4797
1955/09

The Voice of Free

Georgia



NOVEMBER 1955

No. 7

EDITORIAL BOARD: D. Chatara; L. Dumbadse; S. Natoshvili;
M. Simonidse; D. Sindikeli; A. Tchenkeli.
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: Alexander Tsomaia, 1335 Madison Ave., New York City.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Colonel Amilakvari	1
2.	Russification ..... *by M. Simonidze*	1
3.	The Legal Position of the non-Russian Nations ..... *by Prince N. Nakashidze*	7
4.	What has changed in the Soviet Union ..... *by A. Tsomaia*	9
5.	The Caucasian Problem ..... *by M. E. Rasulzade*	13
6.	The Truth about the Soviet Union	16
7.	Persecution of Religion ..... *by V. Sangulia*	17
8.	Tbilissi - Siberia - New York ..... *by A. Kekelia*	19
9.	Soviet Press and Radio Attacks Georgians in Exile	23
10.	Prince M. Soumbatashvili	24
11.	Michael Kedia ..... *by A. Tsomaia*	25

THE VOICE OF FREE GEORGIA

PERIODICAL INFORMATION BULLETIN

No. 7 New York November, 1955

Lieutenant-Colonel D. AMILAKHVARI

ACCOLADE FROM FRANCE

THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT has announced that the 1954-56 class (Promotion) of the famous military school of St. Cyr (the French West Point) will be named — "The Class of Lt.-Colonel Amilakhvari." This great mark of respect is accorded only to the most distinguished and gallant military leaders. The last years of life of this brilliant officer were described in No. 5 of the *Voice of Free Georgia,* by Major Alexis Tchenkeli. The action of the French Government and the General Staff confirms what we have said about the great services which Lieutenant-Colonel Amilakhvari rendered to the cause of the Allies and all humanity.

We are proud and happy for this recognition accorded to our countryman and are honored to extend our congratulations to the children and the brother of the dead hero.

30768

RUSSIFICATION

by M. SIMONIDZE

In my first letter on the subject of "Russification,"* I tried to show the great intensification of the policy of Russification which is being carried out in Georgia (and no doubt in the other national republics of the U.S.S.R. as well) by Moscow Communists. The past twelve months have not seen any change in this respect. If anything, this policy has been intensified still further. Everything is being done to make Russians out of Georgians and to make them adopt Russia for their own. More than ever is the Georgian language being corrupted by the introduction of Russian words. More than ever is history being falsified. All the emphasis is on what enormous services Russia and the Russian people (never referred to otherwise than as "the great Russian people") have supposedly rendered to Georgia. The treacherous annexation of Georgia by Czarist Russia in 1801 and by Communist Russia in 1921, is being represented as having been of the great-

* See the Voice of Free Georgia No. 6. November, 1954.

საქართველოს პარლამენტი
ეროვნული ბიბლიოთეკა

est benefit to the Georgian nation etc. etc.

Zarya Vostoka (the organ of the Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party published in Tbilisi in the Russian language) of December 15, 1954, reviews a new historical play by I. Mosashvili, entitled "The Way Into the Future." The reviewer says—"...This play shows the centuries old friendship between the Russian and the Georgian peoples. We see how, during the great historic events and during the perpetual fight for freedom and independence, the idea of brotherhood with the great Russian people was born in the minds of the Georgians... One of the main scenes of the play shows a dialogue between King Irakli II and an old peasant. The dramatist shows in this scene the unity of the King and the people in their wish to unite with Russia... When the King receives the news of the approach of the enemy, the Russians declare that they will take part in the battle and aid the Georgian troops... the battle takes place and the Russians save the King and his army."

Nothing could be further from the truth. It is an historical fact, that when on April 19, 1770, King Irakli was getting ready for the decisive battle against the invading Turkish armies near Aspindza, General Todtleben with his considerable Russian force left him on the very eve of the battle and took no part whatsoever in the fighting. The Georgians, led by their valiant King in person, won this battle, but certainly not thanks to the Russians, who did not fire a single shot. Todtleben's action was undoubtedly part of the deliberate Russian policy of weakening Georgia and thus facilitating her ultimate absorption into the Russian Empire. At any rate, the policy of interfering in support of Georgia and then leaving her in the lurch was consistently followed for nearly a century and finally led to that result. In 1722, Peter the Great of Russia led the first Russian expedition into the Caucasus. An alliance was concluded with the King of Georgia, Wahtang VI, who sent an army of 40,000 to assist the Russians. However, in 1724, the Georgians were dismayed to find that Russia had concluded a separate treaty with Persia and that Peter the Great had gone back home. The same thing happened during the reign of Empress Anne and, as we have seen, Empress Catherine. Russian archives still preserve Catherine's letters to her generals and agents, instructing them "to do nothing likely to strengthen Georgia." In 1795, when Persia's Agha Mohammed Khan was approaching Tbilisi with an overwhelming force, the Russians, in spite of a formal promise of help contained in the Russo-Georgian Treaty of 1783, did not send a single soldier to Irakli's aid and allowed his small army to be destroyed and Tbilisi taken and put to sack.

And yet, in spite of these historical facts, the reviewer of the play considers that the outrageous distortion of the truth contained in it is not enough, and concludes by saying: "...the great theme of centuries old Georgian friendship demands further realistic appraisal by the Georgian dramatists." And he is not the only one to make this demand. *Zarya Vostoka* of December 15, 1954, says: "...the great theme of centuries old economic and cultural ties between the Georgian and the great Russian nation is not yet fully worked out in the creations of our writers, poets and dramatists. The Georgian writers *must* show in their works, more widely and clearly, the theme of friendship between the two peoples and to show the unselfish aid of the great Russian nation to the Georgians." The same paper for January 11, 1955 says: "...up to now, our historians have not shed much light on the centuries old ties between the

Georgians and the Great Russian peoples." In the same paper for January 18, 1955, a Professor of History writes on how history should be taught in the Georgian schools: "...we must stress the study of the heroic struggle of *our people* (meaning the Russian people—M. S.) against the Mongol, Swedish, German and French invaders and create in young students the feeling of *national* pride (again meaning Russian national pride—M. S.)... the students must be shown what great influence the ideas of Russian revolutionary democrats had on the foremost men of Georgia—Chavchavadze, Tzereteli, Nikoladze. "In the same paper for February 16, 1955, there is a long article on A. Tzereteli, one of the greatest Georgian writers and poets. Here is an extract from this article." ... in Georgian literature, Akaki Tzereteli was a great fighter for friendship and brotherhood of peoples. He admired especially the great Russian people and its culture, under whose influence he began his work." The truth is of course that Akaki Tzereteli simply hated Russians and everything Russian.

More than ever before, everything is being done to make Georgians love and admire Russia and the Russians. As I have already mentioned, Russia is never referred to in terms other than *great* Russia, or the *great* Russian people.

Zarya Vostoka, Dec. 15, 1954—"...there is no force which can break the brotherly ties of the Georgian and the great Russian peoples. We would like to see more written about this in the works of the Soviet Georgian writers." The same paper, on Dec. 19, 1954—"...in all branches of national economy and cultural life, the Georgian nation is achieving more and more success, thanks to the brotherly help of the great Russian people."

On February 25, 1921, the Russian Red Armies occupied Tbilisi. This day has become a day of mourning for all Georgians. Yet this is what was written in *Zarya Vostoka* on February 25, 1955.—"Today we remember that unforgettable day, February 25, 1921, when the Red flag began waving over the ancient Georgian land. On that historic date the Georgian people, under the direction of the Communist Party and with the help of the great Russian people, overthrew the Government of the despicable tools of Anglo-American Imperialists and established the Government of the Soviets...today, as always, the workers of Soviet Georgia are filled with immense love for their older brother—the great Russian people—whose brotherly help is the principal cause of the economic and cultural development of Soviet Georgia and all the other peoples of our country...strengthening to the greatest extent the friendship of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., the Communist Party is carrying out a pitiless struggle against any deviation from the principles of socialist internationalism and Lenin-Stalin national policy."

In the same number, Chubinidze, the latest Chairman of the Praesidium of the Georgian Supreme Soviet, says: "...only the close friendship and the union established forever with the great Russian people have enabled Georgia *to preserve her freedom and to defend her national independence.*" It really sounds incredible, but that is what Chubinidze wrote.

It seems quite obvious that the régime is really worried about the hatred of the Georgians and other non-Russians of the Soviet Union for Russia and the Russians. Otherwise why this frantic campaign to make them liked?

"The brotherly help of the great Russian people is the principal cause of the economic and cultural development of Soviet Georgia"—that is what the Communists are repeating

endlessly. Well, what are the facts? Here is an extract from "Communist Takeover and Occupation of Georgia," Special Report No. 6 of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, House of Representatives, Eighty-Third Congress, Second Session, Page 25.

"Right from the first, the Communists adopted a "colonial" economic policy in Georgia. That is to say, the whole economy of Georgia was geared to that of Soviet Russia and gradually Georgia, which up to the first World War and during the period of independence, had a very considerable trade with the outside world, became entirely dependent on the Russian market. Georgian manganese used to supply the steel plants of England, Germany, Belgium and France; Georgian tobacco went to England, Scandinavian countries and even Egypt, from where it was re-exported as Egyptian; Georgian fruit and wines were world famous and found a market in all the countries of Europe. All these products, and many more besides, now go exclusively to Soviet Russia."

It is true that the Communists have industrialized Georgia to a great extent. A great many hydro-electric plants have been built; the mining industry (manganese, iron, copper, lead, zinc, barytes) has been greatly expanded; metallurgical works, iron and steel plants, machine building, the automible industry, the chemical industry—all of these have been either begun or greatly expanded. But all of them are of very little real benefit to Georgia. All their products go exclusively to Russia, and when Georgia becomes independent once again she will have a hard time finding markets for her industrial products—except in Russia.

