

DISPATCH

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3020
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

DISPATCH SYMBOL AND NO.

EGOA-15811

TO Chief, SR

HEADQUARTERS FILE NO.

THRU: Chief, EE
INFO: KUPLUM

FROM

Chief of Station, Germany

DATE

10 October 1961

SUBJECT REDWOOD/CABEZONE/FJFASTINE/AERODYNAMIC
Status of DS-960 Debriefing

RE: "43-3" - (CHECK "X" ONE)

MARKED FOR INDEXING

NO INDEXING REQUIRED

ACTION REQUIRED

For your information

INDEXING CAN BE JUDGED
BY QUALIFIED HQ. DESK ONLY

REFERENCE(S)

- a. DIR 16009, dated 5 October 1961
- b. EGOW-2424, dated 13 September 1961

1. As requested in reference a, herewith a brief report on the progress of DS-960's debriefing and a few comments concerning his present attitude. A PIR meeting on Subject was held on 11 September 1961, and since that time he has been under interrogation for positive intelligence. Every effort is being made to expedite the PI debriefing so as to permit eventual concentration exclusively on XUCAGE-type material.

2. Along with PI debriefing, Subject has also been undergoing a steady and varied interrogation on political and propaganda topics. In accordance with DIR 08656, dated 29 August 1961, Subject has been made available to TPLINGO; he has been interviewed twice by TPLINGO Munich representatives, including a session with [] and on 11 October the Ukrainian program editor is scheduled to arrive for an interview with Subject. [] left several scripts of PECHORD's Russian programs, which Subject has critiqued in his spare time, and recently [] forwarded three tapes of PECHORD Russian Broadcasts which Subject will also review.

3. The Munich representative of QKFLOWAGE spent a day debriefing Subject on radio listening habits, audience analysis, and popular attitudes, and left questionnaires on allied topics which Subject is now engaged in answering.

4. Subject has also been partially interrogated on political topics by the ODACID unit at CABEZONE, and was requested by a representative of that unit to write an account of his views on political attitudes in the Ukraine, stressing particularly the views of youth toward the Soviet regime, Ukrainian nationalism, and the West. A copy of Subject's recent answer to that assignment is herewith attached in rough translation. It will be of interest to you not only because parts of it coincide with questions included in reference b, but because it is very revealing of Subject's attitude toward the West and Western democracy. CABEZONE plans to publish the article in the RC reports series.

5. As can be seen from the above, Subject's interrogation in both the PI and PP fields has been moving apace. Hence, to date no concentrated effort could be made to levy on Subject all the questions posed in reference b, although the literature has been given to Subject both to get his opinions thereon and to satisfy his thirst for Ukrainian, non-Communist reading material. It appears advisable to wait with the gathering of the substantive material required by some of the questions until the present diversified interrogation is completed and Subject can settle down to a serious concentration on one line of questioning and one interrogator. This might be a good moment to reconsider your earlier suggestion of sending [] to handle Subject's exploitation. The ODUNIT interrogator presently assigned to handle KUBARK's requirements for Subject is fulfilling his responsibilities admirably, but he does have other duties,

EGGA-15811

including the PI debriefing of Subject as well as other defectors; the assistance of a TDY-er with first-hand knowledge of Headquarters interests, who could devote full time to Subject's KUCAGE debriefing would definitely be of value.

6. Subject's attitude toward his own participation in any propaganda effort remains substantially as was outlined in FRAM 3280 of 25 August: he does not wish to participate in any activity, be it press conference, interview, lecturing, writing, or other, that will identify him personally with such an effort. He is willing to be debriefed and even to serve in an advisory capacity, provided his participation is kept from public view. He does not want to remain in Europe, but is anxious to resettle in FBPRIME and resume his engineering career. He concedes that he may eventually become a member of some Ukrainian organization, at which time he might be ready to make some public statements in furtherance of the interests of a free Ukraine. But he emphasizes that such activity on his part would not be guided by the interests of Western authorities. Obviously, Subject is disappointed at the reception accorded him in the West, to wit, the detention by the Austrian authorities, their failure to render him assistance, the bona fides interrogation at CARRIGNE (which appeared to him to be unnecessary probing), and the (in his view) long wait for emigration to FBPRIME. It is possible that when Subject has been successfully resettled he will lose some of his suspicions of the motives of Western authorities and will be amenable to more active participation in some kind of propaganda effort. It should be noted, however, that despite what appears to be a fear of being "manipulated" by Western authorities for their own selfish ends, Subject continues to be in good spirits, cooperative, and hard-working.

APPROVED: _____

Attachment: MEMORANDUM
As stated

Distribution:

- ✓ 1-Chief, SA w/1 cys enc.
- 1-Chief, EE w/o enc.
- 1-KUPLUM w/1 cy enc.

CONFIDENTIAL

Translation from Ukrainian

Contrary to the assertions of Soviet propaganda, the Soviet society, the Soviet people, is not homogenous or, even, consolidated. In the Soviet Union, there are many different social groups, classes, and strata. People belonging to these various groups differ from one another in their way of thinking and in their attitudes towards various events.

