4797
1957

The Voice of Free

Georgia



JANUARY, 1957

No. 8

THE VOICE OF FREE GEORGIA

PERIODICAL INFORMATION BULLETIN

No. 8 New York January, 1957

ALEXANDER TSOMAIIA



The cause of Free Georgia and Georgians the world over have suffered a great bereavement in the sudden death of Alexander Tsomaiia, lately editor-in-chief of this journal. His passing makes another irreparable gap in the ranks of those who labor for the liberation of Georgia and for government based on the principles of freedom and justice under law for all.

Alexander Tsomaiia was born in Kutais, Georgia, on March 16, 1907, the son of Basil Tsomaiia, and Pauline Pagava.

His whole life from boyhood was spent in working and fighting for the freedom of his motherland. During his university days he was twice imprisoned by the Communists, finally escaping with the help of the underground and making his way first to Istanbul, thence to Paris, where he spent many years, growing to manhood among some of the outstanding elder statesmen of Georgia and, like them, in exile devoting his talents and powers to his country's service. He had notable sagacity and skill as a journalist and a thorough knowledge of history and government and of world politics. His writings are a cogent presentation of the case for Georgian statehood. His chief work was a history of the relations of Georgia and Russia. It is a carefully documented work upon which he spent many years of research. A great patriot has gone from us but his work will go on. May light perpetual shine upon him.

30811

საპარლამენტო ბიბლიოთეკა

IN MEMORY OF A FRIEND

Merciless death has taken from our midst a man the only object of whose thoughts and actions was the fight against communism and the liberation of Georgia.

Devotion to his country gave meaning and justification to his existence and this love burned throughout his life and finally turned it to ashes.

It is necessary to know something about the time which produced and formed Alexander Tsomaiia, in order to understand the purposes and feelings of the generation of which he was such a worthy representative. Only then can one grasp the mystery of his indomitable soul, his dedication to his native land and the natonal ideal.

Having passed through many misfortunes, having seen many victories and many defeats, forged in the struggle to maintain her national existence, the Georgian nation finally fell victim to the treacherous policy of Russia. The destruction of Georgian statehood was followed by a number of bloody uprisings and massacres of countless Georgians who fell in the unequal struggle. The overwhelming superiority of force and means triumphed in the end and the Georgian nation had to reconcile itself temporarily to circumstances, waiting on opportune moment for resurgence.

Alexander Tsomaiia was the child of that generation. Youthful and unformed, he instinctively became body and soul a part of the struggle for the restoration of Georgian national statehood. The supremacy of the fatherland, and its inherent historic right to national independence henceforth were foremost in his mind. This was the generation on which Georgian independence was to be built, but the enemy struck before it had gained its full powers.

1921 saw the destruction of the new Georgian State and the return of the Russian occupation forces. Forces of resistance began to be formed from the very first day of the destruction of the Georgian State and the defiance towards the occupier permeated the whole nation. In February 1922, on the first anniversary of the occupation, protest demonstrations took place in every town and village of Georgia. This was proof of the desire of the nation for independence and it made the enemy understand that "Georgia was not dead, but only asleep."

Alexander Tsomaiia, who was then still a schoolboy, took an active part in these anti-Russian and anti-communist demonstrations. As he used to relate - "Once I was beaten senseless with rifle butts by the Tchekists, who left me for dead in a field."

Perhaps it is because he shed his blood there, that he loved so deeply the fields of his country. Perhaps because of this he dedicated to Georgia his whole being. The first defeat did not break Alexander's heart, did not kill his fighting spirit. On the contrary, with even more energy he joined underground organizations and fearlessly took part in the work and fight for liberation. He had not yet reached full manhood when the great 1924 insurrection began; nevertheless he took an active part, fighting side by side with grown men.

The results of the 1924 uprising are well known. Once again the Russian wave submerged the Georgian nation and the jackboot was planted even more firmly on its body and soul. Moscow took revenge on the defeated Georgians and mercilessly massacred them. Those who escaped death were imprisoned and ruthlessly treated by the communists. Among them was our friend whose memory we honor today.

Thus was he christened in battle; this was his first communion. The defeat of his people, the cowardly revenge taken on unarmed, helpless men and the bloodthirstiness of communist executioners, strengthened even more young Alexander Tsomaiia's determination to fight the enemy to the finish and to make no compromise. His hope for the eventual liberation of his country and the belief in her destiny never faltered during the whole of his life.

Always active, always in movement, he commanded attention at first sight. Tireless, energetic, one could see on his countenance the high idealism with which his mind and his soul were impregnated. One could see also the readiness for self sacrifice. When opposed to an enemy he was unyielding, energetic and quick to act. He was completely devoted to the work and the fight for Georgian liberation. Deeply believing idealist that he was, he would never for a moment dally or compromise at the price of the national ideal. He was intolerant of vacillation and of any readiness to yield to or deal with the enemy. Many a "tired emigré" in whom he noticed disillusionment or readiness to compromise for personal interest at the price of the national good felt the sharp sting of his pen and of his command of the Georgian language. Letters, articles, speeches which he left, show his inflexible position in anything pertaining to national affairs and his deep and abiding love for his country. His belief in his country and in her destiny, his energy, intelligence and ability, and his spirit of dedication, soon made him stand out among the Georgian political emigration and made him a noted member of the new generation.

After emigrating into exile, he joined the ranks led by the late Spiridon Kedia. Kedia was a man of high moral principles, richly endowed by God with intelligence and goodness. Under the leadership of this selfless and devoted servant of Georgia, Alexander Tsomaiia reached manhood and stature. This period saw the final formation of his character and the flowering of his attractive qualities. Now he became a man—serious, able, kind, an excellent speaker, a gifted writer—in short, a good and reliable servant of the people. Of his youthful traits there remained only the boundless love for his country, the readiness to sacrifice everything for her, and an undying enthusiasm for the Georgian cause.

The second World War became a kind of examination, a test, for the Georgian political emigration. "The enemy of our enemy is our friend," was heard in every group and organization of the Georgian emigrés. Alexander Tsomaiia was one of the first who, without any conditions, without any pretensions, put on a soldier's uniform. Dedicated to the service of his country, he had patience and cheerfully bore conditions new to him. He demonstrated for future generations how great is the potency of personality, when it is dedicated to a worthy cause and when love for one's country is boundless as the sea.

Alexander Tsomaiia was a man of sunny nature. He was in nowise a shallow optimist, but he had a profound faith that, ultimately, "good will be the final goal of ill," and this conviction carried him buoyantly through all his life in exile during more than three of the stormiest decades the world has known.

We who were close to him will always find consolation in recalling how happy he was, after his long pilgrimage, to have been able to come to the United States of America. As a student of history and government,

he had a real understanding and a genuine love for the American system of government, for the American social and political structure and institutions. He looked forward with eagerness to becoming an American citizen. Many of us remember how often he expressed his thankfulness that his young son could grow up in a free country. No one who has ever come for refuge to this land has had greater love and appreciation of what the American ideal is and what hope it holds for the world than had Alexander Tsomaiia.

He held in warm regard his American friends and associates and also his friends among the nationals of many groups who, like Georgians, have found a haven here, and look toward the day of liberation for all enslaved peoples.

Particularly important was his work in the U.S.A. Owing to various unfavorable circumstances, or perhaps just because of ill luck, the Georgian question did not exist here, and this not only with regard to American public opinion, but even for the Georgians living here. Very careful work was needed and Alexander Tsomaiia utilized all his intelligence, ability, knowledge and experience. His articles and letters, published both in Georgian and in English publications, show his great love for his country and his thorough knowledge of his subject. The time has not yet come to reveal and evaluate fully the work he has done both openly and behind the scenes here, where our destiny will sooner or later be decided. When the time does come, Georgian society will see how in these difficult conditions he managed to advance the Georgian cause and what a great service was rendered to this cause by his invariably correct approach and evaluation. After the Tbilisi demonstrations of last March, he played a major role in explaining the real significance of this event and completely refuted the allegations of those who said that the demonstrations had a pro-Stalin character. One of his last political addresses was carried over major television and radio networks and was quoted in the New York press.

Cruel death has taken from us this still young, intelligent, experienced and devoted servant of Georgia and the staunch and unflinching defender of her rights. His place will not be easy to fill.

We know that wherever the great and the good who have passed from our sight foregather, there will be found Alexander Tsomaiia. And with all our hearts we say, with the ancient poet, "The just shall be had in everlasting remembrance."

THE UPRISING IN HUNGARY

The holocaust in Hungary and the immolation of her people to the insatiable Moloch of our times can nowhere be better understood than in Georgia and by Georgians. They were the first to feel the impact of Russian military suppression, and what is now taking place in Hungary is an old, old story in Georgia. Our manhood and youth have also been slain by the thousands, and deported by the tens of thousands. Therefore, our hearts go out to the embattled Hungarian people in their magnificent fight for freedom and self-government, their heroic barehanded defiance of the Russian war machine. By God's grace may they be delivered from the demoniac oppressor before their extinction is complete.

With the Tiflis uprising in March 1956, the Georgian people gave a clear answer to Bulganin and Krushchev: They said: "If you admit the crimes of Stalin, you should by the same token recognize the right of the people enslaved by Stalin to self-determination and national independence." In reply to this Moscow sent machine guns and tanks. The rulers in Moscow fatuously believed that the idea of freedom should and would be stopped short of the borders of the Russian Empire.

The first echo of the Tiflis uprising was heard in Poland, the country which during all its long history has always fought for freedom. The workers of Poznan unfurled the banners of liberty. This was the beginning of a movement which was taken up by the entire Polish people and was crowned by the attainment of a certain, even though limited, independence for this country. The Free World has interpreted this movement for independence by the satellite countries as an expression of Titoism. This is a misconception, a misinterpretation.

Hungary is a clear example of this. In Budapest it was the youth who first made the stroke for freedom. Factory workers, miners, and students united in the common cause. It would be incorrect to assume that these young people were motivated in their actions by the memory of the old régime, as at the same time when Hungary became a Soviet satellite they were but ten or twelve years of age. This movement, started by the youth, was instantaneously followed by the Hungarian people, seized by the consuming passion for freedom. They rose against the régime which had promised them justice with equality, a promise which was never fulfilled: indeed, the very right to existence was instead denied these people. They rose against the foreign overlords who had come from the country of which Abraham Lincoln once said, "Russia, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy," and from the people—again to quote Lincoln—"who make no pretense of loving liberty."

The Hungarian people obsessed by the desire for freedom rose against this ruthlessness, the barbaric domination, and in this movement every idea of Leninism, Titoism, or Communism, no matter in which form, was lost.

