

8. RTY SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF AN INDEPENDENT UKRAINE

Mr. DODD, Mr. President, last Friday, January 22, was the 42d anniversary of the proclamation of an independent Ukraine.

Almost three centuries of czarist domination and attempted Russification had not been able to extinguish the will to freedom in the hearts of the Ukrainian people. When the czarist regime collapsed in World War I, the Ukrainian people asserted this will by proclaiming their independence and establishing a democratic parliamentary government.

In all of their early statements, the Bolsheviks had promised the right of national self-determination to all the subject peoples of czarist Russia. But these promises were as false as all their other promises. In 1920 the Red Army invaded the Ukraine, dispersed its legal government, and inaugurated a reign of terror which persists to this day.

I am profoundly convinced that, wherever it has taken power, the tyranny of communism has won for itself

the unifying hatred of the great mass of people: I am also convinced that this hatred is particularly intense in areas like the Ukraine where hatred of foreign oppression combines with the general hatred of communism.

Nowhere in the vast territory of the Soviet Union has the Kremlin encountered greater or more stubborn resistance than in the Ukraine. And nowhere has the Kremlin been more ruthless. According to a study made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, from 5 million to 8 million Ukrainians perished in the regime-made famine of 1943. In addition, almost 2 1/2 million were deported from the Ukraine to Siberia and other remote areas.

The policy of Ukrainization, which the Bolsheviks tolerated for several years after their takeover, soon gave way to a policy of compulsory Russification. Why is this so? Hugh Seton-Watson, a British student of Soviet affairs, has suggested that the Soviet Government seeks the destruction of the non-Russian nationalities, not in the interest of the Russian nation per se, but rather because the totality of its power demands the destruction of national differences and the creation of a monolithic, unified, Russified, Soviet people. Whatever the explanation may be, there can be no disputing the mass of evidence that the Soviet regime has been seeking to destroy the national spirit of the Ukrainian people by destroying their culture and progressively Russifying their language.

According to all reports, the Kremlin has not been successful in achieving this objective. After 40 years of persecution, mass murder, and cultural oppression, the Ukrainian people, more than 40 million strong, are perhaps more united than ever before in their desire for freedom and in their yearning for national independence.

May I suggest, Mr. President, that in observing the anniversary of Ukrainian independence this year, we go a bit beyond the simple expression of sympathy which has characterized our resolutions of previous years. I feel that this is a time when we ought to ask ourselves whether we are doing everything that is within our power to foster the will to liberation among the captive nations of central and eastern Europe and among the captive peoples of the Soviet Union itself.

Because of certain inhibitions that seem to be an organic part of democracy, it would be politically unrealistic to expect any American administration—or, for that matter, any democratic government—to engage in open subversion of the Soviet regime or openly to espouse the cause of Ukrainian independence. Needless to say, the Kremlin suffers from no reciprocal inhibition. But there are a number of things we can and should do to encourage opposition to the regime in general as well as the natural desire for independence of some of the non-Russian peoples.

We should remind the Bolsheviks at every opportunity how they promised the right of national self-determination when they were seeking power and how they trod this promise underfoot once

they achieved power. We should in our broadcasts place emphasis on events and holidays that have special national significance. Certainly we must avoid anything which might give the impression that we accept the subjugation of the satellite states of Europe or the national structure of the Soviet Union itself as things that are final and irrevocable.

Everything that has happened since the Khrushchev visit makes me fear that we are, in effect, turning our back on the entire policy of liberation. If we do, we do so at our own risk. The dissatisfaction of the peoples of the captive nations, of the Ukrainians and the other subjugated minorities within the Soviet Union, has played a far more important role than is commonly realized in restraining the Kremlin's expansionism.

Every lapse on our part which can be utilized by the Kremlin to discourage the spirit of resistance, leaves it that much freer to engage in pressures, ultimatums, limited aggressions, and military challenges. Every measure that we take to encourage the hope of liberation is an additional deterrent to Soviet aggression, an additional assurance of peace.

We must, therefore, in the critical period which now confronts us, rededicate ourselves, in terms of concrete actions, to the goal of freedom for all men everywhere.