It is only natural that, even though I may know and understand the thoughts and ideas of various people, my knowledge about the thoughts of all these groups is rather limited. My personal views generally agree with the views of those young Ukrainian intelligentsia who show an active interest in political and economical life and treat critically the (Communist) Party ideology.

I could not say that such people constitute the majority. No, the majority of people are not interested in politics. Not because politics are uninteresting, but, rather, because interest in politics is impractical. This attitude is understandable, because a person whose horizon is limited by every-day problems is not interested in the advantages and shortcomings of the existing regime. Regardless whether it is good or bad, one has to live with it.

In order to be interested in politics one has to be, at least to a certain degree, an idealist. I can state positively that among my generation there are many "idealists" who are critical of Communism and there are no "idealistic" communists who actually believe in its teachings and are loyal to its theories.

I used the term "idealistic" (Communists) because with this term our youth refers to those who pretend that they believe in Communism and that they believe in Communism and that they are willing to fight for its ideals. Such people are usually secretaries and active members of Komsomol who by these means start their Party careers.

I knew personally such "idealistic" communists and I know that they understand perfectly the essentials of the present Soviet regime. They are by no means "blind." They simply feel that this is the best and the smartest way to adapt themselves to the circumstances. Such people never have any definite opinions about political events. Their personal opinions they only share with their closest friends. Their public opinions always reflect the latest Party directives. Parenthetically, in private life many of such people are very decent and worthy of respect.

Only among the critically thinking youth can one meet the real idealists, idealists without the quotation marks. It is the opinions and ideals of such people that I shall try to explain.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-2-

I. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Every Soviet student, regardless of specialization, has to learn such subjects as basic Marxism, dialectic and historical materialism, and political economy. The extent of study depends upon individual inclinations, but they all have to learn it. Now I would like to discuss the extent of criticism with which our youth regards socialism and communism.

The philosophy of dialectic materialism is undoubtedly correct and it accurately reflects the laws of our world. This philosophy could be compared with arms. The fact that these arms are presently in the hands of the CPSU (Communist Party of Soviet Union) does not mean also that the arms are vicious. On the contrary, only on the basis of dialectic materialism can one most successfully destroy the communist ideology. This ideological fight should not be understood as a fight for different interpretation of the dogma, a different interpretation of the "Bible."

When a scientist investigates the laws of nature, he makes various hypotheses which are correct only under certain conditions, within certain limits, and only for a certain part of the phenomenon. As he probes deeper into the property of the matter, he is forced to gradually change, extend, make more precise his original hypotheses without changing his basic, his philosophical view of the matter. Analogous to this, if we want to understand correctly the mechanism and tendencies of the social structure of the contemporary society, we should not try to "squeeze" our knowledge into the frame of a dogma. We must, however, have some definite basis and be governed by some definite philosophical thoughts. The dialectic materialism, with its presentation of the constantly developing material world, provides us with such a philosophical basis.

Whether the communists, the CPSU, are the true followers of this philosophy is a different question. In the environment where there is a lack of freedom of thought, in the environment of dictatorship, in this suffocating atmosphere, even the most fertile and noble soil will produce poisonous plants and molds. I shall not try to discuss in detail a direct critique of the communist ideology; it is a serious subject and requires a separate study. I only wish to comment that the idea of "communism" as a social order is contradictory to the essence of dialectics, because this idea means a definite end to further developments and progress. There is not even one communist who could answer the question, "what will come after communism?" Communism can exist only among absolute idealists. History shows, however, that the number of such people does not increase with the time. Christianity, with its teaching of love, mercy, etc., tried to make people idealistic, but failed. Neither Christianity, with its preaching and inquisition, nor Communism, with its idealistic teachings, executions, and concentration camps, have achieved their goals.

CONFIDENTIAL

The present Soviet political economy attempts to prove that the social order now prevailing in the USSR is the very socialism (the first stage of communism) that the working class strived to achieve. Every educated person knows that it is not so, or, rather, that it is completely opposite. When one studies and compares the economy of the classical capitalism (according to Marx) with the Soviet economic structure, he can clearly see that what we now have in the USSR is nothing but a certain type of capitalism which consolidated in the hands of a single monopoly both political and economic power. Lenin mentioned in his works about the possibility of such a social order. But now, when we look at the results of his and his party's work, we can illustrate the irrelevance of his laws by using his own examples. Lenin was apparently an honest man and actually believed that he was laying the corner stones for socialism. Instead, however, his party gave birth to a new class of exploiters, a hierarchical apparatus of monopoly.

What about socialism, however? Since Marx, "capitalism" has changed, apparently. Judging from these changes, one can really see that socialism will follow capitalism. (Shares, growing role of the government, that is of society, in governing the economy.)