The same is true of agriculture. The Communists have expanded tremendously the tea, tobacco and citrus fruit industries—because Russia needs these products. On the other hand, wheat and corn have been neglected, and Georgia is obliged to import grain and flour from Russia (when she can get it). From time immemorial Georgians have been famed for their wine making and Georgia for the quality of her wines. This industry has been neglected, probably because the Communists believe that Russian vodka is better for the working masses than Georgian wine. All the products of Georgia go to Russia. One has only to pick up one number of the Tiflis newspaper *Communisti* to see quite open statements to that effect and even photographs which show trainloads and truckloads of Georgian fruit, tobacco, canned goods etc., being sent to Russia. Georgian butter, cheese and other dairy products are plentiful in Moscow, but there is a scarcity of them in Tiflis. Oranges, mandarins, grapefruit, are sent to Stalingrad and to the industrial centers of Siberia, yet they cannot be found in Batumi, the center of the citrus fruit industry.

According to a reliable report received from Georgia, in May of 1953, Beria ordered that all products of local manufacture were to be first released on the local market, and only after it was taken care of was the remainder to be sent to Russia. It was also Beria's plan to have sufficient land set aside in Georgia for raising grain, in order to satisfy in full the need of the local population. Needless to say that, after the liquidation of Beria, these measures were revoked and the situation is even worse today."

The foregoing facts are given in a report by a Congressional Committee. Now let us quote another authority. In the *VESTNIK*, No. 6 (13), 1954, published by the Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the USSR. (Munich), there is an article by A. Popluiko entitled

"Socialistic Diistribution of Industry and the Economic Development of Union Republics." It is a most interesting and revealing article. Here are some extracts from it:

". . . Notwithstanding the fact that the industrial development of the Union Republics is proceeding at a faster rate than that of the Russian S.S.R. (which fact the Soviet propaganda always underlines M. S.), the economic dependence of each republic on the economies of the others, and especially on that of the Russian S.S.R., is growing all the time. Whether this is done deliberately or not, the fact remains that the economic interdependence of the whole territory of the USSR is becoming more and more pronounced. . .in fact, during the next ten years, provided that the rate of development of the economies of the national republics remains the same as it is today, neither in absolute numbers nor in their proportion to the economy of whole Union will the national republics equal the development of the central part of the Union. . .

"Analysis shows that in reality the Soviet régime has not followed some special policy of development of the national economies of the Union Republics. Everything that has been done and is being done now has answered a deliberate purpose, namely new industries in the national republics have tied their economies still more with the all-Union economy. (In fact, a purely "colonial" economic policy. M. S.) . . .

"Most of the heavy industry created in the republics needs to export most of its production. For instance, machine tools and small turbines produced in Georgia can be used on the spot in only very limited numbers. The Georgian metallurgical plant in Rustavi, produces mostly piping for the oil industry, practically nonexistent in Georgia . . .(The same could be said of the Kutaisi Automobile Construction Plant, which is supposed to produce 50,000 trucks a year, practically all of which go to Russia. Also the Zestaphoni Ferro-Manganese Plant, of the products of which probably 90 to 95% are exported." M. S.)

Popluiko then gives some very interesting figures, of which I will quote only those pertaining to Georgia.

The population of Georgia today is 1.95% of the population of the whole Union. Yet of the total capital expenditure of the Union, only 1.47% was spent in Georgia in 1941 and 1.70 in the years 1946 to 1950. Also, the latest figures show that the industrial production of Georgia in percentages of the total industrial production of the Soviet Union, was as follows:

Percentage higher than the percentage of population: Silk Material, 4.9%. Footwear, 4.0. Autos, 4.0. Coal, 2.4. Woolen Cloth, 2.4. Machine tools, 2.3.

Percentage lower than the percentage of population: Cast, Iron, 1.7%. Electric Power, 1.6. Coke, 1.5. Meat, 1.2. Cement, 1.1. Steel, 0.7. Sugar, 0.6. Animal Oils, 0.4. Vegetable Oil, 0.4. Oil (Natural), 0.3. Fish, 0.3.

Popluiko's figures are not complete of course. We could add —

Tea, about 100%. Citrus Fruit, 90. Manganese, 80. Wine, 50. Tobacco, 50. Barytes, 50.

I think that these figures prove that Georgia produces more of what her population does not need, but what Russia needs, and less of what would have been of real use to the Georgians. If ever Georgia is to regain her independence again, she will still be economically dependent on Russia, at first at least. All her industrial products—tea, citrus fruit, tobacco etc.—will have to go to Russia, because it is unlikely that, as far as tea is concerned for instance, Georgia will be able to compete on the world markets with India, Ceylon or

China; or as far as the citrus fruit is concerned, with Italy, Spain, Portugal or Israel. And of course, if she exports to Russia, she will have to import from there, too. The Georgian economy today is completely unbalanced and is developing on the lines useful to Russia and not to Georgia.

There have been no reports of any large-scale deportations from Georgia during the past 12 months, but Russian immigration continues. There are many signs of it and many quite outspoken statements in the press. For instance, in *Zarya Vostoka* for February 25, 1955, G. Leonidze, the Secretary of the Union of Soviet Georgian writers, says: ". . .the voluntary brotherly union of all the peoples of our country was achieved by carrying out the Lenin-Stalin national line of the Communist Party and by gathering all the other nationalities round the great Russian people . . . the friendship of the Soviet peoples is based on disinterested mutual aid. The workers of Georgia well remember when the weavers of Moscow sent them as a gift a complete weaving plant . . . Russian craftsmen taught the first Georgians weavers . . .Russian engineers and qualified workers lent their knowledge, skill and experience to the Georgians during the construction of the Khram Hydro-electric station, the Rustavi Metallurgical Plant and the Automobile construction plant in Kutaisi."

In fact, Rustavi was settled by 50,000 Russians; Kutaisi received about 15,000 of them and Khrami, I do not know how many. These three are good examples of the colonization of Georgia by the Russians.

Zarya Vostoka for December 21, 1954, says: ". . .the new cotton weaving plant in Gori is one of the most important industrial plants in Georgia. The famous weavers of Ivanovo came to Georgia to start the plant and are staying here, teaching and helping the Georgians." And they will no doubt settle there.

There are many more such indirect indications. At the same time thousands of Georgians are being compelled to leave Georgia and go to work on the "virgin lands" of Kazakhstan and other parts of Central Asia and Siberia. The Georgian papers are simply full of the stories of "volunteers" going away, of their "wonderful" life on the new lands of their letters home telling their friends to join them, etc. At first only single men and women went, but lately whole families. Voluntary emigration in such numbers is absolutely unknown in Georgia's 2,000 year-long history and it is most, most difficult to believe that there is anything voluntary about it. It is simply a new scheme to get more cheap labor, and at the same time to depopulate Georgia and other national republics of their native inhabitants. It is just impossible that any Georgians, everyone of whom is passionately attached to his country, would volutarily ex change it for the arid deserts of Kazakhstan. To name just a few, *Zarya Vostoka* for December 15, 1954; January 1, 13, 14, 16, 1955; February 5, 12, 25, 1955—carried stories of these "volunteers."

For over 2,000 years, the Georgians have fought to preserve their language, traditions, way of life—their national identity. Today they have to fight harder than ever. But who can doubt that the Moscow Communists will fail in their evil designs, just as have all those who came before them.

The Legal Position of the Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R.

by Prince N. NAKASHIDZE*

The Western states regard the problem of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union as complicated and difficult to solve, and are undecided on this point.

They thus hesitate to acknowledge and proclaim the right of these nations to regain their independent status, as they did in the case of the Baltic States.

The solution of this problem is left to the future and to a possoble turn in events and to newly created conditions.

Some of the Western politicians go so far as to regard this problem as a domestic problem of Russian politics which can only be solved with Russia's approval.

The West contents itself with defining the right of self-determination of the nations in general terms.

What exactly is the status of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union from the point of view of constitutional and international law?

I. *Historic Facts*

The following historic facts must be acknowledged:

The old Tsarist empire was created by conquering foreign countries and by subjugating foreign nations.

Many of these nations are in no way related to the Russians, either by origin, history, language, or culture.

The states of all these non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union existed for several centuries before either the Russian nation or the Russian State was formed.

The nations which were compelled to become part of the Tsarist empire —the Finns, the Baltic nations, the Caucasian nations, the Ukrainians, the people of Turkestan, and also the Poles at that time—were conquered by force; after the collapse of the Tsarist empire in 1917, these nations detached themselves from Russia and once more set up their own states in the shape of democratic republics.

The process known in international law as the "rehabilitation of the international person" (Jellinek) was thus effected.

These states were recognized by other states which already existed, and have thus become subject to international law.

At various times the non-Russian countries of the present Soviet Union were overpowered by Russia's military supremacy (in those days the RSFSR=the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic) and robbed of their independence. Some of these states, as for instance Georgia, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, were recognized de jure by Russia.*

Forcible seizure cannot be recognized as a lawful condition; and this

* See Foreign Affairs Infomation Series No. 28. Published by Scottish League For European Freedom. Edinburgh.

* It should be noted the Ukrainian Independent Republic was also recognized by a number of the Western Allies, including Great Britain, and, at Brest Litovsk, by Russia.

principle has been accepted by every state in the civilized world with regard to international law.

II. *The position from the point of view of international law*

1. The non-Russian member-states of the Soviet Union have been forcibly occupied by a foreign State, namely Russia (RSFSR).

