin was taken ill on March 2 but it was not until March 4 that that illness was revealed to the Soviet people and to the world. His death was again concealed for approximately eight hours. How many of the Soviet leaders themselves were fully informed as to the course of the illness and when? It will probably never be known when the news of his illness was first conveyed to those sections of the government that were not by custom in direct contact with him. It was the same with his death. The forces that were necessary to ensure tranquility could easily have been moved during the hours when there came no word from the Kremlin.

It was not surprising then that within twenty four hours it was possible for the new regime to be set up and to commence functioning and that the new government represented the forces which seem to have been the closest to the dying dictator and which would logically be best aware of the minute by minute development of the situation. The first and most pressing persons involved were the leader of the Communist Party, Georgy Malenkov, Stalin's closest collaborator and the man who delivered the main address at the Communist Party Congress last October, and Lavrenty Beria, the dreaded head of security. Malenkov was "elected" or "selected" by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, and the U.S.S.R. Supreme Council Presidium to occupy the two leading posts in the new administration. He became Chairman of the Council of Ministers and the senior member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Beria, who in the opinion of foreign observers — was losing power, especially after his Ministry was criticized for allowing the death of Zhdanov, now was put in charge of a combined Ministry of Internal Affairs and State Security and the second member after Malenkov of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. It is interesting to note that at the session of the Supreme Soviet on March 15th, Beria was the man who nominated Malenkov for Stalin's place.

Was this a palace revolution or was it the extension and the carrying out of the plans of Stalin and the entire hierarchy of the Party and the state? This again cannot be answered satisfactorily, unless we learn in one way or another what actually happened within the walls of the Kremlin during those days and what has been the normal procedure for making or breaking the members of the old Politburo which was later transformed into the Presidium of the Party. The efforts to rank definitely the various members of this all-important group have failed and observers have ultimately come to emphasize the position which

the various members held in the great spectacles staged in the Red Square on the different national holidays, because these positions, while more or less constant, still admitted such variations as to leave plenty of room for speculation. Communist discipline and the veil of secrecy have so far prevented any revelation of the real picture of the inner relations and no one who had been in the inner circle and left has survived to speak.

The most startling aspect of this latest reorganization has been the reduction in the number of high officials by the return of the system to that which in general prevailed before the October Congress when the Politburo was replaced by a Presidium of 36 members and 11 alternates. That number is now reduced to 10 members and 4 alternates with a considerate reshuffling of the Ministries and numerous demotions as well as promotions among the Ministers, Deputies and Secretaries, even to the replacement of Shvernik, the former technical head of the Supreme Presidium of the Supreme Soviet by Voroshilov, the oldest and almost the best known of the entire regime. Any Ukrainian who remembers the careful way in which in the early 30's Skrypnyk was systematically and quietly demoted from one position to another cannot fail to realize that while some of these changes may be routine, some of them may have a more sinister meaning which will be made clear in due course.

These promotions and demotions do not exhaust all the interesting possibilities, for the assignment of the Deputy Chairmen of the Council of Ministers to superintend departments and ministries was probably more of a step toward reducing the number of titles than anything else. Yet these deputy premiers each represent in a way a very potent force in the Soviet administration and their order of naming may not be by chance. First of course is the President, Malenkov, who rose through the organizational work of the Party to be the Secretary of Stalin. Second is the Georgian Beria in charge of security. Then ranks Molotov, as Foreign Minister and in normal states it has been customary to treat the section or Ministry of Foreign Affairs as the first place of its kind. That was true before in the USSR but not now. Fourth ranks Bulganin, the War Minister, and last Lazar Kaganovich, whom Stalin had sent twice to Ukraine to correct conditions and liquidate his "enemies," the Ukrainian people. He alone is not made a Minister but among the deputies he can speak for the industrial and perhaps the agricultural forces of the country. In the Presidium of the party, the rank again is Malenkov, Beria, Molotov, then Voroshilov and Krushchev, Bulganin and Kaganovich, and finally the three others, Mikoyan, Sabirov and Pervukhin as heads of trade and industrial ministers. The insertion of

Khrushchev along with Voroshilov (not named as a Marshal) may be another delicate way of placing the Party ahead of the Armed Forces and of showing the superiority of the forces of security over those of industry, and we must remember that all the published bulletins have stressed security.

Does such a situation indicate peace and harmony in the future among the leaders of the state? It is tempting of course to look back to the death of Lenin and the establishment of the triumvirate of Stalin, Zinovyev and Kamenev with Trotsky as a militant outsider. That struggle lasted for years until Stalin became the final victor, while Trotsky was forced into exile and murdered and Zinovyev and Kamenev liquidated. The differences are as striking as the resemblances.

In 1924 although the Communists were in control, most of their leaders were engaged in proving that there was a distinction between the Soviet Union and the Communist Party. To-day there is no longer any pretext of that. Then all of the leaders were old style Russian Revolutionists, men who had been abroad (Stalin was the only one who knew little of Europe by personal experience) and all were men who had thought and written about Communism during its formative period. Even despite the Communist discipline, it was an open secret that they differed in their attitude toward world revolution, the basic forces of the Soviet Union, the role of Petersburg and Moscow and for a time at least the struggle between the old masters wore an intellectual garb.

To-day that is not true. The big men of the Presidium are to-day the Ministers in charge of the administration of the state openly and directly. They are men who have made their mark in various branches of the administration and if they should work together, their knowledge would be complementary and not competitive. Lenin was never as deified as Stalin and his long illness amid the confusion of the times did not allow him to formulate policies as rigidly as happened during the post-war years of Stalin. Yet that very rigidity and difference demands for its success that there should be a hoop to the barrel and that is the task of Malenkov. Furthermore that barrel now includes the satellite states which have to be still further purged and reorganized to fit them completely into the Soviet scheme. There is no need even to speak of the problems offered by Communist China and the Asian situation. The task demands that Malenkov step into the shoes of Stalin, to whom the others were equally loyal and assert the influence of Stalin as well as his power.

We can willingly admit that all of these outstanding men are sincerely loyal and unselfish in their devotion to the Party and the memory and teachings of Stalin. The men of 1924 felt the same toward Com-

munism and Lenin but the strain of world events even in an era of relative peace brought out latent discords and the struggle was on. Will the tangled problems of the day lead to the same outcome or will there arise jealousy between the individuals?

To put the situation more bluntly, even after we accept the standardization of the Soviet man, is it possible to maintain a one party, cliqueless state? With all the power of Stalin, it has seemed fairly certain that there were individuals who yielded for the sake of Communist discipline, when in their hearts they believed that something else was the better policy. The Nazis felt the same in the rivalry of Goebbels and Goering for the ear of Hitler. Stalin allowed some of the younger men to compete for his favor and the renewed transfer of posts on the first day of the new organization seems to indicate that some of the men who had risen like Malenkov through the organizational work of the party may be slated for more prominent posts. Will that create a resentment in other quarters or is one or the other of the services so secure and all powerful that the others will be glad to take the crumbs that fall to their share? Are the numbers of higher officials reduced to check intrigue or to give Malenkov the chance to promote his own, still unknown partisans?

It has been indeed rare in history when any state, be it an inherited monarchy or an elective republic has been able to maintain in office an unbroken continuity of greatness. The Soviets were fortunate in having Stalin succeed and continue the work of Lenin but will Malenkov with even less personal knowledge of a non-Communist old Russia and a non-Communist world be able to continue to strengthen and direct the ship of state?

It would be rash to assert that there will be discord and feuds but the world will still wonder where the purges will first begin. The Kremlin may decide not to publicize them but if there is any latent ill-feeling between any of the high group, there should be signs somewhere, however they may be interpreted in the beginning. Yet such a condition is strongly hinted by the changes since the death of Stalin. The scrapping of many of those institutions in March that were set up with such fanfare only last October suggests that there may be still more changes, once the new men are sure of themselves.

This leads again to still another problem and that is the problem of the non-Russians. In the ruling circles to-day there are only three non-Russian Soviet citizens by the appointments to the alternates of the admiration of the Russians for Stalin, that they would look with favor on the extension of the power of another Georgian. Kaganovich

is a Jew and Mikoyan, one of the lesser figures politically, is probably an Armenian.

There has been a left-handed admission of the existence of the non-Russian Soviet citizens by the appointments to the alternates of the Presidium of the Communist Party. Melnikov is a Russian who was sent to dominate the Communists in Ukraine. Ponomarenko is a Byelorussian or a Ukrainian and Bagirov is from Azerbaijan. It is interesting that these three along with Shvernik who has been demoted (?) from the technically executive head of the state to the Chairmanship of the Trades Unions should be the only alternates for the Presidium and all but Shvernik come from areas where there is a growing national feeling.

Yet such appointments in a system where the second man has the same value as the inferior fleet in a battle can hardly satisfy the moderate and much less the out and out national elements—of the non-Russians—the bourgeois nationalists about which the Kremlin loves to complain. Why should it?

The slogan for 1953 after the death of Stalin stresses unity and security, the unity of all the peoples of the Soviet Union and security against the foreign spies who are trying to thwart the peaceful efforts of the Kremlin to infiltrate everywhere and take over the world peaceably, so as to commence its reign of butchery without war. Those words are directly by the Soviet authorities themselves.

On March 5, 1953, while Stalin was dying, the Communist newspaper *Pravda*, the organ of the Party which first unofficially hinted the accession of Malenkov, published an appeal for the unity of the Soviet people in the crisis caused by the impending death of the leader. That editorial makes the appropriate quotations from Lenin and Stalin as to the support of the masses and then it goes on:

“The ardent, selfless support which the Soviet Government enjoyed in the difficult years of the war from all peoples of the U.S.S.R.—and above all, the confidence in the Soviet Government displayed by the Great Russian people, the leader among the peoples of our country—was the decisive power which ensured for our country the historic victory over the worst enemy of mankind—fascism.”

Here again at the moment of an appeal for the unity of all the people is that same policy which through the thirties and the forties bedeviled the life of the people of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the other non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union. In season and out of season they are told that their one mission in life in the name of Communism is to turn themselves into imitation Great Russians in thought, in culture, and in habits or to become bourgeois nationalists

and be punished, as American agents and spies of international capitalism.

It is easy then to understand the growth of national sentiment among the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union who have suffered for three decades under that yoke which to-day is being imposed upon the satellite states. It is easy to understand why the appointment of a Russian in charge of the Ukrainian Communists or a Byelorussian or an Azerbaijanian placing himself at the disposal of the Kremlin and receiving the post of alternate as a temporary sop will hardly seem enough to prove anything except the essentially Great Russian character of the USSR? When we reflect that it has only been Stalin and Beria, the two men who proved their Great Russianism by the savage suppression of the independence movements in their own country of Georgia, that have been admitted to the inner circle, we can well understand how far the people of the non-Russian republics and the satellite states have to go before they are deemed worthy to be mentioned in the same breath as the truly "international" Russian nature which is to be preserved pure as the pattern for international and world Communism.

It is still too early to know how the death of Stalin will affect the cold war, whether it will remain as it is or become more violent as the new group of Stalin's associates under the leadership of the rigid Malenkov settle down in their posts and ranks. Yet there is still no sign from the past of any of the prominent members that there will be any softening toward the West or any relaxation of the effort to continue to infiltrate and dominate the free world. What it does offer the free world is the opportunity to react vigorously and strongly against the Great Russian attempt to dominate the satellites and the non-Russian peoples of the Union. The Soviet appeal for unity has furnished the text if the West will but shake off its apathetic neglect of the oppressed nations and resolve upon a broad campaign to counter the Great Russian attempts at domination by a definite proclamation that the Soviet Great Russian hierarchy have no inherent right to tyrannize over the non-Russian peoples even if they are in the Soviet Union. Every speech, every percentage put out by the Great Russian Communist leaders shows that they depend for their final support solely upon the Great Russians and that should finally penetrate the West and as the opposition to Communism grows, encourage it to demand the extension of democracy to all the oppressed peoples. Once that is done, the West will find new allies in building a peaceful world in which the oppressed nations of the Soviet Union as well as the satellites will be glad to play a part for the welfare of humanity.

THE VETERINARY ORGANIZATION OF SOVIET UKRAINE

By DR. IVAN ROZHIN

The Ukrainian Veterinary Organization is charged with the protection of animals from unproductive losses, the protection of the population from diseases common to people and animals, and is now a real component part of the state system of Ukraine and its national economy. In 1940, the veterinary organization was united with the zootechnical service which previously existed as an independent service, so that now in Soviet Ukraine there exists a Veterinary-Zootechnical Organization, whose function is not only of treating and preventing disease, but also the rearing of animals, the improvement of the quantitative and qualitative character, and the protection of the products of animal origin.

The veterinary (and zootechnical) organization is from top to bottom a state system and so it has legislative, control and operative functions. In this connection, it contains:

1. High, intermediate and lower schools for the preparation of the various grades of professionals: veterinarians and zootechnicians of high qualifications, feldschers, zootechnicians of an intermediate class, sanitary workers and animal inspectors as lower functionaries.
2. Scientific research institutes for the study of the current problems, chiefly for discovering new methods of combatting disease and the improvement of the breeds.
3. A system of institutes and courses for the raising of the qualifications and the requalification of its members, who work in the system on various grades from veterinarians and zootechnicians of high education to sanitary workers and inspectors.
4. Scientific practical establishments: district and regional bacteriological laboratories, diagnostic and control laboratories in the large state enterprises, large kolhosps, slaughter houses and meat factories, dairies and preserving plants, etc.
5. A system of medical establishments: veterinary areas, veterinary points, polyclinics, ambulatories, quarantine stations for infected animals,
6. A bio-industry, i.e. special factories for the preparation of serums and vaccines.

7. A system of zootechnical stations and breeding stations for animals and birds.

8. Points for artificial insemination (especially of horses, cows and sheep).

9. An inspection system, from inspectors of the main administration in Kiev (the highest is in Moscow), to regional inspector.

From this we see that the Veterinary-Zootechnical Organization is a net of connected sciences concerned with the nature and function of healthy and sick animals and birds, diagnostics, treatment, prophylaxis and inspection of animals and birds. Accordingly, the organization has the task of working out, developing and controlling zootechnical, veterinary, prophylactic and medical enterprises, and also of preparing a staff for its purposes.

For the functioning of the entire organization there is special legislation, on the basis of which there must be assured:

1. The best conditions for the multiplication and exploitation of animals and birds.

2. Their protection from infectious and non-infectious diseases.

3. The protection of the population from diseases common to animals and people.

4. The appropriate conditions for the securing, handling, preserving and transportation of food and industrial products of animal origin.

5. The veterinary and sanitary protection of the frontiers of the state from the introduction of diseases dangerous to animals and people.

6. The securing of the defensive needs of the state.

At the base of the entire veterinary-zootechnical organization is the principle that it serves for one object i.e. animal industry and the national economy and not the reverse. Therefore, the veterinarian has the obligation to seek out his patients and not the reverse. The directing veterinarian and the zootechnician in the sphere of their activity are responsible for the condition of the animals.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF SPECIAL COMPONENT PARTS OF THE VETERINARY-ZOOTECNICAL ORGANIZATION

The high veterinary-zootechnical schools in Ukraine are located in Kharkiv which is the oldest veterinary institute (100 years); there are also veterinary institutes in Lviv and Kiev; in Bila Tserkva there is a veterinary faculty in the agricultural institute. In Derehachy (near Kharkiv) there is a zootechnical institute, and in Bila Tserkva, Kherson and Dnipropetrovsk a zootechnical faculty in the agricultural institutes.

There are intermediate schools in almost every district and the lower courses for sanitary workers in every regional laboratory.

All higher schools are financially dependent on the Ministry of Agriculture, National Food, and the various state economies; in a methodological (political) relation they are subjected to the Ministry of Higher Education in Moscow. The intermediate and lower schools are under the local ministry of education.

The scientific research institutes were formerly under the Ukrainian Academy of Agricultural and Economic Sciences, but after its liquidation, they are now under the Ministries and methodologically (ideologically, politically) under the All-Union Lenin Academy in Moscow. At the present time there is in Ukraine an Institute of Experimental Veterinary Science in Kharkiv with its branches and zonal stations in various places in Ukraine. For example, the centre for the study of the diseases of horses is in Putivl, the bird station in Kamyanets Podilsky, the institute of swine-raising in Poltava. Besides, there are zootechnical stations which have not only a scientific but also a practical function, and are in various places in Ukraine, especially the zootechnical stations in Terezino (Kiev district) and in Nova Ukrainka in the Kharkiv district.

Scientific practical laboratories have been established (actually re-established, for they were created before the revolution as Zemstvo Bacteriological Institutes) in every district. Each laboratory, besides its director, a veterinary physician, has on its staff at least 4-5 other physicians, an epizootologist, a serologist, a parasitologist, and a chemical technologist. It has also an appropriate number of other personnel motor transportation including a mobile diagnostic veterinary bacteriological laboratory.

For preparing bio-products there has been established a special *Bio-Industry*, larger or smaller factories to prepare serums and various vaccines, for diagnosis, curing and prophylactic purposes. Such plants are in Kharkiv, Poltava, Kherson, Sumy and Holeschchyno. To show their size and field of work we will only say that some have 5,000 workmen and have many thousands of animals used for the serums. These factories produce yearly: serum against anthrax, 956,000 litres; against swine abortions 58,000 litres; against hog cholera, 512,000 litres; and of various diagnostic serums 13,000 litres.

They also produce vaccines against anthrax 59,000 litres; against swine abortions 5,000 litres; against emphysematic carbuncle 40,000 litres; against plague virus 5,000 litres, tuberculin 9,000 litres, mallein 9,000 litres and other similar preparations.

In each plant there is a special control laboratory with an appropriate staff to control the entire production and approve it for distribu-

tion and use. It is interesting to note that the whole control of these products is under the Central Control Institute in Moscow, although there is a special control department in the Ukrainian Institute of Experimental Veterinary Science and Zootechnics; this is not concerned with the work of the control laboratories. It must also be noted that, while the control of these preparations is very strict and carried out on the basis of special instructions, very often the production of Soviet bio-preparations is not perfect and they do not give the proper effect when applied.

The organization of the veterinary-zootechnical service is very complicated and not perfect; under the conditions of state capitalism, however, it is easily possible to build an ideal organization according to the planned outline. But the low technical level of the country as a whole, and the absence of understanding to maintain general sanitary norms, quite often nullifies the work of the regulations or of individual functionaries on the ground.

The highest organ for *planning measures* is the Chief Veterinary Administration in the Ministry of Agriculture in Moscow. And so the Chief Veterinary Administration in the Ministry of Agriculture in Kiev is really an administrating organ, the main function of which is to translate into the Ukrainian language, multiply and distribute the existing regulations and personnel sent from the Moscow Centre. Before World War II and still more since, even this did not have to be done because a certain amount of printed material in Russian was sent from Moscow for distribution.

The Chief Veterinary Administration in Kiev is headed by a director who is responsible only to the Ministry. His aides are "Inspectors" of horse ailments, large horned cattle, diseases of sheep, of swine, rabbits, birds, etc. There is also a controller of the statistic division, of agricultural education, clinical and medical supply, editor of the veterinary journal etc. and all together they form the administration.

The lowest and final link is the veterinary-zootechnical area with the senior veterinary physician or inspector at its head.

Parallel to this other ministries have special veterinary organizations, which are autonomous but in broad state enterprises are subordinate to the Chief Veterinary Administration. These veterinary organizations or services are found in the Ministries of War or Defense, Railroads, Waterways, the Food Industry, State Economy, Regional Economy, and Internal Affairs.

THE VETERINARY-ZOOTECHNICAL AREA

The veterinary-zootechnical area is the basic unit not only in Ukraine but in the whole Union and perhaps now in the satellites, in the

system of the Ministry of Agriculture. Usually, the area is divided into two or three veterinary points. The veterinary-zootechnical area always corresponds to the administrative region, and as a rule the senior physician of the area is the regional inspector. This is the tragedy of all Soviet veterinary workers, for the lowest and basic official performs both functions; he himself administers and controls himself. In all other cases the veterinary inspection works as in the free countries of Europe.