The historic role of the social order presently prevailing in the USSR was obviously limited to the preparation of the ground, despite the personal desires of the dictators, for a free society which will be socialistic not just in propaganda but also in reality.

I also would like to mention the merits of the present order: industrialization, achievements in the economic field, and the current slogan "to pass and surpass the USA." These problems should have been solved - and they will be solved - by a new regime if it existed - and it will exist - in Russia and the Ukraine after the dictatorship.

Generally, the Party (communist) regime has solved the industrialization problem, even though at a very dear price. Millions of human lives, long years of poverty suffered by many classes of people, and the present rather low living standards, this is the price of industrialization. What is done is done, however. This is not a literary work, thus poetry is perhaps out of place; I do wish to quote our poetess Lesya Ukrainka, who in one of her poems describes her impressions of the Egyptian pyramids. She said that the pyramids are a monument not to the Pharaohs, but to the people, for it was the people who built them. In her poem a pyramid stone said, "I was created by the oppressed people." Our nations, especially Ukrainians, paid for the industrialization with their sweat and blood. The main task of any new form of government in any of the (Soviet) republics is to further develop the independent economy of its respective homeland. If we were to accuse the present Ukrainian "government" of treason, we would base our primary accusation on the fact that, being a branch of the Moscow Government, it never took into consideration the interests of the Ukraine.

CONFIDENTIAL

-4-

The main task of an opposition, if we were to assume the possibility of its organization, should be a rapid development of the country and improvement of the standard of life. The strongest accusation of the communist regime lies in its inability to develop, or to improve, the productivity of labor. Ideological upbringing, in which the communist oligarchs were, and are still, setting so many hopes, did not bring the desired results. They are trying to improve the labor productivity of the Soviet worker by means of udarniki (very efficient workers), stalhanovtzy (the most efficient workers), socialist competitions, and brigady (teams) of communist labor. To date, however, the productivity of labor still depends upon and is motivated by the material interest of the working class and by proper (work) organization.

The new class of exploiters had enough time to learn to defend its interests, but they become less and less capable of defending the interests of all people. Party and Soviet (government) officials of higher levels have in the USSR a special system of service (accommodation) and supply, special stores, ateliers, etc. A great variety of food and consumer goods, usually unavailable in normal stores, are always available in these special stores at lower than normal prices. When Khrushchev mentioned the first sprouts of Communism, he probably meant this; the communists do get everything determined by their needs. The working class, however, has to work "by ability," listen to their (communist) preachings, and participate in "socialist competitions."

The mechanism used by the CPSU to pump out the national resources, or to put it more bluntly to rob the people, is a rather curious one. The main part of the USSR budget is not obtained from direct taxation. Very soon the taxation will be abolished altogether. According to (Soviet) propaganda, the budget is being supplied by the interests of the state establishments. If one should carefully inspect this system of taxation, he will see that it is based on interests derived from the so-called taxation of working capital of the II category (I think) establishments, that is from establishments producing consumer goods; as far as I remember, the I category is assigned to establishments producing capital goods. This taxation of the working capital is actually an indirect (hidden) tax on various goods bought by the general population. The system was invented and put into practice by Napoleon and his minister of finances Goden (?). The hidden tax does not create any problems between the tax collector and the payer. The tax payer does not even notice this hidden tax when he buys something. And the products will always be sold out in the USSR, because the (Soviet) monopolism does not tolerate competition. This tax collection system is especially heavily felt by the lower, least provided for, social classes of the (Soviet) population. Items of first necessity are assigned the highest taxes. Normally, this type of tax may be 100 and more percent of the actual production price. The luxury items, however, which are rather expensive anyway, may have rather low taxes. When one compares two different monthly salaries, for example

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-5-

A. 100 rubles and B. 200 rubles, he cannot rightfully say, therefore, that B. gets twice as much as A. Actually, B. gets three-to-four times more than A. With higher wages this difference is even greater.

At the end of this chapter dedicated to the interior policies of the USSR, I wish to point out some of the inconsistencies committed by Western propaganda.

First of all, the religious questions. It seems to me that it is a complete absurdity to preach love thy neighbor, humility, etc., to people who were brought up in Soviet reality, especially to people who were brought up in the Soviet Ukraine. Ukraine is a rather well-developed country and its population is generally made up not of savages, but of people who respect the law and human morals. Concerning universal love of people, it is very difficult to love communists and it is very difficult to be humble to them and forgive them. We are forced to do all this, but do you want us to believe that it is right?

The second question is a comparative appraisal of capitalism and communism. Socialism does not yet exist in the USSR, but the idea of socialism is not forgotten. Both farmers and workers strive to attain just socialism and they will not support someone who would want to turn history backwards. Products, factories, soil, and other means of production must belong to all the people of a country. Presently, this is not so; presently, the owners are the new class, the Party members. Justice will triumph, however, and our countries will become free, will become socialist. Capitalism will never be allowed to return to the Ukraine.