2. From the viewpoint of international law these states are in the same position as were Holland, Norway, Belgium, etc., during the German occupation, and as are at present Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States under Soviet Russian rule, that is to say completely in Russia's vassalage.

3. The problem of all the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union is thus an international one.

4. The states of these nations had already been recognized and it is therefore not necessary to grant them recognition once more. The question at issue is the liberation of these countries from foreign, that is to say Russian, occupation and from compulsory membership in the Soviet Union.

5. Even at the present time the non-Russian states of the Soviet Union are formally and legally sovereign states. Even though their sovereign status may be only feigned for the sake of appearances, these states are nevertheless legally defined as such in the constitution (Articles 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 18a, and 18b of the Constitution of the Soviet Union.)

6. This legal fact has been corroborated in accordance with international law by the states of the free world, inasmuch as they have admitted Ukraine and Byelorussia, to the UNO as members enjoying the same rights as all the other members of that organization.

7. By reason of this conclusive act all the other non-Russian states of the Soviet Union have also been recognized as such, for they have been forced to become part of the Soviet Union in the same circumstances, and are members of the Soviet Union with the same rights and under the same conditions, as Ukraina and Byelorussia.

8. The annexation of the countries which Russia has occupied since 1939 has not been recognized by the states of the free world; their liberation from foreign occupation and vassalage and the restoration of their sovereignty and independence has been proclaimed and is demanded by all.

9. Legally and ethically it is nonsense to single out 1939 as the year by which to establish the right to restore the independent state.

The claim and the right to freedom and to the restoration of its sovereign status of a nation which has been forcibly subjugated cannot lapse with any one year.

10. The date on which the country in question was occupied is of no importance. If it were, this would be contrary to all ethical, legal and democratic principles.

11. After its collapse or disintegration the Soviet Union will cease to exist as such, and the various member-states will therefore no longer be part of the Union. In any case, they could not continue to be members of a Union which no longer exists.

12. There are no legal objections to this legal fact being corroborated according to the principles of international law. Moreover, this would not be an act of hostility towards Russia for, according to Article 17 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union, each member-state has a right to secede from the Union voluntarily.

13. In keeping with the acknowledged ethical, legal and democratic principles of the civilized world, the right of the non-Russian countries of the Soviet Union to the restoration of their independent status must be recognized without prejudice, similarly to the rights of the Baltic and other countries, and must now be proclaimed.

In order to ensure that the Russian Empire shall continue to exist, Russia is endeavouring to extirpate these subjugated nations by every possible means and is seeking to reduce the nations to a lower level by re-settling them in far-off districts of Siberia.

If the free world disregards all these facts, and sacrifices all ethical and legal principles, which form the basis of civilization and if, in the erroneous belief that it can ensure the "peaceful co-existence" of the two worlds by making light of the fate of millions of people and of the subjugated nations, it allows itself to be guided by "sacro egoismo" and recognizes Russia's right of possession over the nations as a vested right,— it will bring about its own downfall and will be doomed to destruction as was National Socialism and Fascism.

WHAT HAS CHANGED IN THE SOVIET UNION

by A. TSOMAIA

GREAT CHANGES occurred in the ranks of the rulers of the Soviet Empire after Stalin's death. Abroad, only the names of the executed, removed, or otherwise punished leaders are known. But, together with these leaders, tens of thousands of officials of lower ranks were also executed or removed. In Georgia alone, over 6,000 men were executed, arrested, dismissed, or otherwise punished after the fall of Beria. The same thing happened in all the sixteen Union Republics. And even though Malenkov is still alive, his dismissal also did not pass without a purge.

It is an invariable rule that the fall of a leader in Moscow is always followed by the dismissal, or worse, of many officials in the peripheries who had been connected with the fallen leader by personal, party, or administrative ties. This has been the rule in the Soviet Union for the past thirty-five years and it still remains the rule.

In the past, after every great purge it was always necessary to put new men into the Administration to replace those who had been liquidated and, until this was done, the work of the Administration and the Party could not, of course, go on unchanged and with the same tempo as before. The clean-out of "Beria men" inter-

fered very seriously with the working of the Soviet apparatus in Russia itself and in the national republics. Practically at a stroke, many thousands of experienced Government and Party workers were removed and this caused considerable anarchy and chaos.

In the Free World it was thought that the change in the leadership in Moscow would be followed by political changes in the country. It is evident that every person reacts in a different way to various events. It depends on temperament, intellect, education, and many other factors. It was of course impossible to expect that Stalin's heirs would act exactly like him in every respect. Molotov, Gromyko, Kruschev, Bulganin, differ greatly in their approach to events and persons, even though they serve the same cause and have the same purpose in mind. How reasonable were the expectations of the West and what, if anything, has changed in the U.S.S.R.?

Stalin, preoccupied with his plans and combinations, was always detached and pensive. He hardly ever smiled. Bulganin always has a wide smile on his face. This is the first outward difference. In Stalin's days, the whole internal and foreign policy was exclusively in his own hands. He had of course his agents who were sometimes called Commissars and sometimes Ministers (Litvinov, Molotov, Vishinsky, etc.), but they were all only completely subservient lackeys of his wishes. Today, the foreign policy is in the hands of two men—Kruschev and Bulganin. This is the second difference. These two go everywhere together and there is no doubt that there is a definite purpose behind this double-headed diplomatic arrangement. The main reason is of course the mutual distrust with which they look upon each other. Neither of them has as yet sufficient power and authority to become the absolute master and so, to avoid unpleasant surprises, they control each other and neither lets the other out of his sight. Kruschev has the Party behind him, but Bulganin is also not without support. Besides being the leader of a group of influential Army leaders, by taking an active part in the liquidation of Beria, he insured the mastery of the Great-Russians and thus won the support of the patriotically disposed Russian Communist intelligenzia. It is said that Beria was strangled to death at a meeting of the high Soviet leaders, and that the first man to attack him physically was the present Premier Bulganin. The Great-Russians in the Party and Administration cadres will not soon forget the part Bulganin played in getting Russia rid of yet another foreign, Georgian, master.

Thus, it is difficult to say who will eat who, but one thing is certain beyond any doubt: such a situation can not last long. Double-headed leadership, double-headed diplomacy, is a proof of the internal weakness of the Soviet Government and of the bitter conflict between the leaders. One of them must win and this in not too distant a future.

There is no doubt that temporarily the Soviet Union has come back to the theory of "co-existence" and that

Moscow propaganda has considerably changed its tone. There is less talk now about the "encirclement by enemies." This is an old, often used manoeuvre. The word itself—"co-existence," was coined by Lenin. And ever since then, whenever the Soviet Union was going through a crisis, was preparing an aggression, or was actively engaged in one, Stalin used to proclaim that the capitalist and the Communist worlds could live side by side and that this co-existence was both possible and desirable. This was done to soften the reaction of the West. Stalin even came out with a "theory" of his own, which said that Socialism can be built in one country, and all the surrounding countries remain capitalist. He himself did not believe this "theory" and he used it only to deceive the "capitalists" and to gain time. There is no doubt that by such "theories" the Communists did manage to gain time, deceive many "statesmen" and achieve great successes.

During the Big Four Conference in Geneva, Moscow again resorted to these tactics, and the sweetly smiling Bulganin offered to the Free World the preservation of the Status Quo. This made such an impression on the public opinion of the free countries, that a completely different attitude towards the Soviet Union has been noticeable since the Big Four meeting. In the press, side by side with unbiased, well founded criticism and evaluation, one sees more and more letters, articles, and items of news, written in a tone friendly to the Soviets. Gradually an opinion is being formed that the new rulers of Moscow are better than the old ones, that they may give up the policy of aggression and cooperate in the establishment of true peace.

How solid are the foundations for such illusions and who profits by them? We say categorically that they are useful only to Moscow and that they are deadly dangerous to the Free World. Communism is an aggressive doctrine. Aggression and oppression are the very nature of Communism. And the leaders of World Communism are not prepared to renounce their nature. To forget or ignore this absolute fact, to foster hopes that an evolution is taking place in Moscow and that great changes are about to occur, is to weaken to a dangerous point the West's will to resist and defend itself, and to disregard the ever present danger.

Nothing has changed basically in Moscow's policy. The Soviets have not given up a single one of their plans and intentions. The tactical manoeuverings of the Bulganin-Kruschev clique were forced upon them by a serious economic crisis within the Soviet Union, by the growth of discontent with the policy of Russification practiced in the national republics, and by the fear of the growing strength of the U.S.A. But there is not the slightest doubt that when Moscow has managed to put in order its internal affairs and has caught up with the U.S.A., she will again return to the attack. And the first bombs will fall on the United States. The Communists want to gain time until they are ready, and Bulganin's smile serves this purpose only —to gain time.

Perhaps we are mistaken in our analysis and Moscow has really changed? Maybe Bulganin's Government has given back to the people what Lenin and Stalin took away from them—freedom of speech, assembly, the press? the right to strike? Maybe they have restored private property and freedom of religion? Or put an end to executions? Or freed millions who were being tortured in the Slave Labor Camps? Maybe they have given back independence to Poland, Roumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Georgia, the Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Albania, Bulgaria, Armenia, Azerbaidjan, and so on and so forth? Maybe Moscow has given up its plan and hope of conquering the world and has brought to an end the subversive activities of its spies and agents? Of course nothing of the kind has happened. Moscow remains exactly what it was and will not change as long as it exists. Every country has a definite view as to what represents its national interest. A change in the Government does not mean a change in these views. Change of personnel may mean a change in tactics, but the purpose remains the same. In Great Britain, France, the U.S.A., and other democratic countries, governments change time and again, and men of different opinions, different approach to internal and external affairs, succeed one another at the helm. But every one of them works in the interests of his own country and not one of them deviates from the general policy.