The uprising was purely nationalistic and patriotic. Here fought shoulder to shoulder, peasants, workmen, teachers, and priests, on an equal footing and in a spirit of real brotherhood. Hungarian officers, graduates of the Russian Military Academy, and the Army indoctrinated by the Moscow commissars, wholly sympathized with the Hungarian patriots who showed great spiritual power and a willingness to sacrifice equal to that of their valiant forebears of 1848, who fought against the Imperial Russian Army.

In 1956 as in 1848, it was a battle of the heroic and desperate Hungarian nation, wounded in its national spirit. It was a battle against slavery, humiliation, and misery.

This is the system which Moscow has long since established in its own country and superimposed on the nation which cherished democratic liberty and the culture of Western civilization.

The fact that the patriots tore down the red flags, broke in pieces the statues of Lenin and Stalin, shouting "Down with the conqueror," "Long live liberty," and heroically letting themselves be crushed by Krushchev's tanks, proves that the nationalistic instinct was too strong to be suppressed by the occupiers.

The Muscovites thought that their political decisions, their bayonets, and the Russian boot, could prevail against the Hungarian national instinct, could arrest the course of its history, could banish to oblivion their

traditions, and make this nation subservient to Russian Imperialism. Their illusions were dispelled. The Hungarian example has shown that every nation has an invincible, an inexhaustible latent force, a mystic reserve which gives it the strength and the energy to oppose the conqueror and at an opportune moment to launch an attack at whatever cost, for the sake of its dignity and liberty.

The Editors

COMPROMISE ON PRINCIPLES

By Guivy Zaldastani

As this issue goes to press, the Soviet Army has strong garrisons all over Hungary. They will stop the flow of refugees towards Austria, Yugoslavia or any other doors of escape. The leaders of the uprising will be arrested through treachery. Mass deportation will start towards Siberia and new methods will be devised to erase the spirit of freedom from the Hungarian mind. The people of Hungary will be facing broken homes, hunger, the cold of winter, and foreign uniforms at every crossroad. They will be looking back to the 23rd of October as a dey of hope in their fight to recover freedom, dignity, and belief in human values.

Meanwhile, the western nations will be opening their doors generously to those who have managed to escape. Representatives of many countries will be stressing the tyranny of the Soviet occupation and its barbaric behavior. Impressive demonstrations of protest will be organized in every capital. Magazines will run exclusive accounts from eye-witnesses and motion pictures will dramatize even better the admirable fight of a nation left alone to defend the basic principles of the Free World.

On the 24th of August in 1924, a thousand milles away from this brave nation, an equally dramatic series of events took place in Georgia. After three years of Red domination, the people of Georgia rebelled against the miseries of slavery and the whole country rose against Soviet collonialism. At first, as in Hungary today, the insurrection was successful. Within a few days, more than half the provinces had passed into the hands of the patriot insurgents. Bells were ringing again in churches and national flags had replaced the Soviet emblems. But soon the Red Army poured additional reserves into the battle. Several divisions converged from the North, South, and East towards Tiflis. Left alone like the Hungarians today, Georgians had no other choice than to die, just to be remembered. For almost three weeks they fought. Without any outside help they had no chance of winning. The world was astonished at such bravery. The Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations expressed the greatest sympathy for the Georgian people who were fighting so valiantly for freedom. France opened her doors to the Georgian refugees. Poland set up a special budget to help the new emigrés. Over 7,000 Georgians had been executed, and more than 20,000 deported to Siberia. The Georgians who remained in their country returned to work, but through the years — 1928-1932-1937-1942 — they still tried sporadically to recover their freedom. Each time they were suppressed; each time thousands more were killed or deported. Throughout all those years the spirit of liberty, the consuming desire to express their own convictions, led Georgians to oppose the domination of the Soviet regime. Last April they again violently expressed this deep national feeling and their hatred of the Soviet rule.

WILL HUNGARY FARE NO BETTER THAN GEORGIA?

Are the responsibilities of the Free World limited only to pity and short-liived indignation in the face of the enslavement and massacre of small natons? Can the Free World afford to see crucified and annihilated people who fight for their human rights and not challenge the brutal force which threatens to destroy the very foundations of its own social structure? The Free World must realize that it cannot compromise on the principles which are the very basis of its existance—that until the enslaved nations regain their lost liberties, stability will never be achieved and peaceful coexistence will not be possible.

FROM THE EDITORS

The purpose of our journal is to inform its readers of the struggle of Georgia for her national independence beginning with February 1921, when Georgia was occupied by the Red Army, until today. The reader will see that the Georgians have not for a moment resigned themselves to the Russian occupation and have never given up the fight for independence.

The events of last March were the logical continuation of this fight and had nothing to do with the defense of the "Stalin cult," as the men in the Kremlin proclaimed and a part of the Western press repeated.

Editorial Board.

FALLEN IDOL

By S. CHIRAKADZE

During Stalin's lifetime, no one dared to conspire against him. Now that he is dead, criticism is easy and does not involve, as before, the courage of open dissent. The only necessary step was to get rid of some of Stalin's friends, in particular Beria. Even such a "big revolutionary figure" as Khrushchev could only then turn his back on Stalin.

Yesterday, he and his colleagues were crouching in base flatteries as sycophants and accomplices; today, they curse Stalin's memory, to hide their own misdeeds and to appear, in the eyes of the Russian people as liberators.

It may be possible that all this serves Khrushchev in building up his own renown, worship and finally dictatorship. However, because of Stalin, he is fighting the Georgians, who, as a matter of fact, are fighting for their liberty and not for Stalin. Stalin bears more guilt toward the Georgian people than toward Russia, and Khrushchev should know, if only from the Stalin-Beria example, that no rule founded on Georgian bondage was ever secure, and that he too cannot stand against the Georgian spirit.

A renewed Russian nationalism is steadily and methodically nationalizing Communism, to make it specifically Russian, returning to Leninism, proclaiming it as a purely Russian ideology, denying its international character, and striving to get rid of foreign elements, in particular of Georgian Communists, whose influence was effective in the machinery of the Soviet States.

According to the established plan, a systematic denial of Stalin's statesmanship and achievements is pursued, to erase his name as an historical figure important in the creation of modern Russia as a first-class world

power. Russian national pride resents the fact that half a century's history, and the period of attainment of world leadership, should be connected with the name of a foreigner, and that modern Russia should be the work of a Georgian.

Armenian Mikoyan's and Georgian Mjaranadze's seditions — the first against Stalin and the second against Beria—did not exist before the 20th Party Congress. Both men are now, as in Stalin's day, second-rate performers and they have to declare whatever is told them from above. Today's line is to please Russian nationalism. The aims of the 20th Congress were to eradicate Stalinism, to "defend peace," to strengthen cultural, economic and political ties with foreign countries, and to explore various ways for the attainment of socialism, etc. All this had already been examined at the previous congress and nothing new was stated by Khrushchev. A change in the Communist rule, so anxiously awaited by world opinion, did not occur.

The accusations against Stalin did not reveal anything new; these facts were already known to all, in particular to the political refugees. However, such a sudden reversal of sentiment about Stalin was quite sensational for everyone, and confusing for the Communist Party in Russia as well as abroad. The leftist and neutral press at first considered this reversal as the beginning of a new era for the Soviet Union. It gave them hope of a fundamental change in Communist rule which would favorably influence foreign policy. If in the past, international conferences were fruitless, they said the fault lay with Stalin; from now on it will be different, and we will try to settle all differences with the Western European nations.

From such declarations some statesmen conclude that fundamental changes might occur in Soviet Russia. We think these hopes exaggerated, and that these conclusions stem rather from desires than from an objective analysis of realities. Therefore we are convinced that there can be no radical change as long as those who shared Stalin's power remain in office.

And what is the value of an affirmation of separation of the present leadership from the preceding one, in which they played such an active part for so many years and which, thanks to their contribution, reached the worst form of oriental despotism? The present bosses of Russia denounce the cruelty and the doings of Stalin. At the time of Lenin, they claim, discussion was usual inside the party, and members could express their opinions freely. They therefore request freedom of opinion. We can but applaud this; but alas, they ask it only for themselves; in fact, they deny this right to others, and maintain tne long established terror.

At the 20th Congress, the resolutions were accepted unanimously, with the same monotonous submissiveness as in the days of Stalin. They repudiate Stalinism, but the ugly features of Stalinism remain unchanged. Therefore it is a mystery to us why some believe this an evolution tending to democracy. There is still no liberty of speech, of assembly, or association, neither is there a free press. The labor syndicates remain in allegiance and under control of party bureaucracy, which takes orders from Khrushchev's "collective" leadership. The concentration camps, where millions of human beings are torturned under the worst conditions of forced labor, are still in operation. The Kremlin chiefs proclaim the end of Stalin's persecutions, the lawless reprisals of opponents without trial, but the collective leadership handled Beria and his colleagues' fate with a ruthlessness equalling that of their late overlord. And was there any trial in the liquidation of the Georgian Communists? What's more, on March 9th of this year, the Russian troops fired at a public demonstration in Tiflis which was being held in protest against the

Russian forces of occupation and to defend the rights of Georgia. Is there any difference between this and Stalin's methods?

In 1936 Stalin did grant to his enslaved peoples a constitution. They called it the "most democratic," and then, as now, many statesmen abroad saw in this an evolution in the system. Twenty years later, Malenkov stated seriously that dictatorship was abolished forever "We shall never return to it." We all know that this excellent constitution was but an instrument invented by a despot to strengthen his tyranny. There are many words written into this constitution which are meant not for fulfillment but to deceive. The tyrant is dead, but his constitution is still effective. As they shatter the Stalin cult, they should nullify his constitution, too, as a document that is but an instrument of totalitarianism.

The Russian leaders only now admit Stalin's half madness, his mania of persecution, which led him to annihilate every suspect. They confess this, as if it were enough to justify their former complicity. It would be erroneous to look upon them as pioneers of a new democracy, and unutterably foolish to trust them. Their attitude is merely temporary. Soviet diplomacy has taken on a polite and shrewd aspect, but its nature remains unchanged. This is proven by the cynical speeches of Khrushchev concerning the colonial powers during his visit in India.

We must note only one innovation: Russian approval, in words if not in deeds, of economic rehabilitation of backward countries, and in this field, too, the expression of their desire to challenge the western world. Yet Moscow does not hide its underlying desire to spread seeds of revolt everywhere, and to exploit what they call their "holy war against capitalism." Khrushchev has shifted from the idea of violent conquest to that of peaceful infiltration. This is a tactical approach connected with the present wolrd stalemate and is in no way a renunciation of their final aim of violent world conquest. From now on, and so as not to commit its forces, Moscow considers feasible the seizure of power through normal parliamentary channels.