II. NATIONAL QUESTION

The national question in the Ukraine was solved, from the point of view of its Russian masters, in favor of Russia. The establishment of an independent Ukraine was defeated during the civil war of 1917-1920. The Ukrainian Communist Party, recruited from that part of the Ukrainian intelligentsia and working classes which supported the bolsheviks, was physically destroyed and partly infiltrated in 1929-1937. Ukrainian farmers were purged and destroyed (as a class) during the tragic 1933. During the same period was purged the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the eastern Ukraine and in 1946-1948 of the western Ukraine. Presently, the Russian language prevails in the Ukrainian cities and in the offices and industrial establishments. In schools, the Ukrainian youth do not learn the history of their homeland; instead they have to learn Russian history and the Russian language. Higher (college level) technical and specialized education can only be received in the Russian language. Ukrainians are serving in the Russian army. In the Ukraine, the Russians (unofficially) do not even hide their contempt towards the language of the people on whose territory they live; for them it is a plebeian language, the language of a lower, oppressed people.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-6-

What, then, forces the Soviet Government to preserve some attributes of the Ukrainian State? The flag, the national anthem, (Ukrainian) theaters and signs on the stores, radio and television, Ukrainian newspapers, (required) knowledge of the Ukrainian language by officials who have to maintain contact with people, what is the reason for all this? Is it just a screen created for the benefit of foreigners?

No, no matter how terribly they destroyed the Ukraine, the Ukraine cannot be ignored, they cannot openly suppress the feeling of national dignity. The Russification program led by the Russian Government is being realized in a very delicate and carefully calculated way. Both Ukrainians and Russians have equal rights to pursue a career in military, political, administrative, or scientific fields. The only thing that a Ukrainian has to do to have this right is to adopt Russian culture and become a Russian, even if in his passport his nationality continues to be shown as Ukrainian. He can still be a Ukrainian at home or among his friends, however, what is there to complain about? Here is a typical example. During a certain period the Russians liked to "patent" old inventions. It turned out that the steam engine was invented not by Watt, but by Polzunov, the locomotive was invented not by Stevens, but by Cherepanov, etc. The pupils during this period had to re-learn the entire technical history. I remember some typical chapter titles in our text book: Russia, Homeland (originator) of the Steam Engine; Russia, Homeland of Radio, etc. And in the Ukrainian schools, with Ukrainian language of instructions, the pupils had to memorize all this in the original, conceitedly patriotic, Russian language. In Ukrainian, the phrase "our homeland (native) Russian invention..." makes as much sense as "dry water" would make in Russian. The Ukrainians are being constantly, but inconspicuously, fed the idea that there is no difference between the Ukraine and Russia. Ukrainian patriotism, even the most basic and human love of the homeland, may always be misconceived as a demonstration of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism," and woe to anyone who is suspected of such a nationalism.

A different culture or language alone, however, do not constitute a national feeling. The Russians understand this very well, and that is why there are in the Ukraine numerous amateur and professional national ensembles (choirs and dance groups), theaters, publishing houses, etc., which are preserving the Ukrainian national culture, "national in form, and socialist in content."

The vitality of the Ukrainian national consciousness lies in realization and understanding of the essence of national interests and, especially, of national economic interests. It is very clear to all, to half-educated farmers, to workers, to the intelligentsia, that were Ukraine an independent country, it would have been one of the world's richest countries. It is just as clear, however, that this possibility is very far from reality. This is the very reason for the interest of the Ukrainian youth, especially the young intelligentsia, in the Ukraine, its culture, its past, its present, and its future.

I shall not take time now to describe how Russia, Moscow, is exploiting the Ukraine, or how important is the Ukraine and its resources presently

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-7-

and how important it was during the industrialization period. Unfortunately, I do not have the exact figures of how many millions of tons of steel, sugar, and grain, how many millions of laborers were sent (from the Ukraine) to Russia and Siberia. Even the exact figures, however, would not reflect the actual losses. The millions of human lives lost in 1933 alone cannot be returned with any figures, with any money.

It would be very difficult to figure out the harm done by lowering the production efficiency in Ukraine and Russia. Were there a border between the Ukraine and Russia, the Russians would have to buy everything they need from the Ukraine. In such a case they would have been forced to create some means of exchange, they would have been forced to earn these means, and it would have been profitable and useful also for them. Presently, however, they can have everything gratis, thus there is no reason to improve the work. Also, the Ukrainians are losing their aspiration to work better, because they know that all their achievements will be taken away by their Russian brothers.

Naturally, I rather over-simplified the last example, but its general essence is still correct. Parenthetically, despite all this the standards of life are higher in the Ukraine (in the rural areas) than that of Russia.

Involuntarily, I find some analogy between Russia and Spain of the XVI-XVII centuries. After plundering numerous territories (countries) Spain had at its disposal seemingly inexhaustible riches. Later, however, when the western countries developed trade and industry, the colonies became independent and Spain ended by being a very poor country. This could probably be explained by the fact that Spaniards never had to learn to work.