The veterinary area, or rather, its personnel serves all the institutions and other objects in its territory (slaughter-houses, dairies, depots of products of animal origin). Only the railroad stations, wharfs, and border quarantine points have a different personnel, which are under the physician of the area only in the case of seasonal, planned state enterprises. At the head of the veterinary area is the veterinary physician who has also the right to call to account and punish violators of the established norms and effective laws. The personnel of the area is very often composed of a few medical specialists, an epizootologist, a parasitologist, a surgeon (especially in delivery), etc. The minimum staff of an area is a physician, a zootechnician, a feldscher, sanitary man, a statistician, a groom or a chauffeur, manager and a clerk. The veterinary-zootechnical area contains a veterinary ambulatory, drugstore, diagnostic laboratory, a permanent hospital for non-contagious diseases, a quarantine for contagious, a gas chamber for the treatment of animals with pulmonary troubles, and an artificial insemination point. The area also has establishments of a sanitary type, a place for the utilization of the bodies of dead animals (usually a primitive "Fat boiler," a specially prepared cemetery or a "Czech Baker pit" for the corpses of infected animals), a regional blacksmith shop to prepare the hoofs of horses for shoeing and especially for diseased hoofs. Some veterinary hospitals are provided with X-ray and physiothermal sections. All offer courses for the training and improving of the veterinary sanitary staff and inspectors of animals on the kolkhosps. Also in the areas the students of the veterinary institutes receive compulsory practical experience. There are 2880 areas in Ukraine and they have 4825 veterinary points.

The veterinary-zootechnical area has as its task:

1. To inspect the sanitary condition of all animal enterprises and other establishments in its territory.
2. To cure sick animals.
3. To carry through mass prophylactic measures for the protection of animals and people from contagious diseases.
4. To inform the ministry of all contagious diseases and to collect the statistics of all diseases and enterprises.

5. To prepare staffs of veterinary and zootechnical workers with basic qualifications.

6. To take part in the state insurance of animals.

7. To inspect on the ground gatherings of animals, the preparation, transportation, and preservation of animal products, on the ground the killing of animals and birds, and also to inspect and rate the products of animals.

8. To control the veterinary points and to control and supervise the veterinary personnel of other systems located in the area territory.

LEGISLATION AND LEGAL BASES FOR THE VETERINARY-ZOOTECHNICAL ORGANIZATION

The Veterinary-Zootechnical Organization works on the basis of special legislation. In this connection the organization has the right and sometimes the duty to kill or order killed animals, and since in the Soviets the life of an animal is often considered more valuable than that of a person, the legislation is especially strict, complicated and detailed, i.e.

1. The veterinary law is approved and signed by the Supreme Soviet.

2. Special instructions of the Ministry Agriculture and of other ministries which regulate the duties of the veterinary-zootechnical personnel.

3. Special rules and resolutions of the veterinary administration which regulates various enterprises.

4. Compulsory regulations as temporary acts of the local state organs, as applied to various local enterprises.

The veterinary-zootechnical legislation or more accurately the veterinary law and all the instructions are collected in a special collection which is the hand book for all veterinary physicians, zootechnicians and even administrators of agriculture and enterprises connected with it.

The basis is the veterinary law which gives: a) the basic methods for the discovery and liquidation of contagious diseases, b) necessary measures in the localities for caring for the animals, the preparation of animal products and in places the killing of animals and also the movement of animals and their products by all kinds of transport, c) the basic items of the organization of the veterinary-zootechnical work in the state; d) the order and degree of punishment for the violation of veterinary legislation. All these instructions have been worked out as a specification of the veterinary law. We must note that by this excessive detailing i.e. the diverse instructions, the state has turned highly qualified professionals (physicians and zootechnicians) into technical executives

for their entire activity is so conditioned by different prescriptions that they are practically unable to do anything themselves. It is only necessary to study the appropriate instruction for one case or another and to carry it out without deviating a particle. Once the work of a physician or a zootechnician is seen in this way, it is easy to understand the many trials and annihilations of these specialists in Ukraine.

Despite this, Ukraine even in the veterinary zootechnical work is the most advanced republic in the USSR. Recently there has begun a movement to transplant veterinarians and zootechnicians as graduates from Ukrainian high schools and send them to Russia, most frequently beyond the Urals, to Siberia and Asia and to replace them in Ukraine with people from Russia. There are now in the veterinary-zootechnical service of Ukraine 6124 veterinary physicians and 4250 zootechnicians of high qualifications, a total of 10374 professionals with high education. There are also working in the system 15065 veterinary feldschers and 15,000 zootechnicians of intermediate qualification, in all 30,065 specialists of intermediate qualification. In regard to those with the so-called "mass qualification" the latest data showed 72,500 persons, or 22,250 sanitary workers and 50,250 qualified animal inspectors, chiefly brigade leaders, dairy inspectors, etc.

VETERINARY-ZOOTECHNICAL MEASURES AND THEIR RESULTS

The veterinary-zootechnical system in Ukraine is so arranged that all the enterprises which it supervises must be concentrated in the kol-hosps and state enterprises. To answer this purpose all enterprises are attached to it, although it is often only in theory. All great establishments are arranged (or supposed) to satisfy the demands of modern hygiene. This applies to the planning of buildings, their construction and material. Whether from the careless attitude of the whole mass of workmen to their duties or from unsatisfactory material and execution of the building, all these systems, of ventilation, draining, water supply and stalls for the animals, and fastenings do not benefit but cause harm. In every establishment there is veterinary and zootechnical personnel, in the large ones with high qualifications and in the smaller with intermediate or low. In every animal enterprise there is as a rule a quarantine for contagious animals, some shelters for the healthy, meadow installations, dairy buildings, a veterinary drugstore, a smithy for shoeing horses, and even "a death place" for killing animals for meat to feed the workmen. All these operations are performed regularly by seasons and the calendar. Some devices have given good results and for these, several thousand veterinarians and zootechnicians have paid with their lives. There have been wiped

out entirely in Ukraine such diseases as contagious pleuro-pneumonia and cattle plague in the larger horned cattle and glanders has almost been eliminated from horses. Others as hog cholera and rod fever, anthrax, scabies, Herpes tonsurans, although they exist, have been reduced to sporadic outbursts. Tuberculosis, brucellosis, paratyphus have been reduced by 50%. There is under way the work of the complete elimination of such dangerous plagues as tuberculosis, brucellosis and rabies. Before the war there were regions in the districts with community owned cattle as Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhzhie which were completely free of tuberculosis and brucellosis.

On the other hand as a result of the sudden and radical change in the conditions of the care and exploitation of cattle and as a result of the change of the social conditions of the population and the entire agricultural production, there have been created specially favorable conditions for the appearance of new, and even previously unknown or little known and long eliminated infectious diseases as encephalomyelitis, stachibotrycosis, dairy diseases of movement, anemia infectiosa suporum. Non-contagious diseases have attained especially threatening forms and proportions as those of feeding and digestion, traumas and lung troubles, diseases of the skin and extremities. These have become a misfortune for the state, whereas in Europe and especially in Germany, they have no importance and some are not even included in the statistics.

Thus we have the strange paradox, on the one hand under the conditions of state agriculture, there are all the possibilities for the carrying through of large scale and expensive radical measures concerning the housing of cattle, quarantine, mass slaughtering, etc. for prophylaxis or the elimination of contagious diseases, and on the other the same conditions favor the appearance of new diseases or the spreading of non-contagious diseases to the point of a popular misfortune. It is interesting to compare the losses from contagious and non-contagious diseases in Ukraine in its 1939 boundaries in 1940.

In that year there were 986,491 cases of infectious diseases and of these 25,764 ended fatally by nature or by slaughtering. These cost the national economy 4,982,215 rubles. In the same period the losses from non-contagious diseases far surpassed this and affected even 15-20 or even 25% of the animals, while from contagious diseases only 1-1.5%. In 1940 on the Ukrainian territory there were sick from non-contagious diseases 1,994,539 head of animals, horses, cows, sheep and swine. Of these there perished or were killed 276,601 head. The treatment and losses from this came to 72,122,425 rubles.

From official data on contagious diseases there were good results for the statistics on the severity of these diseases read:

	<i>Glanders</i>				
	1933	1937	1940	1948	1950
Number clearly sick	0.96%	0.002%	0.94%	0.52%	0.50%
Number hidden illnesses or with mallein	0.93%	0.004%	1.5%	0.93%	0.90%

	<i>Tuberculosis of large horned cattle</i>				
	1933	1937	1940	1948	1950
Number clearly sick	1.005%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
Number hidden or reacted to tuberculin	10.0%	5.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%

This is the position in regard to the total number of head and this is the data from the official statistics. If we analyze more closely the actual condition, we will have an unconsoling picture, for in the special enterprises and regions of collectivized cattle raising, i.e. the regions where tuberculosis and brucellosis flourish, the clearly sick and the reacting, i.e. the concealed sick are 50% (or even more), and 25% are sick of brucellosis or more. The coastal regions are strongly infected with pyroplasmosis; diseases of the foot and mouth as anthrax, hog cholera and hog plague are not absent.

In conclusion it must be said that the veterinary statistics, like all statistics in the Soviet Union, never correspond to reality. The official statistics, for example, do not show the amount or the percentage of those diseases which are important for international conditions. Some diseases are minimized, or not given in their real state and it is possible that epidemic epizootic is raging and is given in the statistics as sporadic illness. The same is true of the figures of infectious and epidemic diseases of people.

In Ukraine as in the entire Union there are two sets of statistics, one for the public and abroad, the other for "official use" and they are kept in the safes of the special division of the appropriate department.

We must add also that the veterinary-zootechnical organization, like all others in Ukraine, is controlled by a special secret service of the Ministry of Security. For that purpose there is in every institution the so-called "special section," the collaborators which are appointed by the appropriate organs of the Ministry of Security. These special sections control the work of all the veterinary and zootechnical workers, their correspondence, reports and even the private life of the worker and his family. It is thus possible to hide from the outside world and their own citizens an unsatisfactory condition. It is all done with a propagandistic purpose and commercial motives not to limit the exports.

WHY JEWS TODAY?

By NICHOLAS PRYCHODKO
author of *"One of the Fifteen Million"*

A RETROSPECTIVE VIEW

Anti-Semitism is not a new problem on the territories of Russian imperialism. During Tsarist times the Jews, more than anyone, were discriminated against and were limited in their rights as compared to the ruling Russian nationality. They had the right of residence only in areas earmarked for them, usually in the subjugated countries. They were prohibited from living in the larger cities, from occupying responsible positions in the government, from becoming army officers, and so forth.

From time to time, when the situation at home became tense the Russian government attempted to ease the atmosphere by organizing Jewish pogroms. The biggest wave of extermination of Jews arose in 1905 when as a result of the shameful Russian defeat in the Russo-Japanese war Russia was on the verge of internal revolt.

"The Association of the Russian People" and the Tsar's "Okhranka" (political police) were the chief moving spirits in the pogroms and utilized for this disgraceful action degenerate elements from different nationalities. At the same time the government played its part through propaganda in the press and at show trials. The most notorious was perhaps the trial of Beilis, charged with murdering a Christian boy in order to secure his blood for the Jewish passover.

During the Civil War, 1917-1920, the dominating slogan of the White Guard Russian military forces, who strove to restore the undivided Tsarist Empire, was: "Kill the Jews and save Russia." This slogan was printed in large block letters on every military train, on the walls of large buildings and in all public places, even though it was considered unofficial.

From the very time when they seized power until the present the Soviets have been perpetuating the imperialistic policies of the Tsars. In the first days of the Revolution they directed their main efforts toward conquering and forcibly uniting with the Empire the nine democratic republics then proclaimed on the territories of Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, etc. Today the Soviets have established a Russian totalitarian regime in the countries of eastern and south-eastern Europe and on immense

territories in Asia. The Russian Tsarist Empire with a population of around 170 million has now changed into a Russian Soviet Empire ruling about 800 million people.

But in the beginning of Soviet existence great changes took place in connection with the Jewish question. Urgently needing all possible support in the task of fighting the nationalist-liberation movements and requiring the support of world public opinion, where international Jewry played a large role, the Jews were the first people called to the aid of the Red Russian imperialists. As a result of the Tsarist repressions the Jewish people counted the greatest circle of revolutionaries among them and in compensation for their active part in the victory they were given possible citizenship rights, privileged and responsible positions in the government, the police apparatus and the army.

Later, when oppositional tendencies became evident among the Jews in leading positions the oppositionists were liquidated, along with the oppositionists of other nationalities, as enemies of the nation. The propaganda show trials of Trotskyists, Zinovievites and Bukharinians showed in no uncertain terms that the government would liquidate all who veered from the "general party line," regardless of race, revolutionary merit or rank in government. That was the first symptom that the Jews had already fulfilled their function in the Soviet Empire and were becoming less indispensable to the Russian imperialists.

But at this time, and later in 1937 when Hamarnyk, Chief of the Political Administration of the Red Army, Yakir, Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Military District, Yagoda, Chief of the NKVD of USSR, Balytsky, the Chief of the NKVD in Ukraine, and others were shot, their Jewish origin was not mentioned. However, at the same time an intensive campaign began for the assimilation of the Jews in the USSR. Arguing in the press that Zionism was hostile to Communist ideology and socialist society the Soviet government took energetic action against synagogues, private Jewish schools, Jewish theatres and almost totally annihilated these and other Jewish institutions.

Beginning with that period a large number of Jews were imprisoned and sent to concentration camps in Siberia where in 1938-1941 I had the misfortune of sharing with some of them the fate of a Soviet slave. In 1938 to 1941 tens of thousands more of them from the "liberated" countries, Western Ukraine, Poland and the Baltic Republics, were exiled to Siberia. After careful screening some of them were transferred to Birobidzhan in the Far East and the rest worked as slaves in the Siberian snows with other nationalities, among whom Ukrainians were predominant. These Jews were innocent of any political offence. On the contrary they had welcomed the Soviets with open arms, but these never-

theless were apprehensive of their ties with the Zionists in the Western World and uncertain whether they would forsake their faith and traditions for the gratification of Russian imperialism.

The fact that at the beginning of the Second World War the Soviet press and radio did not warn the Jewish population in USSR of Hitler's physical destruction of Jews on the German-occupied territories is significant, for it shows Kremlin's unofficial participation in that barbarous action. The Soviet government was responsible for the great tragedy of the Jews after the German invasion. When they were being collected, with their belongings for mass execution by the Gestapo they believed that they would be deported to America.

There is an unofficial but likely rumor that actually it was Soviet confidential advisers in Himmler's department who advised the Germans to destroy the Jews in large masses in order to bring down Western indignation on Hitlerism and so strengthen Stalin's position. The foremost of these agents was Opperput, Himmler's chief adviser on Russian affairs. He was discovered by the Gestapo and executed in the fall of 1943.

WHAT CAUSED THE PRESENT TIDE OF ANTI-SEMITISM IN USSR?

Many years of watching events behind the Iron Curtain, of reading between the lines of the Soviet press and of talking to escapees from the dominated territories give me grounds to name the following causes for the present pogrom of the Jews in the USSR.

1. *The Kremlin is disappointed and offended by the policy of Israel.* At one time the Soviets actively supported the establishment and recognition of a Jewish state. They were certain that with the aid of leading Jews in the USSR they would create in Israel, which is in the vicinity of the enormous oil fields and important communications, a great strategic centre for subversive activity and espionage. These plans have failed to materialize because Israel united its political course with the Western World.

Recently a Soviet Magazine, "*New Times*," printed a long article on the activities of world Jewry. This article gives a lengthy interpretation of the Soviet opinion that the Jewish Zionists "sold themselves to American imperialists." As proof of this statement there is given an account of the Washington conference in which Truman, Acheson, Morgenthau, Ben Gurion and Mozhé Piyade participated. At this conference, the *New Times* continued, an agreement was reached whereby the Jewish Zionists would work together with American imperialists against the Soviet Union.

2. *Today the Kremlin has decided to play up to the Arabs against Israel to gain their sympathy and make it easier to carry out its future*

plan of aggression in the Near East. In the same way the Kremlin played with Hitler and against him, with Japan and against it in the Second World War. The same article in the *New Times* states: "the Jewish armed forces in Israel destroyed whole settlements of defenceless Arabs. The Jews seized Arab lands and businesses, reducing the Arab population to slaves of Jewish capitalism..." This tone is also evident in all Soviet newspapers.

3. *Jewish demands to emigrate from USSR to Israel were considered by the Soviets as a grave affront.* Soviet propaganda has one constant theme: the happiest citizen on earth is the one living in the USSR. This idea was contradicted by the Jewish demands for mass emigration to Israel. Even before the general purge of Jews the Soviet press had criticized the Jewish enthusiastic demonstration in Moscow on the arrival of the Israeli ambassador. Even then it was evident that a bitter persecution of the Jews was imminent. Without doubt, the present outbreak of Jewish repressions will make others think twice before applying for permission to go to Israel.

4. *Considering the U. S. the greatest stumbling block in its drive for world domination the Kremlin wishes to liquidate all actual and potential American sympathizers.* From its underground army of *seksots* (informers) the Kremlin knows that a great majority of Jews are favorably disposed towards the U. S. where they enjoy all possible citizenship rights and opportunities for free enterprise. The Kremlin also knows that Israel's pro-Western course was in large measure responsible for strengthening the pro-American feeling among Soviet Jews. The Kremlin rulers understand the strong Jewish nationalist solidarity throughout the whole world and therefore, preparing for a clash with the U. S. they are endeavoring to remove all chances of treachery in favor of that country.

Here is a pertinent illustration of this idea. Speaking at the convention of the Association of Communist Youth, January 27, 1953, in occupied Ukraine, H. Shevel, the acting secretary, said: "... We must carry on a struggle against beastly American imperialist agents—the Ukrainian and Jewish bourgeois nationalists and Zionists." He also stated that: "... the struggle with Ukrainian and Jewish bourgeois nationalism constituted a special problem in the present situation" and so forth.

Ukrainian nationalists have now fallen under a new wave of shootings, together with Jewish nationalists, for the reason that an overwhelming majority of them had hopefully awaited the coming of the Americans to Ukraine.

It may be worthwhile to mention here an interesting historical analogy. After conspiring with Hitler on the "Liberation" of Poland and

being desirous of removing all obstacles in the way of carrying out this plan the Soviets arrested, inside of two weeks, 85 per cent of the Poles then living on USSR territory. I saw first hand how in 1938 nearly all the professors and thousands of students from the Polish Pedagogical Institute in Kiev vanished overnight.

Some were shot and others shipped to Siberian concentration camps where later I had occasion to meet several of these "Polish bourgeois nationalists." The two professors and several students who remained were evidently left for some purpose.

5. *The Kremlin hopes to gain sympathy among Hitler's followers in East and West Germany.* Lenin had declared: "Russia, plus Germany, plus China and India will assure the victory of Communist idea in the whole world." Stalin, Lenin's disciple, is fulfilling his masters creed.

The German problem, since the time of Lenin, has been the key problem in the Soviet attempt to dominate Europe. For this reason the Soviets gave so much attention to the political education of German officers and soldiers captured at Stalingrad and other points during the Second World War. These political schools for German prisoners-of-war were organized before the conclusion of the war and showed the Kremlin's far-reaching plans for bringing Germany under its control.

Naturally those Nazis who became Moscow's servants in East and West Germany must have been disappointed to a certain extent by the Kremlin's policies in the Russian-occupied zone. While Germany is not yet wholly in the Soviet grip concessions as well as terror are necessary especially to those who are in leading government positions and heading fifth columns. One such concession to the living spirit of "Mein Kampf," is the anti-Semitic campaign in the USSR and the recent trial of G. Dertinger & Co. in Germany.

6. *The Soviets are using Jews as scapegoats to ease some of the acute political and economic tensions in the USSR and the satellites.* Malenkov's criticism at the Party Convention of party members for deviation from the "party line" and transgression beyond their capacities; an analogous criticism of the party discipline by Khrushchov; an official judgment against the project of incorporating "kolkhosp towns;" the criticism of NKVD activities, in *Pravda* and *Izvestia*; all denote an acute political crisis in the USSR. This is substantiated by a whole series of symptoms evident between the lines of the sharply censored Soviet press.