This simulation of democratic ways is only for the seizure of government in order to impose one-party rule. The old Communist aim of dictatorship of the proletariat remains unchanged, the rule of the masses, that is, by the party.

Today the real meaning of this dictatorship is obvious to everyone, whether the leaders be Lenin, Stalin, or Khrushchev: suppression of every freedom, terror, repression, the concentration camp, and physical annihilation!

Khrushchev believes that in certain countries, and in particular in France and Italy, the government might become Communist by securing a majority of voices in elections. He is convinced that his soft tactics will ease the approach to the socialists and facilitate the combination of their forces. Yet the Moscow aim remains the achievement of world Communism. The suppression of the Cominform does not change the final goal. This body became useless after Stalin's death, since it was intended for the overthrow of Tito.

The new leaders, by their reconciliation with the Yugoslav leader, have made the Cominform superfluous. Yet, with or without the Cominform, Moscow will continue to interfere with and control the Communist party abroad. In any event, these parties will continue to remain under Russian control, because they are subsidized by Moscow, and money not only rules the world, but also moves minds—and often disturbs them.

So the Cominform's dissolution is only a propaganda gesture, and the disavowal of Stalin seems to be a

manoeuvre of the same kind, for Stalin is rejected, but the party and governmental machinery he created remain unchanged.

Bolshevism, though it seems to have taken on a new look, remains unchanged.

For mankind's security, it is necessary not only to suppress Stalinism, but the Bolshevik rule itself.

SPARKS CAUSE A CONFLAGRATION

By A. TSOMAIIA

THERE HAS BEEN heavy fighting in Poznan. The proud and liberty loving Poles came out unarmed against Russian tanks and machine guns. In the Communist world, this is the third occasion after Stalin's death, on which people raised the flag of freedom, came out into the streets and began an open fight against the occupation forces and rule. The first occasion was the rebellion in East Germany in June 1953; the second—that in Georgia in March 1956. The whole world's attention was directed to these events. And the general opinion was that something had given way in the Soviet Union and that some important changes were occurring.

How correct is this opinion and is it likely that changes will take place in Moscow of such nature as to satisfy us as Georgians and as fighters for the liberty of men? In 1913 the Romanoff dynasty solemnly celebrated the 300th anniversary of the beginning of its rule over Russia. If at that time anyone had suggested that in something like three years the Romanoff dynasty would be overthrown, no one would have believed him. And even at the end of 1916 nobody would have believed that in February 1917 a revolution would break out in Russia and that this revolution would be victorious.

Likewise, in theory it is not at all impossible that very important changes will in due time take place in Moscow. It would depend on a number of internal and external factors. And first of all it depends on the Soviet population—on its feelings, temper, and its capacity to fight. In fifteen out of sixteen (*written before the abolition of the Karelo-Finnish Republic—Ed.*) Soviet republics the feeling against Moscow's rule is so strong that there would be no difficulty at all in rousing them to a fight for freedom. Even in the Slav republics—the Ukraine and Byelorussia—separatist feeling is very strong. Already during the war, in 1943-44, we had long reports about a bitter conflict between two factions in the Kremlin. According to these reports, Lavrenti Beria acted as the representative and spokesman for the non-Russian peoples of the USSR, a role he was totally unfitted to play, judging by his past. It appears that he was demanding that the rights "guaranteed" to the nations of the Soviet Union by the Stalin Constitution should be granted them in actuality and not only on paper. At that time I did not believe these reports, thinking them an invention of Beria's agents; however, subsequent events convinced me that there was some truth in them and that there really was a struggle in the Kremlin.

After the war, Stalin declared and underlined that "the great Russian people won the war." Why the Russians alone and not all the other nations of the Soviet Union? Stalin was a realist and took the side of the stronger (and more acceptable to him personally) element. He did it also to satisfy the Russians' self-esteem and their pretensions to play the leading role. Up to the day of his death

Stalin was defending the supremacy of the Russians, but the conflict flared up again immediately after he died. And there is little doubt that Beria's liquidation was one of its results. Today the Russian element is completely preponderant and victorious, but this does not mean that the non-Russians have given up the fight. There is a feeling of great resentment in the peoples of all the non-Russian republics, but numerically all of them together are just about equal to the population of the founder of the Soviet Empire and its staunch defender—the Russian Republic. In all the national republics Moscow has party and administrative cadres faithful to her and through them she exercises a strict control.

In such conditions, struggle begun at the periphery, be it Poland, Georgia or the Baltic States, will always have less chance of success than struggle begun in the center itself. To defeat the non-Russian peoples, Moscow has always depended on Russian troops and up to now there was not a single occasion when these troops did not fulfill Moscow's expectations and orders. Therefore, up to now, the only real and faithful defenders of the Soviet Empire have been the Russian people and Russian bayonets. And it follows that the question—"Will there be any radical changes in Moscow or not?"—depends only on the Russian people and on how they feel about it.

Is the Russian nation today convinced of the necessity of fighting the existing régime? If this feeling is really widespread in Russia, then it is possible that some event, internal or external, may precipitate an explosion. And Russian history teaches us that once aroused the Russian people are capable of terrible destruction and merciless annihilation. But does such a feeling, such a conviction, exist in Russia today? Only the future can give us an answer.

But there is hardly any doubt about the conflict among the present day leaders of the Communist party. Stalin's death brought to an end the only authority which ruled over all. The new oligarchy began to build up its own authority by destroying the cult of the old one. Stalin was declared to have been an evildoer. We always said that, even during his lifetime. But Khrushchev's saying this resembles the actions of a man who cuts off the branch he is sitting on. Stalin was a maniac, but how much more criminal and completely base lackeys are all these Khrushchev-Mikoyans, who for thirty long years declared Stalin's every word to be the word of a genius, who applauded every one of his steps and measures, encouraged him and competed with each other for his favors. And today these men shamelessly proclaim that they were against the dead dictator. Khrushchev and his kind are as much responsible for Stalin's crimes as he was himself. Beria's case is typical of these criminals. At the 20th Congress of the Communist Party, Khrushchev declared that Beria was executed because he was a foreign agent. According to reports emanating from the foreign embassies in Mascow, Beria was set upon during a meeting of the Central Committee of the Party and strangled. Later Khrushchev told a French delegation visiting Moscow that Beria wanted to be the top man and that during heated discussions on this subjects Mikoyan shot him from the back. When was Khrushchev lying and who is he trying to fool? His Party Congress or the French Ministers? But both versions make one thing clear—the Soviet leaders and ministers murdered their own colleague without any trial, just as society's lowest and most degraded elements—professional murderers and bandits—murder their victims. Such are today's Soviet leaders.

From the Georgian viewpoint, Beria deserved every punishment that could be meted out to him, but the verdict should have been decided on

by a Court of Law, as is the way in every civilized country. Khrushchev and his kind accuse Stalin-Beria of murdering people without trials, but they themselves are guilty of the same enormity. It would be a mistake to think that nobody in the Soviet Union is aware of this fact. No one has the right to speak out in the Communist paradise, but no one can be stopped from coming to certain conclusions. And it is impossible that these lackeys and murderers who danced "gopak" when Stalin ordered, can have any authority over the people now. This is proven also by the protests of the foreign Communist parties. The Italian, French, British and American Communists raised, and quite rightly, the question of Khrushchev's responsibility for past errors. This also would not have escaped the notice of Soviet citizens and especially of Party members.

The greatest influence on the future actions of the Soviet population will be the policy of the Free World and particularly of America. If the free countries choose the policy of appeasing and making friends with the Kremlin criminals, the people will not dare to do anything against them and the apparatus of dictatorship, weak today, will again be strengthened. Khrushchev's place will be taken by the Army, which will worsen the position of non-Russians and will increase the danger of another war. But if the free countries really want to aid actively all nations (including the Russian) subjugated by Moscow to liberate themselves from Communist dictatorship, then the battles of Poznan, Georgia, and of the slave labor camps, may spread and even the Russian nation itself may join in this battle. Today it is still possible to start such a conflagration in the Soviet Union as would destroy forever the dictatorship of criminals. This would be the best means of avoiding another world war and of bringing a real and lasting peace to humanity.

In conclusion—our struggle is of national character, that is to say, we are fighting not only for changes of a political nature, but also for our national sovereignty. Because of this, no matter what changes take place in Moscow, our fight will continue until the Russians leave our country.

TBILISI – MARCH, 1956

By M. SIMONIDZE

More than ten months have passed since the demonstrations and rioting in Tbilisi (Tiflis), capital of the Soviet Republic of Georgia. A considerable amount of information received preceding and after these events makes it possible to reach certain definite conclusions, some of which are based on known historical facts and some on logical deductions. The conclusions which one must inevitably reach after studying all the evidence—Georgian and Russian papers and magazines, broadcasts of Radio Tbilisi, pronouncements of various Communist leaders, and occasional eyewitness accounts either by foreigners who have visited Georgia or by Georgians who had been lucky enough to escape—are as follows:

1. The disturbances had a much more serious character than the Soviet Government admits.
2. Even more serious disturbances are to be expected.
3. Disturbances (attempt at an uprising would be a better description) had nothing to do with the "down with Stalin" campaign started by Khrushchev and other present day leaders of the Soviet Union. They were manifestations of Georgian national feeling and of the hatred the Georgians feel for the Communist régime and for Russia, the foreign occupier of the country.

Ever since February 1921, when the Russian Red Army treacherously attacked and overran Georgia, Georgians have been fighting against Communism and the Russians by every means at their disposal. Numerous local uprisings, the great nation-wide insurrection of 1924, innumerable executions and "purges," mass deportations of Georgians to Siberia and Arctic Russia—all these facts prove beyond any doubt that Georgians have never submitted to domination by Red Russia. And the Georgian nation has never forgotten that the chief instigator of the attack on Georgia and the man chiefly responsible for all the misfortunes which consequently befell Georgia was Stalin. With the possible exception of the Baltic States, proportionately to her population, Georgia has lost more in killed, executed and deported by the régime than any other nation of the Soviet Union. To suggest that Stalin-Djugashvili had any Georgian national feeling, or that during his reign Georgians occupied a privileged position, would be entirely incorrect. Nevertheless, this was the opinion (and judging by some Western journalists still is) prevalent not only in the Free World, but in the Soviet Union as well, probably because Stalin was surrounded by Georgians, renegades like himself, who no more represented the Georgian nation than the Rosenbergs represented the American. Stalin ordered the massacres and deportations, Beria and his henchmen carried out these orders, and the Georgian nation is not likely to forget these facts.