It is about 400 years now that Russia has been pursuing one well-defined aim. "Moscow is the third Rome and the fourth will never be"—this basic Russian formula clearly shows the idea and conviction of an eventual mastery over the world. The Russian State has never deviated from this aim. In order to achieve it, religion and Panslavism were brought into play in Czarist times; today, Russia uses communism. There is hardly a parallel in the history of mankind when the intentions of one country to win control over the whole world were so clearly stated. One instance occurred in our times—Hitler, who in his "Mein Kampf" clearly stated that he meant to conquer Europe for the Germanic race. Yet, though he did not hide his aim, many so-called "statesmen" did not believe his words. We all know the result. Exactly the same thing is happening now only this time it is Moscow which is not hiding its intentions. Every day in the press, by radio, and in the speeches of her leaders, it is repeated and repeated again that the final aim is the conquest of the world for the Russian-Soviet-Communist rule. And yet Bulganin's smile was enough to offset all this—in Geneva he was sitting next to decent people.

For us Georgians the question is simple. We know Moscow; we know the nature of communism. We know that one can not trust the Kremlin's smiles and promises. Snakes change only their skins; the poison remains. We have always been, and are now, bitter enemies of communism and we will always be in the ranks of those who are fighting against it.

THE CAUCASIAN PROBLEM

The Idea of Caucasian Unity at Home and in Exile

by M. E. RESULZADE

It is with deep regret that the Editorial Board of the Voice of Free Georgia has learned of the death of the author of this article. Mr. M. E. Resulzade, was a well known publicist and public figure of Azerbaidjan. He fought tirelessly for the freedom of his country, but was a true friend of all the Caucasians, in whose common interests and eventual unity he fervently believed.

The idea of the unity of the Caucasus, which arose under special geopolitical conditions during the course of its centuries' old history, was proposed more than once at the time of the independent existence of the Caucasian republics by their various leaders who were willing to face reality. Of the many facts in this connection, we would like to cite here one characteristic exposition by the late Ahmed Bey Agaoglu, the well known publicist, and public figure of Azerbaidjan.

In 1918, Ahmed Agaoglu, who had returned from abroad, said the following to a reporter of "Azerbaidjan:"—

"The only form of organization which could ensure a stable future for the Caucasus is a confederation of the Caucasian republics. I cannot even imagine how the Caucasian nations could exist independently, each on its own, without a confederation. Those who think that one or another of the separate nations of the Caucasus could exist independently are deeply mistaken. Only by uniting can the nations of the Caucasus become strong enough to resist aggression from outside and eliminate that internal friction which I regard as a deadly danger for the whole of the Caucasus."
("Azerbaidjan," No. 31, 10. 9. 1918, Baku).

Politically conscious leaders of the Caucasus were deeply grieved to see the Transcaucasian Diet disintegrate under the pressure of great events. At the same time they did not lose hope of organizing confederative union on new beginnings in more favorable circumstances in the future. The idea of uniting the Caucasian republics after the disintegration of the Diet and the emergence of independent states in May, 1918, was constantly confirmed in the decisions of ruling parties, national governments, and republican parliaments, and in the acts of public organizations, which lett no opportunity slip of demonstrating their aims in this connection.

At All-Caucasian assemblies and international conferences, the representatives of the Caucasian republics ceaselessly stressed the vital necessity of setting up a confederative state.

The idea of Caucasian solidarity and confederative union is sustained in repeated declarations of the representatives of the North Caucasian republic on the necessity of confederation; the announcement of the representatives of Azerbaidjan (including the writer), when the Diet decided on 13th April, 1918, to secede from Russia, that it was essential to include the North Caucasus in the

Diet; the declaration by the head of of the Georgian State that one fine day the Caucasian republics would again form one confederative state; the defensive alliance of 16th April, 1919, between Azerbaidjan and Georgia, which Armenia was free to join; the resolution on the need for a Caucasian confederation carried at the Musavat party congress in Baku in 1919; the proposal of the Azerbaidjan government on this subject at an Armenian- Azerbaijan conference in 1920, repeated by the Azerbaidjan government at the conference of Caucasian governments in Tbilisi; the military and financial help given to the North Caucasian Republic for its defense; expressions of sympathy in all the Caucasian parliaments for the North Caucasus in resisting aggression by the armies of General Denikin; and many other acts.

This idea, whose realization was prevented by the Red Army's invasion and conquest of the Caucasus, continues to live to this day in exile. Among Caucasians enduring the misfortune and national humiliation and violence to which foreign occupation is subjecting our motherland, the idea of confederation had become the principal slogan of the fight. The question of confederation was thoroughly studied and clearly formulated by the various political parties and groups of the Caucasian emigration.

Various and numerous national public and political organizations, parties, groups, and publishing bodies discussed this question in their press and at lectures and meetings. Finally, the idea of Caucasian confederation took shape in 1928 as the Committee for the Independence of the Caucasus.

That same year, the Committee began publishing the French language "Prometheus" in Paris; a periodical to promote the idea of Caucasian confederation. Caucasian confederation was also supported in other national periodicals of exiled Caucasians, including the Turkish language organs of the Azerbaidjani National Movement—"Yeni Kavkasiya" ("New Caucasus"), "Odlu Yurt" (("The Country of Fire"), "Azeri Turk" ("Azerbaidjani Turki"), "Istiklal" ("Independence"), and "Kurtulus" ("Liberation"); the North Caucasian organ in Turki and Russian—"Volni Kavkaz" ("Hur Kavkasiya"); "North Caucasia" ("Simali Kavkasiya") the Georgian organ "Prdzolis hma" (The Voice of the Struggle"); and finally, the "Kavkaz" of those days, published in five languages under the editorship of the well known Haidar Bammate, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of the North Caucasian Republic.

On 14th July, 1934, on the initiative of the Committee for the Independence of the Caucasus, the representatives of three nations of the Caucasus—Azerbaidjan, Georgia, and North Caucasus—signed, in Brussels, the Pact of the Caucasian Confederation, whose text it is useful to recall:

Whereas—

—The complete development of any nation is only possible if there is national independence;

—The achievement of this aim will be hindered to the greatest extent without the union of all Caucasians within the confines of common frontiers;

—For the defense of the vital interests of the Caucasian nations, it is essential to unite their foreign policy and national defense;

—Only by means of such a union will it be possible for each Caucasian nation to safeguard its territorial integrity, which is essential for the complete development of their moral and material forces;

—Being sure of the complete support of all their compatriots for the principle of the unity of the Caucasus and recognizing that the Confederation of the Caucasian Republics is a form of organically linked political collaboration, the representatives of Azerbaidjani, North Caucasian, and Georgian National Centers, declare the following principles of Caucasian Confederation:

1. The Caucasian Confederation will safeguard, internally the particularity and territorial integrity of the republics and, externally, will act on behalf of all the republics, as the subject of the supreme state body. The Confederation will have a common political organ, and common customs frontiers.

2. The foreign policy of the republics forming part of the Confederation is conducted by authorized representatives of the Confederation.

3. The defense of the frontiers of the Confederation is entrusted to the Confederative army, consisting of the armies of the republics belonging to the Confederation and this army is subordinated to the command under the orders of the ruling institutions of the Confederation.

4. Any conflict arising between the confederated republics which cannot be settled by peaceful means, is submitted to the decision of obligatory arbitration or to the supreme court of the Confederation, whose decisions are subject to complete realization.

The fifth point envisages the setting up of a commission of experts to draft the future constitution of the Caucasian Confederation to serve as a basis for the work of the first Legislative Assembly of each republic. The sixth point leaves a place open for the Armenian Republic.

In 1940, the Armenian representatives joined this Pact of Confederation.

When the Second World War broke out, the Caucasian Movement found itself in a very difficult situation. After the conclusion of the notorious non-aggression pact between Nazi Germany and Bolshevik Russia in 1939, the German authorities ordered all the emigré organizations in German-controlled countries to stop all anti-Soviet activity.

After the outbreak of war between Germany and the Soviets in 1941 everything obviously changed radically, but with Hitler the national question was pushed into the background. The enormous importance of the national problem became apparent, however, in the course of military operations. The German leaders became convinced of the real force of the national factor which, in one way or another, could influence the outcome of military operations.

On the initiative of several senior officials of the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, including Count Schulenberg, who was shot on a charge of havingg taken part in the

attempt on Hitler's life in 1944, some of the leading representatives of the Caucasian political emigration were invited to Berlin to give their views on the Caucasian question, as the German Army was preparing to occupy the Caucasus.

The representatives of Armenia, Azerbaidjan, Georgia, and North Caucasus submitted memoranda, in which the political aims of their nations, and their insistence on the restoration of the independence of the Caucasian republics and their union were clearly outlined. This thought was particularly stressed in the collective memorandum submitted on 22nd June, 1944, and signed by the four representatives of the Caucasus.

However, the demands of the Caucasian representatives were rejected by Hitler's Headquarters.

Subsequent events in Germany in connection with the Caucasian question after this failure will be examined separately.

The Truth About The Soviet Union

On October 13, 1954, the Congressional Committee known as the "Kersten" Committee, charged with the investigation of Communist aggression, examined the case of Georgia. We are giving below two of the testimonies given during these hearings. They describe life in Georgia under the savage rule of the Communists, the suppression of religion, and the cruel treatment of ordinary human beings.