The Scandinavian countries, on the other hand, whose climate and natural resources are similar to those of central Russia, managed during the last hundred years to achieve much higher living standards than Russia, which is so proud of the fact that its territory constitutes 1/6 of the world's dry land.

The essence of the border between the Ukraine and Russia lies undoubtedly not in a customs barrier, but a barrier which will be able to save the Ukraine from Russian coercion and plundering.

The secret of the success of England, which at a certain time managed 1/4 of the world to transform into its colonies and to plunder them, lies perhaps in the fact that during the English rule the trade element prevailed over that of plunder. This fact made the fate of Spain so much different from that of England.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-8-

Russia always strived to utilize the Ukraine also as a market for its products. I do not know about the tsarist times, but presently it is being done artificially. An example of this is the auto industry. Could not Ukraine with its material and technical bases create an automobile equal to that of world-market requirements? Of course, it could. But the Ukraine is forced to buy products of the Moscow, Yaroslavl, Gorkiy, and other plants. And the reason for that is a simple fact that the master in Kiev is Russia. Were there between the Ukraine and Russia a border, the Ukrainian automobiles would have forced out all other automobiles on all markets east of the Baltic sea and Carpathian mountains. There are numerous other similar examples.

Because of its national policy, the present regime hinders economic development also in other countries of the USSR, because everything I have said before also applied to the other republics. In all cities, towns, villages, and in all corners of my homeland, people, some of them through intuition, know and understand these facts.

Only people who do not realize the power of a totalitarian regime will not understand why Ukrainians cannot openly demonstrate the feeling of national unity. There is no crime punishable more strictly than for being a "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist."

Due credit must be given to the Russian workers, as well as the Ukrainian or Byelorussian workers, who have never shown dislike of their comrades simply because they were of a different nationality. In the Ukraine, a Russian worker does not differ in any way from his Ukrainian counterpart; they are both earning their bread honestly and have no reasons for a feud. I knew some Russians who, when asked about their nationality, used to say they were Ukrainians of Russian extraction; of Russian origin, but Ukrainian nationality.

Only the petty bourgeoisie attribute much importance to national origin. Such Russians openly show their contempt to everything Ukrainian, and Ukrainians of this class strive to become Russians as soon as possible; they send their children to Russian schools and sometimes even change their nationality in their documents (passports).

The essence of the Ukrainian national movement of liberation must be based not on national contrasts, but on understanding of the expediency of the separation of these two countries, Russia and the Ukraine. Naturally, the Ukrainian feeling of unity (Ukrainian self-determination) is not limited to such an understanding. The glorious pages of our (Ukrainian) people's struggles for freedom give this feeling (self-determination) an emotional base. That is why Ukrainian history is being ardently kept a secret from the Ukrainian people, Ukrainian youth. I remember with what tremendous interest were read a few fragmentary editions

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-9-

dealing with Ukrainian history which were passed from hand to hand. I remember how Ukrainian youth had to read the scanty Soviet official publications dealing with Ukrainian history, where between the falsified lines they found some truth about their homeland.

I doubt whether now, in the twentieth century, there is any literature which could affect the reader as much as publications dealing with events of the Ukrainian past of hundreds of years ago. I doubt whether any other literature dedicated to the past would be as essential as that of the Ukrainian past. I doubt whether any other literature is being persecuted as fiercely.

III. ABOUT THE CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

First I would like to discuss briefly the attitude of my countrymen to Americans, America, and the Western World.

I must say that in our concept the Western World is not necessarily a "free world" as it calls itself. We understand naturally that the freedom enjoyed by American and Western European Workers is the real freedom and that their ability to defend their rights and interests cannot even be compared with that of our working class. We know that Western intelligentsia enjoys a right of expressing themselves to an extent incomprehensible to us (because of our reality something like that would be unthinkable).

But, there is a whole number of "buts."

I shall start with some examples. Let us take a big banker and a stockholder on one side and a worker on the other side. As citizens of a free country they are equal before the law; but do they actually have equal opportunities? Who makes the law, who is ruling the country, who decides the course of the foreign policies? To a simpleton, and there are very few simpletons in our days, the answer is "the people." America as well as the entire West is being ruled solely and completely by the proprietary class, the class of people who own the material riches or control them in one or another ways.

Perhaps this class, or these classes, for Western structure is rather complicated, favorably differ from the Soviet ruling class, in that the Western ruling class takes into consideration interests of other classes as well as the interests of the entire society. I have mentioned already that in our concept the working classes of the West are successfully defending their interests. It would be an exaggeration, however, to identify the Western regime with freedom. Of course, Marx's criticism of bourgeois

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-10-

freedom sounds in our days rather grotesque (he said something like this: "the freedom of a worker in a capitalist country is the freedom of choosing between starvation and submission of his interests to that of the capitalist"), but generally, there is an element of logic in this statement. The eternal rule is that he who is stronger and richer is the master. The best "recipe" for a free country remains socialism, but as yet there is no socialist country. I have mentioned already that the regime prevailing in the USSR is not a socialist one mainly because no one there even heard about freedom. This discussion does sidetrack me, however.