However, Georgia was made responsible for having produced Stalin and Beria and after one of them died and the other was "liquidated" Moscow took a bloody revenge. There have been several "purges" in Georgia since that time, incomparably worse than anywhere else in the Soviet Union. We can not even estimate the number of people executed, but we do know about the numbers cleaned out. Soon after Beria's downfall, 3,300 (Soviet official figures) Georgians were dismissed from their posts, and in February of this year, just before the disturbances in Tbilisi, 2,800 more. Practically all the Georgian Ministers have been dismissed during the last three years or so. Some of the Ministries have had several heads during this short time. All those executed and otherwise cleaned out were accused of having been members of "Beria's gang." In some cases this is just not true. Ruhadze for instance, one of the Ministers executed, was Beria's personal enemy. He was tried (?) and executed together with Rapava, Shalva Tzereteli and several other Ministers and officials. Rapava was the man who in 1942 was reportedly in contact with the Germans and was slated to head the Government of independent Georgia. Shalva Tzereteli was for many years the head of Stalin's personal bodyguard. Their trial was particularly interesting because of the composition of the Tribunal (Military Board). The Chief Prosecutor was General Rudenko; the judges—Chetkov, Kostromin and Golovtzov; Defense Counsel (?)—Gavrilov, Zverev, Galkin, Sannikov, Apraksin, Gugulev and Zorin. The Russians did not even find it necessary to save appearances and to have at least one Georgian on the tribunal.

During the past year or so, a considerable number of German prisoners of war have been released by the Soviets. Many of these prisoners had spent a considerable time in Georgia. Interviews with them give a most revealing picture of the conditions there and of the feelings of the Georgian people. In a short magazine article it is impossible to give everything they say, but here are a few short extracts. All refer to the

period between the death of Stalin and the demonstrations in Tbilisi.

" . . . Georgians very proud and independent people, who are simply waiting for the opportunity to overthrow the régime. . . . Russians much less hostile to the régime than the Georgians . . . great majority of Georgians regard the Soviets as an intruder into their way of life . . . Georgians pose quite a problem to the Soviet régime . . . being a strongly coherent group they seldom betray their fellow countrymen. . . . "

" . . . Georgians very friendly people, alway smiling, talk freely. . . . They detest Russians, especially the 'experts' who come from Russia . . . if you addressed a Georgian in Russian he would pretend that he does not understand and would not reply, or reply in Georgian. . . . I have seen notices in the Russian language torn down, also street signs in Russian . . . have witnessed several cases of deliberate sabotage by Georgian workers . . . have been told by a Georgian worker that several Russian soldiers were killed in his village. This was in January or February 1955 . . . convinced that if there is a war, not a single Georgian would fight for the Russians. . . . "

" . . . have heard that in December 1953, there has been violent fighting between Georgians and Red Army detachments in Dusheti region. The police could not cope with the situation and that was why Red Army was sent . . . have personally seen 27 trainloads of Georgian prisoners being sent somewhere . . . have seen many fist fights between the Georgian and Russian workers, also cases of stabbing . . . have seen at least two Russians beaten to death. . . . "

This is the kind of information which the German prisoners of war and other sources give All of it points to the explosive situation which was prevalent in Georgia just before the demonstrations and fighting in Tbilisi.

No less interesting are the opinions and conclusions reached by many Free World experts of Soviet affairs and by those Western correspondents who had visited Georgia. "I have found in Georgia abundant evidence of a proud and strong Georgian nationalism," writes Harry Schwartz in the *New York Times*. While Welles Hangen of the same newspaper says: " . . . The fact that Georgian nationalism, even chauvinism, is not dead, is attested by almost daily appeals in the Republic's press for more attention to educating the young people and workers in 'Soviet patriotism' and 'proletarian internationalism' . . . Stalin himself had to deal with Georgian nationalism more than once. . . . Georgia and its untamed mountain people is not likely to fit any preconceived Marxist pattern. . . . "

On April 23, 1956, a leading article in the *New York Times*, entitled "Murder in Tiflis," said: " . . . It was Georgian nationalism which drove the people of Georgia on to defy the massed troops, and Stalin figured only as the symbol of a Georgian being victimized by Moscow, as Georgia has so often been victimized by Moscow in the past. And why should not Georgians rebel? Why should Georgia —or the Ukraine, or Armenia, or Poland or any of the captive Sovietized areas—be denied free self-determination in an era when Moscow hypocritically preaches freedom to what remains of the colonial world? . . . " Many more extracts could be given, but even these few will suffice to show that informed people in the Free World are well aware of the state of affairs in Georgia and of the feelings of the Georgian people.

Like every nation worthy of this name, Georgians also want to be independent and free to manage their own affairs. They have done so for over 2,000 years. Theirs is a country richly blessed with natural resources; they are a highly intelligent, cultured and proud people, with a far greater proportion of educated men and women than Russia, and they are

quite sure that they can run their own country successfully. They have been fighting for the preservation of their national identity and proud heritage throughout their history and they are certainly not prepared to give up now.

Never perhaps has Georgia been face to face with such a peril as she is today. Her people are threatened by total physical extermination, or by complete Russification—that is to say, by the loss of their national identity. Ever since the coming of the Russians, Georgia has faced these two dangers, but they have grown infinitely more serious during the past few years. Georgia is being colonized by Russians. Thousands and tens of thousands of them are being sent to Georgia by the régime and settled there. Georgians on the other hand are being sent to Kazahstan, Siberia, the Russian Far East, and other parts of the Soviet Union. Georgia has more academically trained people per capita than any other Soviet Republic including Russia, and under the pretext that there is no work for them in their own country, young men and women of Georgia who have completed their studies are being sent in ever-increasing numbers to other parts of the Soviet Union and in particular to its Asiatic domains.

The Soviets are making an even more determined effort to russify Georgia. Everything is being tried to make Georgians like Russians and forget that they are Georgians. We have innumerable examples to prove this contention. (See "Russification" by M. Simonidze, *The Voice of Free Georgia*, Nos. 6 & 7.)

Is it surprising then that the Georgians demonstrate and resist by every means at their disposal And what has the "down with Stalin" campaign got to do with it?

What, actually, did take place in Tbilisi and other parts of Georgia last March and again in May? There have been a number of reports from various sources, and even though none gives a complete account, we will attempt to reconstruct the whole story.

That not everything in Tbilisi University was going according to Communist plans had been fairly evident for some time. Despite all efforts, by its own admission the régime failed to indoctrinate students with the "proper political outlook," or to eradicate in them the "bourgeois-nationalistic" feeling (Communist jargon for patriotism). The students refused to attend classes on Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism, Dialectical Materialism and kindred subjects. According to *Kommunisti* and *Zarya Vostoka* (organs of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia, in Georgian and Russian respectively), over 94,000 man-hours of classes were lost at the University during the four months preceding the disturbances, and time and again professors had to lecture before empty or half-empty auditoriums. Both newspapers, as well as various Communist leaders, also strongly attack University authorities and students for "undue preoccupation" with ancient history (read Georgian history), and antiquity." Apparently classes on these subjects were always full and it is obvious that conscious of the great past of their country young Georgians wanted to learn more about it. They objected to those lectures which were too Marxist-Stalinist and too Great-Russian. They objected to a teaching which put too little stress on Georgian nationalism.

Students—young, vigorous, intellectual men and women—are the best representatives of any nation. They feel as the nation feels and they are more likely to speak their minds and to act. The Georgian students are no exception. They did not hide their feelings and they were prepared to act when an occasion arose.

The occasion was March 5, the third anniversary of Stalin's death. In previous years this day was commemorated by solemn ceremonies, meetings, speeches; the Soviet Press was filled with articles glorifying Sta-

lin; universities and schools were closed and the students given a day off.

Nothing of the kind occurred on March 5, 1956. The authorities meant this day to pass completely unnoticed.

Why should the Georgian students and Georgians in general have objected to this slight to Stalin, whom the great majority of them hated and despised as a cruel tyrant and a traitor? Ernest S. Pisco of the *Christian Science Monitor* gives a plausible theory. " . . . the students rediscovered the former dictator as a Georgia fellow-countryman," says Pisco, "and took Stalin's downgrading as a national affront. At the same time, some of them may have suspected . . . a new Russification drive and tightening of Moscow's grip on the individual republics." And they were not wrong, as the following months showed.

On the morning of March 9th (some reports say March 8th), demonstrations led by students began in Tbilisi, the capital. Several thousand demonstrators congregated around Government House and sent in a deputation demanding the restoration of the rights of Georgia and of individuals. Attempts to seize the main Post Office and one of Tbilisi's airfields were made. Apparently the demonstrators were trying to get into contact with the Free World, seize a plane or planes and send representatives to the West. It is true that some portraits of Stalin were seen, but the demonstrators carried not the red flag, but the banner of the House of Bagratidi, the ancient Royal Family of Georgia. Many of the demonstrators wore in their lapels little flags with the Georgian national colors, emblems of St. George and of St. Nino and portraits of the great Queen Thamar and other Georgian Kings.

Demonstrations soon took on a menacing aspect—it is quite conceivable that the Georgian police did nothing to stop them—and soon Russian troops were called out by frightened Communist authorities. Shooting began and the demonstrations were broken up and dispersed. Approximately 100 people lost their lives and many more were wounded. Midnight curfew was ordered and troops and tanks patrolled the streets for days afterwards.

This, in a nutshell, is what happened in Georgia during the first days of March 1956. For several weeks after these events Georgia was completely cut off from the outside world. No one was allowed in or out of the country. The first Western correspondents were allowed in on April 15. But the Communists could not hide the truth completely. Too much evidence had accumulated showing that serious disturbances (attempt at insurrection?) had taken place in Georgia, that they were purely an expression of Georgian nationalism and patriotism, and that the régime had replied with the usual Soviet ferocity. The highest officials of the Soviet Union had to admit these facts, but naturally they tried to play them down. How could they admit that one of the "fraternal republics of the Soviet Union," one of the "younger brothers of the great elder brother—Russia," hates this elder brother and wants to get rid of him? How could they admit that after three decades of relentless, unremitting and continuous indoctrination, the Georgians still hate Marxism, Communism, Soviets and all the rest? But deny it completely, even the Soviet leaders with all their facility for bare-faced lying could not do.