Soviet economy, strained by colossal expenditures for war preparations, is also suffering a serious crisis. Refugees from behind the Iron Curtain state that the living standard of workers in the USSR has dropped even below that prior to World War II. They say that thousands

of cripples and blind, casualties from the last war, are begging on the streets, at railroad stations, on trains and everywhere where there is a chance of getting a crust of bread.

During the war the Kremlin promised these people paradise after victory. So far there is no paradise, the tension is increasing and as in any tense period scapegoats are needed. This time the scapegoats are Jews, the so-called agents of American imperialism.

A propaganda show trial was held in Kiev recently and the two defendants, both Jews, were shot. They were: the director of the Kiev Freight Station and his assistant. Both were charged with "marketing foodstuffs." This trial was meant to banish some of the discontent among the hungry population and to turn its dissatisfaction in another direction.

Soon after these proceedings the *Ukrainian Pravda* printed a sharp article stating that a huge organization of "thieves and criminal elements" had been uncovered with its "headquarters in Moscow and affiliations all over Ukraine." The names of those belonging to this organization were entirely Jewish: Nodelman, Fiederman, Igel, Cohan and others. It is reasonably certain that for belonging to this fictitious organization, hundreds, perhaps thousands, will now be shot secretly in the dead of the night without show trials.

7. *The anti-Semitic tide is counted on to strengthen the Kremlin's position in the Red Army.* At the beginning of World War II "Political Commissars" were added to all military branches. To these Polit-Commissars was assigned the task not only of directing political propaganda in the army but also of keeping track of the activities and conduct of the commanders. They had the authority to cancel the orders of the commanders. Actually they were the NKVD eyes and ears in the armed forces and most of the commanding personnel and enlisted men hated them for they considered these appointments the result of distrust of themselves and the humiliation of their dignity. There were even cases where these commissars were killed in the front line confusion.

Because the Kremlin was reasonably certain that they would not betray Russia in the war with Hitler the majority of these Commissars were Jews, often quite incompetent in military matters. This fact and the tactlessness of many Commissars caused the commanding staff to regard Jews with animosity and today in getting ready for war, the Kremlin is sacrificing the Jews so as to wipe out past unpleasant impressions in the Red Army.

8. *Anti-Semitism serves to strengthen the hate-America propaganda.* A great majority of the USSR population, including a large majority of the Red Army, is very favorably disposed towards the free and prosperous United States even though they know very little about it. I can personally

vouch for this friendly attitude from my own 24 years of experience behind the Iron Curtain.

In 1928 a book written by two Russian journalists Ilf and Petrov was published in USSR, entitled "One-Storey America." It was an account of their tour of the United States and instantly became a best-seller. At the libraries the lists of names of those waiting to read the book ran into hundreds. In spite of the fact that living conditions in America were depicted worse than they actually are the people were enraptured by it. In a year the book was prohibited and in due course one of the authors was arrested. The other was fortunate enough to die a natural death just before.

Being aware of this friendliness towards America and of the unfriendliness of some of the people towards the Jews, the Soviets are capitalizing on the latter to promote their hate-America campaign. In America, they preach, the Jews from Wall Street run everything and are endeavoring to dominate the whole world and turn the Soviet people into their slaves.

9. *The anti-Jewish action is also counted on to frighten into submission those Jews who are still indispensable in certain major and minor positions in USSR and the satellites.* In their own interest it is still convenient for the Soviets to utilize some Jews for the time being. They are also used in the process of liquidating their brother-Jews. This practice is prevalent in the USSR with all nationalities since the beginning of the Revolution.

10. *Finally anti-Semitism is the result of the Kremlin struggle for behind-the-scenes leadership.* The present Kremlin intrigue is similar to the one which ended in the assassination of Kirov in 1934 and the death of Zhdanov, both influential Politburo members and leaders of the most responsible Leningrad Communist Party Organization. This organization had represented the strongest opposition to the Kremlin. I have no doubt that both Kirov and Zhdanov died at the order of Kremlin because their activities and prestige in the Leningrad Party Organization overstepped their boundaries. Postyshev, a Politburo member and general secretary of the Communist Party in Ukraine also died in the Kremlin hospital after he became too popular and allowed himself to be called the "father of the Ukrainian people." The story of the Kremlin intrigues and murders and its influence on genocide in the USSR will one day be revealed in all its abomination. Today it is possible to make only certain conjectures from the external repercussions of the Kremlin behind-the-scenes struggle.

I am inclined to believe that Malenkov, Khrushchev and one of the marshals wield a great influence over Stalin and they were his chief

advisers to begin an open anti-Semitic action. Charging Jewish doctors with killing party leaders is nothing more than propaganda bluff and has nothing in common with the real reason for anti-Semitism.

Before putting into effect its plan for anti-Semitism the Kremlin no doubt took into consideration the possibility of negative results: the incurring of world indignation, especially by the solid Jewry of the world, and has employed suitable antidotes. The communist press throughout the Western World is trying to convince its readers that no anti-Semitism exists in USSR; that only a few Jews were punished for having committed crimes against the country. I have recently had a conversation with a Jew, obviously a Communist, who was energetically trying to deny that there is anti-Semitism in the USSR. In February the Red Dean of Canterbury went to Canada with a plan of several lectures refuting the existence of anti-Semitism in the USSR.

IS AN OPEN POGROM POSSIBLE IN THE USSR?

I am convinced that the Politburo will not allow an open pogrom of the Jews for the following reasons:

1. An open pogrom of the Tsarist or Hitler type would disillusion those gullible Communists and fellow-travelers who think that a communist system and an equality of nations exist in USSR. It would dispel the belief in the thoroughly false Stalin Constitution written for propaganda purposes abroad.

2. A pogrom would weaken the Kremlin's fifth column in which it places great faith to help conquer the world. It would also call forth a strong answer from world Jewry.

3. The Politburo needs no public executions. It employs other means: mass shootings in the nape of the neck in the darkest hour of the night in isolated NKVD cellars or physical destruction in the remote concentration camps in Siberia. Without organizing pogroms the Kremlin has already liquidated far more Jews than the Tsars in all their pogroms.

At the present time, according to information from the Jewish Committee of the USA there are about 800,000 Jewish prisoners in Soviet slave labor camps out of a total of about 15 to 20 million other nationalities. Due to living conditions there they are approaching certain death. This death can be speeded up at a moments notice from the Kremlin by machine-gun fire in the deaf Siberian taiga.

Is this not a pogrom?



VASYL KRYCHEVSKY

1873—1952

By VOLODYMYR SICHYNSKY

On November 15, 1952 one of the greatest Ukrainian artists, Vasyl Krychevsky, died within two months of his eightieth birthday. As an outstanding individualist and an artist of wide interests, V. Krychevsky represented the whole period of the development of the modern Ukrainian art of the first half of our century. For a full half century the entire artistic movement in the central part of Ukraine was in one way or another connected with his name. His creative work touched all branches of plastic art — architecture, painting, engraving, and applied art. He worked also as a theatrical designer and arranged the settings for movies; he prepared an edition of Ukrainian folk art and wrote on the contemporary problems of art. Among other works he prepared the illustrative material for a special edition of the London *Studio* in 1912, which was devoted to Russian and Ukrainian folk art.

This, perhaps excessive activity was the result not only of the many-sidedness of his talent but also was conditioned by the new ideas and tendencies demanded by the period. With the development of the Ukrainian national movement at the end of the last century, interest grew in Ukraine for the Ukrainian historical and folk art; there was also the need of creating a modern art on the basis of the national culture. Krychevsky was one of the strongest supporters of the new artistic movement which profited by the past and created the new modern art.

Vasyl Krychevsky was born January 12, 1873 in the village of Vorozhba near the city of Lebedyn, Kharkiv district in the family of a medical assistant. After finishing the Technical School in Kharkiv, he worked for a long time in building firms as a draftsman.

The outstanding abilities of the artist and the practical experience in construction gave him the possibility of all the special fields in the planning of architectural structures, of becoming an assistant to the architects and of executing independent projects for the creation of interior and exterior facades for large public buildings and private villas.

In 1902 in a large competition of architectural plans for the Zemstvo building in Poltava, he won the first prize and from that time on he commenced to work independently and to construct various buildings. Among

these was the house of Prof. Michael Hrushevsky, which was not only his home and his study, but also housed his great collections of Ukrainian art. In the years 1911-12, Krychevsky, with the assistance of Prof. Hrushevsky, made a study trip through Italy, Austria and Germany. As his biographers assert, he was most impressed by the great artists of the Renaissance and by the English portraitists as Watt as well as by the architecture of Bailey Scott. Previous to World War I, Krychevsky managed the well-known firm of the Khanenkos for the manufacture of kilims in the village of Olenivka and the ceramic works in Opishnya in the district of Poltava. He was also chief decorator of the well-known Ukrainian theatre of M. Sadovsky in Kiev.

After the Revolution of 1917, when the government of the Ukrainian National Republic opened in Kiev a State Academy of Art (November 22,



Zemstvo Building in Poltava. Project of V. Krychevsky

1917), Krychevsky was appointed Ordinary Professor and the first rector of the Academy. When in December, 1917, the Bolshevik army sent from Moscow bombarded with artillery the city of Kiev, the first structure at which the Bolsheviks deliberately aimed their fire was the private home of Prof. Hrushevsky, then the head of the freely elected Parliament, the Ukrainian Central Rada. When the building went up in flames, the library and the collections of Hrushevsky and of Krychevsky himself were destroyed. In the 20's Krychevsky worked as a professor of the Architectural Institute and the Art Institute in Kiev which the Bolshevik administration had "reorganized" out of the Academy of Art, for they did not wish there to be an Academy in Kiev apart from the Academy in Petersburg (Leningrad). In the years 1925-1928, Krychevsky worked

in Odesa in the production of Ukrainian movies, among them *Taras Shevchenko*. Later these films were banned by Moscow as "nationalistic" and removed from production. Now the Soviets have produced a new and falsified *Taras Shevchenko* which was shown in New York in 1952. (We may also say that the film *Nazar Stodola* which Krychevsky directed was shown in the New York theatre "American" October 24-25, 1952.).

In the spring of 1940 Krychevsky had a great one man show in Kiev displaying 1055 examples of his work from 1892 to 1940. During the last war he left Kiev, stayed for a while in Lviv, later in Slovakia and Western Germany, and in 1950 he emigrated to Venezuela, where he died in Caracas on November 15, 1952.

In architecture Krychevsky represented the whole artistic movement of the rebirth of the Ukrainian style. Taking as his starting point the



Inside of the Zemstvo Building in Poltava

historical heritage of Ukrainian architecture, he more than any of his contemporaries advocated the use of folk art motifs. He carefully collected this material and transformed it in the modern spirit, applying the architectural forms to the modern methods of construction and materials. Beside the picturesque character of the architectural forms which he created, his buildings were on constructivistic lines and always were marked by the moderation of decorative adornments and details. His most outstanding work was the building of the Poltava Zemstvo, which in its day produced a sensation by its originality and also called forth attacks and criticism of the Russian authors who ceaselessly asserted that a Ukrainian style in architecture "does not exist" and "is not known." The house of the Poltava Zemstvo gave visible proof that such

a style did exist and this was later acknowledged by the most prominent Russian and other art students. Of his later works we can mention the memorial museum on the grave of Shevchenko which he did with his pupil Kostyrko in the years 1936-1938.

Of his paintings, special attention must be paid to his landscapes drawn from nature. His great talent as a painter, based on the local soil, gave him a special manner of painting with rich coloration and tender but soft tones. He was one of the creators of the Kievan school of landscape painting, which produced a series of Ukrainian painters.

In the graphic arts Krychevsky represented the turning point in the history of the Ukrainian book. On the basis of the old Ukrainian engraving and folk art, he created the new modern type of book binding and bookplates which were extraordinarily original in plan and in varied graphic execution. Beginning with Baroque motifs in preparing the well known editions of Prof. Hrushevsky and passing over to folk primitives (Cf. *Ukrainian Art* of the brothers Shcherbakivsky, the works of Chuprynka, etc.), in his later years he was prone to constructivism in an original treatment (the works of Yu. Yanovsky, O. Slisarenko, D. Revutsky, etc.). We owe to him also the state coats of arms, seals and the 2 griven notes of the Ukrainian National Republic of 1918-1920.

In his theatrical settings, Krychevsky was a keen and deep student of Ukrainian life, folk building and applied art. His settings were marked by purism, without losing beautiful stylistic features and picturesqueness.

The same can be said of his settings for Ukrainian films, especially in their architectural aspects and the interiors. Thus in the sketches for clothing, types of actors and the accessories, the artist gave a keen impression of style, removed from excessive flamboyancy and excessive decorativeness. There are beautiful scenes in such films as *Taras Shevchenko*, *Vernyhora*, *Nazar Stodolya*, and the *Fair at Sorochyntsy*.

Works of applied art made according to the designs of Krychevsky, especially the kilims and embroideries, despite their pure folk patterns, seem also modern works distinguished by a noble simplicity of composition, an harmonious scale of soft colors and also by a clear, original style. The kilims made in the Khanenko factory from his designs before World War I, had a great demand abroad and were also purchased for collections in New York.

The long pedagogical and artistically productive work of Vasyl Krychevsky were reflected in the modern Ukrainian artistic life on a great scale. The artist, architect, painter, engraver, decorator and pedagogue trained hundreds of the modern outstanding Ukrainian artists. Vasyl Krychevsky inspired in the broad circles of Ukraine respect, love and enthusiasm for art and native Ukrainian culture.

THE SUCCESS OF A MISSION AND ITS ECLIPSE

By LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

In the past two months innumerable inquiries have reached me as to the outcome of a mission on which the eyes of many interested observers in America and abroad were focused. It is somewhat in the nature of a general response to these inquiries, as well as a necessary sequel to a previous article, that a succinct account is presented here of the mission in a meaningful framework of reference which will acquaint the reader with all the essential aspects and data of the case down to the very present hour. This framework entails (1) a necessary background to the mission, (2) the main accomplishments of the mission, (3) the early eclipse of the mission, and (4) the remaining avenue to a constructive solution of the basic problem. It need scarcely be said that in developing the framework of this analytic report, I am doing so in an individual capacity.

THE NECESSARY BACKGROUND TO THE MISSION

In the preceding issue of this journal a concise integrated presentation was given of the fundamental bases upon which a vitally important mission was to be executed by four members of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America in cooperation with the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia toward the eventual participation of Ukrainian emigre groups in the Coordinating Center for the Anti-Bolshevist Struggle, located in Munich, Germany.¹ These bases, in the nature of points of understanding and agreement, were cogently established in a formal communication to Admiral Leslie C. Stevens, chairman of the American Committee, last October 4, and received confirmation from him in a reply dated October 31. Before the communication was released, the contents were formally approved by an overwhelming majority of the Congress Committee at a meeting held in New York City on October 3. This letter and its contents are extremely important since they represent a bond of faith and trust, a contractual meeting of the minds, on which the cooperation of the Congress Committee with the American Committee

¹ "The Making of a Mission," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, No. 4, Autumn, 1952, pp. 328-338.

was founded. Because of this and its crucial importance to an appreciative understanding of subsequent events, the letter is reproduced in full here for the open record:

Dear Admiral Stevens:

It is assuredly my pleasure to state in outline form the orientation and means by which we intend to cooperate fully with your Committee in the solution of an important problem that has absorbed considerable thought and energy these many months.

With the candid understanding that the policy of your Committee is non-committal regarding the generally known ultimate political issue underlying Russo-Ukrainian, as well as other non-Russian, relations and in the good faith that the rights of all bona fide groups constituting the European counterpart of your organization will be equitably observed and properly safeguarded, the delegation which I shall feel privileged to head on the proposed mission to Europe clearly views as its sole and prime objective the membership and active participation of acceptable Ukrainian representatives in the Coordinating Center in Munich.

The formula by which we hopefully seek to realize this desirable end entails the formation of an ad hoc committee consisting of representative Ukrainian emigres who shall become directly involved with the activities of the center through their dual chairmanship based on the two votes of absolute equality with the other non-Russian participants. In our contemplated negotiations with the popularly recognized Ukrainian groups we shall strongly emphasize that it is plainly understood by all concerned that in adopting this medium they shall in no manner suffer any compromise or sacrifice of their fundamental political principles aimed at a sovereign and independent Ukrainian state. An additional cardinal point that will receive equal emphasis is the good will and fair disposition of your Committee, as indicated by its avowed intentions to alter the much disputed title of the organization and to include trustees sympathetic toward the non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R.

Moreover, it will be judiciously explained that over and above the requirements for standard Radio Liberation programming applicable to all sections of the center, fertile autonomy of endeavor within the basic framework of policy will be afforded each national group in order to avoid the regrettable blunders known to have been made by the Voice of America. Needless to say, in concrete conformity with the concept of equality the logical determinants of the sectional scope of operations are understood to be the proportional base of quantitative populational differences and the relative productivity of imaginative and creative group application. Because of the dominant factor of close Ukrainian relations with other broadly representative non-Russian organizations and for natural reasons of consistent practice, the measure of success realized by these and other avenues of persuasive reasoning will, in our mutual understanding, be made readily available to the organized non-Russian groups.

To effect an efficient solution of this problem, I have recommended the early departure of one of our delegation to meet in the course of a ten day period with all the responsible leaders of the various Ukrainian organizations for the purpose of laying a systematic groundwork upon which the remainder of the delegation, arriving ten days hence, may pursue with maximum expedition its course of action toward the fulfillment of its declared objective as evidenced by

written resolutions of agreement. Before this operation gets under way the entire delegation should, in my opinion, be given the privileged opportunity and pleasure to meet briefly with you.

I am convinced that if the strand of rationality evident in our whole approach to this problem should serve as the watermark of our negotiations abroad, only a successful outcome is possible. I believe further that the essential points of understanding presented here are precisely accurate and in accord with the general tenor of the long preliminary discussions that have been held to recent date.

May I at this concluding point express my sincerest congratulations on your appointment and wish you every measure of success in your vital undertakings.

Sincerely yours,
(signed) LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

In the course of the month of October a body of statutes was completed in the Coordinating Center, and the text was received and distributed in this country. As shown by illustration in my previous article, the overtones and innuendoes of these statutes were unmistakably pro-Russian imperialist in character, and served to complicate the preliminary preparation of the mission. This event undoubtedly cast a shadow of doubt on the professions of the American Committee, and bolstered the reservations that many in the Congress Committee had necessarily, in the light of the past record of the former, to maintain. The explanation that this was the result of uncontested Russian initiative in the Center was not wholly satisfactory. Nor was the promise, emanating from certain interested and associated quarters that the objectionable features of the statutes would be altered, at all impressive—again in the piercing light of the past record. In my judgement, as I wrote about it, this still did not constitute an adequate cause for any form of retreat from the position assumed by us earlier in the month. This judgement was staked on an “on balance political interpretation,” as described in my article, and couched in the feeling that it was still an insufficient test of the avowed good will of the American Committee. However, the Congress Committee, as a result of this incident, issued in November a communique and set forth certain directions of thought rejecting the body of statutes and its supporting cause, namely the organizational basis of the Center and its apparent insurance of Russian domination.

Despite this unfortunate exigency, the ground of justification for the mission was not seriously undermined since the prospective exchange of *all* views and ideas with the bona fide Ukrainian emigre groups had inevitably to result in a new level of concrete negotiations toward the desired end of a sound and fair united anti-communist front. The mission was accomplished in the period of December 15 to January 11, 1953, and with measurable success. It is the measure of this success that shall be depicted here to the point where certain further developments sud-

denly emerged at the very completion of the mission to virtually blight the foundations of this endeavor. The placement of responsibility for these damaging events in an enterprise which is so quintessential to American psychological warfare shall be reserved for the determination of the reader. As always in a constructive and rational manner it is now our responsibility to recommend alternative means, necessitated by the new situation whereby something can be salvaged to predicate the enterprise of the American Committee on a prolific operational footing.