The logical conclusion from this point of view is that no one expects that liberation from communism will come from America or the West in general. People of the elderly generation still remember the kind of freedom brought to our people by Hitler. Someone might say that Hitler was a fascist (a national socialist) and a racist, and that his regime was as totalitarian as that of the Soviet Union. But what of it? That is why the conflict between these two totalitarian regimes was so terribly fierce. History remembers that during the downfall of feudalism, the most fierce wars took place between the newly-established republics, the young bourgeois countries (the French-English war of the XVII-early XIX century, the English-Dutch war of the XVII century). Even though there was a dictatorship in some of these young republics, (Cromwell), it is doubtful whether its citizens wanted to be liberated from the dictatorship by a feudal country. France is a good example of such a "liberation" (from Napoleon). Historically, the liberation of France from Napoleon was not very profitable and after this "liberation," the French people had to fight for their freedom many times.

It would be desirable if the western leaders had a realistic policy towards the peoples of the Soviet Union, also towards the Ukrainian people, which in an eventual world conflict would be directed against totalitarianism, against Moscow imperialism, and not against the socialist movements (reforms) which took place in our country during the last forty-four years. Even if not all of these reforms are actual improvements, in the condition of freedom our nations, being protected from the possible interventions of Russian communism or, on the other hand, the reactionaries (by the reactionaries I mean some groupings who dream about turning backwards the "wheel of History:") will be able to join the world family as nations who will not threaten the existence or wellbeing of other nations, as nations who will decide their internal problems at their own discretion. Then, perhaps, the Ukrainian saying "save me from my friends, oh Lord, for I can take care of my enemies myself," would be appropriate.

In armed world conflict, if we consider it probable, the most serious danger for America and the West would be the transformation of a war between the regimes (between the governments) into a national war, a war between peoples.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-11-

Supposing that our land should be attacked by atomic bombs, that against our land will be directed missiles with deadly loads, then everybody will forget the various party, social, and national differences, and everyone will become a soldier and will defend his land "to the last." There could be no doubt about that, for bullets and bombs will not differentiate between the communists and their opponents. What is more, communists and only communists will have a chance to survive the deadliness of the contemporary atomic war, for it is they who have the bombshelters and safe places. A soldier, on the other hand, has to win or to perish.

Does it mean then that any war must be a war between nations, an external war? Once more I want to use a historical analogy. Napoleon captured Moscow, but lost the war; his brilliant career was ended in Moscow. Hitler was at Leningrad, Moscow, and Stalingrad, but what has happened to him after that is hardly enviable.

There are, however, different examples: in 1856, Russia lost the Crimean campaign, but in 1861, there followed an important and progressive reform, the emancipation of peasants, which did not make Russia a leading country, but which, nevertheless, converted Russia from an Asiatic into a European country.

In 1905, Russia lost the war with Japan, and this defeat was followed by a revolutionary movement.

In 1917, Russia was thrown into the revolution by the absurdity of the war with Germany. Parenthetically, the provisional government was overthrown by the new revolution, because it senselessly attempted to continue the war.

Is it a coincidence? No. In both cases the wars were lost, but in the first example the nation reacted by transforming the war into a national war, defense of the Homeland, achievement of victory, whereas in the second example the nation reacted to defeat by an aspiration which was at first expressed in the accusation that the existing regime was not capable of assuring a victory and later that the regime was completely bankrupt and reactionary. At the same time all previous sins and guilts of the regime were recalled, and the regime just fell apart. Parenthetically, it is a very characteristic feature of the Eastern Slavic peoples: a man whose sins and offenses are known is not being accused of them until such time as he is tried for any one offense (which does not have to be the most serious one). But when he is tried, none of his previous offenses will be forgotten and the sentence itself might be based not on the offense which actually led to the trial, but on the previous ones.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-12-

The common factor of the last cases (examples) was the absence of a threat to the lives of the people. The fact that the regime was losing the war served as a reason to strike against the regime weakened by the war. It is interesting to note that even the military success of the Russian army did not save tsarism, and that an offensive did not save Kerenskiy, but ruined him. For the revolution it was sufficient that the regime was weakened and disorganized.

It seems to me that in case of a war it would be wise for American strategists who prefer the offensive tactic to maneuver in the area from the Arctic Ocean to Central Asia, and between the White Sea to Kamchatka. According to rumors, the main striking force of the nuclear weapons of the USSR is concentrated in such areas. In such huge areas it is easier to camouflage and more difficult to hit the nuclear missile bases; these are the logical considerations on which this military strategy is based. Another favorable consideration for such strategy is the fact that not a large number of people is required to service these bases.

The majority of the population lives in Europe (slightly north of the polar circle), Caucasus, and Central Asia. The political and national centers of countries and peoples are in these areas, whereas the centers of military power are in the huge areas of Siberia and the North.