Mr. Charles Kersten and the members of his Committee have done a magnificent job of informing the people of the U.S.A. and the Free World in general of the tragic fate of the nations enslaved by Communist Russia. Not everyone here knows that a bitter unceasing struggle has been going on in the Soviet Union—the struggle between Moscow and the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union. When circumstances permit this struggle takes on the form of armed resistance, but always the passive, underground resistance is there. This fact is being deliberately withheld from the people of the West. The so-called "experts" on Soviet affairs are always trying to prove that no problem of nationalism exists in the Soviet Union and that all its multi-national population is treated alike and is in the same position and situation. This, of course, is quite untrue. The population of the U.S.S.R. consists of two main and quite distinct blocks—the Russians and the non-Russians. The first block, the one that launched the Bolshevik Revolution, gradually—by force of arms, subversion and treachery—conquered the neighboring nations and formed the Communist Empire. Russian bayonets and treachery of Moscow agents established Bolshevik Communism in Georgia and other Caucasian States, and in Turkestan, the Ukraine, the Baltic States, Poland, Roumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany etc. etc. These conquered nations are doubly oppressed today—by the Communist régime and by the foreign occupier. We believe that even in Russia itself many are opposed to the Communist dictatorship, but how much more so is the Baltic or the Caucasian, for whom this savage régime is something that was forced on him by foreign machine-guns and bayonets.

Mr. Kersten undestands all this, but, what is more important, he was not afraid to proclaim the truth. By this he has won the undying admiration and gratitude of all the anti-Communists fighting for freedom against the Russian Communist Imperialism.

We consider it a privelege to extend to Mr. Kersten and to the members of his Committee our thanks as well as the thanks of all our countrymen and to express the hope that in the future they will be able to continue their useful and humanitarian work.

Following are the testimonies given before the Committee by two Georgians:

30768

Persecution of Religion in Georgia

by V. SANGULIA

Mr. FEIGHAN. Did you have any personal experience of persecution of religion in Georgia?

Mr. SANGULIA. Yes sir; I had personal experience. I knew very well a friend of my father's by the name of Harebeva, who was not only beaten but tortured by Communists, and they tortured him this way: The Greek Orthodox priests always wear a beard. That is their distinguishing characteristic in Georgia. Anyone with a beard was a priest. The Communists burned it off him, actually while he was still alive, set fire to his beard and burned it and I was a witness to that.

When I was a small child at school, all I used to hear from Communists about religion was that religion is the opium on the people, is the poison of the people, that it is an invention of capitalists, imperialists, and its only reason is to suppress the poor.

And we were told when we were young children that every time we saw a priest, that is how we should look at him, as an enemy of the people.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is what you were told by the teachers in school.

Mr. SANGULIA. Not only were we told so by the Communist teachers in the school, but they also told us that every time we saw priests we should abuse them, and call them all sorts of names and tell them exactly what the Communists were teaching us.

About 2 years—I don't know exactly the date, but about 2 years after the insurrection, the Communists came to our house and took my father who was a priest away. My mother, my poor mother, ran after him and took me with her. I was only a small boy, but I still remember what happened.

The Communists first of all wanted to kill him. However, they didn't execute him then and there, but they abused and maltreated him terribly. They cut off all his religious vestments from him, they tore his cross from him. Then they kicked him down on the ground and forcibly shaved his beard off, which was the greatest insult they could do.

Mr. McTIGUE. Do you know what the Communists did to the hight clergy in Georgia?

Mr. SANGULIA. Yes sir, I know that all the high clergy of Georgia was persecuted right from the beginning. However, at first, they didn't dare to touch the head of the Georgian Church, who was a very venerated and very holy man, Catolicos Ambrossi. Catolicos Ambrossi appealed later to the West for help. He sent a memorandum which described exactly the position of the Georgian people under the Communists.

Because of that he was arrested, but even then the Communists didn't dare to execute him, and they decided to bring him to public trial. The story of his public trial, of course,

საქართველოს პარლამენტის
ეროვნული ბიბლიოთეკა

was headlined all through Georgia, because, as I said before, he was a very venerated man.

Mr. McTIGUE. Did the Georgian people maintain their religious faith despite persecution of religion under the Communists?

Mr. SANGULIA. Yes sir, there is no doubt at all that the Georgian people have not only conserved the religious faith, but, on the contrary, because of the persecution, they even increased it.

I personally know of many cases when people used to come to my father, even after he ceased to be a priest, had no church and had no right whatever to perform any religious rite, people used to come to my father, usually at night, and asked him to perform some religious rite, either baptize a child or ask him to go and give the last rites to a dying man.

They used to do it very secretly. For instance, when they brought a child, we used to take him in the room and lock all the doors and all the windows and put the blinds down and hang blankets down, so nobody would be seen, and then quietly, my father would do the necessary rites.

And that was not just one or, two occurrences, that went on all the time.

I would like to bring one example which is very characteristic and which shows how dangerous it was for the population to do anything like that. For instance, one day a woman brought her child to be baptized. We knew she was the wife of the local Communist boss who was a Captain Toria. Of course, she brought the child without her husband knowing anything at all about it.

My father baptized the child, but shortly, perhaps a few days or a few weeks later, the fact became known. Well, not only the mother herself, but her husband as well were arrested, kicked out of the Communist Party and then he was sent away somewhere and disappeared. Even that he himself was a Communist did not help him—only just the fact that his wife had a child baptized was the issue.

I would like to point out, besides persecuting the clergy, the Communists also destroyed practically all Georgian churches and monasteries. As you may know, the Georgian Church dates from the beginning of the fourth century. During all these centuries, the Georgians defended their faith and there was a tremendous number of monasteries, cathedrals, and churches all over Georgia.

The Communists started right from the first, as soon as they occupied Georgia they started destroying it. First of all, either they took them out—for instance, the cathedral in Tbilisi, was destroyed. Or they converted them into clubs, or as animal stables—in fact, desecrated them as much as they could.

One particular example which I can cite, they took a cross of a very famous and old cathedral and put Lenin's statue on the top of it, Lenin's bust on the top, instead of the cross.

I would like to add one fact. Out of the thousands and thousands of churches in Georgia, in 1922 there were only about 1,500 left. That was stated in the memorandum which Catolicos Ambrossi sent abroad. And the interesting fact is that after the Second World War, in 1949 or 1950, a well known journalist named Salisbury, who was in Tbilisi and spoke to the present Catolicos, was told by him that the total number of churches in Georgia today doesn't exceed 100.

Besides destroying churches and desecrating them, the Communists, of course, looted every church of all the treasure which had been accumulated over the centuries. The Georgians are very religious people, and the cathedrals and churches used to receive very big gifts from Georgian kings, from Georgian aristocracy, and from the people. These treasures were kept for centuries and centuries. But, of course, the Communists looted them all and the interesting fact is that after they looted them, all of this treasure was sent off to Russia.

On one particular occasion a very famous monastery in western Georgia was looted. It contained treasures donated to it by a very famous Georgian king. Because of that, there was a protest sent to the Communist Government, asking them to return these treasures.

Well, they were very cynically told that these treasures were sent to Moscow for restoration. Of course, that was the last ever heard of this treasure.

I would like to point out that it is a custom

in my country to wear a cross. Usually, most people, when they are baptized, they get a little cross, and then they wear it through their lives. Well, the Communists tried by all means to remove all of these crosses from the population, and I personally know of a man who was appointed by the Communists as a sort of a collector of crosses in his particular village, and he told me himself, personally, that he collected everything except crosses—on not a single occasion would anybody give away his cross. They hid them away, in order not to give them to the Communists.

I would like to point out when I was at school, to what length Communists went in order to eradicate religion in Georgia. The school children, after every religious festival, for instance, after Christmas or Easter or some holy day like that, the Communists would examine the children and ask them whether they had any special sort of a dinner or anything on that day at their home, in their family.

And if the child would say, "Yes, for Christmas we had turkey," immediately his family would be arrested and maybe deported or maybe worse.

Or, another thing, in Georgia, as in many other countries, there is a custom at Eastertime to dye eggs different colors, you know, they dye them red or green or blue. Well, after every Easter the Communists would come to the schools and examine children's fingers. If they saw the child had his fingers dyed, that means that they had religious feelings in the family, and immediately they would go to that family.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Sangulia, did the Georgian clergy elect to remain with their people after the occupation by the Russian Communists?

Mr. SANGULIA. Hardly any Georgian priests left Georgia after the invasion. They all elected to stay with their flock and look after them. And I know, from personal experience, that they did everything they could under the very worst conditions to look after their people. And I am quite certain that if there are any left alive in Georgia they still continue to do so.

Mr. FEIGHAN. How did the Communists attempt to separate the children of Georgia from the clergy and their historical religion?

Mr. SANGULIA. All the time I was at school, I was under the very strongest possible Communist antireligious propaganda. We used to have special men who gave special lectures, telling us of the evils of religion, telling us that religion is only an invention for the benefit of capitalists, imperialists, etc., telling us that we should forget about all this, and believe only in the one faith, which is the communistic faith.

They told us to abuse the priests because they were the so-called enemies of the people.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Sangulia, on behalf of the committee, I want to express appreciation for the testimony which you have given, which is a real contribution to these hearings. What you have depicted shows clearly that one of the essential tenets of Russian communism is the absolute destruction of belief in God, the eradication of all moral values, and moral principles, the severance of all filial and brotherly devotion.

The Russian Communists desecrated all that was holy and in the service of God and our fellow men. We thank God for the perseverance of these fine Georgian people and their clergy.

Tbilissi -- Siberia -- New York

by A. KEKELIA

In 1921, when the Russians invaded and occupied Georgia, I wae only 14 years old and did not take part in the actual fighting. My father was a fairly well-to-do merchant, but after the Sovietization of Georgia he went back to his native village and started working on the land. I was helping him when in 1924 the great insurrection broke out in Georgia.