A letter received after the disturbances by a Georgian residing in New York, from his aged mother in Tbilisi, said—" . . . many apartments have become vacant in Tbilisi." Anyone who has lived in the Soviet Union will know what this means. It means that many people were executed, killed, arrested or deported and that their apartments and houses have thus become vacant. The worst sufferers were probably the students and their professors.

30811

Will the régime succeed in crushing the spirit of the Georgians and their will to resist? Without hesitation we say no! They will fail just as miserably as have all the others before them. As a Georgian said to Roy Essoyan, Associated Press Foreign Correspondent, in Tbilisi on April 15—when tanks and troops were still patrolling the streets—"Governments come and governments go, but the people go on forever."

Matters did not end with the March disturbances as is shown by subsequent events in Georgia. Four thousand troops and militiamen were stationed around streets leading to Lenin Plaza in Tbilisi, when a sixty-five foot statue to Lenin was unveiled on April 21. The explanation given by the authorities was that new demonstrations were feared and that these were to be put down at all cost. On May 26th, the Georgian National holiday, anniversary of the proclamation of the Georgian Republic, posters appeared on the walls of buildings in Tbilisi once again proclaiming an "Independent Georgian Republic." Soviet and secret police moved quickly to crush the flare-up against Kremlin discipline. More than one hundred persons were arrested on the day the posters appeared. Another raid the next day netted more members of an underground organization opposed to Russia. Reports reaching Vienna said secret police concentrated on searching for members of an anti-Russian—though not necessarily anti-Communist—underground organization believed to have printed and distributed the posters.

It is obvious that there is still serious trouble in Georgia. Otherwise why the almost daily appeals by the Soviet press and Communist leaders to strengthen Party discipline, to pay more attention to the education of the youth and the working masses in Marxist principles, to eradicate bourgeois nationalism, to love Russians and everything Russian? On August 8th, *Zarya Vostoka* said—" . . . the defects of the ideological work of Georgian Party organizations is evident from the fact that there still exist in Georgia nationalistic elements, who profit by Soviet democracy and come out openly against the policy of the Party and its Leninist principles." On September 2nd, the same paper said—"During a long period our republic was ruled by the evil enemy of the people, the despicable agent of imperialism, Beria, and many of the important posts in the Party and Government were held by avowed Georgian nationalists, who carried out subversive work. . . . Party must increase the fight against bourgeois-nationalism and improve propaganda and education of the workers in the great principles of Marxism-Leninism. . . . Up to now we still have scientific and literary works, in which we find views contrary to Marxism-Leninism and in which the past of Georgia is described from an anti-Marxist viewpoint, the historical friendship of the Georgian and Russian peoples is not given prominence and the progressive role of the union of Georgia with Russia is denied and decried."

Later the same week, *Zarya Vostoka* came out with a warning. The Party will fight mercilessly any manifestations of Georgian nationalism, says the organ of the Central Committee. This warning was broadcast by Radio Tbilisi, which had a special program commemorating the anniversary of the incorporation of Georgia into the Tsarist Empire in September 1801. In the past even the Communists themselves called this "incorporation" an act of simple annexation and that is how it is described in the *Bolshaya Sovietskaya Enziklopedia.* Now however, both the *Zarya Vostoka* and Radio Tbilisi call this event a great progressive step in the history of the Georgian nation, one which is a cause for celebration.

But most revealing was a speech

საქართველოს პარლამენტის

by V. Mzhavanadze, the boss of the Communist Party of Georgia. This is what he said at the meeting of the Central Committee of the Party at the beginning of August. " . . . It is well known that the actions of the despicable enemy of the people, the agent of imperialism, Beria, caused colossal harm to the Soviet and especially to the Georgian people. During the long period when he was running our republic, Beria and his henchmen were trying to arouse in the Georgian people a feeling of national exclusiveness, contain it in narrow nationalistic frame and isolate it from the brotherly family of the peoples of the Soviet Union. . . . By all means at his disposal Beria supported, protected and aided the activtivies of nationalistic elements in our republic. . . . Beria and his gang treacherously destroyed the best cadres of the Party and Soviet workers, as well as notable representatives of Georgian intellectuals. . . . The Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party has underrated the fact that the cult of Stalin's personality is deeply ingrained in the minds of the people of Georgia and that here it has taken a particularly exaggerated and nationalistic coloring."

What is all this if not an absolute admission of a strong nationalistic and patriotic feeling among the Georgian people? Mzhavanadze can lie about the cult of Stalin, but he knows as well as anyone that it is the cult of Georgia which is deeply ingrained in the minds, hearts and souls of the Georgian nation. And why is Mzhavanadze compelled to admit it now? " . . . It is no secret," continues this renegade Georgian, "that scientific works and writings of our authors contain nationalistic ideas foreign to Leninism. These remnants of bourgeois of Khrushchev, "that scientific works and writings of our authors contain nationalistic ideas foreign to Leninism. These remnants of bourgeois-nationalism did not meet with sufficient resistance on our part." Thus the novel of Sh. Dadiani, "Juri Bogolubski" (called originally "The Unfortunate Russian" by its author, who was later ordered by the régime to change the title—M. S.) which is permeated by nationalistic spirit, was published and republished both in Georgian and in its Russian translation. In various scientific and literary works, the historical past of Georgia is described scientific and literary works, the historical past of Georgia is described from an anti-Marxist viewpoint. The actions of kings, princes and military leaders are idealized, while the role of the masses of people is minimized. As an example we can quote the first three books of the tetralogy by K. Gamsakurdia, "David the Restorer." Such historians as Djavahishvili, Berdzenishvili, Surguladze, Dondua, Tzintzadze, approach questions of history from anti-Marxist positions. They deny the great progressive meaning of the incorporation of Georgia into Russia. . . . One of the important duties of the Georgian historians is to prepare a MARXIST HISTORY of Georgia."

Then Mzhavanadze attacks the Georgian universities professors and students and says, " . . . Out of 75 dissertations presented during the years from 1940 to 1954 in the Institute of History of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, there was not a single one dealing with the history of the Soviet period. During the 10 years of its existence, the Institute of Philosophy of the same Academy did not prepare a single serious study of the actual questions of Marxist philosophy.

Mzhavanadze and after him many other orators spoke at great length on this and similar themes. All these speeches give yet further absolute proof, if such were needed, that the Georgian people, to put it very mildly, do not feel friendly towards Russia and the Russians and that they have rejected Communism. This is true of professors, school teachers, students, workers, peasants—of an enormous majority of Georgians of every sphere and walk of life. They do not want Russia, which destroyed their rights as a nation, and they do not want Communism, which destroyed their rights as individual human beings.

It is quite obvious that there is a deep unrest in Georgia. Georgians have a tradition of fighting for their freedom and independence. Today they cannot hope to win in an armed struggle; so the Georgians defend themselves and their national interests by other means. One of these is a boycott of Russians and the Russian language.

The régime undoubtedly fears even more serious disturbances in Georgia than the events of last March. There is no other explanation of sudden intensification of propaganda and of the campaign of threats directed against the slightest manifestation of the national feeling and patriotism of the Georgians. But why should we suppose that where others have failed, the present day rulers of the Soviet Union will succeed?

It is absurd to suggest that today the Georgians are incensed at the slight to Stalin. They rioted and rebelled and fought against Stalin when he was alive and powerful. The only attempt ever made to assassinate Stalin was made in Georgia and by a Georgian, and the only attempt to assassinate Beria was also made in Georgia and by a Georgain. The real cause of the recent riots is that the Georgians detest—hate would be a better word—Communism and their foreign oppressors. They want to be independent again. They want to enjoy all those rights of nations and individuals which are denied them and to which they have as much right as anyone else.

It is inconceivable that the Free World, and America especially with her great tradition of freedom and liberty, can be anything but sympathetic to Georgia—this attractive, freedom loving little nation, small in numbers but very great in spirit. To take but their recent history, for thirty-five years completely isolated, unarmed, greatly outnumbered and without any hope for aid from the outside, the Georgians have been fighting by whatever means they could muster for those principles and rights for which they and all men have fought since the dawn of history.

And it is monstrously unjust, to say the least, to dismiss their latest show of spirit—the courage of unarmed men who braved the might of the Red Army—by saying that it was "apparently caused by a slight to the local boy," as much of the Free World press has been saying.

TO THE TRADE UNION DELEGATION OF GREAT BRITAIN

SOON AFTER THE 1924 August-September insurrection, a delegation of British Trade Unions visited Geor- of British Trade Unions visited Georgia.

The central organ, which organized and led the insurrection was known as "The Committee for Georgian Independence" and was composed of the representatives of all the Georgian anti-Russian and anti-Communist political parties. At the same time of the visit of the British delegation to Georgia, most of the members of this Committee were in Tbilisi prison, but they found a way of communicating with the delegation and of informing it of the true state of affairs in Georgia.

Below we publish the letter which the prisoners addressed to the delegation. It was written by K. Andronikashvili, who at one time was the President of the Independence Committee.

IN THE DECEMBER 2, 1924, issue of the newspaper *Communist*, one can find a conversation of one of the members of the delegation with the representative of the above mentioned newspaper. The conversation showed that the European and particularly the British newspapers were wrongly informed about the state of affairs in Georgia and the insurrection which took place there. Therefore we, the political prisoners of Metechy jail, consider it necessary to give you, the representatives of the British working class, a correct account of what we could learn from the comrades who were arrested during the insurrection and brought down here. We are convinced that, together with our brotherly greetings, you will give to the British proletariat a true picture of the events which occurred in Georgia in August and September of this year, 1924, and of the horrible things which the Georgian nation, suffering and fighting for its freedom, had to experience.

What happened in Tiflis: In the days of the insurrection, that is at the end of August and the beginning of September, there were taken out from the jails of Tiflis, and shot, prisoners who were arrested long before the insurrection and who had no connection whatsoever with it. Thus on August 30, 31, and September 1, 2, and 3, 1924, 146 political prisoners were taken out of Metechi jail and shot, without being tried and sentenced. Among them were old revolutionaries and socialists, members of the Constituent Assembly of Georgia, writers and journalists, trade union leaders, many peasants and workers and the élite of our military men. Some of them had already served their sentences. The cases of the others were in process. One hundred and twenty comrades, among them a number of women, were taken from Tcheka and shot. Seven men were taken and shot from the so-called penitentiary No. 1. Fourteen patients were taken from jail hospitals and executed. This was in Thelavi. Now, in various other places of Georgia:

1. About 100 men were shot in the town of Batumi.
2. Approximaetly 90 men were shot in the region of Samtredia.
3. 20 men were shot in the town of Poti.
4. 8 men were shot in the town of Osurgethy.
5. In Mingrelia, 800 men were shot, the majority of them peasants.
6. In the town of Kutais, 300 men were shot, among them the Metropolitan of West Georgia —Nasarius.
7. In the town of Chiatura, where the bulk of the population consists of mine workers, 200 men were shot in wagons, under the fire of machine guns.
8. In the country of Rachalechkumi, 300 men were shot.
9. In upper Svanety the fight was on until September 25, and the number of victims was great.
10. In the town of Khashury, 29 men were shot.
11. In Gory, everyone who happened to get arrested was shot, approximately 400 men.
12. In regions of Gory the shooting took on a mass character and turned into a real massacre; 500 were shot, among them 2 priests and 2 women.