THE MAIN ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE MISSION

Needless to say, the tasks assumed by the mission were exceedingly difficult and ponderous in view of the blatant unpopularity of the real and fancied issues involved. In short, a solid wall of resistance confronted the delegation, a wall built these few years out of a greatly justified disillusionment and to some extent, rumor and vague speculation. Yet, considering the crystallized circumstances of the moment, it can be easily maintained that the mission was remarkably successful in achieving definite results which constituted at least the working foundation for eventual legitimate Ukrainian participation in the Center, until the crisis developed over the so-called "federalist" issue. Known to only a few, the preeminent fact is that in the negotiations which preceded the mission itself, both the members of the delegation and the officials of the American Committee assessed the situation abroad accurately against the familiar background of accumulated circumstance by viewing any immediate Ukrainian participation in the Center as a miracle. From our viewpoint this was not possible until words of promise were translated into deeds. This miracle was certainly not to be construed as the empirical criterion of the forthcoming success of the mission.

We have always with a sense of considerate and temperate disposition been impressed by the almost nebulous complexity of the problems facing the American Committee, but it was upon our arrival in Munich that we first encountered the wide ramifications of these known difficulties. The network of interest in the Center and Radio Liberation extends wide and far, includes both friend and foe. Nevertheless, the two and a half day conference in which all the bona fide Ukrainian political parties and individual Ukrainians of exceptional stature participated was efficiently and successfully managed. In Munich as well as elsewhere, it was indeed a mutual achievement to join with the assembled leaders and spokesmen of these diverse groups for the constructive purpose of calm and deliberate discussions bearing on a most complicated subject. It was perhaps a far greater achievement to decisively overcome an understandable and natural reluctance to enter into an undertaking in which

chronically imperialist-minded Russians, despite their restrained verbal professions, have been given a dominant role of operation and situation. Beyond doubt the most outstanding accomplishment was the deep and wholesome penetration of the wall of resistance by a powerful stimulation of thought on the ideas presented, which in turn led to an increasing receptivity on the part of many groups and individuals of several of the proposals discussed.

By the end of the Munich conference it was clearly evident that on the whole there was no comprehensive understanding of the interrelated proposals submitted and that a waiting period was necessary for a sufficient percolation of several of the points of agreement conveyed by the delegation. Throughout this affair characteristic emphasis was placed on principles, absolute parity, and Stalin's propagandistic stress on Ukrainian independence in a manner of logical digression and tangentiality from the directions of thought set by the points of understanding with the American Committee. This is not to say that the political conferees were not on valid ground in their objections to the Russian influence, the organizational complex and the statutes of the Center. In fact we all agreed that the situation was far from the ideal. But, in brief, the discussion and fair exchange of ideas were simply being effected in different contexts of thought and political orientation. As a comparison between the context of my essay and that of the communique issued by these political groups clearly reveals, the discrepancy rested in the failure to realize generally that what was proposed was a tactical procedure bidding us to enter the Center in time in order to fight with a reasonable chance of success for the principles we stand and to curb much of the pro-Russian nonsense that is being currently published and disseminated. In practical terms it was essentially a tactical medium for the protection and expansion of Ukrainian interests against active hostile influences seeking to capitalize on continued Ukrainian abstention from the Center. And the best, solid proof of the basic soundness of this position was furnished by the Russians themselves when in the very course of the mission they maneuvered, on a threat of withdrawal from the Center, to demand the arbitrary inclusion in any Ad Hoc Committee that was to be formed by legitimate Ukrainian representatives, of Gulays (a group of Russianized individuals who in the eyes of Ukrainian public opinion are regarded as traitors to the Ukrainian cause).

Within the context of their thinking and from the point of combined strength in their solidarity the leaders of the various political parties were perfectly correct in their demand for an in advance improvement of the conditions of admission into the Center. When one begins to appreciate with warm understanding the many times they have been tricked and

deceived by Russian and other influences, their position of caution and care seems only natural. Notwithstanding this general condition, our cool and dispassionate approach in this exchange of views and ideas appealed to many participants in the conference to the notable extent of cultivating a range of opinion regarding the strength and attractiveness of the proposals advanced. On a candid individual basis this range extended from complete acceptance to one of outright rejection with the majority hovering somewhere right of center in the spectrum of individual opinion. Face to face with the members of the delegation, no one presumed to question or doubt the good faith or the basic principled position of the delegation. Nor could anyone deny that all the proceedings were conducted with complete democratic sway and without the slightest tinge of duress. What seems to escape the mentality of some unfriendly quarters to the Ukrainian cause is the fact that the genuine solidarity of Ukrainian interest is by no means identical with an enforced uniformity of thought but rather with a dynamic unity accomodating a rich diversity of weighted opinion. It is important to note that the general resistance on the part of the political groups was no longer a blanket one, but instead one of graded strength and force, reflecting degrees of amenability to the proposals discussed. Yet, quite understandably, it was necessary for them to oppose as one voice participation in the Center until further realized guarantees were made by the American Committee, especially on the matter of votes and changes in the statutes. The Resolutions of the Ukrainian ad Hoc Committee in Europe resulted in the common political bans of all Ukrainian parties and cultural institutions.²

Time and patience for an evolving reconciliation of viewpoints were now the guiding factors by which we made the necessary preparations for our visitations in the field to other Ukrainian centers in Western Europe where the cited results of a somewhat extraneous nature, especially as regards the favorable opinion created in official circles on the struggle of Ukraine for national independence, can be noted from the January 1-15 issue of the "Ukrainian Bulletin" which describes in detail the course of this eventful itinerary, covering Rome, Madrid, Paris, London and Bonn. The governing purpose of the trip was to achieve a firmer groundwork of support for the accomplishments realized in Munich conferences. Beyond doubt the most outstanding accomplishment was the profound feeling developed by the mission for the closest cooperation between the Ukrainian emigration and the officials of the American Committee, as best expressed on the part of the former in its formation of a Temporary Working Committee for the manifest purpose of necessary direct negotiation with these officials in the immediate future.

² See Annex I.

The pronounced intention and willingness to work out satisfactory arrangements for Ukrainian participation in the Center must by all means be respected by the American Committee which was expected to consult directly with the Temporary Working Committee but hasn't as yet. Thus as a further result of the mission's success in crystalizing this spirit of cooperation, there is no ground for irresponsible propaganda that the Ukrainians are fanatical, uncompromising, and uncooperative which certain Russian elements are prone to exploit.

The genuine solidarity of the Ukrainian emigration is a precious asset that must be maintained at all costs. As emphasized above, this does not mean a blunt uniformity of thought. Happily, most of the emigre leaders view it in this manner. The vast majority of the emigre leaders agreed with the delegation that the deliberations set in motion much constructive thinking and activity on the issue. Who would audaciously deny that such a healthy ferment of thought among the emigration does not deepen the foots of genuine solidarity? Unless he is a would-be dictator. Plainly, it was in this new environment of stirred thought that the delegation deemed it necessary to have a central body established for continued negotiations, and the Temporary Working Committee was the result. Very simply the aim was basically to insure that the creative energies of this new environment find expression without unstabilizing beyond control the main props of an enriched solidarity.

THE EARLY ECLIPSE OF THE MISSION

With further negotiations the possibilities for the formation of a legitimate Ukrainian committee to enter the Center were indeed bright. We had every reason to be joyous over the results of the mission and the prospect of such a committee until, quite unexpectedly, at least at the moment, the atmosphere was befouled by the emergence of a new issue, namely the so-called "federalist" issue on which all patriotic Ukrainians, organized political-wise or otherwise, can render only one verdict. The official statement released in New York on this matter placed the delegation in an extremely unenviable position as the general consensus of opinion in Europe developed to construe this foolish action as "a stab in the back." Regardless of the source responsible for this, this attempt to appease the rampaging Russians represented an unmistakable breach of contract between the Congress Committee and the American Committee as concerns the oft-repeated agreement on dealing exclusively with valid and legitimate Ukrainian representatives. The damage that this violation of trust has incurred is incalculable.

The natural consequence of this blunderous and inexcusable act was generally typified by the reaction which, dependent on further developments, was expressed rather mildly in a statement released on February 6,

1953 by the Congress Committee. Against the background provided here, the meaning and significance of this statement should be obvious.³

The Russian demand for the incorporation of what organized Ukrainian emigres properly regard as quislings into any Ukrainian committee entering the Center is presumptuous, inordinate, without empirical foundation, and, under the condition of their adamant threat to withdraw from the Center in the event of failure to satisfy this demand, typically arbitrary. As a matter of fact, in the free world there isn't a shred of political evidence among the culturally and politically organized Ukrainian emigres to certify the existence of any "federalist" trend. In Ukraine, to which Russians fostering this colossal illusion point as a field of support, there is also no creditable evidence for it. From the time of Ukraine's declaration of independence in 1918 to the present the accumulated evidence is overwhelmingly to the contrary. It is not without substantial cause that the Soviet constitutions and propaganda feign Ukrainian independence. Moreover, the living proof of East Ukrainian sentiment is the well organized Ukrainian emigration from that area, and their loyalty to the noble cause of Ukrainian independence is no less forceful than that of other Ukrainians. Also, from the viewpoint of sound logic it is plainly erratic to speak of federalism before the preliminary condition of equal sovereignty among nations is fully realized. For the simple fact is that the phenomenon of federalization is by nature not a unilateral process, unless some contemplate, of course, the repetition of the use of brute force in Eastern Europe's political arrangements.

As far as patriotic Ukrainians are concerned, on empirical and logical grounds there is really no federalist issue. Potentially every Ukrainian patriot seeking national independence is a federalist, and undoubtedly with inclinations toward the culturally compatible West than toward backward Russia. This state of potentiality cannot with free will be actualized unless and until complete national independence is attained. On this score no amount of verbal jugglery and Soviet-like semantics and dialectics can obscure the crystal-clear logic and truth of this position. The only implementation conceivable for the aspiration of a "free and independent Ukraine" is simply a "free and independent Ukraine." To maintain as a mode of implementation of this aspiration "freedom and independence within a federation of equals that includes both Great Russia and the Ukraine" is not only verbal nonsense but a contradiction of logic itself, so strikingly akin to current Soviet imperialist propaganda in Ukraine. Obviously in logic as well as in time sequence a "federation of equals" presupposes an independence of equals necessary to the consummation of the contract of federation, and once this eventuates in-

³ See Annex II.

dependence necessarily gives way to interdependence if the federation of whatever kind is to have any real meaning. The questions of possibility and desirability of a federation with "Great Russia" are logically incidental to this basic process of political evolution. There is only one inference to draw from this nonsensical insistence on the part of the American Committee or any other body to press the so-called federalist issue, namely that contrary to its verbal professions it is playing an imperialist Russian game.⁴ If in appeasing the obstructive Russians it is unalterably given to the inclusion of Gulays in the Center, then our sincere recommendation is that these Russian stooges be accommodated in the Russian section where they properly belong.

THE REMAINING AVENUE TO A CONSTRUCTIVE SOLUTION OF THE BASIC PROBLEM

With the eclipse of the success sustained by the mission the American Committee has placed itself in a precarious situation for which there exists only one practicable solution at this stage of its endeavors. A solution that is in conformity with the farseeing proposals advanced last May by certain individuals who conferred with Admiral Kirk on this very problem. The letter embodying these proposals is appended here for the reader's judgment on the wisdom of the stated position.

It is now urged that the American Committee seriously consider the reorganization of the Center in the basic interest of long-delayed operational activity and results. There is no logical reason now, with a background of experience emerging from an endless succession of politically inspired problems, why the operational substance of the Center and Radio Liberation should any longer be stifled by the theoretic luxuries of statutes, "principles," parities and the like. The essential aims of the Committee as reflected in spontaneous operational results, rather than in nebulous and basically wasteful theoretical involvements, can be expeditiously realized through the formation of two independent operating sections—The Russian and non-Russian under a native American coordinator responsible for the observance by each of basic policy to the interest of America. The puny Russian elements in the Center now are to be restricted to their own section of interests, and the composition and activity of either section should be of no concern to the other. If the meddling Russians are intent on nurturing their Gulays and other stooges, it will surely meet with no non-Russian opposition if they undertake this in their own nest. By the same token justice would dictate that the non-Russians should be given the opportunity to nurture Russians seeking

⁴ See Annex III.

Russian independence, i. e. independence of its costly empire as well as independence of each of the peoples of the USSR.

The anti-Communist unity of emigre forces which the American Committee seeks would in no way be qualified by this expedient structural adaptation to the problems at hand because the position of other non-Russian emigre groups is the same as that of the Ukrainian.⁵ On the contrary, it will begin to bloom with concrete operational effect. For some time it has been a source of wonderment to numerous observers conversant with the realities of East European politics and emigre existence as to why this course of least resistance, insuring both the objective of unity and a differentiation of this project from the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, was not pursued from the beginning, with considerable economy in effort and funds. It would seem that the time has arrived for this investment in experience to pay off or simply write it off as a bad venture on the part of misguided or misleading political enterprisers. The cumulated experience points now directly at the above framework and the following essential contents:

ANNEX I.

DECLARATION

**BY THE UKRAINIAN POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS
CONCERNING THE ANTIBOLSHEVIK ACTIVITY OF VARIOUS
AMERICAN CIRCLES**

Authorized delegates of all Ukrainian political institutions and organizations in Europe have discussed the affair of the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" on December 27, 1952, based on information from the delegation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (U.C.C.A.) on the 19th — 20th Dec., 1952. At this meeting, specially convoked for the purpose the delegates unanimously resolved in the name of the institutions and organizations represented, that the following declaration shall be regarded as obligatory directive for the Ukrainian policy as to the said affair:

(1) *Cooperation between the Ukrainian political forces and various American circles in the field of antibolshevik campaign and on an appropriate political basis is necessary for the Ukrainian struggle for liberation, as well as for the common fight against bolshevism. Therefore the undersigned Ukrainian political institutions and organizations are willing to fight against bolshevism and Russian imperialism in common with the said circles, under certain conditions.*

(2) The delegates are of unanimous opinion that the political conception and the structure of the so-called "Coordination Centre of the Anti-Bolshevik Campaign" (C.C.A.C.) which was constituted with considerable assistance from the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia," renders cooperation with American circles impossible. The C.C.A.C. repudiates the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations and the equal rights of nations; it allows representatives of those Russian parties to join and prevail, which, in practice, is based on Russian imperialism and deny the right of the Ukrainian and the other

⁵ See Annex IV.

subjugated peoples to restore their independence and democratic states. This conception impairs in its principles our struggle for deliverance and common fight against bolshevism, as

(a) it is for maintaining the Russian empire, at the cost of the subjugation of Ukraine and other non-Russian peoples;

(b) it tends to weaken morally and politically the most powerful and active factor of the anti-bolshevik fight within the U.S.S.R. namely the national movements for liberation and national independence of the non-Russian peoples;

(c) it diverts the policy of the United States of America to supporting Russian imperialism and renders the cooperation between the national movements for liberation and American anti-bolshevik activity impossible;

(d) it abuses the American aid and funds by combatting the anti-bolshevik movements for the independence of the nations subjugated by Moscow.

Those principles upon which the C.C.A.C. is based render impossible such reform of it that would allow the Ukrainians to join. Therefore any attempt in the direction of reform are in vain. Only the complete rejection of the said conception would render the organization of a common and expedient fight against bolshevism possible.

(3) Ukrainian political organizations are willing to participate in the activities of the different anti-bolshevik American circles, provided that the following premises have been realized:

(a) Affirmative attitude towards the fight of Ukraine and the other subjugated peoples for their national independence.

All national representations joining the anti-bolshevik front bind themselves to respect the struggle of all nations for their independent democratic states, within their ethnographical boundaries and not to work against their fight. Only Russian anti-bolshevik forces, which will respect the principles mentioned and will observe them in their activities, are allowed to join this common front.

(b) Each national representation keeps its independence in all domains of a liberation policy. International cooperation is to be achieved in coordination and not in one-sided leadership.

(c) Cooperation is exercised through equal delegations of each national group (equal votes to each people, as in the United Nations).

(d) Each national group is represented by authorized delegates of the political emigration of their respective people.

(4) On the basis of these premises the American circles have the possibility to endorse the common anti-bolshevik front and to warrant simultaneously the realization of the premises mentioned above by appropriate political conception.

Thus natural possibilities are at the same time given for a successful functioning of the common front of all subjugated peoples fighting for deliverance, including all peoples within the U.S.S.R. as well as the so-called satellites subjugated now.

*The Executive Committee of the Ukrainian National Council (V.O.U.N.R.);
Foreign Representation of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council*

(Z.P.U.H.V.R.).

Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Z.Ch.O.U.N.).

Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Solidarists) (O.U.N.S.).

Union of Ukrainian Monarchists (S.H.D.).

Ukrainian Peasant's Party (S.Z.S.U.).

Ukrainian Democratic Revolutionary Party (U.R.D.P.).

Ukrainian Socialist Party (U.S.P.).

Ukrainian National Democratic Association (U.N.D.O.).

Ukrainian National State Union (U.N.D.S.).

ANNEX II

**STATEMENT OF THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA
CONCERNING UKRAINIAN PARTICIPATION IN THE ANTI-BOLSHEVIK
ACTIVITIES**

(1) The trip of the UCCA delegation to Europe took place after the meeting of the Board of Directors of the UCCA on November 18, 1952, at which a communique was issued which stated that neither the statute nor the organization framework of the Coordinating Center "permit any possibility for Ukrainian participation in the anti-Bolshevik front of the peoples of the USSR" and the exchange of information with Ukrainian political leaders in Europe. At the same meeting special instructions were given to the delegation which, according to the decision of the Board of Directors of February 6, 1953, will be published separately.

(2) The UCCA delegation held a series of conferences and consultations with the representatives of all Ukrainian political groups, especially a joint conference with these on December 19, 20 and 21, 1952 in the matter of the Coordinating Center of the Anti-Bolshevik Struggle. At the above-mentioned conference and in talks with responsible leaders all arguments "for" and „against" were thoroughly discussed, and it was decided that there exists no possibility for Ukrainian participation in the Coordinating Center. The conclusions of the discussion were expressed in the special communique of December 21, 1952 and in another statement of Ukrainian political groups in Europe of December 27, 1952. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America welcomes this unanimous stand of all Ukrainian political groups in Europe, supports it and will help it with all the means at its disposal in the realization of its objectives.

(3) The statement of the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia of December 24, 1953 which was announced in the press after the departure of the delegation is, according to the information given by the members of the delegation, not compatible with the basic theses of talk between the representatives of the UCCA and those of the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia. Particularly, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America rejects and denounces the assertion of the above-mentioned statement as to the parity of the so-called Ukrainian federalist groups, artificially created by the Russians, with the genuine Ukrainian forces which struggle for independence. Such inaccurate information damages the liberation struggle of all the peoples, impedes the mobilization of the forces of the Western world for this struggle, and above all, damages the interests of the United States of America.

(4) The UCCA delegation, in addition to conferences and consultations with Ukrainian political leaders, held a series of official meetings with the representatives of Western European governments and with U. S. military authorities in Europe, all of whom expressed interest in the problem of the Ukrainian liberation.

(5) The Board of Directors of the UCCA suggests that the organs of the UCCA help the Ukrainian political forces in Europe to undertake all necessary steps for the creation of a common front of all the non-Russian peoples for the struggle against Russian imperialism and Bolshevik-communist aggression. The creation of such a center would help unite and utilize all active anti-Bolshevik forces

and would greatly assist the United States of America and the free world at large in their struggle against the Russian communist imperialism and would considerably enhance the outcome of the struggle of the enslaved peoples against Moscow and for their independence.

(6) The Board of Directors of the UCCA with especial gratification notes the active and live interest of the Ukrainian community in the free world, and especially that of the United States of America, in the activities of responsible Ukrainian leaders. This interest was reflected in the unanimous reaction to the latest developments in the Ukrainian political front and in the decisive resistance to all the outside endeavors to break up the monolithic Ukrainian front in the struggle for sovereignty and independence. The Board of Directors hereby appeals to the Ukrainian community to make sacrifices for and actively support the Ukrainian liberation and political activities.

ANNEX III

LETTER OF THE PRESIDENT OF UCCA DR. DOBRIANSKY TO ADM. ALAN G. KIRK

May 12, 1952.

Admiral Alan G. Kirk, Chairman
American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia, Inc.
6 East 45 Street, — New York 17, New York.