To the reader of these lines, these facts are probably not new. I mention them here because in case of war the enemies of the USSR can count on victory only if they will limit the fight to the Soviet military power. If, however, the war will be against the people, it might be that such a war will result in the destruction of civilization; the war will be unyielding. I feel that in such a case, the USSR would be the victor. That is, if one can talk about a victory in such a bloody fight, and if there will be somebody left to talk about it.

I have been talking about the terrible possibility that events would lead the opponents to a war.

For me, as well as for all other people living in the USSR, however, such a development is not only undesirable, but also seems to be incredible. The fact is that both the Soviet ruling class, the new Soviet bourgeoisie, and the classical bourgeoisie of the Western countries are more interested in preserving the status-quo, they are interested in preservation of the present, rather good for them, situation. The struggle they have between them is for world domination (the "splitting" of the world), and in this struggle they blackmail each other. It seems that to date Khrushchev is more successful and he "wrenches" from the West one concession after another.

The peaceful co-existence of both systems is not a rignamarole, but rather, a reality necessitated by the catastrophic possibilities of a

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-13-

contemporary war. When Khrushchev states that the descendants of the Western peoples will live under communism, he does so only because being a representative of communist ideology he could not logically state or even admit a possibility of the opposite. In his own way he is even right, because society is constantly progressing, despite people's wishes. If socialism is to replace capitalism (I do not, naturally, mean the kind of socialism that exists in the USSR) then it is very possible that it will happen first in the West. Perhaps the West and not the East, which is being held fast in the vices of dictatorship, will be the cradle of the free socialist countries.

Using blackmail methods, Khrushchev is still crowding the West, thus securing more advantageous position for himself. However, as they say in the Ukraine, "A crow will never peck at the eyes of another crow"; Soviet and American bourgeoisie, even though they differ so much in their natures, can co-exist even in the constant struggle of the "cold war."

They cannot find a common language because there is no "third power" which would be equally dangerous to both of them. In face of a common danger, if there could be such a power, the two opponents would have found a common language.

Khrushchev, by the way, is even interested to some extent in the existence of capitalism and does not want capitalism to "die," for its existence provides him and his successors with an excellent excuse for postponing indefinitely the "final structure of communism," this utopian social structure. All Khrushchev's definite plans of building communism are always stated with a reservation that it can only be done if capitalism will not hamper him.

The Western World differentiates itself from the Communist East on the basis that the former is a "free world." Some deeds of the Western World contradict this definition, however; facts slandering the Western World are always a favored food for Soviet propaganda. It is a pity, but some of these facts speak for themselves. The attack of England and France on Egypt in 1956, cannot be called anything else but aggression. Perhaps they wanted to liberate Egypt from the "little Hitler," Nasser? No. Both countries were protecting their financial and economic interests. Only the stand taken by America vindicated the West to some extent.

At the same time in the center of Europe the small nation of Hungary was fighting for its freedom. With what other reason, but cowardice or the incompetence of the Western leaders can one explain the fact that Hungarians never received any help from the outside world? Why is it that Nasser could appeal for "voluntary" help from the Eastern Bloc, while

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-14-

Imre Nagy had to rely only on his own people? Were there no people in the Western World who would really voluntarily help Hungary materially and with arms? Perhaps there were none, but then it testifies to the weakness of the Western World. May the West then retreat in face of the strong enemies.

Soviet propaganda, by the way, anyway stated that the (Hungarian) riot was instigated by the West and that they (the Hungarians) were secretly assisted by the West. It seems to me that it would have been much better if these words were true, if there were actual and realistic help from the West which, however, was done secretly. The unreality and weakness of the West towards Hungary were also demonstrated by the fact that they (the West) tolerated the return (to Hungary) of people who have no right to be in politics any more, the obscurants who are not capable of understanding the situation and who feel an animal-like hatred for all changes that took place (in Hungary) during their absence. These people helped Khrushchev.

From these two events one can derive a conclusion that the West is interested not in "liberty," but in preservation of its financial, economic, and other positions. One can also conclude that the West's interpretation of the word "freedom" is a wrong one. They (the West) fancy that the overthrow of the hated dictatorship should be followed by restoration of the old forms of the social structure and destruction of all new reforms. All this discredits the Western "freedom," for it does not guarantee the "freedom" of preservation and further development of all the national and useful progress which was achieved under the dictatorship.

The attitude of America towards Cuba and its relationship with other Latin American countries does not increase the prestige of the USA. It can be presumed that the people of Latin America had some reason to greet Nixon with rocks.

Our people are inclined to sympathize with the Cuban fight against foreign monopolies and for its economic independence. It is true that the situation has become rather complicated because Castro went too far in his relations with the allies, but the fault lies probably even more with the Americans because of their inflexible and selfish policy. Castro did not want to be an enemy of America, he only wanted to improve the condition of his people, but by cutting the sugar quotas the Americans pushed him into the arms of Khrushchev.

