

Fourum Five continued...

Leadbeater's arguments, Prof. Ustina stated that in comparison to the plight of political prisoners and persecution in other lands, Moroz's case was not very serious. Indeed, he paints a picture of the Soviet authorities as being humanitarians who "took the necessary steps to keep him alive when he chose to go on a hungerstrike in the hope of becoming a martyr". Since nothing short of barbaric could describe Moroz's incarceration, Prof. Ustina's evaluation must be based on values other than humanitarian. So that he should not dismiss these statements as being mere emotional drivel, I would like to refer Prof. Ustina to Amnesty International's reports on the situation.

Unfortunately, Prof. Ustina's letter chooses to overlook the outright illegality of both Moroz's trial and sentence, which in itself is grounds for opposition. He also overlooks the fact that Valentyn Moroz cannot be considered alone, but has become a symbol of the literally millions who are the victims of unjust policies perpetuated by the Soviet Union today, which deprive the Soviet people of civil and con-

stitutional rights and pursue an active course of systematic religious and cultural persecution. Professor Peter Reddaway of London University, an internationally recognised authority on Soviet affairs, estimates that there are perhaps 1000 prison camps in the Soviet Union today, each with over 1000 people. If this, Prof. Ustina, is not serious, what is?

With regards to Prof. Ustina's statement that "if these elements were concerned about Moroz for humanitarian reasons then surely they would show similar concern about the more serious violations of human freedom and dignity in other lands", perhaps the best reply, may be to mention one of these "elements", who will be in Edmonton in the near future, Philip Berrigan, who has long been an active opponent of U.S. involvement in Vietnam and is currently very involved in the defense of political prisoners in South Vietnam and the Soviet Union, will be in Edmonton on February 9 and 10 to speak on the issue of Valentyn Moroz and other political prisoners, both in the USSR and elsewhere.

In conclusion, since Prof. Ustina is apparently enlighten-

ed as to the true nature of the current "vehement" Valentyn Moroz campaign, perhaps he could clear away the "smoke screen" and expose it to the rest of us who, until this time, must spend sleepless nights clinging in the dark to his rather nebulous statements of an odious and nefarious plot.

Nestor Makuch

The truth

On Dec. 31st, 1974, candle-light vigils and marches were held in several major Canadian centers manifesting public concern for the plight of Valentyn Moroz and other imprisoned dissidents in the Soviet Union. In attendance were city mayors, members of provincial legislatures and federal MP's, clergymen of various denominations, students and elderly people, workers, professionals, and academics a fairly representative cross-section of Canadian society. Hardly just "certain elements", as prof.

Ustina in his article, "Threat to Dignity" which appeared in *Gateway*, might have us believe.

What was the reason for these public gatherings? To show that the intensive efforts to bring public attention to the case of Valentyn Moroz and countless hundred of other prisoners of conscience illegally held in Soviet jails and labor camps, will not stop. On the contrary, they shall continue and with increased vigor in 1975.

In his letter, Prof. Ustina, perhaps with genuine concern, urges Canadians to take a closer look at the Moroz Defense Campaign and what it really means. I agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. Ustina attempts (as might be expected) to somehow link up the Defense Committee with "certain elements" who given the opportunity would show their "true" colors, i.e. "persecute dissidents" even more harshly than.... well, he doesn't say who.... perhaps Nazis or maybe Stalin N.K.V.D. (secret police). But that's hardly the point. Mr. Ustina, and others like him, who for some reason have a terrible aversion to ever saying anything critical of the real injustices perpetrated by the Soviet regime, cannot resign themselves to the fact

that their arguments "justifying" or "rationalizing" Moroz's imprisonment and treatment hold no water whether on a legal basis, humanitarian basis or otherwise (refer to Jan. 14th *Gateway* article, "Moroz, a Rebuttal"). And thus, all these references to fascists, Nazis, subversive elements, sinister plots, etc., etc. It's old hat I'm afraid. By avoiding the real issues in favor of blatant sophistry, Prof. Ustina appears to be adding fuel to the fire he is desirous of extinguishing. People will become even more interested in how the Soviets and their apologists can term "legal" a closed trial; or justify incarceration in mental asylums for persons advocating adherence to such documents as the Universal Charter of Human Rights; or rationalizing ten, fifteen, and twenty-five year sentences to concentration camps for persons "guilty" only of public criticism of existing injustices including Russification, and police terror and intimidation.

The question remains: is it for lack of evidence that Ustina is suspicious of our cause? There is more than ample evidence appearing in law journals, Amnesty International documents and reports, numerous books on the subject, and the Western press (which M Ustina so liberally quotes from carefully omitting any reference to Soviet political persecution) almost daily, testifying to the veracity of the statements and accusations made by the Moroz Defense Committee.

What is it that Prof. Ustina is fearful of? The truth? Or perhaps the Defense Committee's position on human rights (which he, whether intentionally or not, has grossly misrepresented)?

To clarify once and for all our position on the issue of human and civil rights, I refer *Gateway* readers to the course of action recommended by Dr. W. Tarnopolsky, prof. of Law at Osgoode Hall, in a speech made to the 11th Congress of the Ukrainian-Canadian Committee held in Winnipeg in October, 1974. Prof. Tarnopolsky is a Canadian civil liberties legislation expert, was a former dean of law at the University of Windsor, and is presently chairman of the Toronto Committee in Defense of Valentyn Moroz, which is the co-ordinating body for defense committees across Canada.

Prof. Tarnopolsky states, "... We will not convince anyone of our genuine concern for the human rights of Ukrainian dissenters in the Soviet Union unless we at the same time join in protest against the treatment of the dissenters of all nationalities in the Soviet Union, including the Russian, the Jewish, the Tatar, the Volga Germans, etc... Furthermore, many people will consider us hypocritical unless we show similar concern for the deprivations of other peoples, whether it be in South Africa, in Spain, Chile or in the Soviet Union. We cannot argue that the human rights of Ukrainians are the concern of everyone, unless we in turn are concerned with the human rights of others,

continued on next page

SHIRTS

CORDS

SWEATERS

JACKETS

ONE DOLLAR SALE

BOOTS

SHOES

LEATHER HANDBAGS

**BUY ONE ITEM AT REGULAR PRICE
GET YOUR SECOND PURCHASE
UP TO EQUAL VALUE FOR**

**THE
LITTLE BRICK
SHIRT HOUSE**

PH- 439-0535

\$1.00

**KAMPUS
KOBBLER
SHOES**

PH- 439-8476

IN HUB

BRING A FRIEND AND SPLIT THE SAVINGS

**Transcendental
Meditation**

FREE LECTURE

4 FEB., 8 P.M.

Tory Building - 14th Floor
Graduate Students