Dear Sir:

On behalf of Professor Burnham, Commissioner O'Connor and myself, I wish to thank you for your cordial reception this past Saturday, May 10, at the Metropolitan Club in Washington.

We were exceedingly happy to note your sound recognition of the forcefulness of the four essential and indispensable points we advanced for the achievement of a unified collaboration among the various genuine emigre organizations in Western Europe and Turkey. In view of your stated intention to discuss these inseparable points with the members of your committee toward this end, I should like briefly to recapitulate them here. They are, you will recall, as follows:

(1) Change of the title of the committee, specifically "the Peoples of Russia," in order to disallow any intimation of a contextual prejudgement for the exercise of the right of national self-determination. The substitution of "the Peoples in the Soviet Union" was suggested;

(2) The acceptance of the principle of absolute equality, signifying the democratic condition of equals among equals, which in application would manifest itself (a) in the European counterpart of the committee through the allotment of one vote per national or ethnic entity in all matters in which such groups are expected to take decision by majority opinion and an equitable distribution of financial aid for projects, which demonstrate the greatest possible return and (b) in the American committee, composed exclusively of American citizens, by the balancing membership of additional functioning representatives known to be acceptable to the non-Russian groups abroad and sympathetic with their basic interests;

(3) Within the democratic and liberal framework of the Great American Tradition the complete freedom of all anti-communist emigre groups abroad to pursue and expand, with the equitably distributed aid of the American committee, their current propaganda and cognate undertakings;

(4) The avowed adherence of your committee to the principle of unqualified national self-determination and the need for its full and unfettered application in the finest spirit of the American Declaration of Independence.

In reviewing these points before your committee you will doubtlessly recall too, the many aspects of the content of argument we provided for each of them. We earnestly hope that these necessary recommendations, enumerated for your convenience here, will receive favorable consideration and action on the part of your committee.

We look forward to the results of your committee conference on these matters which you clearly indicated will be communicated to us toward the end of this month.

With kind best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,
(signed) LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

ANNEX IV

DECLARATION OF THE ALL-CAUCASIAN CONFERENCE

The authorized representatives of the Azerbaijan National Centre, the Georgian National Political Centre Abroad, and the North Caucasian National Committee assembled in Munich from December 11 to 15, 1952, so as to thoroughly discuss and elaborate the fundamentals for their common fight, in order to re-establish the independence of the Caucasian Republics that were forced to surrender after the invasion of Soviet Russia (R.S.F.S.T.) in 1920/21 and have ever since lived under the yoke of that country.

The members of the Conference unanimously agreed with all actions discussed and decided to prepare the following Declaration:

(1) Upon having most thoroughly discussed and examined the international situation, this Conference arrived at the conclusion that, due to the constantly increasing oppression of the Caucasian peoples by Moscow imperialism, aiming at a russification of the Caucasian nations, and due to the increasing resistance displayed by our nations toward the invaders, it is imperative immediately to start common action by the national centers in order to back the fight for the liberation of our home-country, so as to guarantee the unconditional re-establishment of the sovereignties of the Caucasian republics, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia and North Caucasia.

(2) After the successful termination of this national fight for liberation and the re-establishment of the sovereignties of the Caucasian republics, this Conference considers a close cooperation on the basis of a Caucasian confederation, to be of greatest importance, and the members of this Conference suggest that the idea of such a confederation be spread and strengthened among the Caucasian nations and the surrounding world.

(3) This Conference wishes to bring a fact to the attention of the entire free world: The national problem of the Caucasian Republics is one of the most pressing international problems, and the members of this Conference wish to remind the world that the aggressive policy of the U.S.S.R. did not appear for the first time in 1939, when Poland and the Baltic States were occupied, but already in 1919 with the invasion of Ukraine and the Caucasian Republics that have likewise enjoyed international recognition.

(4) This Conference wishes to assure the solidarity of the Caucasian nations with all other civilized nations on this earth, who acknowledge and share the idea of Human Rights as well as the Principles of free nations, anchored in the Atlantic Charter.

(5) The members of this Conference appeal to the United Nations and request that action is taken immediately to stop the genocide which the Caucasian peoples have been particularly subjected to.

(6) In consideration of the above mentioned situation this Conference has decided to establish an All-Caucasian Centre under the name of Committee for Caucasian Independence, in order to accomplish the following tasks:

(a) Representation of the Caucasian nations and conduct of the national fight for liberation.

(b) With the Caucasian peoples' overwhelming desire for freedom this Conference chooses its place on the side of the free world, led by the great democracies of the United States and in Western Europe, and determines that the Committee for Caucasian Independence will actively share the anti-bolshevist fight of all national and international organizations, the participation in which all peoples under the Communist yoke are longing for.

(c) This Conference also determines that the Committee for Caucasian Independence will coordinate its activities with the actions of other peoples in Eastern Europe, Turkistan, and other countries that are likewise fighting for their independence and freedom, so as to strengthen the anti-bolshevist battle front. A realization of the independence of all these oppressed nations will insure the principles of true democracy throughout the world.

(d) This Conference wishes to stress that the Caucasian peoples do not feel any resentment toward the Russian people as a whole, and that they want to fight Soviet imperialism only, as they are fully convinced that the fall of this despotic regime will not only liberate Caucasian peoples, but will also bring about a liberation of the Russian people.

Finally, this Conference, being deeply moved by the pain and grievances of the Caucasian peoples, wishes to express its fraternal sympathy with all Caucasian sons who have desperately fought against Soviet terrorism on Caucasian soil for 32 years, and praises their heroic endurance. Let us honor all heroes whose blood marks our road to freedom!

Munich, this 15th day of December, 1952.

Presidency of the Conference:

M. E. RESULZADE,

President of the Azerbaijan National Centre.

R. GABASHVILI

President of the Georgian National Political Centre Abroad.

A. MAGOMA,

President of the North Caucasian National Committee

Remarks: Similar declarations were issued by National Turkestanian Unity Committee, New Union of Fighters for Independence of Idel-Ural, and Supreme Caucasian Representation.



THE BOLSHEVIK FREEDOM OF RELIGION

By MICHAEL J. NAGURNEY

What is freedom of religion to the Communists? It is just another tool employed to drive the masses into the communist camp. The term is also used to befog the minds of the pseudo-liberals and dupes in countries which they have not yet conquered.

What is freedom of religion to the Communists? Certainly you have heard the claim that they permit full religious freedom. Is there freedom of thought behind the iron curtain? Certainly there is, so long as the opinions coincide with the proposition that the human being is a tool of the state.

Don't take my word for it. Take the word of a priest who "enjoyed" this religious freedom and freedom of thought. Listen to what he told me and then make up your own mind.

When the Russians occupied Western Ukraine (1939) then under Poland, they announced themselves to be the liberators of Ukraine from the Polish yoke. Nothing in the lives of the people was to be changed; they insisted on maintaining the status quo. But in the meantime they set out by devious ways to prepare the masses to want a change. They set out to create villains of those whom the people were most likely to support. They put a plan into operation which was designed to make rascals and boors of those whom the people in normal circumstances were most likely to defend.

The plan followed a thoroughly prepared pattern. Its execution required time, cunning and patience by the Communists; but there was no doubt its being thorough.

When the Communists first arrived, their commissars were in the vanguard. They immediately called mass meetings at which they announced that nothing was to be changed in the lives of the people; that they came as protectors. All public servants were instructed publicly to carry out their specific duties with diligence. The people must be served.

And so life went on for a very short period — long enough for everyone to become accustomed to the new conqueror; his liberty and his generosity. Then came the taxes and the rules for equality amongst men. The priest, they announced, must carry on his priestly function, but he must not be a parasite upon the people. He, too, must work. He must

not expect remuneration from the workers; he must contribute to the welfare of the workers. He was taxed 600 lbs of meat and 30 bushels of grain annually. Money could not be used to pay this tax. It had to be paid in the commodities listed.

Again quiet settled upon the land. Priests, though the burden was almost too great to carry, laboured in the fields all week, then performed their priestly duties on Sunday. They also ministered to the sick and those in need of solace. Some faltered under the burden as humans often do, but the majority became accustomed to the ruthless pace. Then the Communists were ready for the next step in their program.

All clerics of the area were instructed to appear at a meeting on Sunday morning at a town which required several hours travel. They were warned in advance that the meeting was a secret one and that none could reveal their destination. In the meantime, as the populace gathered at the church agitators went amongst them, jibing at the insolence of the priest who refused to serve his people; mocking the holiness of the man who was ordained but was too tired on a Sunday morning to do his duty, frolicking about the "people's servant" who went visiting his friends and forgot to come home.

The process was a ruthless one. The priest who failed to appear at the meeting was arrested because he was unwilling to serve the State. Deportation to Siberia or to the Caspian Desert was but the first step in the process of restoring that willingness. The priest who went to the meeting found a mean mob awaiting him upon his return. Yet he was powerless to explain, because the meeting was a state secret and any one divulging the secret was quickly arrested and deported to the wastelands of Russia.

There was no kidding among the Communists. They had a plan; they executed the plan with the precision of an instrument maker. And as a priest was whisked away in the midst of the night never to be seen again by his parishioners, a party agent ordained by the party was installed by the party as the priest for the congregation.

There was no defense against the plan; either way you were wrong. So my friend escaped the iron curtain before it was rung down for the second time in 1944.

Do the Communists believe in the Freedom of Religion? Figure it out for yourself.



I AND THE OTHER "ENEMIES" OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE

by PETER KOLYMSKY

This article is a continuation of a series of articles of the author printed in Vol. VIII, Nos. 2 and 3 of the *Ukrainian Quarterly*.—Ed.

The unendurable pain from the beatings during the examination of last night had weakened my whole body and all day long I kept wetting my handkerchief and applying it. Four of the men in my cell had been taken for examination and had likewise been beaten, some more and some less. They began to discuss whether it would not be better to give false testimony, to accuse themselves and thus put an end to the torture. Denysiv explained that a self-accusation would not end the torture, for it might bring about worse, if the person refused to name as members of a non-existent organization those persons suggested by the NKVD. In spite of the unendurable physical pain, I categorically protested against any self-accusation and the involvement of completely innocent people who would then have the same fate as myself. Their families would reject any one who had thus confessed. No! Better death at the hands of the executioner than to fall so low.

Almost all the inmates went each night to the examinations and were terribly weakened by the lack of sleep. No one was able to keep awake and he automatically fell asleep, sitting up, for one or two minutes, until the guard woke him by a loud knock on the door, for he absolutely demanded that we sit with eyes open and look into the glass window in the door into which he peered every one or two minutes. Yet involuntarily our eyes closed and the guard threatened us with the *kartser* (cell). Yet during the day each prisoner succeeded in falling asleep sitting up 10 or 15 times for one or two minutes each and this gave him freshness and strength for the next night's tortures. They brought into our cell a new inmate whom I had seen somewhere. On looking more closely, I recognized in him a colleague in the Kiev University, Prof. Ya. Savchenko. He had been arrested in July and kept in the special part of the Lukyanivsky prison.

TORTURES TO FAINTING

At nine o'clock in the evening the guard opened the window in the door and called us for the investigation. They put three of us at once in the "dog houses." At 2 A.M. they called me before the examiner. After

the last beatings I was in a bad physical state and also depressed mentally. The examiner did not rely on this and with still greater fury and threats demanded that I give the false accusations. As in the former times, I categorically refused the accusations presented to me, for they were false and I told the examiner that it was time for him to understand that my arrest was the result of a false accusation.

It was long after midnight. As the last time, I heard in the neighboring rooms the tortured cries of a man and a woman. These lasted for three or four minutes and then there came a heavy groan. The last words which I heard from the tortured woman "There is nothing for me to confess," gave me a still greater determination to die rather than involve myself and others. When the groans grew still in the neighboring rooms, the same two torturers came in as previously. Their first question was as to whether I had confessed my counter-revolutionary activity. The examiner shook his head and said that tonight he would carry the investigation to its logical end.

All three began unrestrained abuse and then the examiner read the statement that it was the declaration of my wife who had declared me "an enemy of the people." They assured me again and again that regardless of whether I confessed or not, I would never see freedom again, and that the only way to improve my lot was to make a confession in accordance with the accusation. I answered that I would rather die than make any false confessions. My answer enraged the examiner and they began to draw the curtains over the windows and to take from the shelves the instruments of their trade — thick rubber hoses. With the hoses in their hands they came up to me and asked again if I was planning to confess. I shook my head in the negative and then I felt the first blows of the hoses. The still fresh bruises from the last investigation under the new blows hurt unendurably and cut into my heart. The infuriated torturers threw me to the floor, kicked me from one side to the other and beat me everywhere on my whole body. My lack of sleep and the tortures of previous days took away my strength. I do not remember what happened next. The following day I was told in the cell that two men of the NKVD had brought me in and put me on my bed sometime about 5 A.M.

At 6 A.M. after the bell, when I did not get up, the guard woke me but I could not get up. He called the assistant of the chief of the Tyurpid, who lifted my shirt and saw I had been beaten. He went out without a word and sent in the prison physician, who gave me permission to lie in bed for one day.

CONFRONTING MY ACCUSER

During the next three days I was not called for examination and only on the fourth was I called after dinner. This surprised me, for such

privileges were given only to those who had begun to give false testimony. I found in the office of the examiner a group of people (examiners) with whom he was studying a new law about imprisonment for 25 years. When I came in and greeted them, they stopped their conversation and the examiner asked me my age. I answered "32." He then told me of the new law and that I would be tried under it and receive a 25 year sentence, and that I could return home only when my seven year old son would be 32. He then changed his tone and told me that I could ease my fate by confessing the charges brought against me. I replied that I would rather accept as an innocent man the 25 years than accuse myself falsely. He assured me that regardless of whether I confessed, they had enough material to sentence me to 25 years. He then began to read the testimony of "E" who had won me over to membership in a Ukrainian nationalist organization. I called the charges of "E" false from beginning to end. I decided to bear again for perhaps the last time the tortures of last night but not to accuse myself falsely. The examiner began to hint what I would say if I were forced to a personal meeting with "E." In fact in a half-hour, "E" was brought into the office of the examiner.

I was surprised by his clothing and his appearance. It was already October and quite cold but he wore dirty white trousers and shirt and canvas shoes. Before his arrest he had been black-haired and at this meeting I saw him grayish white at an age of 31. His grayish white head showed me without a word what he had gone through during two months of arrest.

When "E" was brought in, my examiner told him to sit down at the table opposite me at distance of 1.5 metres. The first question put to him was whether he knew me and since what date. He answered that he had known me since 1924. I confirmed this.

The second question put to him was whether he was on friendly relations with me and whether we had not quarrelled. "E" answered that we knew each other but were not close friends and we had not quarreled. I confirmed this.

The third question was whether he belonged to a Ukrainian Nationalist Organization and who had introduced him to it. He answered that he was an active member of a Ukrainian Nationalist Organization and that one Kaplan had introduced him.

The fourth question was under what conditions and whether he had won me over to membership in such an organization. He answered that he had known me from the institute as hostilely disposed to the policy of the party in the village. That sometime in 1929-30 I had told him that the collectivization of village agriculture was harmful to the further development of the country. Secondly, when in 1933 I had gone to Kharkiv

and spent the night with him, I had told him that the kolhosp system was not workable and would sooner or later meet with a fiasco. Both remarks had given him the basis to win me over to a non-existent organization.

I categorically denied these false statements, for if I had really in 1929 and 1933 made such remarks, "E" would not have let me leave his home but would have handed me over to the NKVD. As to introducing me to the organization, I answered that "E" had never introduced me to a Ukrainian Nationalist Organization and I did not know of the existence of one.

On hearing this testimony, I was hurt and pained that a man could fall so low in slandering himself, for I was and am convinced that "E" had never belonged to a Ukrainian Nationalist Organization and did not know of its existence. He was shot and his wife imprisoned — for nothing. He was compelled to insert in the protocol of his confession 18 names. Of these, some were shot in Kiev, among them "E", two came back (of whom I was one) and the rest probably died in the Stalin camps of death from exhaustion, hunger, cold, and moral dejection.

I categorically denied the testimony of "E" and tried to induce him to tell the truth. But the examiner forbade me to turn to "E" and told me only to answer the questions of the examiner. Against his will, I cried out to "E": "If your conscience is clear with such lies, look me in the eye." For it I got four blows in the face. As I learned in 1940, my challenge and behavior had their effect upon "E" and he softened his charges against me over what he had written in the protocol. The examiner asked "E" what mission I had carried out. He answered that I had been a passive participant in this counter-revolutionary organization and had never done anything. At the meeting "E" and I signed.

MY TRIUMPH

This personal meeting cheered me up. I had actually come out victor. Not only "E" but the examiner to my questions as to whether he believed the testimony of "E" in replying by threats, did not dare to look me square in the eyes. After this interview I never saw Kozachenko again. My case was handed over to a subordinate examiner. All the prisoners in my cell saw in my opposition worthy conduct and regretted that they had not endured the tortures but had given false evidence against themselves and their neighbors. All thought I would be set free and so did I.

The new examiner called me twice. He tried by threats to make me say what he wished, but was compelled to accept my testimony in the protocol of the personal meeting. After my last call before the examiner, I was transferred from the investigating section of the NKVD to the

special section of the Lukyanivsky prison. This ended my examination with the understanding that I had categorically refused to give false testimony. I was not a member of a Ukrainian Nationalist Organization, and I did not know of its existence in 1937 and even now, I still do not know — here in America — whether there was in fact such an organization. I only know that more than two million people were imprisoned and more than 400,000 shot on the charge of belonging to this non-existent organization in Ukraine.

MY COMPANIONS IN THE INVESTIGATING PRISON — THE COMMUNIST VSEVOLOZHSKY

To make more clear the character of the charges and the methods of examination in 1937, I will cite the case of my cell-mates which I knew well. The first was Vsevolozhsky. The last years before his arrest, he worked in the Donbas two years as secretary of the local committee of the Party in the Starobelsk district and just before his arrest as head of the Donets Regional Executive Committee. In May, 1937 he was chosen a candidate member of the TsK KP(b)U and on September 23, 1937 was arrested as "an enemy of the people." He was charged with belonging to the Right-Bukharin group, headed in the Donbas by Sarkisov, a member of the TsK VKP/b and a close friend and collaborator with Stalin and also charged with wanting to murder Stalin. In the field of economics, he was charged with wanting to destroy the coal mines, to sabotage the securing of lumber for shoring up the mines and to injure the ventilating system. He categorically denied and confuted the charges. The first days of the examination he maintained his position and gave no false testimony. As a former party bigwig, he was violently beaten every night with narrow sacks filled with sand. He categorically denied the charges. He often said in the cell that if he had to answer for any crime, it was for what he had done as secretary of the district committee of the party and head of the regional executive committee, in carrying out the orders of the TsK VKP/b, headed by Stalin, orders directed against the workmen and peasants.

When the examiners became convinced that they would not secure the desired testimony by the beatings, they applied a reliable system — uninterrupted standing. He stood in the office of the examiner 5½ days without sleeping or eating. He had a special guard whose duty it was to see that he did not sleep, — God forbid — standing. His feet swelled up and he could scarcely take off his shoes. At the beginning of the sixth day, he lost his mental balance and began obediently to perform the desires of the examiners. In this condition he confirmed all the accusations and put them in fantastic forms. When he was returned to the

cell, for two days he paid no attention to anything and spoke to no one, and only later told us of the standing.

After five days he was called back to sign the rewritten material of the examination. When he saw the material in his right mind, he denied what was written. The plan for the murder of Stalin was especially fantastic, for he was to do it with his own hand at his first presentation in the Kremlin. He categorically refused to sign the protocol on the ground that he had written it when he was suffering from lack of sleep and had lost his mental balance. They began to beat him again and kept it up until he signed. Soon after the examiner informed him that his case had been handed over to the jurisdiction of the military college of the supreme court. In the autumn of 1937, this court only imposed death sentences, and so Vsevolozhsky was probably shot and his wife sent to Siberia, for it was the rule that the wives were arrested when their husbands were condemned by the military college of the supreme court.