In short, as far as we can establish from the information given by the prisoners, the number of the executed amounts to somewhat more than 3,000 men. (Ed. Later figures give the number of executed as from 7,000 to 9,000.)

It is not our intention here to evaluate the events which took place in Georgia during August and September of 1924, or describe the great national struggle of the Georgian people during the last four years. We only give the information of that sacrifice which followed the above mentioned events. But in addition we must point out:

1. The insurrection had a popular, mass character. The whole of the people was engaged in one struggle; old and young, men and women, all possessed by the enthusiasm for achievement of national independence. This is proven by the official information given in Soviet newspapers and by what took place in Gouria, Samegrelo, Imerety and in every part of Georgia, wherever the insurrection broke out.
2. The Soviet Government showed an unheard of ruthlessness even in those regions where the insurrection did not occur at all. Hundreds of innocent people were shot in Chashuri, Signagy, Telavi, and elsewhere.
3. The leaders of C. P. openly admit that the cause of insurrection was their policy toward the peasantry, their ruthless persecution of religion, suppression of social rights, etc. etc.

Pointing all this out, we request you to deliver to the English working class the truth about the state of affairs which prevails now in wounded and suffering Georgia.

GEORGIA — MARCH 1956*

By A. TSOMAIIA

IN THE UNIVERSAL propaganda of Moscow a very considerable place is given to propaganda against colonial and imperial policy Not only by word, but also by money persuasion, by instructors, by organizers drilled in Moscow, and by Red Army officers, all over the world there goes on uninterrupted, systematic activity directed toward replacing the existing order by Communist regimes. It is difficult to say where this activity is more intense, in Europe and America or in Africa and Asia. However, according to the results, Moscow's endeavors have proved to be more successful in Asia than, for example, in America.

But what can the people of Asia expect from Moscow, once Russia gets a hold over them? Unquestionably the same treatment accorded the people living in the Ukraine, the Baltic countries, Byelorussia, Turkestan, Caucasia, and all the countries which have been so generously "liberated" by Moscow.

AS IS KNOWN, demonstrations against Moscow took place last March in the capital of Georgia—Tiflis. The Western press described these events as an expression of the sympathy of the Georgian people for Stalin. We consider this evaluation of recent Georgian events to be misleading and we would try to put forward more than one proof showing that the underlying reason for the demonstrations was entirely different. However, to understand the present behavior of Georgians, it is necessary to take, at least, a glance at our recent past, since the Russian revolution of 1917.

On May 7, 1920, Russia recognized the national independence and sovereignty of Georgia, and promised noninterference in its internal affairs. The first paragraph of the pact reads as follows:

"The Soviet Socialist Federal Republic of Russia recognizes without any reservation all the rights of the independent Georgian nation, its full sovereignty and inviolability of its territory."

The second paragraph of the pact specifies that "Soviet Russia undertakes the obligation of non-intervention in the internal affairs of Georgia." But Soviet Russia acted in this case exactly as in all other similar cases; on February 11, 1921, without a declaration of war, the Red Army crossed the Georgian borders.

*Speech made by Alexander Tsomaia at a conference held in Carnegie Hall by the "Institute for the Study of the USSR."

The invasion started from three different points: The 11th Soviet Army and the 18th Caucasian Division attacked from Armenia and Azerbaijan respectively; while the cavalry of Jloba and the 98th Brigade of the 33rd Infantry Division advanced from Vladikavkas through the Mamison Pass. After six weeks of fighting Georgia was vanquished and occupied by foreign troops. This was a conquest by the Red Army and not a revolution. Proof of this is found in the text of a declaration made by the President of the Georgian Communist Party of that period, Mr. Ph. Maharadze. This text had been sent to Moscow to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party on December 6, 1921, and in part it reads as follows:

"The arrival of the Red Army and the establishment of Soviet power in Georgia had the outward appearance of a foreign occupation because in the country itself there was nobody who was ready to take part in a rebellion or a revolution. And at the time of the proclamation of the Soviet régime there was, in the whole of Georgia, not only not a single Communist cell, but not even a single member of the party capable of organizing action or providing leadership, and this task has been accomplished mainly by doubtful or sometimes even criminal elements." (See M. Sindikeli in the *Voice of Free Georgia* No. 2.)

The Communist government immediately began to enforce the Moscow policy: Abolition of private property, taking all natural resources into the possession of the Russian state, persecution of religion and destruction of churches, replacement of the Georgian national language by the Russian state language, and complete negation of all those spiritual values which had been created by the Georgian nation itself during the centuries. A people who had fought for self-preservation throughout twenty centuries could not accept these conditions.

The first insurrection took place in summer of 1921, that is, six months after the establishment of the Soviet Regimé. The first battle took place in Svanethy. In August 1922 the insurrection broke out in upper Karthly and Chevsurethy. In 1924 the insurrection became general throughout Georgia. In 1927 there was armed conflicts in Racha-Letchchumy. In 1929 in Achara. Active resistance of small guerilla groups in mountain regions continued until the beginning of World War II.

What was the part played by Stalin in these events? All available documents prove beyond any doubt that the plans and all practical arrangements for the conquest of Georgia by Red Russia were prepared by Stalin in 1920. He it was who convinced the Communist leaders and finally persuaded them to strike at Georgia. Lenin was against this move; he was afraid of the unfavorable reaction of Europe and counselled against the invasion of Georgia. But Stalin was not to be deprived of his revenge and of his determination to become master of his mother country, Georgia, the country which had rejected him.

Victorious Stalin visited Georgia in 1921 a few months after its bloody conquest by the Red Army. He was already quite a big man in Communist Russia. But when he came face to face with the Georgian people, he saw that conquering a country by foreign bayonets was one thing, but destroying the ideas of libetry and national independence was quite another matter. While speaking at a meeting in the Tiflis Palace Hall he was constantly interrupted and several thousand Georgians shouted: "Traitor, murderer, traitor." Stalin, pale and uneasy, left the hall surrounded by his guards. That same evening he called a meeting of the Central Commitee of the Communist Party and told them:

"Georgia must be gone over with a hot iron." That "hot iron" burned many thousands of Georgians.

When Soviet Russia's tyranny had become unbearable and a nationwide armed rebellion broke out in Georgia in August of 1924. Stalin declared at a meeting of the Politburo in Moscow: "Georgia must be plowed over with the utmost thoroughness." This order was carried out and, indeed, with thoroughness. Georgia was plowed over and under. The rebellion was quenched in blood. More than 7,000 Georgians were executed during the first three days after the rebellion was broken; more than 20,000 were deported. This was the first large scale blood bath, with many others to come. This is what Stalin did to his native country." ("See N. M. K. in the *Voice of Free Georgia* No. 2:)

THAT IS WHY, for the generation which remembers the years 1921 and 1924, Stalin is held to be the most pernicious enemy and traitor to Georgia. He sent the troops of the Red Army to Georgia and destroyed her freedom. After this all exterminations of Georgians were the deed of Stalin, as was well known throughout Georgia. Besides, what was going on among the Georgian Communists themselves? The mood of the Georgian people could not possibly fail to influence the Georgian Communists. They were forced to realize that Moscow was a real oppressor, depriving all the non-Russian nations of any autonomy. And this realization was the more acute the higher a person was in the hierarchy of the government. Philip Maharadze, Budu Mdivany, and many others of the old Georgian Communists were at the head of the government and were receiving their orders—secret or open—directly from Moscow. They could not fail to see that the Soviet Constitution and all talk about the equality and brotherhood of nations, etc., was just camouflage for the imperialist desires of Moscow.

The revelation of the real aims of Moscow and the unanimous resistance of the Georgian nation forced the leadership of the Georgian Communist Party into open opposition. This was the first official opposition in any Communist party on Soviet territory. Moscow labeled them "deviators" and purged them by shooting or deportation to Siberia.

Since then there had never been any ideological unity in the so-called monolithic Communist party. But we are here concerned only with the nationalist deviation, the position of which was aptly characterized by a simple member of the party, Tsertsvadze, who said: "It is true that Marx wanted the proletariat of all countries to be united, but he never wanted all the Russians to get together in Tiflis."

As all the world knows, Moscow's policy has never been conspicuous for moderation. The Georgian oppositionists were exterminated to a man, but their ideas proved to be enduring. As proof of this there are the purges which have been going on continually in every branch: The Communist Party, the Young Communist League, administration, unions, army, science, industry, etc., etc. The number of Georgians among the deported, arrested, and executed Communists amounts to a very high percentage. It suffices to enumerate only the leaders who held the most responsible posts in the republic: M. Orachelashvili and his wife, B. Mdivany, M. Kakhiany, L. Gogoberidze, S. Mamulia, T. Shgenty, M. Toroshelidze, V. Agniashvili, Sh. Mathikashvili, G. Devdariany, Georgobiany, Goglidse, Kekelia, Bedia, Alaverdashvili, Khaneishvili, Kharthvelishvili, Sh. Eliava, D. Kiladse, Georgikashvili, Lortkipanidse, Shorsholadse, Kandelaky, Kuchaidze and Kandid Charkviany with all his aides. The generals: Tuk-

harely, Kutateladze, Buatshidze, Mirotadze and others.

Each of those held a post of great importance in Georgia, either as head of government, or minister, or party secretary and the like; each of them was accused of the same offense: "Nationalist deviation." The displacement and arrest of each was followed by the arrest of hundreds of less known persons. Gradually, it became evident that Moscow was unable to find the cadres who would execute the directives without any criticism. Kandid Charkviany, who was the First Secretary for more than twelve years and consequently was the real master of the country, faced in 1952 the same accusation: "Nationalist deviation, support of the idea of separation of Georgia from the Soviet Union." Together with him were punished:

Prime Minister Chkubianishvili
Minister of Security Raphava
Secretary of Supreme Soviet Gogua
Vice-President Ketshkoveli
Minister of Food Industry, Kruashvili
Minister of Justice Chubinidze
Minister of State Controle Paghava
Minister of Finance Sturua
Members of Georgian Politburo Baramia and Sambakhidse
Secretary of Tiflis Committee Gibladze
Head of Propaganda Department, Jijinashvili
President of Tiflis Committee, Bakradze
Secretary of Y. C. L. Sodelava
President of Ajar-istan Supreme Soviet Davitadze
and many others.