This sugar is now being bought by the Ukraine, a country which develops and produces millions of tons of its own sugar. It is a paradox, but it is true, nevertheless. The Ukrainian people were not very enthusiastic when Cuban cane-sugar appeared in their stores. The population was dissatisfied, people understood that it was their money that paid

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-15-

for the Cuban independence. It is not a secret that the peoples of the USSR are covering the food shortages of China, and, whenever necessary, that of other countries -- "friends." Peoples of the USSR are buying from these "friends" everything they want to sell. Also, Cuba has become such a friend now.

It must be said that generally our people are indifferent towards politics. They only react in cases like that of Cuba, when they can see that it touches their interests. The people are indifferent to questions as whether Chiang Kai-shek or Mao Tse-tung will be members of the UN, and whether Chiang Kai-shek will exist at all, people do not care who will win in Laos or that the Americans will or will not give-in in Berlin. But the people do care when the USSR is generously helping some of its friends while there are shortages of some goods in their own stores. There was a time, I remember, when India was such a "brother-nation." During that period, the slogan "Hindu-Rusi-bkhai-bkhai" could be heard on the radio and could be seen everywhere on placards. This slogan was not forgotten and was later used with some irony.

All (Soviet) people, regardless of social and Party status, are disturbed by the ambition of China to become the leader of the Communist bloc. It is not a secret that the Chinese do want an atomic war, that their Communist Party defends the most orthodox views, which in our country were long ago forgotten. One speaks ironically about Mao Tse-tung's pretenses to the title of living classic of Marxism.

In conclusion, I will say a few words about the Ukrainian youths who are more developed politically and who are critical of the existing regime.

They, these youths, do not actually participate in the expansion of communism and they do not take sides in the East-West argument. Their position is that of an observer who is watching with interest a fight between two boxers, or a game between two soccer teams when neither of them is the home team. The youths are familiarizing themselves with current events utilizing all possible sources of information. Perhaps, the best comparison for the East-West cold war is a chess match between two "worthy" players. After each new move the fans discuss the new position of each player, their advantages, and their mistakes. The sympathies of the fans usually belong to the player who knows how to win. To say it more seriously, such an attitude could be described as indifference.

I must also admit that I do not care who will be the victor of the Berlin crisis. I can only say that it (the victory) will depend upon the sense (the intellect) and the patience of the opponents.

It was with a certain sympathy that we Ukrainians followed the struggles of oppressed peoples of the Latin America, Asia, Africa, and other small

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-16-

nations. Probably, justice has not yet ceased to exist in our world if those nations were able to find the road of national growth. But not all, probably, have the right attitude towards their problems if they frequently have to look for allies in the Communist world. Some of these countries are skillfully "navigating" between the West and the East, deriving from this position certain benefits; this is only natural and understandable.

We, Ukrainians, are also looking at the world with the eyes of a people who are interested in the well-being and progress of our nation, without resorting to injustices against others. It is a pity, but in the present world we do not yet see a camp or a country to whom we could look up to like to a lighthouse, about whom we could say, there are friends, there are our kind of people.

GERMAN-POLISH-UKRAINIAN RELATIONSHIPS

Slightly outside the scope of this paper is the problem of the German-Polish-Ukrainian relationship. This problem, even though at the present time it seems to be solved, is very important to us Ukrainians. The Ukrainian-Polish border along the Bug river can be considered a just one. Among the anti-communist Polish emigrants, however, there are people who are completely against it and who are talking about a new revision of this border. They are trying to feed the ever-lasting flame of the Polish-Ukrainian struggle, which was already almost completely dead. They are forgetting about the German-Polish situation where there are supporters of a border revision and in this case not only among irresponsible people.

And who can benefit from this (situation) more than the Russian government?

It seems to me, that even if Germans sometime could receive back Koenigsberg (the Kaliningrad oblast of RSFSR), it would be too late for any of them to call it homeland. The Germans would have to re-colonize this region. If at that time they will need territory, "Lebensraum," which is doubtful, then why necessarily this small and isolated piece of land? In our world, there are still numerous territories, just as remote from Germany as Koenigsberg, that are richer and much more useful, there are territories which are still virgin, and where our future generations will be able to discover new Americas.

The Kaliningrad oblast (Koenigsberg region) is not needed by Russia, they keep it only as an insurance, but the Polish remote territories are vital to Poland. However, I do not wish to talk in the name of the Polish people.

About the Ukrainian-Polish arguments concerning independence and the borders, I can say that it is already past history. People who want

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

-17-

to renew these arguments are pushing Ukraine towards Moscow, towards Russia. Between the two evils, Poland and Russia, the Ukrainians learned to choose the least one. I hope that the Ukraine will be able to rid itself also from this "least" one, which is by no means a small evil.

The idiot who would want to stab the Ukraine in the back, by revisions of Ukraine-Polish borders, would also kill Poland, because Poland was always next after the Ukraine the country to submit its interests to Moscow.

CONFIDENTIAL