DENYSIV, A SOVIET INDUSTRIALIST

This man was charged with belonging to a Right-Bukharin organization and for damaging property. This damage was classified by the NKVD as 1. the mixing of specially prepared metal splinters in the products of the mills; 2. the mixing of rusty nails in the products of the mills; 3. the addition of ground glass to the flour, all with the object of weakening the power of the Red Army, for most of the production of the mills, the Trust of Right Bank Ukraine, *Soyuzmuka*, went to the army and 4. the wetting of the wheat before grinding.

The NKVD in making these charges rested its case upon incidents that had happened in the work of the Trust. In 1929, in peas sent to the Moscow military district, there was found in one of the sacks some metal discs. This was noted and the case closed. In 1937, when Denysiv was arrested as director of the Right Bank Trust *Soyuzmuka*, the NKVD charged that he had ordered at the metal factory *Bolshevik* in Kiev two carloads of metal filings. These he scattered around the mills of Right Bank Ukraine so as to have them mixed with the products of the mills.

In 1932 there was found a nail in the flour and this was the basis for the accusation that Denysiv had bought specially 10 tons of nails and distributed them through the mills for mixing with the products.

For the third item traces of glass found in flour in 1935 served as the basis of the charge that Denysiv had two stores in Kiev which bought used glass vessels. These were then pulverized and ground in one of the mills of Kiev and then distributed through the mills of Right Bank Ukraine.

Denysiv categorically denied these mad claims of the NKVD on the ground that they were impossible under Soviet conditions, even if he had had the desire to do them. He told the examiner that there had been individual cases with the filings, nails and glass but asked where was the rest of the material prepared for the mills. The examiner answered that it was sufficient for the investigation to note what was in the records to confirm the charges of carloads of metal filings, tons of nails and glass.

In passing the wheat through the husking machines, the grain was watered so as to wet the husk, while the kernel was left dry and firm. This made easier the separation of the husk from the kernel. The NKVD in 1931 saw in this an act of sabotage and presented it in the charges against Denysiv. He could not convince the examiner that this was demanded by the technological process of grinding and he demanded that the examiner call the Head Engineer Medvedyev and inquire as to the process. He did not know whether the NKVD did this but the charge was dropped from the accusation.

Denysiv was over fifty years old and the first days he endured firmly. He was called out more than 10 nights and beaten each night, twice so severely that the NKVD men brought him back to the cell. He endured and gave no false evidence. To compel him to speak, the examiners told him that if he continued to refuse the necessary information, they would arrest his wife. The next night, she was led through the room where he was being examined. When she was taken into another room, the examiner told him that she would be held, until he gave the necessary testimony.

The following night he was shown a letter written by his wife, who said that she had been taken to the NKVD but was then at home. She also wrote him that the NKVD had told her that her freedom depended on the conduct of her husband. Seeing the hopelessness of his position, he began to write out fanciful self-accusations of things he had never done. The final charge of each confession was the winning of members for the organization. He declared that he had had enough of this nonsense and had won over no one. They began to beat him again and he named 22 people from the mills under him, names which the examiner proposed. He had reconciled himself to his self-accusation, but when he thought of the fate of the 22 people whom he had listed in the protocol, he lost control of himself and beat his head against the radiator to end his life; he was taken to the hospital and two days later returned to the cell.

YA. SAVCHENKO, PROFESSOR OF UKRAINIAN LITERATURE

The examination of Prof. Ya. Savchenko from his entrance into the investigating prison had a different character. He was called from the

Lukyanivsky for examination 14 times and he gave none of the desired testimony. He was accused of belonging to the regional leadership of a non-existent Ukrainian Nationalist Organization with the charges based on art. 54, par. 2, 6, 8, 10 and 11. He was charged with revolt, espionage, terrorism, agitation and belonging to the organization. Prof. Savchenko categorically denied the accusations and declared that he was not a member of a Ukrainian Nationalist Organization, and knew nothing of its existence. He categorically denied all the paragraphs of the charges for he had never done the acts of which he was accused. He pointed out to the examiners that during the entire period of the Soviet regime, his works had never been regarded by official criticism as nationalistic, and therefore, he could not say what was the cause for his arrest and accusation.

The examiner informed Prof. Savchenko that he did not wish to use on him methods of physical violence and so he should confess of his own accord. The examinations for the next three nights gave no response, and then standing was called into play. Prof. Savchenko was in the office of the examiner for four days, after which he became an obedient tool in the hands of the NKVD and wrote a whole volume of testimony which was suggested to him. He came back to the cell in a semi-conscious condition and for two days spoke to no one. Only on the third day he began vaguely to remember the past examination. On the fifth day the examiner called him to sign the reworked protocol. Prof. Savchenko refused to sign on the ground that it was written while he was unconscious. He was called out two more nights, but he did not sign and so he was again forced to stand. He stood a day and a half in the office of the examiner and decided to sign the protocol to end his physical and psychic sufferings.

**MEDVID, DIRECTOR OF DEPARTMENT IN THE UKRAINIAN
COMMISSARIAT OF AGRICULTURE**

A new prisoner was brought into our cell, who like the others did not speak for two days. He was frightened and had the appearance of a psychically abnormal person. He wore boots with broken strings for his feet were swollen. On the third day he came to himself, and began to tell who he was and of what he was accused. His name was Medvid and he was chief of the village economic division of the Rada of People's Commissars of Ukraine. He said that six months after the suicide of P. Lyubenko, head of the Rada of People's Commissars of Ukraine, there had begun the arrest of the collaborators of the Radnarkom. In three days (after the arrest of Medvid) more than 70% of his subordinates were arrested. Medvid was accused of being an active member of a Ukrainian Nationalist Organization and a direct assistant of P. Lyubenko. He

was charged on art. 54, par. 2-13 inclusive. He was accused by the NKVD of organizing regiments for a revolt. The first night he was beaten so badly that he was in bed for a whole week in a cell in the Pechersky prison (the former garrison guardhouse). At his second summons he was beaten in the headquarters of the NKVD. There he was stripped naked, hung by the feet with his head down and beaten with leather whips. As a result, his skin was torn over his whole body. He categorically denied the charges brought against him, for he was not a member of a Ukrainian Nationalist Organization and had done none of the things with which he was charged. Three days later he was called to stand, and he stood 6 days, and then landed in our cell.

When he came to consciousness and was called to sign the protocol, he was frightened by the nonsense that was written. There was an incredible fantastic character in all the points of the accusation. Medvid categorically refused to sign the protocol. He was summoned by the assistant of the Narkom of Internal Affairs and Medvid told him that he would rather die in the NKVD but would not make false statements against himself. After some time he was taken from us and I do not know how his examination ended.

Engineer Grinberg worked in the engineering division of the Kiev military district. He was accused of belonging to a Trotskyist organization. He was over 50 years old, did not endure the torture and gave false denunciations on himself and his friends (including his wife). He was called to confront personally the people whom he had introduced to this organization to which he did not belong and which the NKVD had charged him with. He had one such interview with his wife who was an artist of the Ukrainian Dramatic Theatre of Ivan Franko in Kiev. His wife did not confess to the charges and so they confronted her with her husband. Being mortally afraid of the information he had confessed to in the special section, on meeting his wife, he asserted that she was a member of a Trotskyist organization and he had introduced his wife into it. After this meeting with his wife, he wept the whole time and spoke with no one although at times he came to himself and consoled himself by the fact that his wife knew why he had accused himself and the others.

THE POLISH KOMSOMOL GORCZYLO

Along with the citizens of the USSR, there was in my cell in the prison a Polish komsomol Gorczylo, who had been persecuted by the Polish police and had fled to the USSR. He crossed the border in the region of Yarunya and went to a guard post. There he showed his card as a komsomol and said that he had fled from Poland. The guard took his card and sent him to the Lukyanivsky prison where I saw him. The

NKVD accused him of being a Polish spy with a komsomol card in his pocket. He categorically denied this, but when they beat him for two weeks, he wrote that he had crossed the border with the object of espionage for Poland. He was condemned by a military tribunal and given 15 years of imprisonment in distant camps.

Along with people who even under the Soviet draconian laws had committed no crimes but had landed in the prison, I met there in the Kievan prisons two men who had knowingly acted against the Communist regime.

THE YOUNG UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST TSEHELKY AND HIS UNSUCCESSFUL PLANS

Tsehelsky, a seventeen year old fellow in the art department of the Kiev film studio, on the eve of the celebration of May 1, 1937 prepared an attack on P. Lyubchenko, a traitor to the Ukrainian people and the then head of the Rada of People's Commissars of Ukraine. At night between April 30 and May 1, the NKVD arrested the participants in the plot. All immediately confessed what they intended to do, and their case was considered by an army tribunal on August 17, 1937. They were given 10 years of imprisonment and moved into the corridor for deportation.

On September 2, 1937, Tsehelsky was returned to the investigating section and called before the examiner. The latter did not tell him what had happened to P. Lyubchenko, but began to accuse him of having deceived the examiners, because he had planned to kill not P. Lyubchenko, but the General Secretary of the Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, S. Kosior. Tsehelsky categorically denied this. They began to beat him for a stretch of three nights and he wrote thereupon the false accusation that he had planned to kill Kosior. At the end of November, 1937, Tsehelsky was again called before the examiner and the latter proposed that he rewrite the protocol and replace the name of Kosior with "the leaders of the party and government." When he had been told to replace Lyubchenko with Kosior, he had learned from newly arrested prisoners that Lyubchenko had shot himself and so, when he was told to cross out the name of Kosior, he and the whole cell guessed that Kosior, as General Secretary of the TsK VKP/b, and a member of the the Politburo of the TsK VKP/b, the dictator of Ukraine, had probably been declared an enemy of the people and was in prison. And so it turned out.

THE JANITOR NIZHAKIVSKY

In 1937, the Communists celebrated the 20th anniversary of their seizure of power. All institutions and enterprises prepared something for this celebration as a gift. On November 7, 1937, Nyzhakivsky, a

janitor of a building in Kiev, while it was still dark, put a torn set of underwear on the rails of the trolley with a note saying "As a gift to the 20th anniversary of October." When it grew light, and the people began to go to the demonstration, they found this underwear with the note. The NKVD was called and before evening they discovered the author from the writing. Without a beating, at the first questions of the examiner, Nyzhakivsky confessed that he had done it so that the demonstrators would not forget what rags the happy citizens were wearing at the twentieth celebration of October. He told the examiner that the radio and press were blaring out the great achievements of the USSR while many people did not have ordinary linen, because they had no money with which to buy it. He came to prison in a cloak which had been secured by his grandfather. This had been reseeded five times. Its surface was riddled with holes but it had the appearance of good material, while the Soviet products after 2—3 months looked like rags.

In 1937 I met in prison, in the deportation stations and camps thousands of persons accused of the so-called counter-revolution but only these two had done something which possibly deserved punishment; the others were completely innocent people, like those whom I have described in this article, and who were the victims of the bloody, unintelligent, diseased terror of Stalin. In further sketches, I will tell typical episodes of the charges against hundreds of thousands of prisoners, whom I met in the Siberian camps and of their life and existence in these camps of death.



DEPTH OF SOUL OR DOCTRINAIRE FANATICISM

(On the margin of the publication of "*Der dialektische Materialismus, seine Geschichte und sein System in der Sowjetunion*. Gustav A. Wetter. Wien, 1952. Herder Verlag I—XII, 647).

By NICHOLAS D. CHUBATY

Despite the studies made in special institutes throughout the world, the Soviet Union is still a sphinx for most people, who have not lived under that strange state form. It is no easy task to explain the secret of the success of the Soviet system.

In this book Gustav A. Wetter, a professor in the papal Oriental Institute in Rome, has attempted to explain the Soviet system from the standpoint of a philosopher who finds it to be the result of Soviet philosophy. His work was originally published in Italian but then it was translated into German and published in Vienna by Herder-Verlag.

The work is unusually substantial and is well within the good tradition of European university handbooks. The author indicates as the original source of Marxism the philosophy of Hegel, Feuerbach and finally of Marx and Engels. At the same time Russia had its own leftist predecessors of the Bolsheviks — the nihilists and populists. The original German Marxism soon found in Russia a long series of adherents as Plekhanov, Struve, Ziber, Bohdan Kystyakovsky and many others. The author considers them all as Russians, although the last two were of Ukrainian birth. It was not long afterwards when Marxism acquired a concrete form by the formation of the Russian Social Democratic Workman's Party in Minsk in 1896.

Then began the differentiation of the Russian Marxists, some of whom remained loyal to materialism and rejected religion as Lunacharsky and Gorky who spoke of *the creation of god*; the others placed religion at the centre of Marxism as *the God-seekers*, Bulgakov, Merezhkovsky, and Berdyayev. Some wanted to realize Marxian socialism through evolution — the Mensheviks, Struve, Kystyakovsky and Ziber, while the Bolsheviks Plekhanov, Bukharin, Stalin and others wished to achieve it through proletarian revolution. The formal split between the two wings came in London in 1903. The Bolsheviks accepted the purely Russian explanation of the empyriomonism of Bogdanov and then Lenin emphasized

the practical plan of a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Bolshevism accepted dialectical materialism as its philosophy, and adapted it to the needs of the Russian soul. The conception of truth in dialectic materialism is regulated by social life, and so every scientific study of Bolshevism must be partisan. It is in fact a denial of all science and of objective truth and even of philosophy itself.

Lenin connected Western European Marxism with the old Russian mysticism of the Slavophiles and artificially imbedded Russian nationalism in the frame of formal internationalism.

Prof. Wetter reviews one after the other the philosophical streams within Russian Marxism during the period of the Soviet government down to our own times, including the philosophy of Aleksandrov which has been criticized recently. He gives a broad review of the "philosophy" of Stalin and asserts that this final phase of Russian Marxism, i. e. Bolshevism, is a theology and a religion without God.

In dealing with the history of Russian Marxism as a historical system, the author sets out in Part II the system of Soviet philosophy in his chapters on the Bolshevik Conception of Philosophy, Dialectic Materialism and Natural Sciences. Finally he unrolls the principles of Soviet Dialectic Materialism.

The book contains a great mass of collected material and is a definite guide to the theoretical side of Bolshevism and its application to practical life. *The author convincingly shows how Western European Marxism poured into the old Russian Messianism since the time of the Russian Slavophiles and became a truly Russian doctrine.* This section the author has written with a great knowledge of both German and Russian philosophy, and it is the most valuable part of the work, for the problem as to the national character of the present Bolshevism is of great practical importance. The author supports his theoretical conclusions with analogous opinions of such Russian philosophers as Berdyaev, Struve, etc. who like Prof. Wetter have come to believe that Bolshevism is a product of the Russian spirit.

As a professional philosopher, the author approaches all the phenomena of Bolshevism from the point of view of a philosopher and shows how they are the products of Soviet Marxism, which can be explained by materialistic dialectics. Perhaps he is even inclined too often to see philosophy where it does not exist and where there is only the Russian Soviet tendency to cover practical imperialism with a philosophical doctrine.

Prof. Wetter expresses the view that in some ways Soviet dialectic materialism is similar to the Christian philosophy. Yet the similarity is confined only to the one fact that the Christian philosophy and the Rus-

sian dialectic materialism are partisan concerning their final results. Christian philosophy likewise had definite conclusions ready. Except for this it is a purely illusory similarity. The Christian philosophy bases its predetermined results on faith in the supreme authority of God, which it accepts with reason and faith. Bolshevism does not have such an authority and therefore the pronouncements of Stalin on subjects of which he had no knowledge are accepted with the same authority as that of God.

Moreover every philosophical system provides a basis for philosophical ethics. These may be strange and even contrary to natural truth, but they are still principles. Bolshevism has no ethical principles except materialistic ethics, and that is ethical which is good for the party. This is a total denial of all ethics, for it is the ethics of the bandit, who thinks that in a given situation it is a good thing for him to kill. This is not philosophy but the perverse practice of life.

In the asceticism of the Russian nihilists, and the fanaticism of the Russian Bolsheviks the author sees their nearness to the moral purity of the ascetics of the Christian East. Similarly some blinded Christians of the West looking at their positive purity, their power of soul consider them "Idealisten der Erde" and believe that they could even revive Christianity, if Russia were converted. No one denies that there does exist in the Russians a fanaticism and a readiness to sacrifice themselves for some doctrine, but it is not for the good of their neighbor, their brother.

The realization of Communism as a system for the good of millions by basing it on the corpses of millions and the denial of their human value and sufferings of their souls is as far from Christian ascetic altruism as heaven from earth. The enthusiasm of some Westerners for Russian fanaticism and asceticism in reality only testifies to the lack of a depth of spirit in the west and not to its existence in Russia.

This same depth of spirit in Russian Communism is what attracted the American liberal snobs who became Communists or fellow-travelers and they ignored the most brutal acts perpetrated upon millions of Russians and still more non-Russians. Some Catholics of the West have been fascinated by this imaginary depth of the Russian spirit and they have even not seen the crimes perpetrated by the Tsarist Russia and Red Russia against their Eastern rite Catholic brothers in former Russia and in the Soviet sphere of influence as well; they hence tend to overlook them.

In saying this I wish to emphasize that Prof. Wetter does not have this blindness for Russian Bolshevism, but in some passages he does express sympathy for the asceticism and willingness to sacrifice of the Russian Communists and Marxists. He overlooks the fact that this depth of spirit and altruism for the general cause of millions and not for any imagined and partially evil doctrine as in Russian Communism can be

found today in still more noble forms among other Slavic peoples, in the efforts at the national liberation of the peoples enslaved by Moscow.

This ignoring of their personal good and the acceptance of the ascetic life for the liberation of millions we find in Ukraine, in Poland, Lithuania and the other peoples of Eastern Europe. There the revolutionists for dozens of years have sacrificed and are still sacrificing their lives so as to secure a better free life without spiritual and material oppression for millions even at the price of their own deaths. It is a pity that the Western world pays so little attention to the existence of the underground Catholic Church in the catacombs of the Soviet Ukraine and knows so little of the daily life of the Ukrainian underground. There thousands of young people have gone voluntarily and knowingly to death and have ignored their own happiness, their lives and through unexampled asceticism so as to secure the free life of free men for others.

These patriots, who are struggling for the liberation of their people on the principle of "Contra Spem Spero" during World War II at the same time carried on the struggle against the Nazis and the Communists in the name of the ideal expressed in the Holy Scriptures: "There is no greater love than that a man lay down his life for his friends." Is not this the true depth of spirit, and power of soul, for which Western Christian thought is longing and seeking?

Prof. Wetter ascribes these qualities of the Russian leftists to the fact that many of the leftist Russian leaders were reared in religious homes as children of priests and in the religious seminaries of Russia. We doubt that this indeed was the cause of fanaticism and the asceticism of Russian leftist circles. A married priesthood (Catholic and Orthodox) exists also in Ukraine. The families of the priests have played an important role in the cultural and social life of the community, and have produced many intellectuals, but in Ukraine for instance we cannot ascribe any special merit to these homes in the development of greater altruism and greater consecration to the general cause among the children of the priests than to the children of secular homes, usually simple peasants.

In ending this review of the book of Wetter, we emphasize again that it is an excellent encyclopedia of Russian Bolshevism written by a philosopher who has secured full information on the published materials about Russian Communism and the spiritual and literary currents among the Russian Communists and Marxists. Yet no one can learn from this book the actual Russian Bolshevism, for that cannot be learned even from a book as substantial as that of Prof. Wetter. Russian Bolshevism can only be learned in Soviet reality or at least on its borders.

BOOK REVIEWS

(See also Book reviewing article "*Depth of Soul or Doctrinaire Fanaticism.*" — Ed.)

CONTAINMENT OR LIBERATION? An inquiry into the aims of United States Foreign Policy by James Burnham. New York, The John Day Co., 1953.

After observing what American journalism is still writing about the Soviets and their satellites, we must again affirm that there are few real students of Soviet reality in America and these are primarily people who have once themselves been near to the Communists or by their own intelligence have mastered the method of thought and action of the Bolshevik world.