I was 17, but as I was a former merchant's son and as neither my father nor myself belonged to the Communist Party, I was arrested and sentenced to death. However, with the help of friends and relatives, I managed to

escape execution. After the insurrection was defeated and the Communists became masters again, in our small village alone they shot 18 persons in the first week. Among them was a girl of 15 and two boys of 16 and 17.

The insurrection cost the Georgia nation very dear. There was not a family which did not lose a father, brother, husband, or near relative. As far as I know up to 9,000 Georgians were executed and tens of thousands sent to Siberia.

I went to Tbilisi where in 1925 my father and all the family joined me. The Communists took literally everything my father possessed, so that we were without any means at all. For 13 years all our family lived in one small dark room. And when I was in Tbilisi I lived with them too.

In the same year 1925, I enrolled as a student in the social economic faculty of the Tbilisi State University. In my spare time and during the vacations I worked at whatever job I could find. This was very difficult for me, as I did not belong to the Communist Party and also because my father was an ex-merchant and therefore an "enemy of the people." Only one of my sisters had a permanent job and she helped the family as much as she could. Some relatives also helped us occasionally, but no one had very much himself.

In 1929, when I was preparing for final examinations, I was arrested suddenly and without any reason whatsoever. I was taken to the GPU (secret police) where I was told that the accusation against me was that I was an enemy of the Soviet regime, a counter-revolutionary, and also that I was arrested during the 1924 insurrection and escaped.

The man who was interrogating me handed me an already prepared document, in which it was stated that I admitted having carried out anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation which was punishable according to the Soviet Criminal Code, Chapter 58, paragraphs 10 and 11.

I was ordered to sign this document, but refused and was then dragged into prison. All the GPU men, interrogators, agents, and police with whom I had anything to do were Russians. I was put into a cell which was 4 steps long and 2 steps wide, and in which there were already 13 other prisoners. It was July and very hot. The atmosphere in the cell was unbearable. The cell was literally alive with bugs and rats at night.

We were taken to the latrine only once a day, for five minutes every morning; for the rest of the day there was a latrine bucket in the cell itself. One bucket for 14 men. The terrible stink from the bucket is indescribable.

Our food consisted of 400 grams of rye bread a day each; half a liter of hot water, supposedly tea, twice a day; and 2 soup spoons of gruel every evening. We did not receive any drinking water at all except the tea which I mentioned.

After 2 weeks I was taken out to be interrogated once more. Again I was told to sign my "confession," and when I again refused, I was thrown (literally) into a solitary cell. This was a circular hole, no more than one meter in diameter, so that I could never stretch out. The walls were absolutely wet. Water was streaming down them and the floor was covered with excreta of men who had been there before me. This cell was never cleaned out.

I sat or stood with my mouth against a small crack in the wall, and so could get some air at least. I must have been in this horror for 4 or 5 days. I lost count and finally passed out.

During these days, I was not fed a single time, but was given some water. When I came to, I was outside and surrounded by guards, who took me to the interrogator again. But before, although I could hardly stand up, they ordered me to wash my clothes which were indescribably filthy.

When I again refused to sign the "confession," I was beaten up. The interrogator used a heavy marble inkstand to beat me with. Then he ordered the guards to take me to "the bath."

I was taken to the cellar and thrown into a hole filled with water. When I crawled out they took me to another cell not much better than the one before.

Hungry, exhausted and weak, I broke out in terrible boils, but received no medical attention whatsoever. On the 8th day in this cell, I went on hunger strike. On the 5th day of my hunger strike, I was finally taken out

of the solitary and taken to the Metehi prison. Here conditions were better. I received some medical attention and began to take food again. But my boils were getting worse so a month later they sent me to the prison hospital.

The Metehi prison contained both political prisoners and just ordinary criminals. When I was there, there were about 600 political prisoners (all Georgians) and although every day 150 to 200 were taken out either to be shot or deported to Siberia, as many new ones came in, so that there were always about 600 of us politicals. While I was in Metehi the political prisoners rioted twice. Ten men were taken out for this, tortured and shot. I heard that such riots took place quite frequently.

In the prison hospital I saw a good friend of mine, a student of my faculty, V. K. He was terribly beaten up when he was arrested. His testicles were smashed and they operated on him and took them off. Besides this, his skull was broken just behind the right ear. One of the Russian guards kicked him there with ironshod boots.

Another young man in my ward was covered with wounds which were full of pus. Another one whom I also knew, Abkhazi-Emukhvari, lost his reason while I was in the ward. They used to beat him every day, because two of his cousins were the leaders of a guerrilla band. The Communists managed to capture the father of these two, tortured and killed him and burned down his house.

While I was in the ward a Georgian priest was brought in. He was beaten so badly that his limbs were broken and he died a few days later.

In September 1929, I was notified that I was sentenced to 3 years deportation to Siberia. This was done without any trial whatsoever. On December 10, together with 82 other Georgians, I was put into a cattle truck which was afterwards sealed. On the ninth day of the voyage, during which we received hardly any food or water, we arrived in Moscow.

We were taken to some prison, but 2 days later were again packed into cattle trucks (we call them Stalin's carriages) and started off again. There were six Georgians, and I do not know how many others of sort of nationalities in our wagon which was packed to suffocation.

Eleven days later we arrived in Novosibirsk, which was the collecting point for all prisoners destined for East Siberia. Here two other Georgians were added to our numbers. However, soon we were split up and myself and one other Georgian, P. Gegeshidze, were told that we would be sent to the camp at Biisk, south of Novosibirsk.

While waiting for transportation, we literally starved. Our rations consisted of 200 grams of bread a day, hot water (tea) in the mornings and evenings and once a day some horrible concoctions made of skin and gristle.

The worst plague in Novosibirsk's prison, like in all prisons and camps in the Soviet union, were the hardened criminals, murderers, bandits, thieves, who treated the political prisoners even worse than the guards—robbed, beat and generally maltreated them on every occasion. Cases of murder were of frequent occurence. These criminals were organized into bands and were encouraged by the Communist authorities, because they always sided with them against the politicals.

After eleven days in Novosibirsk, Gegeshidze and I were sent to Barnaoul. In the camp here there was an epidemic of typhus, but we stayed there for over a month. Here we two Georgians became very friendly with a Jew Zionist, Joffe, who was nothing but skin and bones, a real skeleton. He had tuberculosis in an advanced stage, but was getting no medical attention whatsoever. He was a good and kind man, and a good friend.

In Barnaoul camp the food was even worse —only 150 grams of bread and fish soup. which made us vomit nearly every time we ate. Occasionally we received gruel as well. In this camp the prisoners were treated very badly. We were beaten and kicked by the guards on the slightes provocation.

After a month in Barnaoul, Gegeshidze, Joffe and myself were sent to our final destination, Biisk. Here we were very lucky. The GPU commander released us on the second day and put us in the category of "free prisoners," that is to say, we were allowed to live and work outside the camp but had to report to the police twice a week and were not allowed to leave the town of Biisk.

Here I spent the next 3 years of my life. First, I got a job in a carpenter shop where I had to work under terrible conditions for 12 hours a day every day, but a few months later, Gegeshidze managed to get a job as an accountant in a boot and shoe factory and fixed me in the factory as well. But conditions here were no better. There were about 500 of us and every day at least 5 or 10 died. We were paid 6 rubles 20 kopeks ($1.60 by the official rate—in reality less) a month.

In 1932 I was to be released, but instead was given another 3 years (again without any trial whatsoever). The only exception was, that now I could leave Biisk and, as the official document said "reside anywhere in the Soviet Union except 6." That meant that I could not reside in the following six regions:

(1) Transcaucasia and therefore Georgia; (2) Ukraine; (3) Byelorussia; (4) Moscow district; (5) Leningrad district; and (6) Crimea. This was known as "free deportation," and a man in this category was always liable to new arrest and new deportation to the slave labor camps.

I chose for residence the town of Tambov in central Russia, because I had some Georgian friends there, Z. Guruli, G. Phaladze and G. Homeriki. I got some work here and just managed to keep alive, always going in fear of arrest.

In 1933, without any reason whatsoever, we four Georgians were arrested again and separated. I was sent to the prison in Voronezh, where the conditions were terrible. We had hardly any food at all and were packed in the cells so that we could hardly breathe.

It is a well-known fact that there was a terrible famine and a purge throughout the Soviet Union in 1933, which killed many millions of people, and conditions in prisons were much worse than before.

On February 20, 1933, I went on a hunger strike, remembering that it helped me once before. On the 24th day of the hunger strike (this is a true fact, to which I am prepared to swear), that is to say, on March 15, I was released and sent to live as a "free deportee" in the village of Mouchkan, 60 kilometers from Voronezh. Here at the station I was very lucky. I met a Georgian Jew from Kutaisi, Pitchadze by name, who took me in, nursed me and saved my life.

This summer there was a terrible famine. The Russian peasants were dying of hunger, but the Communist police and GPU continued to take from them everything they could lay their hands on. What shocked me then was the way the Russian peasants informed one on another. Perhaps they were hoping to win favor and save their own lives.

Several cases of cannibalism occurred in the village while I was there. The only food available was potatoes and these in very small numbers. We used to add chaff and some grasses to the potatoes and make a soup, which made us sick, but kept us alive. At least half of the population of Mouchkap village died while I was there.

Things improved a little toward autumn. The Communists took all the crop from the villagers, but left them enough to exist. Besides, nearly every peasant managed to conceal some grain.

In 1935, 6 years after being deported from my native country, Georgia, I was released and in September of that year arrived in Tbilisi. I presented myself to the GPU in order to get the papers necessary to obtain a job, but was told to leave the city within 3 days.