Their fall from "grace" took place in April 1952. This purge victimized, along with them, many thousand Georgians. From Tiflis to the remotest village, committee men, and whoever else had been in power during the rule of Charkviany, were removed and deported to Siberia. Mgeladze, appointed by Moscow, characterized Charkviany as "full of nationalistic poison" and gave his oath to the rulers that he would take all measures to liquidate all the partisans of Charkviany. In 1953 came another wave of purges. Mgeladze, and along with him his administration, were displaced and they vanished. Now Val. Bakradze became head of the government, with a new staff around him. Nor did Bakradze last too long. After five months, that is, in September 1953, the Tiflis radio said that Bakradze with all his aides had been removed and arrested.

From the day Stalin died to the fall of Beria, the latter hangman himself managed to carry out two mass purges. And since the fall of Beria the staff of administration has been changed seven times, sometimes in part, and sometimes entirely. After the fall of Beria in Georgia all the power was handed over to a general of the Russian Army—first Antonov and later Fedudinsky. Martial law was imposed for some time. Military censorship was established. Moscow put every Georgian under the mark of suspicion. At one time the situation was such that General Antonov could not find ten men to call upon for government ministries. Finally, the Kremlin rulers dug out in the Ukraine a former aide to Khrushtchev, one Mshavanadze, and made him the First Secretary in Georgia. This Mshavanadze had a hard time to assemble a government. Proof of this is the fact that the staff of administration is changed every two months or so. In the beginning of this year, a Tiflis broadcast said that the President of the Council of Ministers, Malakishvili, had been removed, and along with him five other ministers. There has been started a process of unveiled, naked, and accelerated Russification of Georgia: Opening of Russian instead of Georgian schools in towns and villages, removal of Georgian signs in the streets and establishments, and their replacement by Russian ones. Switch

of business tranactions from the Georgian to the Russian language. Prolongation of the hours for Russian language, literature, and history in Georgian schools and universities. (A great many subjects are taught in Russian, anyway.)

Tiflis newspapers now publish "requests" from remote villages to open Russian schools. The "requests" are immediately granted, of course, by the government. Russian clerks and administrators are placed in every field of work: Kolkhoses, factories, universities, theaters, movies, press, etc.—in every corner of Georgia they subdue everything to their control.

An unbearable situation has been created. People, in face of mass repressions, shun an insurrection, but they have tried another way: They have boycotted the Russian language. According to the word of a European diplomat who happened to be in Tiflis in January, in Tiflis even a policeman refused to answer in Russian. This has been followed by new repressions. According to a Tiflis broadcast, in February 2,800 men were removed from their posts throughout Georgia, all of them secretaries of party organizations, because they allegedly prevented "the growth of Russian cuture." Some of them have already been sentenced. The rest are in jail and waiting to be sentenced.

In Moscow a foreign diplomat had a conversation with a Georgian who is reported to have said: "The present situation of Georgians in the Soviet Union differs little from that of the Jews in Hitlerite Germany."

The March demonstrations were the result of this horrible situation. People could no longer bear the brutish policy of Moscow. Deprived of all human rights, they have tried to make use of the occasion to defend their way of life and their nationality. According to the newspaper *Zaria Vostoka,* the demonstrators carried the slogans "Long live the Stalinist Constitution!" "Away with hooligans and provocators." These slogans reveal the character and the hidden purpose of these demonstrations: "Long live the Stalinist Constitution!" Because, in a word, according to this constitution a nation was supposed to posess at least cultural autonomy. As for the term "hooligan": In Russia as well as in Caucasia the term has a particular political meaning. It was taken from the terminology of the old revolutionary parties in their fight against tsarism and means a man whose political convictions disregard the rights of small nations. In other words, the present Russian policy in Georgia is regarded as one of tsarist hooliganism and the March demonstration was a protest against it. It goes without saying that Stalin must have had some sincere supporters in Georgia, as well as in the other countries. But that, in this case, Stalin's picture was a mere decoration to make the demonstration succeed, is proved by the report of the newspaper *Zaria Vostoka* itself, which was reprinted by the *New York Times* in the March 27 issue. It reads:

"*Zarya Vostoka* (Dawn of the East), the Georgian party newspaper, has described the present situation in Tiflis in frank terms. It disclosed that in the last four months of 1955, 94,083 class hours were cut by students without valid excuses. Absenteeism was particularly common in courses devoted to Marxism-Leninism, dialectical materialism, and Soviet political economy.

'About half the students failed to attend seminars in dialectical materialism. The paper said professors often lectured to empty auditoriums while students went on collective sprees to the movies or less innocuous pastimes.

'Cutting off classes became especially frequent in the second semester (just concluded),' *Zarya Vostoka* said.

Zarya Vostoka complained in its Saturday issue that the university's history department suffered from 'preoccupation with the remote past and obsession with antiquity' and sought to investigate only problems of 'ancient history'.

The Communist organ said university party leaders should have been more diligent in 'vigorously suppressing the slightest manifestation of elements of nationalism' among students.

It said they had been derelict in teaching the 'spirit of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism, to which not only racial and national exclusiveness are alien, but also nationalism and chauvinism and lack of respect for other peoples and nations.'' (See *New York Times*, March 27, 1956, by Welles Hangen. University Aid Dusted in Tiflis.)

That is the whole secret. For the last time, in Georgian universities a great number of subjects have been taught in Russian. This was answered by boycott and the lecture rooms were emptied. It is remarkable that the students failed to appear at Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism lectures as well. This fact does not bespeak the students' love for Stalin. On the contrary, in our opinion, it tells an entirely different story. It is also remarkable that *Zaria Vostoka* admits the following: ''The students are much too busy studying the ancient history of Georgia,'' that is, of the time when Georgia was free. This report does not agree with the pictures of Stalin at demonstrations. In our belief, the demonstrators used a subtle device. The history of Russia knows other cases like this, for example: At the head of the well-known demonstration of January 9th, 1905 in Petersburg, the demonstrators carried the picture of Nicholas II. In both cases, then and now, people were brutally punished by cruel rulers. The pictures of Stalin could confuse and deceive only the foreign press, but Moscow knew very well what was the demand of the Georgian people. This is confirmed by the newest report that ruthless repressions have befallen not only the Party members, but also persons who have nothing to do with party and politics.

Thus, the demonstrations in Tiflis have been one more daring and powerful protest against the bestial imperialism of Moscow.

KRUSHCHEV'S SPEECH AT THE 20th CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY*

By L. DOUMBADZE

WE DO NOT THINK Khrushchev exaggerated in his attack on Stalin during the 20th Party Congress. On the contrary, we consider that he did not say enough, especially about Stalin's role, or his own, in the steamroller advance of Russian nationalism over the other non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union.

Particularly because of the fact that Stalin was a Georgian, Georgians claim the honor of hating him more bitterly than anyone else in the Soviet Union. It was Stalin who was primarily responsible for the Russian Communist conquest of Georgia and for the endless "purges," deportations, executions and wholesale massacres which have followed for the next thirty-five years.

It was during Stalin's reign that even the Communist bosses of the non-Russians could not fail to see that

*This address was made in New York at a meeting and press conference of "The American Conference of the Non-Russian Nations of the USSR."

the Soviet Constitution and all the talk about equality and brotherhood of nations was just a camouflage for the imperialistic designs of Moscow. And what is of importance is that since the death of Stalin these designs have not changed, nor has the process of aggrandizement of the Russian Red Empire slowed down. Different methods are being tried today, that is all.

Since the downfall of Beria in 1953, we have seen an intensification of the naked attempt at a complete Russification of Georgia. Beria was guilty of no fewer crimes than Stalin, but in the eyes of the present day rulers of the Soviet Union, one of the worst of his crimes was his refusal to go along with the complete Russification of the non-Russian nations and of their complete enslavement by the Great-Russians. As far back as 1942, the Georgian emigré leaders began receiving information about the bitter struggle in the Kremlin between the Russian and non-Russian leaders, with Beria as the spokesman and leader of non-Russians defending their rights as set down in the Stalin Constitution. At the time, these reports were dismissed as mere propaganda by Beria's supporters, but the speeding up of the process of Russification in Georgia since his death proves that there must have been some truth in them.

In any case, Beria was overruled by Stalin. At the end of World War II Stalin announced that "the greatest credit for winning the war must go to the Great-Russian people." Stalin was a realist and he knew that there could be no middle way in this conflict between the Russian and the non-Russian peoples. And, as was in keeping with his nature and character, he came out on the side of the stronger group. A non-Russian himself, he became a stronger Russian nationalist than the Russians. He became, in fact, a greater Russian imperialist than the Tsars, not only restoring the old Tsarist Empire, but even enlarging it. He gave the Russian chauvinism a new twist by adorning it with Communist slogans and he carried out repression of the non-Russians with far greater severity and determination than any of the Tsars or their generals. The millions of non-Russians, and the Georgians first of all, will never forget that it was Stalin who led the Russian hordes against them, conquered them and threw them under the Russian domination.

Unfortunately, we do not know everything that Khrushchev said in his now famous speech. Particularly we do not know how he managed to exonerate himself and his associates from Stalin's crimes. The part which Khrushchev and the other present day Soviet leaders played during Stalin's reign is too well known both in the Soviet Union and in the Free World to be glossed over or hidden. They were the closest associates, disciples and agents of the dead tyrant. Do they expect anyone to have forgotten this fact? Despite all the propaganda which tried to make out of Stalin a supernatural being, the peoples of the Soviet Union are perfectly well aware that he was not superhuman and that therefore he could not have possibly carried out all the atrocities single handed. They know that Khrushchev and all the rest of them are not one whit less guilty than Stalin was. They killed and ordered killings. They prostrated themselves and crawled before the master and danced "gopak" when he ordered. And now they try to portray themselves as innocent lambs free of all guilt. But the peoples of the Soviet Union will not be fooled. They are well aware that finding a scapegoat and blaming him for everything is a favorite Communist method. Stalin himself used it time and again.

Khrushchev is supposed to have introduced a new, softer "line." But it does not sound or look too "new" to the population of the Soviet Union. The non-Russians, especially, know that they will continue to be the vic-

tims of the "old line," as far as the process of the Russification of their countries is concerned.