These thoughts are suggested by the book of James Burnham *Containment or Liberation?* There is no doubt that this is one of the deepest American books on Russian Bolshevism and its danger to America, which has appeared in the American political literature of the past 15 years. It shows not only penetration into the depths of the Bolshevik world but, what is still more important, a realization of the danger which threatens America and an understanding of the means of protecting America and the rest of the Western civilized world from a total flooding by eastern barbarism. Burnham's book is written in the heart's blood of an American patriot, who like Cassandra is warning his fellow citizens of danger, before it is too late. An East European intelligent person, who has spent some part of his life in the shadow of the Bolshevik empire, can only be amazed how an American could secure such a deep knowledge of the Bolshevik world.

And yet on reading the reviews of this book at that of Joseph S. Harsch in the *New York Times* he involuntarily has gloomy thoughts about the future of America which has been so little informed by journalists badly oriented in the questions of the USSR. Therefore it is very important for American statesmen, journalists and authors to read Burnham's book and study some sections as a guide to the understanding of the USSR.

The first part of the book gives a basic criticism of the hitherto dominating official policy of America toward Bolshevism, the Policy of Containment and shows that this was indeed the first attempt to define American policy but that it was totally unrewarding, for it was based upon a total ignorance of the dynamics of Bolshevism. This policy gave the Bolsheviks five full years of respite to strengthen and broaden their control of the satellite states and finally to communize China.

In analyzing the previous foreign policy of America, the author considers American strategy in Western Europe, the Far East and Eastern Europe. He shows at times unhealthy rivalry among our armed forces on land, on sea and in the air. Prof. Burnham is convinced that both the American strategic policies in Western Europe and the Far East are necessary but that there is a complete lack of an American strategic policy on the chief front, i. e. in Eastern Europe. He declares himself for the primacy of the air force of America but he regards as the main arm one in which America is completely lacking, the political struggle with the Communist Russian world.

The policy of East European strategy although it is most important, for it is aimed at the very source of Soviet power, has been totally neglected, thanks to

the policy of containment, despite its enormous possibilities. First America has the technical superiority but it has left the superiority in the political struggle to the USSR, although America could exploit all the hitherto unused weaknesses of the Bolsheviks to its own advantage.

Besides, the Soviet Union suffers from great weaknesses because of its class and national conflict. The non-Russian peoples are the natural allies of America but these allies of America have not only not been used but have even been repelled by the policy of containment.

America must pass from a passive to an active role and activate all the anti-Bolshevik forces of the satellite states and the peoples within the USSR, first the Ukrainians. It should organize anti-Bolshevik legions of the enslaved peoples and in case of a conflict create behind the Bolshevik front new fronts in Poland, Ukraine, etc.

Before all kinds of arms, America must give the first place to the political struggle with Bolshevism. In this field it has made basic errors for it has cultivated the theory that Communism was the product of the need of the undeveloped countries. The author quotes facts to show that this is not so. Communism in the whole world is the work of a definitely transplanted conspiracy guided from Moscow, which uses the indecision of the governments of the individual states and advances slogans which can stir up the masses in a given time and a given country. In full detail the author gives the plan for such a political struggle and it is only surprising how a critic of this book can ask "How is it to be done?" The book gives a full answer.

The author sets forth his plan for a Policy of Liberation. *First America must decidedly and without any reservations proclaim its political goal toward the Bolsheviks, i. e. declare that it stands for the absolute and complete liberation of all peoples.* Liberation means that all peoples have full rights to state independence. This declaration must be supported by deeds as well as words. The liberation of peoples must be universal and be applied to all peoples not only in the satellite states but to the peoples of the USSR.

It is not the duty of America to interfere in what will happen after the downfall of the Bolsheviks and the dissolution of the USSR. America can only exert its influence for the free peoples to enter into a federation. Yet to gain the confidence of the peoples, such order must be proclaimed: Liberation, Independence, Voluntary Federation. The author gives special attention to the cause of the non-Russian peoples of the USSR with a knowledge which is rare in American political literature.

The policy of liberation must definitely acquire the character of a kind of crusade, for it is a question of the life or death of Western European Christian civilization — of freedom, human dignity and a free confession of faith in God.

In the opinion of the author this policy of liberation not only does not present more danger of a Third World War than did the policy of containment but even less. The Kremlin, attacked on the East European front and steadily menaced by the possibility of an explosion of the non-Russian peoples in case of war, will find it more difficult to decide upon a general war than it did under the Policy of Containment.

Burnham's book is a true revelation in American political literature. Such an understanding of the Bolshevik world can only be had by a truly intelligent person, who has passed some time in Bolshevik reality. It is the more credit to the author that though he has never lived under the Bolsheviks, yet by his study and keen observation he has succeeded in giving to the American people such

a truly realistic picture of Eastern Europe and the USSR. Without studying this book, scarcely any of the American journalists and statesmen can form a plan for an American policy toward the Bolsheviks.

N. CHUBATY.

MODERN NATIONALITIES, A Sociological Study by Florian Znaniecki. The University of Illinois Press at Urbana, 1952, pp. XXI + 196.

Prof. Znaniecki, one of the most oldest and most respected sociologists of our period, has here devoted himself to the solution of the modern nationalities problem, one of the most important and pressing problems of our time and has tried to make his work not only theoretical but also a practical guide to the regularizing of tense international relations.

On the basis of his own studies, the situation of his own Polish people and comparative studies and especially with the aid of his students who have come from four continents and 28 nationalities, he tries to solve the problem of nationality as a social and cultural phenomenon and to trace out its spiritual components. Nationality is something broader than statehood and so the author declines to accept the Western word "nation" which tends to identify nationality and a state organization.

In the first parts of the work he examines the origin of national-cultural entities. He shows that these are modern, although they do not lack older analogies but he does not connect them with the rise of industrialism, for their origin is associated with the development of those movements which are working to define the national methods and to formulate a national ideology.

In Parts (II-IV) he stresses the great importance which writers, historians, ethnographers, students, artists and economic leaders have in developing these unities and considers the "role of the social groups functioning on behalf of national culture societies."

In the remaining three parts, the author gives a critical and sociological evaluation of the chief sources of conflicts between nationalities and considers the possibility of cooperation between them. Then he shows the importance of these national cultures in the development of world culture as a prerequisite to a world society.

He considers the various forms of aggression, geographic, economic, assimilative and ideological and the tendencies of expansionism which may become aggression.

In all this he emphasizes the cultural factors which are all too often overlooked by students of the political sciences and economies. In this connection he stresses the opportunities for cooperation in the international congresses and meetings of professors and students, scientific meetings, art exhibitions, joint international research, the meetings of young people as in scout camps, and economic cooperation.

In dealing with the future, Prof. Znaniecki shows the importance of the national factor (which the Bolsheviks appreciate and use in a perverted form) and he believes that the way to a world culture is not through the reduction of national cultures but through their development, not in the suppression of nationality but in the understanding of its essence and the role that it can play in general progress, once it is properly understood.

The author answers the question raised by Prof. E. H. Carr in 1945 *Nationalism and After* and he stresses the fact that nationalism is not backwardness and not a product of the bourgeoisie as Marxian dialectics demand.

"Pro domo nostro," we are glad to say that Prof. Znaniecki in his use of the Ukrainian national question handles it objectively. For those who from good or bad motives regard the Ukrainian national aspirations as a movement of a group of intelligentsia, we wish to refer to Prof. Znaniecki's work (esp. pp. 76-77 and 136-7). The opinion of the author on the relations of Russian Communism and nationalism is also not without interest.

Among the studies of this problem of nationality, the work of Prof. Znaniecki is not only the newest but the most competent and deserves the attention not only of scientific circles but of all who are interested in the relations of nationalities and wish them to be solved in a spirit of good will.

I. VYTANOVYCH.

Waldemar Gurian. *BOLSHEVISM, AN INTRODUCTION TO SOVIET COMMUNISM*. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1952, p. 189.

It is only relatively recently that serious studies of Soviet Communism have begun to appear in America and there are still not many satisfactory works on it in English. It is therefore good that this new "introduction" has appeared, and better still that its author is Prof. W. Gurian, a recognized authority on questions connected with the Soviet Union.

The book of Prof. Gurian is divided into the following main sections: Bolshevism as Social and Political Religion, The Soviet Reality of Bolshevism, Bolshevism as World Power. There is also a long appendix which contains source material in the form of excerpts from the classical works of Marxo-Leninism and extracts from the Soviet press. The translations from the Russian were made by a research assistant, Dr. M. Pap.

The most valuable part of the book is, in our opinion, the second section which deals with the Soviet reality of Bolshevism. The author does not limit himself to a theoretical treatise on the bases of Soviet Bolshevism but on the contrary gives detail after detail in chronological order to show the tactics by which the Soviet Communist leaders acquired power and by which they have held and strengthened it. The many facts and statements made here are well-known to students, but it does no harm to have them presented in systematic form, connected with the usually wholly correct views of the author.

We must also gratefully recognize that he distinguishes the terms Muscovite, Russian and Soviet, which are often in other works used promiscuously without any real understanding of their meaning and difference. He emphasized in more than one place and carefully the meaning of *Russian* encirclement which helped the development of Bolshevism. This concerned in the past the typically Russian social institutions on the basis of which Communism more easily developed on the territory of basic Russia and the recent past, and the time of the attempts at liberation of the peoples enslaved by tsarist Russia, efforts also directed against Communism. He asserts that the Soviet Union from the moment of its foundation at the end of 1922 was only a nominal federation but it continued in reality the concentration of power in Moscow, without respecting the definite clause of the constitution providing the right of secession of every Soviet Republic.

The book of Prof. Gurian is also valuable because it continues the development of Bolshevism to the present time and emphasizes clearly the development of Russian nationalism in the Soviets during World War II and afterwards. The constant repetition of the role of the "Great Russian people," as the "elder brother" of the other peoples living on the territory of the Soviet Union, is more and more reminiscent of the tsarist period and a contradiction of the myth of the Soviet Union as a free union of peoples with equal rights. "In recent years there has been an increased tendency to identify Soviet leadership more or less with the Great Russian people, and to stress the positive aspects of the policies of Moscow and of the Tsars who built up the Russian empire. The Soviet Union appears as its heir which overcomes its shortcomings and evils." (p. 88).

Prof. Gurian explains also the frequent tactical changes, so characteristic of Soviet Communism, but he shows that these never destroy the principle of the party monopoly. As an example of these tactical changes he cites the evolution of family legalization from conditions approximating free love in the first years after the October Revolution to the compulsory registration of marriages and then to the restrictive policy as to divorce a quarter century later. It must be emphasized that the extracts in Note 101 from Gzovsky on "de facto" material relations relate only to the RSFSR, for there were completely different laws in Ukraine. On p. 58 he mentions the abolition of the death penalty in the Soviet Union now. The complete abolition of the death penalty lasted in the Soviet in 1947 only a few months and then the death penalty was reintroduced "at the desire of the laboring masses" for "spies, diversants, etc."

The book ends with these interesting conclusions: "Anti-Bolshevism is not enough, for it selects the battlefield according to the dictates of Bolshevism. The prison built by the Bolshevik belief in the self-sufficiency of society in this world must be demolished" (p. 104).

JURIJ FEDYNSKY

SOVIETS IN CENTRAL ASIA, by W. P. and Zelda K. Coates. Philosophical Library, New York, 1951, pp. 288.

Anyone in the least familiar with the predominant non-Russian problems in the vast Soviet prison of nations can rationally and candidly draw only one possible conclusion from even a cursory reading of this work, that the authors are either hopelessly naive or undyingly loyal to the Party line, with the weight of evidence favoring the latter. Throughout the work concentrated emphasis is placed on the enormous achievements of the Soviets in this area, in terms of economic output, numbers of schools, hospitals, cinemas etc., so that the reader is supposed to leave with the favorable impression that general happiness and contentment prevail among these peoples.

The theme of this latest example of the purposeful concealment of essential fact is sounded in the very foreword to the text, as they stress, "whatever may be thought of the Soviet system, no one can deny that the Soviet national policy . . . has been an outstanding success." We are duly informed, too that "the Soviet Republics of Central Asia are intensely loyal to the Soviet Power," this in the face of the abundant evidence on mass defection and desertion in the past war. The authors bend over backwards to uphold these viewpoints by engaging in several varieties of self-legitimation which, if generally accepted, would eliminate the very *raison d'être* of our psychological warfare efforts directed really at the

most tenuous threads in the fabric of Soviet empire-building. To a discerning mind this definitely is the silent intent of the work which amidst much sentimentalized description and for different reasons occupies itself with three main objects of attack, namely the dismal tsarist past, bourgeois nationalists, and Western powers seeking to assist the preceding groups. For those acquainted with Russian history there is, of course, an abundance of truth in this volume concerning the oppressive and genocidal practices of Russian tsarism toward the conquered non-Russian nations in the empire. The Communists have always masterfully employed these truths as a basis of contrast for their own achievements and to their basic political advantage. However, it is evident that the authors are historically inept when regarding the vast expansion of Russia, they rather stupidly observe that the "tiny principality of Kiev of the 9th century had expanded before the close of the 19th century into a mighty unbroken land empire second only to the British Empire in area."

For explanation of the revolution and the period after they depend piously on the Soviet product, "The Official History of the Civil War in the USSR." As for the undying struggle of the Central Asiatic non-Russian peoples toward national independence, the authors, as one would expect, interpret it merely as a "struggle of the bourgeois nationalists who wanted a greater share in government, but were against the establishment of the Soviet Power." By and large the Turkestanian revolution for independence is treated merely as a conflict between the reactionary tsarist forces and the Bolsheviks. However, they apparently felt compelled to make some mention in the introductory historical portion of the book of the struggle of the Basmachi and the nationalist Turkestanian movement against traditional Russian imperialism. Their naivete or deceitfulness is clearly revealed by the observation that "The Feudalists, Nationalists, and Mullahs continued to exploit the native suspicions and hatred resulting from the old Russian domination, but the Bolsheviks had among others, one exceptionally effective reply — i. e. the Soviet decrees on the right to secede if the native peoples so desired." The open record which the writers cautiously sidestep shows that the Soviet Union was artificially contrived by force and conquest and that these decrees, as Stalin himself in the most unambiguous terms declared, were simply expressions of rights, not the power of their exercise.

Over thirty years of strife within the Soviet Union between the non-Russian nations and Moscow are arbitrarily discarded by these "impartial observers." Instead, contrary to overwhelming evidence, it is unabashedly stated that "Side by side with the Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians and other peoples of the Soviet Union, the Turkmenians fought against the invaders (Nazis) on all fronts from the first day of hostilities." The reader is given as Gospel truth the unqualified data that in "elections of the Supreme Soviet of Tadzhikistan in February 1947 over 99 per cent voted, and of that percentage, over 99 per cent voted for the bloc of Communists and non-Party candidates." Happiness, human bliss and overflowing prosperity are simply the order of the day and the elections, we are to assume, demonstrate this. Although the book is valuable for the sole purpose of familiarizing the average reader with the geographical details of this region, its economic resources, and to some extent the cultural background of the peoples involved, its framework is false and its interpretative elements are shamefully robotic and fatuous. Intense Soviet attacks against the peoples of this area indicate a definite fear of their nationalism and Islamic religion. The recent castigation by the party secretary for Uzbekistan, Amin Irmatovich Niyazov, of the work

of a number of Uzbek historians concerning the interpretation of Central Asiatic history is just one meager example of the persistent Russification policy being pursued by the Kremlin. Attacks upon the Uzbek poet Zulfia, the "nationalist heresy" of Kazakh writers, the "obviously bourgeois nationalist poems" of Turkmen poets etc. furnish adequate ground for a psychological strategic policy aimed at this area which, as every student knows, is of keen brotherly interest to the entire Moslem world.

Georgetown University

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

Walter Kolarz. *RUSSIA AND HER COLONIES*. London 1952. George Philip and Son Ltd. Pp. XIV + 334.

What is going to be the destiny of the present Russian empire and of the dozens of peoples subdued by it? What are the main features of Moscow as the center of both international communism and Russian imperialism? What policy should be followed by the Western world in case of political upheavels which are likely to take place in Eurasia in the future?

These are some of the issues discussed at length by the political circles of the USA and the West at the present time.

Mr. Kolarz tackles the problem of the future of the Soviet Union on the basis of a thorough analysis of its internal components, that is of the Russian and non-Russian peoples. The latter comprise over one half of the whole population of the Soviet Union, a fact often disregarded by some circles of the West. The author emphasizes the predominantly Russian character of the Bolshevik Revolution and the Communist Party, "both bound to pursue Russian aims." (p. 12). This can be gauged from official statistics on the ethnical composition of the party membership. "In 1922, when the Civil War had almost ended 79.96% or 270.409 party members were Great Russians, although their percentage of the total population at this time was 52.91%. Other nationalities which had a greater number than they were entitled to on the basis of their numerical strength in the country, were Jews (5.21%), Latvians (2.53%) and Poles (1.5%). . . The Ukrainians, the second largest nationality in the Soviet Union accounted for only 5.88% of all communists, although over 20% of the Soviet population were Ukrainians (p. 8-9).

While this was the character of the communist party from the ethnical point of view, it is not surprising that the triumph of Bolshevism on the territories of the non-Russian peoples could have been secured only by the subversive activities of Russian communists or their agents, e. g. in Central Asia by M. V. Frunze and V. V. Kuybishev, whose names were transformed into "Frunze-aka" and "Koibashi-aka" to disguise their Russian character and to please the native peoples. Similar tasks were carried out in Northern Caucasus by S. M. Kirov and in Byelorussia by the Russianized Jew L. M. Kaganovich (p. 8).

It is noteworthy that this was the typical pattern repeated with striking similarity twenty years later in the Balkan countries, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Nowadays it is evident that the Russian representatives in Rumania, Hungary, Ukraine, or other countries, no matter what their official position (ambassadors, political advisors, party or military chiefs) are actually rulers of the respective countries.

It goes without saying that such a policy must be accompanied by a ruthless terror and extermination of the native peoples. Consequently "the non-Russian peoples lost two sets of their national elite during the period stretching from the October Revolution until roughly the outbreak of the Second World War" (p. 11). Referring to the purges among the Russians themselves, the author forgets that they have never been carried out to such an extent and, what is most important, they occurred in the course of the internal struggle for power in the party, while no Russian communist has ever been shot for the idea of national independence of the Russian people.

The author does not deny the identity of the aims and methods of the Russian Communists and of the tsarist regime in the attitude toward the non-Russian peoples. Genocide is not an invention of the present rulers of the Kremlin. They are following in the footsteps of their predecessors. "It is estimated that during the rising (the unsuccessful uprising of the Central Asiatic peoples against the Russians in 1916 — M. P.) 150,000 Kirgiz were killed either by tsarist punitive expeditions or by Russian colonists... All in all about 30 per cent of the Kirgiz people perished for various reasons between 1915 and 1920" (p. 271).

However, one can not say that such a policy of genocide was condemned by the so-called progressive circles of Russian democracy. Pushkin and Lermontov wholeheartedly supported the bloody extermination of the Caucasian peoples by the tsars (p. 181).

The Ukrainian question as a question of the most numerous people of the Soviet Union, apart from the Russians, is discussed at length in the book. "Ukraine with the prominent participation of Georgia" led the main opposition against "the formation of a centralized Soviet Union as Stalin conceived it" (p. 128). The Ukrainian people always aspired for freedom and for the fulfillment of their national aspirations in an independent state. Their leaders were and have been predominantly of a Western orientation. "In this struggle Ukrainian nationalism commanded an almost inexhaustive reservoir of resistance forces. Bloodshed and terror seemed incapable of stamping out the longing for spiritual freedom. Almost every year brought the discovery of a new conspiracy, a new series of trials, a new trend in national Ukrainian deviations" (p. 131). "The purge of the Ukrainian communist party was so thorough that of the thirteen members forming the Ukrainian Politburo in April 1937, not one was left by June 1938" (p. 134).

Depicting the Ukrainian Liberation Movement during the World War II the author speaks of the UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army) as known "for its fanatical hatred of the Soviet regime and its contempt for Russians" (p. 142).

In view of this relentless Ukrainian struggle of liberation it is logical that the Ukrainian Communist Party could not represent the will of the Ukrainian people at the Fifteenth Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party in 1940. Its composition is very striking. According to *Pravda*, May 16, 1940 "only 56% of the delegates were Ukrainians. As many as 37.2% were Great Russians. 4% were Jews and 2.8% belonged to other nationalities" (p. 12).