From some friends who were released before me, I heard that former prisoners were liable to be arrested and deported again within a few months. The so-called "enemies of the people" have no rights whatsoever in the Soviet Union. I decided to stay in Tbilisi and live illegally without any papers, and for nearly 3 years I managed to do so.

In 1938, some friends of mine obtained for me all the necessary papers, and I could take a job and go about free. I got a job as an accountant in a distillery and worked there until the outbreak of the war.

In 1942, I was conscripted into the Red army and sent to the camp of "politically unreliables." There were many thousands of us in this camp. Soon we were sent to Ukraine and worked just behind the front line (under armed Red army guards) on road and bridge repairs.

We were all impatiently awaiting the arrival of the German troops and were happy to go over to them at the very first opportunity. And thus I left the hell which is the Soviet Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Would you tell us briefly some of the experiences which you went through, particularly with reference to the deportation to Siberia?

Mr. KEKELIA. In 1929, when I was in the University of Tiflis, I was arrested without any reason whatsoever, taken to the Cheka. The Cheka was the secret police. Without any trial and without any accusation being made against me, I was thrown into a horrible little cell, which was only about 4 paces long and 2 paces wide, and which already contained 13 men. The conditions in that cell were indescribable.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Exactly what year was that, again?

Mr. KEKELIA. In July 1929.

Mr. FEIGHAN. How long did you stay there?

Mr. KEKELIA. In that particular prison, I stayed for 1 month and 4 days.

Mr. FEIGHAN. What was the total number of days of your incarceration?

Mr KEKELIA. Over 6 years.

Mr. FEIGHAN. How were you treated while you were in prison?

Mr. KEKELIA. We were treated much worse than any criminal has ever been treated anywhere. We were politicals. There is a distinction in Russia between political offenders and ordinary criminals. The ordinary criminals are treated very well, because they help the Communist Government against the political prisoners.

Practically every prisoner that I came into contact with was either beaten or kicked or tortured in some other way. There was no medical attention whatsoever. Occasianally, when a man was just about dying then perhaps he would be taken to the prison hospital,

Mr. FEIGHAN. Why were you put in solitary confinement?

Mr. KEKELIA. I was given a prepared document which was a statement that I accept my guilt for being an anti-Communist agent. When I refused to sign this statement, I was beaten up and sent to solitary confinement. This happened on several occasions, on at least three occasions in Tiflis I was ordered to sign this statement. Every time I refused and everytime I got worse treatment.

Mr. McTIGUE. When did you leave Georgia?

Mr. KEKELIA. In 1941.

Mr. McTIGUE. When did you eventually emigrate to the United States?

Mr. KEKELIA. In June 1951.

Soviet Press and Radio Attacks Georgians in Exile

Almost half of the first page of the Moscow *Pravda* of December 10, 1954, is devoted to a letter violently attacking the Georgians in exile. On the same day the same letter appeared in the organs of the Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party in Tbilisi, *Zarya Vostoka* (in Russian) and the *Communisti* (in Georgian). It was also published in the papers of the various Union Republics and was broadcast in several languages from the major radio stations of the Soviet Union. The letter names twenty-five Georgians and other Caucasians who are in voluntary exile in Europe and America. Among them are the following: N. Jordania, N. Ramishvili, Eugene Gueguechkori, Ak. Tchenkeli, M. Kedia, Dr. G. Alshibaiya, M. Alshibaiya, S. Kobiashvili, G. Gabliani, A. Tsomaia, S. Menagari, Sh. Odisharia, V. Homeriki, P. Ruhadze, M. Mgeladze, M. Arsenidze, N. Imnaishvili, Ouratadze, K. Inasaridze, Kuchuhidze, A. Kan-

temir, Ahmed Magoma, General Dro-Kanaian, Navasardian and others. All these men are proclaimed to be criminals and war mongers; according to the letter, all of them were agents of the German Gestapo during the Second World War. Now, of course, they are said to be working for the American Intelligence and plotting the destruction of the Soviet Union.

But the Soviet Press has too long and too often overshot the mark in trying to put over its own inventions as being the truth. This is why hardly anyone in the Free World believes its ravings. The article referred to above is no exception and it gives a completely false picture of the Georgians in exile, their lives and activities. But one of its assertions is quite true—every Georgian in exile has always fought communism and the Soviet Union, by words and deeds and whenever possible, by arms. All of us have fought against the conquerers and oppressors of our country and this fight will never be given up while one of us is left alive.

We are glad to note that our journal was greatly honored—three of its founders are mentioned in the *Pravda* article — the editor-in-chief, A. Tsomaia, S. Kobiashvili, and Dr. G. Gabliani. *Pravda's* attack can mean only one thing—Moscow is worried by our existence. This means that our work has not been quite in vain. This is most encouraging and will give us new stimulus to continue the fight against the cruel tyrant and despoiler of our country.

Prince M. Soumbatashvili

IT IS WITH DEEP REGRET that we announce the death in London of Prince Michael Soumbatashvili. Prince Soumbatashvili was born in Tbilisi of a distinguished Georgian family. He displayed at an early age an aptitude for technological subjects and he graduated at the University of Moscow in 1902 in the School of Mining and Engineering. Later he went to the Imperial College of Technology, majoring in chemistry, completeing his studies in this subject at the Sorbonne in Paris, 1905. In 1908 he received a first-degree diploma as Mining Engineer at the Royal School of Mines, Freiberg, Saxony.

He began his professional career as manager of lead and zinc mines at Sacanady, Algeria (1908 to 1910). After this assignment he returned to Georgia to take over the management of the affairs of his family. Their holdings comprised copper mines, lithographic stone quarries, large agriculture tracts and considerable forest acreage.

In Georgia he had held the following civic posts: Honorary Justice of the Peace from May 1911, Marshal of Nobility from 1913 up to the time of the Russian Revolution; President of the Agriculture Society of the Caucasus. During the First World War he was engaged along the entire Russo-Turkish front and in the whole Caucasus as Plenipotentiary of the Union of Provincial Councils, which dealt with hospital and sanitary service at the front and in the interior, various technical services, supplies and transport for the army, and the like.

From November 1918 to the end of 1920 Prince Soumbatashvili was diplomatic representative of the Georgian Republic in Switzerland and one of the Georgian delegates to the first assembly of the League of Nations.

From 1920 to 1924 he was Chargé d'Affaires of the Georgian Legation in London, working at the same time on behalf of the center of the Four United Caucasian Republics created in Paris in 1921.

In 1924 he was elected to membership in the Institute of Petroleum in London. Other offices held by him were: Managing Director of the Service Petroleum Company, Ltd.; and 1930-1932, Managing Director of European and North African Lines Ltd., London. In 1932, at the invitation of Sir Henry Deterding, he joined the Royal Dutch Shell Group as Manager of the Russian Department of the Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Company Ltd., and three years later he was appointed a director of the North Caucasian Oil Fields, Ltd. In addition to these posts he was affiliated with the Ural Caspian Oil Corporation, Ltd., the New Schibaeff Petroleum Company, Ltd., the Grozny Oil Fields, Ltd. In 1937 he became by appointment an alternate director of the Iraq Petroleum Company, Ltd., and other associated companies of the Middle East. He also joined the Board of Iraq Petroleum Pensions.

Prince Soumbatashvili became a British subject in 1945.

Up to the time of his retirement in 1950 he represented Shell Transport and Trading Company, Ltd., in the London Chamber of Commerce and at the British National Committee of the International Chamber of Commerce in London and Paris.

MICHAEL KEDIA

by A. TSOMAIA

Michael Kedia, still in his prime, committed suicide in Geneva, Switzerland. During the Second World War, by force of circumstance, he played an important and responsible role in the affairs of Georgians in exile. After the war he settled in Switzerland or, to be exact, he was interned there by demand of the Soviet Government. During the last period of his life, Kedia went through much humiliation, unhappiness and misery. Far from his famliy and friends, seriously ill with arterio-sclerosis, without any means and what is worse, without any hope for a better future, he finally reached the end of his endurance and volnutarily put an end to his days.

Michael Kedia was one of the leaders of those Georgians who, during the Second World War, worked with the Germans and together with them fought against the Soviet Union. He could easily have proved by many documents which are still preserved in the archives that everything he did was done with the knowledge and on the instructions of well known leaders of the Georgian Emigration and that he never undertook anything without their consent. But this would have meant naming these leaders. Kedia did not want to do this. He preferred to take upon him-

self the blame for collaborating with the Germans and not to involve anyone else. This action clearly shows the greatness of his soul.

To understand well Kedia's actions, it is necessary to know the position of all Georgians—those in the Soviet Union and those in exile—with regard to the Soviet Union.

Soviet Russia recognized the independence of the Georgian Republic by a treaty of "Friendshiip and nonagression" signed in Moscow on May 7, 1920. Notwithstanding this treaty, only nine months later, in February 1921, without a declaration of war, Russian troops attacked Georgia and after six weeks of bitter fighting occupied the country. The Georgian National Government, Members of Parliament and a great number of other political and military leaders, left Georgia and went into a voluntary exile abroad.

The Georgian nation did not recognize the régime set up by Russian bayonets and armed struggle continued. In the summer of 1921 an insurrection broke out in the mountainous district of Svanethi. The population killed or arrested all Communist officials and closed up the roads leading into the district. Moscow was obliged to use a great number of troops with artillery and aviation which, after three months of fighting, succeeded in crushing the rebellion. This was, of course, followed by cruel revenge and oppression. In August 1922, a similar insurrection flared up in another mountainous district — Hevsurethi. The insurgents captured the capital of the district—Dushethi—but in the end they were also defeated by the Red Army.