It was because of the tremendous intensification of this process, and not because they resented any slight to the hated Stalin, that the people of Georgia carried out their mass demonstrations last spring, which ended in mass murder in Tiflis. The name and pictures of Stalin may have served as a convenient front for this manifestation of resistance, which otherwise would have been suppressed even before it got started. The violent repressions make open and active resistance impossible but, as in the supposed "pro-Stalin" demonstrations, the people of Georgia have other means of making their feelings known.

To the Georgians all the talk about "collective leadership," "brotherhood of nations," and all the rest of it, remains just talk as long as their country remains a colony of the Russian police state. The régime which has destroyed the freedom of speech. press and religion and has taken away the rights of individuals and of nations, continues. Prisons and "slave labor" camps are still overflowing. "Purges" and massacres of innocent people still go on.

Stalin's successors have not deviated from his program nor from his ultimate goal, the conquest and domination of the world. Today one half the world's population is in the hands of the Communists or of sympathetic neutrals. Can anyone seriously believe that Khrushchev and Co. are planning to give up any of their empire willingly? Their methods may be different, but they are still following in the footsteps of Stalin. There is no sign of their willingness to restore freedom and independence to conquered and subjugated nations, nor is there any sign of a real lifting of the Iron Curtain.

Can the Free World be justified in believing that Khrushchev and Co. have really changed and are trying to right Stalin's wrongs? For the peoples of the non-Russian states of the Soviet Union the answer is definitely in the negative. They know that change of labels describing the Kremlin dictatorship is meaningless as long as dictatorship of the Communist Party continues, whether administered by one man or a group of men. And they know particularly well that there can be no "peaceful co-existence" between a despotism and its enslaved subjects.

THE GEORGIAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE

On March 25th, 1956, in New York City, the first session of the constituent assembly of the above organization ratified its program and elected its officers. The Georgian National Alliance* is the result of approximately two years of intensive effort directed toward formation of a representative body of Georgians residing in the United States and abroad.

Approximately 70% of the Georgians residing in the United States of America became immediate members of the Alliance. It is expected that there will be a 90% membership in the very near future. Georgian organizations and individuals abroad have welcomed the formation of the Alliance and have indicated their desire to associate themselves with its noble purpose and to participate in its work.

The path of policy and culture of the Georgian people has paralleled that of the people of Western Europe. Even the feudal structure of both was the same in political and social details. At the end of the feudal epoch, the social reformation of the 19th century found warm reception in Georgia. Similar political parties and movements were inaugurated.

The identity of Georgia and the future of Georgia is synonymous with the democratic pattern of the United States of America and Western Europe—not with forcibly imposed Communism.

Democracy has reached its climax in the United States under the constitutional guarantees of freedom of the individual, his liberties and the right to pursue his happiness, which in its turn has rewarded its followers with unprecedented prosperity, as witness thereof. As Georgians by birth we have a natural desire to alleviate the suffering of the motherland by promoting the transplantation of the most suitable features of the democracy of our adopted country into the policy of Georgia.

*The Georgian National Alliance was formed with the full knowledge of the U. S. Government, and this document of intentions, including the outline of its program, is on file in the State Department, Washington, D. C.

Program of the Georgian National Alliance

1. The organization of a democratic new STATE OF GEORGIA, on a European-American pattern, predicated upon a universal, equal, free, and secret ballot.
2. The uncompromising establishment of the full sovereignty of Georgia as a nation.
3. The proscription of Communist doctrines as illegal.
4. Establishment of armed defense —unless there be universal disarmament.
5. Establishment of mutually independent legislative, executive, and judiciary authority, working in cooperation.
6. Freedom of religious worship; freedom of the press, and the right of assembly.
7. The inviolability of private property without due process of law.
8. Collective contracts between labor and management, subject to voluntary conciliation and arbitration.
9. Close alliance with other Caucasian nations.
10. Alliance with such groups as recognize the right of nations to independence, to wit: the United Nations, the government departments of the United States of America, and anti-Communist organizations of the nations enslaved by Soveit Russia.
11. To promote propagation among Georgians of American political, economic, cultural and social ideas.
12. To acquaint Americans with past history and present day conditions in Georgia and with political and social aspirations of the Georgian people.
13. To promote close alliance with other Georgian national organizations in the Free World for anti-Communist action.
14. To organize the groups of Georgian nationals in France, Germany, Turkey, Iran, and other countries, so that they may play an active part in the struggle to combat Communism.
15. All these aims to be attained by lawful means—press, radio, meetings, demonstrations, etc.

The organization has two printed organs, "The Voice of Free Georgia," a quarterly publication in English, and "Georgian Opinion," a monthly publication in Georgian.

A Call to Action

The foregoing document was formulated at a meeting which had been convoked by Mr. Leo Doumbadze, who made the following address to his assembled countrymen, before the election of officers and of himself as president of the Alliance:

May I express my deepest thanks to all who have honored me with their trust and who took a friendly attitude toward my letter of January 18th. It is true that our dream was not realized; the Georgians did not unanimously take the stand of national unity.

A group, among whom are patriots of undoubted integrity, still remains outside our ranks. We intend to encourage them to join us, in the general interest of Georgia. I am convinced that no real patriot will ever remain inactive; everyone will do his share in the cause of liberation of our native land. . . .

We are confident that the Georgian National Alliance will become a significant factor in our national goal. If we look at Georgian or American history, or the history of any serious political movement, we will see that the existence of any potitical organization, its vitality, its capacity for action, is conditioned by two circumstances. First, whether its purpose is realistic and corresponds to the development of events and meets the requirements of present day conditions. Secondly, whether its leaders and all its members are devoted to the cause and are able properly to evaluate current political events. These two conditions are necessary in order that our new organization may become a watchful guardian of Georgian national rights and the Georgian Cause.

It is no longer a mystery to anyone that the world is split into two camps. Two conceptions oppose each other. The Communist—the aggressive one—originated in Russia and has been enforced by Russian bayonets, causing injustice, slavery, poverty and unrest in the entire world. Its development is reaching a climax today, and it threatens all mankind with enslavement and disaster. The opposing camp is the Western, and particularly the American democratic conception, which is the guardian of peace and security. Together with other free nations, it deeply believes in the basic rights of men, that all men are born equal and endowed by God with the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

In this conflict between two worlds, the place of Georgia is among the free democratic countries. Our action can win for our motherland an honorable and important position among the free nations and assure for her that brilliant future which she deserves, by virtue of her history of heroic struggle for self preservation. . . .

I also pointed out in my letter that the program of action of the existing committees is no longer satisfactory. We must acquaint freedom-loving mankind, and particularly the American public, with the fact that we are fighting against an aggressive Communism and Russian imperialism. We must also define our conception of how a Free Georgia must live and how its State organization must be created. This will have a deep significance in our relations with other nations. Today, all of us must be very careful in discussing and developing our plan of action and solving our urgent problems. Upon these we must base our future actions. And according to these actions we will be evaluated by our friends as well as by our enemies. The plan that we are going to work out today will enter the political arena of the free democratic countries. This will be the certificate of our national stature and maturity.

Today, when all free men unite to fight against Communist aggression, we, the first victims of it, cannot simply stand by and watch. We must join, in the interest of the Georgian nation, those friends who believe as we do, in man's freedom and dignity.

We must not forget that our cause has more enemies than is at first apparent. In addition to the Kremlin, we must face all official and unofficial organizations which have been planted by Moscow throughout the world. In addition to these, we must count as our opponents the numerous Russian emigré organizations that are scattered all over the world and which have a firm foothold in some countries. They, like the Kremlin, oppose every

movement for national liberation and independence. They do not understand that our only wish is to live in freedom, in friendship with all Russian people, and peoples everywhere, but with our National Sovereignty.

It is necessary to prove before the world and particularly to the anti-Communist forces, that the Soviet Union is not a voluntary federation of nations. It is a union enforced by violence and injustice. It is an historical fact that the October Revolution actually took place only in Russia and was triumphant there. At that time the nations under or within the Tsarist empire did not have any desire for Communist revolution. Each of them tried to organize their state apparatus according to their own historical tradition. Georgia did not then experience any revolution but was invaded by the Russian Soviet Army in February, 1921. In December of the same year, Moscow proclaimed the Russian Empire as the Soviet Union, to camouflage its imperialistic and aggressive actions. The fact that this fable has been exposed is very helpful to us. World opinion today is increasingly on our side. We are no longer alone. The door is now open for us to make real progress in achieving our national goal along with other subjugated nations.

This is how I understand the actual state of things, and this, I believe, must be the criterion of our national political practice. In my belief, the purposes of our newly created organization must be:

1. To defend the national rights of Georgia and to re-establish its statehood.

2. The problem of Georgia is one of international justice. Georgia juridically belongs to the category of nations the statehood of which cannot be denied and its automatic restoration would be realized by the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

3. Our national struggle for liberation must be based upon the anti-Communist and anti-imperialist forces.

4. To this end the organization must get in touch with the organizations of those nations which, before or after World War II, were enslaved by Russia.

5. Our organization should have close contact and work with all those nations which definitely take the stand of each individual state's independence.

We request the assembly to elect the members of the executive committee, and also suggest that they elect Georgians residing in different states who have become members of our organization, so that they may represent us in their respective states. The Executive Committee, as we see it, should try not only to establish good relations with Georgians all over the world, but it should try also to unite all of our scattered people into a single strong task force for Georgian liberty and independence, a fight which we share with all freedom loving people in our troubled world today.

Printed by Rausen Bros., 142 E. 32nd Street, N. Y. 149

FOUNDER: Alexander Tsomaiia.

EDITORIAL BOARD: D. Chatara; L. Dumbadse; S. Natoshvili; M. Simonidse; D. Sindikeli; A. Tchenkeli; G. Zaldastani.

ADDRESS: Leon Doumbadze, 40 East 65th Street, New York, N. Y.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Alexander Tsomaiia		1
In Memory of a Friend	by M. SINDITIELI	2
The Uprising in Hungary		4
Compromise on Principles	by G. ZALDASTANI	6
From the Editors		7
Fallen Idol	by S. CHIRAKADZE	7
Sparks Cause a Conflagration	by A. TSOMAIIA	10
Tbilisi — March, 1956	by M. SIMONIDZE	12
To the Trade Union Delegation of Great Britain		19
Georgia — March 1956	by A. TSOMAIIA	21
Khrushchev's Speech at the 20th Congress	by L. DOUMBADZE	26
The Georgian National Alliance		29