However, in telling of the Ukrainian struggle for liberty the author remains rather cold toward the aspirations of the Ukrainian people. Though he himself has probably been a victim of a foreign imperialism, being driven out of Czechoslovakia, he falls in line with the principles of the Soviet Russian propaganda as far as the future of Ukraine is concerned. His contention that a people of over forty million, with a powerful industry, with a numerous intelligentsia, with a peasantry withstanding during the ages the oppression of foreigners, can not exist

as an independent nation, is tendentious and even contradictory to the facts delivered by the author.

This also should be said of his suggestions as to the future of other non-Russian peoples of the USSR. In his opinion the future Russian empire should after the collapse of Bolshevism comprise Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, the Moslem countries of Central Asia etc. (p. 317). Proposing to sacrifice the East European and Asiatic peoples to a total destruction by the Russian imperialism, the author, though a student of Russian affairs, seems to forget that the final aim of Russian imperialism is not the conquering of any part of Europe or Asia but of the whole world. The chapters of this book dealing with these questions, are another example of how far Russian propaganda has been able to befuddle the intellectual elite of the Western World.

MYROSLAV PROKOP.

I DREAMT REVOLUTION. By William Reswick. 328 pp. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. \$ 4.50.

Mr. William Reswick's book: "I Dreamt Revolution" is really an amazing book. Every student of the Soviet Union must read it and every American citizen who wishes to have a slight idea of Stalin's tyranny should read it.

Mr. Reswick was born in Ukraine (Starokonstantyniv is his birthplace) under Tsarist rule. He is a Jew by origin. He lived in Ukraine in his childhood. He speaks Russian and, perhaps, he knows or understands Ukrainian for in his book he quotes the Ukrainian proverb: "Big clouds, little rain". As a student he joined a Russian revolutionary movement and then, because of a danger of persecution by the Tsarist gendarmes, he left Ukraine in 1904, crossed the Russo-Austrian border illegally and came to the United States, dreaming of a revolution in Russia.

The Revolution had really come to Russia and Mr. Reswick already a lawyer in New York, went back to Ukraine as a member of the Hoover Commission to help the people struck by the famine. In Odesa, he says, "alone on a bench, I sat and recalled my childhood dreams of revolution. They were the dreams of many generations, and here was their fulfillment — this appalling nightmare on the streets of starved and dying people... and my heart wept. (pp. 33, 45).

That was in 1922. From that time until 1934 Mr. Reswick lived mostly in Moscow as a newspaper correspondent first for the Hearst agencies and then for the Associated Press. He devotes many pages to show how Stalin by his cunning methods, deceit and cruelty became a powerful dictator and the tyrant of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Reswick is not only a talented correspondent but also a keen observer and a good writer. This book proves it. His story from the very beginning to the end is very dramatic. Mr. Reswick describes his travels with Premier Rykov, his first meeting with Stalin, the life in Moscow during the NEP and during the First Five Year Plan, the forced starvation of the Ukrainian peasants during the early 30's, the Bolshevik terror and Stalin's purges. He knows the Russian mentality perfectly.

A Jewish rabbi from Tiraspol in 1927 in Ukraine told him: "Under the Tsar there would be a pogrom once in ten or twenty years. Now our whole life is a pogrom. Hardly a day goes by without arrests, deportations, or executions."

But there are shortcomings in the book. Although Mr. Reswick was born in Ukraine and lived there in his childhood and although he several times visited it he says little about the Ukrainian people and their national aspirations. He once calls Ukraine "a rural Russia." The American reader could get the impression that Ukraine in the Soviet Union is like Pennsylvania or Texas in the United States. In general Mr. Reswick does not touch the national problem in the Soviet Union. We cannot understand how such a very keen observer, could not see the persecution and russification of the peoples enslaved by Soviet Russia within the Soviet Union.

We also cannot agree with Mr. Reswick that the Soviet terror that he saw is mainly due to Stalin's cruelty. We agree rather with Mr. Edward Crankshaw, an English journalist and writer who said: "...the Soviet government is inevitably a product of the Russian people. Lenin achieved his power as the result of a minority conspiracy against an overwhelming majority; but the conditions which made that exploit possible were Russian conditions and the people who produced those conditions were Russian people." ("The Supreme Facts about the Soviet Union". *New York Times*, November 12, 1950). It is true that Stalin has twisted communism in every field. He chose the way of a militaristic and bureaucratic state which was to entrench itself through Russian nationalism and state capitalism. Unfortunately Mr. Reswick didn't see this.

V. VASYIV.



RUSSIAN MONARCHISTS AND THE WORLD DOMINATION

In order to present the views of Russian Rightists on the future Russian world-policy we acquaint our readers with the article of the well-known Russian rightist journalist V. Rudensky "Colonial Problem and Monarchical Ideology" published in *Nasha Strana*, a Russian newspaper in Argentina (Dec. 15, 1951). A translation with few unimportant omissions. — *Ed.*

One of the weakest points in the monarchical ideology is the absence of a complete system of conceptions. If we find a general agreement on all points that are intimately connected with Russia, yet the Russian monarchists have not even tried to answer a whole series of the most general questions of a historical, cultural and political character. It is natural that this absence of wholeness in our point of view weakens us in comparison with our opponents, the Marxists, for their system despite its falsity gives a definite answer to absolutely all questions.

Thus we now see that the Bolsheviki are having a tumultuous success in Asia thanks to the fact that they are exploiting the efforts of the peoples for national independence. What conception can we oppose to them in this field now and in the future?

We regard it as a very dangerous development that because of their conviction that in foreign affairs they must take a rightist position, some Russian monarchists are ready even to defend the position of the European imperialists and even come to the point of speaking about the predominance of the white race, the "white man's burden" and other nonsense of that kind.

We can say that all this has nothing in common either with the monarchical ideology or the Russian national character. The Russian man is instinctively permeated with the idea that all people are equal, without regard to the color of their skin, their stature or the shape of their eyes. In their conquests — usually undertaken for reasons of necessary self-protection — we have always hastened to give the conquered peoples equal rights with their conquerors. The fact that the native aristocracy without delay has mingled with our own, is a clear testimony to the fact that we never acknowledged any superiority of our people over others. From the monarchical point of view we can speak only of a correct or incorrect political system in a given state and the nature of the nation creating it is no of importance. *For a consistent monarchist the Negus*

of Abyssinia is ten times higher than the American President, for the Negus is a hereditary ruler, established by God and not by people, not dependent upon election and reelection; the power of the Negus is based upon the religious act of anointment, which cannot happen to any President; the Negus rules in the spirit of a great century-old tradition and by the laws of the Christian faith, and the President has no tradition and believes in nothing (except the dollar). We are completely indifferent to the purely white origin of the rulers of the USA and see in it no patent either for wisdom or honesty — Marx and Engels were both completely white.

In the case of the Negus it may be of importance that he is the head of Monophysite Abyssinia, which is very close to our own Orthodox Faith. But in essence the monarchist, respecting not only his own but foreign rulers, must look with not less respect upon the Japanese Emperor and Sultan Farouk of Egypt and the King of Siam.

We have not the slightest reason to acknowledge or defend any special right of the European peoples (specially those organized into states with a republican form of government), to overthrow native monarchies and to impose their own government on Asiatic peoples. All these peoples have in principle the right to independence, and when their state assumes the form of a monarchy we can only be pleased.

We must not believe too much the opinions of Western Europe as to its cultural superiority, especially when there is talk of its struggle with countries of age-old high culture as India and China. *Let us remember that the Europeans seriously imagine that their culture is higher than that of Russia and this can only evoke a smile from every Russian who looks at Europe.*

What role have the Europeans played in a political sense in Asia? They overthrew the Chinese monarchy — because the emperor opposed the importation of opium into China! It is hard to imagine a more worthy and noble end for any dynasty. In India and the Malayan Islands they prevented by their interference the creation of great, strong monarchies. And as a result of their greedy, selfish and shortsighted policy, we now have two republics, that is two states in a form completely alien to the continent of Asia. If the Americans did not succeed in deposing the Mikado, it was only because of the exceptional qualities of the Japanese people, who even though beaten and conquered, compelled themselves to be respected. In French Indo-China, the conquerors have only succeeded in shaking and endangering the local monarchy.

Now we are facing the fact that the Europeans are being compelled to withdraw from Asia. This process is developing swiftly and in any case, absolutely irrevocably. The British Empire is falling to pieces, after losing the pearl of its crown, India. Holland has lost Indonesia with its

countless riches; France is scarcely maintaining itself in Annam, Laos, Cambodia, and Cochin China; it is easy to foresee that the hour of the liberation of North Africa and Madagascar is not far off. The position of the whites in Africa (which is more retarded) is somewhat better than in Asia but their expulsion is there too but a matter of time. We have no reason to regret this. We can merely feel sorry that the Communists are using for their own purposes this process of national liberation and the feelings of lawful hate for their foreign oppressors.

After the annihilation of the Soviet power we must face a number of questions of an internal character; we would need time to heal our wounds, but we would still be carrying on a foreign policy. Beside purely economic and strategic conceptions, this must have political implications on a worldwide basis as has always been characteristic of Russia and of Russia only. *Other states have always been inclined to think about their narrowly egotistic and most direct interests. Because of our views which have always been broader than those of the Western nations, we can foresee that Russia in the first place will establish friendly relations with the monarchical states of Asia.*

Japan will be for us a much greater problem. Of course a healthy monarchical policy must demand an alliance with it though in the latest years we have been in a permanent conflict with it. But is this hostility necessary?

The same friendly relations as with Persia we will have to establish with the Arab kingdoms of Central Asia with whom we have no reasons to clash and with whom we can find common economic interests, and also with the states of North Africa, Morocco, Algiers, Tunis and especially Egypt. Since the Russians have here never appeared as colonizers and if they show a willingness to treat these states on an equal footing, there will scarcely be found any obstacles to friendship. We can say the same thing about the kingdoms of Indo-China.

It will be more difficult to arrange things with China. We will have all the bases for an alliance with the nationalists after their victory there, which is completely inevitable in case of the restoration of a monarchy in Russia, — but we can feel a real satisfaction only if China takes the path on which Spain is now moving, as far as we can judge, — that of a peaceful return to the monarchical regime. The establishment of the power of the Bogdykhan in the Celestial Empire and of the royal power in an independent Korea is what Russia must in principle desire, even though it should not interfere in the internal affairs of her neighbors.

Regarding the state of Philippines which has assimilated European culture and Christianity, there is unfortunately no trace left of the monarchical form of government nor conditions from which it could again arise.

This republic has every chance for further existence, if it does not become the victim of some conquest.

As regards Tibet, it is a theocracy, the rule of the Dalai-Lama, a traditional form and it must keep its special features completely undisturbed.

But without interfering in any internal affairs, Russia, probably, will declare and if necessary, show by act that it will not permit the entrance of any of the Asiatic countries into the power of the Communists and that it will be ready in such a case to support with arms in hand the lawful government, which danger threatens. *If Russia at one time bore the name — of which it should be proud — of the gendarme of Europe, it now must be ready under changed conditions to be the guardian of order and of justice also in Asia.* We can expect that such an initiative will find full sympathy in all rulers.

The haters of Russia often see her weakness and the pledge of her ruin in the fact of the presence in her of different tribes (!) which have preserved their own languages and religions. In a true presentation of facts, this must be a source not of the weakness but of the strength of the Russian Empire. All these tribes have had from ages the same rights as the Great Russians who formed the kernel of our sovereignty and they enjoy full freedom. They were — and we must strive that they will be again — devoted subjects of the Russian Emperor. *With an intelligent approach our Moslems and Buddhists could be a cultural advance guard for the people of their faiths and blood relatives outside the borders of Russia and become a tool for an unprecedented elevation of the prestige of Russia in Asia.* It will not be any more impossible than that within the borders of our Empire there have been included important centres of Eastern learning as Bukhara for the Moslems and the Monasteries of Buriat-Mongolia for the Buddhists.

It is worth while to read the memoirs of travelers and the scholarly and literary works picturing the life of Asia in the last century and the beginning of ours to become convinced how high the prestige of the White Tsar stood everywhere in it, what an instinctive tendency toward Russia existed even in places, where the Russians had never penetrated. *The peoples of Asia knew that the Russians were free from the racial pride and oppressive efforts of the Anglo-Saxons, Dutch and French.* With what terror the English in India looked at their Russian neighbors! It is enough to look at Kipling, to value this fear — which of course had some justification . . .

UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PERIODICALS

"A WEAPON FOR THE WEST," by Isaac Don Levine. Life Magazine, New York, March 23, 1953.

For an individual who as European director of the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia was responsible, along with his Russian-born twin, Eugene Lyons, for the creation of an unforgivable and exceedingly costly mess in the European counterpart of this Committee, this writer could scarcely be regarded as a reliable source of advice on the conduct of American psychological warfare. His miserable failure in this small project with a disproportionate waste of funds is the best gauge of the validity and authority of his views and preconceptions, largely derived from his Russomaniacal inculcation. These views and preconceptions which could only lead to disaster for America are repeated with full force in this article, indeed, as though the author manifested political desperation over the wholesome tendencies gaining steady ground in official American and British circles for the liberation and independence of the non Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Levine claims to have "concluded a stay of 15 months in Germany, studying the views of Soviet refugees of all backgrounds." Anyone familiar with the facts of emigre life in Germany can only conclude after reading this misleading article that either this, too, is a lie or the writer is dishonestly withholding facts that cannot be logically fitted into his distorted categories of thought and preconceived notions. Judging by the pictures accompanying the article and the so-called facts presented, the probability is that the former is true, since it is clearly evident that he must have consulted only Russian emigres, not the great numbers of non-Russian emigres and escapees from the Soviet Union.

The Kremlin must take great delight in this article and its accepted Soviet terminology. Mr. Levine has certainly pointed to the weapon for the west, a weapon of self-destruction. Obviously with the intellectually dishonest intent to obscure the real distinction between Russian and non-Russian nations and peoples in the Soviet Union, he has adopted the official communist terminology of "Homo sovieticus, the common man of the Soviet prison empire." Apparently the limits of his desperation are boundless. Contrary to facts known by our Intelligence, he makes ready use of this newly acquired terminology by endeavoring to convince the unsuspecting reader that the "Soviet man is not up in arms against the regime. There is no underground movement, no organized resistance operating inside the Soviet Union." This second part would be true had he said "ethnic Russia," for there has never been an underground movement there.

It may be true that the Russians hunger chiefly for material goods, but Mr. Levine has met with blunt experience in his dealings for the American Committee to know that this is false as concerns the non-Russian emigres from the Soviet Union. Their idealism and devotion to the very principles underlying our Great American Tradition cannot be bought with dollars, as Mr. Levine knows quite intimately, and their patriotism and struggle for the national independence

of their respective countries cannot be enshrouded by the contemptible use of "Homo sovieticus," for they aren't of that breed.

It is significant, too, that the writer adopts the Soviet line laid down two years ago by the high-ranking theoretician, Pospelov, on Western imperialistic designs "to dismember Russia". Again with crass untruthfulness, he deliberately identifies Russia with the Soviet Union, and with the skill of Soviet fabrication makes of the latter the country of the minority Soviet people. On the basis of this nonsense the brilliant observation is made that the "fear that the Western powers are interested not in liberating the Russian people but in dividing up their country has forced many a subject of the Kremlin to subordinate his hatred of despotism to national pride and patriotism." The determining fact is that no one is interested in dividing up ethnic Russia, but every democratic and liberal American is not interested in maintaining the Russian Empire for the continued enslavement of 110 million Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Turkestani, Caucasians etc. who fervently desire the independence of their respective countries. Overwhelming evidence points conclusively to the fact that this vast non-Russian area in the Soviet Union is the most vulnerable for effective psychological warfare, and, to paraphrase Mr. Levine, it is the pivotal point for the concentration of our efforts.

The integrity of this writer may be gleaned from his concluding recommendation that American policy should be aimed at liberating only the so-called satellite countries, "only if it aimed at rolling back the Soviet tide to its original boundaries." Having compromised himself on terminology, Mr. Levine suffers no disturbance in conscience to compromise himself on principle. The chief factor in the background is to maintain at all cost the territorial domain of the old Russian Empire. This suggestion, aside from its basically unprincipled character, lacks even empirical support when one considers the tremendous politico-economic integration that has been achieved by the Kremlin throughout its European domain. But guided by the past illusions of "Holy Mother Russia," our Russian-born "specialist" is not concerned with cold realities, although one would think that his experiences with the American Committee, notably in dealings with the free world emigre expression of non-Russian aspirations in the U.S.S.R., were an adequate lesson. In the light of this stand it will be interesting to know how this Committee justifies his retention as a trustee. His record of performance is enough to justify his ouster.

"SALUTE TO THE EASTERN CHURCHES," an editorial. *America*, National Catholic Magazine, New York, January 1, 1953.

Reference is made here to the issuance of the encyclical, *Orientalis Ecclesias*, at the end of last year, wherein the Holy Father expresses praise and encouragement for the Catholic martyrs in Ukraine and Bulgaria. As the editor observes, "Singled out for special mention were the Ukrainians, who form the largest single rite, with almost five million communicants. The Ukrainian bishops, the Holy Father recalled, were 'among the first in the defense of their religion to endure hardship, affliction and outrage.'" Beyond doubt, this encyclical is a great source of comfort and encouragement not only to Catholic Ukrainians but to all engaged in the fight for the liberation and independence of Ukraine where freedom of worship will become the mainstay of the reborn state.

"NOT A COUNTRY, BUT A WORLD," by Mikhail Koriakov. *New York Times Book Review*, New York, February 8, 1953.

This book review of Walter Kolarz's "Russia and Her Colonies" is another exhibit of the type of "scholarship" permitted by unknowing authorities at our

various institutions of higher learning, in this case the pathetic Russian Institute of Fordham University. The reviewer is a teacher at the Institute which is generally known to be a nest for imperialist Russian emigres. In the review of this work, significantly written by a Czech journalist residing in London, he spares no space in quoting at length the tenuous and even false conclusions arrived at by the book's author on the matter of Western psychological strategy toward the captive non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R. Imagine, propaganda for the disintegration of the Russian Empire, or looking at the other side of the coin, for the liberation and independence of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., must be avoided because it "would irritate the Great Russians and make them skeptical regarding the intentions of the Western World..." In effect, it is argued that a legal authority must not restore possessions to their rightful owners because it would only irritate the thief. The Soviet state and its undoubted ethnic Russian base has as its aim the disintegration of Western Society, and the best means of unappealing retaliation is the disintegration of this traditional menace to Western Society through the Western-oriented non-Russian nations.

"WHY THE 'GREAT RUSSIAN' STAND IS UNSUPPORTABLE?," by Reuben Darbinian. *The Armenian Review*, Summer, 1952.

In connection with the endeavors of the American Committee for the Liberation of Peoples of Russia to create a unified Anti-Bolshevik front of peoples of the U.S.S.R., the chief editor of the *Armenian Review* gives an excellent exposition of the standpoint of the non-Russian nationalities of the Soviet Union. The author refutes the assertion of Russians that the establishment of Soviet regimes in the territories of the non-Russian nationalities was accomplished by the local communists. The contrary is true. No one communist regime was tenable in the non-Russian lands of the Soviet Union and in the satellite states without the force of Russian arms.

The author clearly states that the use of terms "national majority" Russians and "national minorities" in relation to the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union is not realistic, because all 16 component republics of the U.S.S.R. possess national majorities of the population concerned and Russian national minorities. This fact is acknowledged by the Red Russians, but unfortunately not by the White Russians and their followers in the West.

Very clearly the author refutes the contention of Russian emigres comparing the Soviet Union with the U.S.A. The Soviet Union is an artificial conglomerate of old nationalities with their own territories. U.S.A. is a country developed by immigration, which grows in a nation by natural process without any violence. The article of Darbinian is concluded with an appeal to Americans not to be neutral in this matter because the right of peoples in the U.S.S.R. to be free is a natural right of the democratic mind. Liberation of the subjugated is not an anti-Russian action.

L. E. D.

Errata:

Page 15, line 20 should read: "on Nov. 20, 1917" instead: "on Nov. 20, 1919."