On August 29, 1924, there was an uprising throughout Georgia. The European and the American Press carried considerable information about this nation-wide rebellion. Russians put down this revolt and many thousands of Georgians were executed and tens of thousands were sent to Siberia or the Arctic regions to perish in the slave labor camps there.

After the failure of these insurrections it was impossible for the Georgian leaders not to change their tactics. The Georgian nation understood that it could not free itself by its own forces alone and that futile insurrections would only give the Communists the pretext to wipe out completely the Georgian people. The period of conserving the nation's forces began now. All hopes were pinned on possible changes in the international scene. In our opinion, the Communist's plans and ambitions for world conquest and domination must inevitably result in a world war, and we thought that this war would end in the total destruction of the Soviet régime because Russian people themselves would not be interested in its defense. The defeat of Russia would mean liberation of all countries enslaved by her.

Such was the opinion of Georgians, both in Georgia and in exile, and out of this conviction new tactics of the fight for liberation were devised.

World War II began in 1939. During its first stage, Germany and the Soviet Union were Allies. Georgians in exile in Europe honorably performed their duty and fought in the Armies of the Western democracies against Germany and the Soviet Union. In France, the Georgians formed a special military unit. In Poland, the Georgian officers gave a very good account of themselves and kept up the military tradition of their country. And in spite of the fact that there was a large Georgian colony in Germany, no Georgian fought in the ranks of the German Army. This proves that during the first period of the war, that is to say during the period when the democratic West was fighting against the Nazi-Communist Alliance of Germany, and the Soviet Union, the

Georgians were wholeheartedly on the side of the West. In 1939, two declarations officially put this on record. One was issued by the Georgian National Government-in-Exile and the other by the Georgian Opposition.

In 1941, Germany attacked its former ally the Soviet Union and the second period of the war began. By this time Germany was holding nearly the whole of Europe from Norway to Greece and its victory over Russia seemed to be a foregone conclusion.

The Georgian political emigration was confronted with a serious problem—were the Georgians to take part in the war against the destroyer of the independence of their country, or were they to renounce this fight and give up the hope of returning to their homeland because of their dislike for Hitler's régime? There was no reason to believe that the Nazis would be better for Georgia than the communists. At the same time there was no reason to think that, in the final count, Hitler would be victorious. Of all the possibilities, the most likely one was that the events of the first World War would be repeated. Then Germany defeated Russia, but was herself defeated later by the Western Allies. It was becoming fairly obvious that sooner or later the United States would come out against Germany and, in that case, the Nazis could not win. Our hope and expectation was that before this came to pass—that is, the vanquishing of the Nazis by the U.S.A.—the Red Empire would be destroyed. It was imperative that when this Empire began to fall apart the active forces of the Emigration should be in Georgia in order to help the local people in the task of re-establishing the Georgian State.

This was in the minds of all those Georgians who began collaborating with the Germans and together with them fought against Soviet Russia. Every nation considers as its ally any other nation which is fighting against its enemy. Britain's Prime Minister Churchill became a close ally of Stalin because his country's interests demanded this alliance. But it would be stupidity indeed to conclude that Churchill had any sympathy with communism or the Russian régime. History gives us many examples of unnatural alliances. The democratic republic of France and autocratic Czarist Russia were allies in the first World War; the democratic U.S.A. and Great Britain became allies of the tyrannical régime of Russia in the second. Germany was fighting against the enemy and oppressor of Georgia, against whom the Georgians themselves had already been fighting for nearly twenty years. This enemy was indeed the only reason for the existence of the Georgian emigration. Therefore, whatever the nature of the German régime, objectively Germany was our ally in the fight against our enemy. This is the only reason why the Georgians worked with the Germans, and it would be futile to look for another reason. The position which the Georgians took was well understood by the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, House of Representatives, Eighty-third Congress, which in its Special Report, No. 6, entitled "Communist Takeover

and Occupation of Georgia," said as follows: ". . . It must be clearly understood that these Georgians did not fight for Germany because of any particular love for her, or belief in her cause, but because they thought that Germany was the power which would destroy the Soviet régime and its tyranny. They went over to the Germans because it gave them a chance to fight against communism and the Russian invaders of their country." This was the conclusion of unbiased, honorable men, who made a thorough study of the whole question. Their words apply to Kedia, as well as to all the other Georgians who fought on the German side.

It should be noted that Kedia began working with the Germans quite by chance. In the fall of 1940, a German official was sent from Berlin to Paris with orders to investigate the whole question of the Georgian Emigration and decide what was to be done with it. His first act was to close down the "Georgian Office," which had managed all Georgian affairs since the Georgian Legation in Paris was closed down in 1936, the year when France recognized the Soviet régime. The Secretary of this Office was arrested and it became necessary to have someone who would be able to defend the interests of the Georgian Emigration before the German authorities. Obviously this man would have to have a thorough knowledge of the German language and of the German mentality. Kedia, a former student at Heidelberg University, answered these requirements, and that is why he was entrusted by the leaders of the Georgian Emigration (Prime Minister N. Jordania and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, E. Gueguechkori) with the task of acting for the emigration in its relations with the Germans.

Thus began Kedia's work with the Germans and it must be said that until the end of the war he defended the Georgian interests ably and honorably. Gradually his stature changed. He had a big responsibility and he succeeded in putting himself above personal and Party interests. He showed tact, good judgment, intellect, and a remarkable ability for getting to know people and making friends. In Berlin he managed to establish close ties with all those Departments and persons who had anything to do with the Georgian question. Three of his best personal friends were: Count Shulenbourg (former German Ambassador in Moscow, a man who had lived in Georgia and who was a good friend of the Georgians; later he became one of the leaders in the plot against Hitler and he was arrested and hanged by the Dictator's orders in 1944); Professor Gerhardt Von Mende (the Head of the Political Department of Rosenberg's Ost Ministerium. Together with Shulenbourg he took part in the July plot, but escaped death); Erich Engelhaupt (the Head of the Caucasian Dept. of SS (Amt. VI), who also took part in the 1944 plot and as punishment was sent into the front lines in Russia).

With the help of these men, all of whom were opposed to Hitler's régime, Kedia managed to achieve a great deal. In fact, the history of the Third Reich has no precedent to equal

some of Kedia's achievements. We will name but a few. The Nazis considered all Social Democrats as their bitter enemies and in every country which they took over they arrested not only all the communists, but all the Social Democrats as well. And yet, no Georgian Social Democrat was arrested. An exception was made for them, thanks almost exclusively to Kedia's efforts. Another example—the Nazi's treatment of the Jews is well known; yet the Georgian Jews were not touched. Michael Kedia achieved something which seemed impossible of achievement—he managed to obtain a special status for the Georgian Jews and thus saved the lives of not only hundreds of them, but also many other Jews, by declaring them to be Georgians. We are reproducing below the letters of the Grand Rabbi of Paris and of other Jewish organizations, from which the reader can see what was achieved by Kedia. It is true that the whole of the Georgian Emigration helped Kedia in this matter, but this does not lessen his personal merit. No one would have been surprised had he said that he would not help or that he could not do anything. Georgians saved their countrymen of Jewish faith and, if we are not mistaken, there was no other similar case in the whole of Europe:

CONSISTORIAL ASSOCIATION OF ISRAELITES OF PARIS

Consistory of Paris
General Secretariat
17 Rue Saint Georges,
Paris IX

October 16, 1944

Mr. Michael KEDIA

Sir:

Having been informed by Mr. Eligoulashvili of the great services which you have rendered to your countrymen of Jewish faith, by generously aiding to save them from the consequences of racial laws, I associate myself with the sentiments of gratitude which they feel for you.

Please be assured of my personal thanks for your kind solicitude for their welfare and accept the expression of my respect.

The Grand Rabbi of Paris
Signed Julius Weiss

all Kreger's efforts and his anger, did not budge from his position—namely, that the non-Russian formations should not be incorporated into Vlassov's Russian Army. Finally Kreger gave in and said that the whole question of the national military formations would be reconsidered. This was a great victory for Kedia and the non-Russians.

Just before the end of the war and the final collapse of Germany, Kedia managed to escape into Switzerland, with the help of the representative of the International Red Cross, Dr. Martin. There he prepared a detailed account of the anti-Soviet effort of the non-Russian national groups during World War II and appealed to the British and the Americans to save the remnants of the Georgian military formations. Nothing came of this, unfortunately, and several tens of thousands of young, vigorous, anti-communist fighters were sent to a certain death at the hands of the communists.

Kedia remained in Switzerland until the end of his days. He could not return to his family in France, because in French eyes he was a collaborator with the Germans and therefore a "war criminal." Like every other active politician, Kedia also had not only friends, but bitter enemies as well. It is interesting to note that during the war these enemies tried to convince the Germans that, with the help of the Social Democrats and Jews, Kedia was working for the Anglo-American Intelligence; while, after the war, the very same enemies declared that Kedia was an agent of the German Gestapo. In reality, of course, he was neither. He was a representative of the Georgians, an Ambassador of the Georgian Emigration, and he was only defending the interests and honor of Georgia. This duty he accomplished as well as he could and as far as it was possible in the circumstances. In future, when the full history of the emigration is written, documents will be found to prove that Kedia was fighting for the liberty not only of Georgia, but for liberty and justice for all peoples. Even more to his credit is the fact that he was fighting for these humanitarian ideas in Nazi Germany.

We shall always remember with profound respect the name of Michael Kedia.

X 35.024

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

The Editorial Board wishes to express its thanks to all those friends and well wishers, Americans, Georgians and others, whose voluntary and generous contributions have made the publication of the "Voice of Free Georgia" possible.

However, more is needed and the Board wishes to remind all those who are in sympathy with its aims, that, although, there is no fixed subscription fee, all contributions, no matter how small, will be gratefully received.