

---

# THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

---

VOL. I—NUMBER 3

- THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE AND UKRAINE . . . . *Editorial*  
SOME LESSONS OF THE EUROPEAN CONFLICT 1939-1945, *Rhys. J. Davies*  
PANSLAVISM, ITS USE AND ABUSE . . . . . *Clarence A. Manning*  
THE ISSUE OF UKRAINIAN NATIONHOOD . . . *William H. Chamberlin*  
SILVER JUBILEE OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
1918-1943 . . . . . *Nicholas D. Czubytyj*  
IVAN FRANKO . . . . . *Stephen Shumeyko*  
IN SUPPORT OF THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM . . . *Simon Demydchuk*  
MYKOLA KHVYLOVY—COMMUNIST AND PATRIOT . . . *Honore Evach*  
THE UKRAINIAN SITUATION—BOOK REVIEWS—

UKRAINICA IN AMERICAN PERIODICALS

---

*Published by* UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA.

---

---

---

*Edited by* EDITORIAL BOARD  
*Editor-in-chief,* NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ  
*Associate editor,* STEPHEN SHUMEYKO  
*Published by* UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA  
*with the support of contributions of Americans of Ukrainian descent.*

---

---

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
The San Francisco Conference and Ukraine . . . . .	205
<i>Editorial</i>	
Some Lessons of the European Conflict 1939-1945 . . . . .	212
<i>Rhys. J. Davies</i>	
Panslavism, Its Use and Abuse . . . . .	216
<i>Prof. Clarence A. Manning</i>	
The Issue of Ukrainian Nationhood . . . . .	228
<i>William H. Chamberlin</i>	
Silver Jubilee of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, 1918-1943	236
<i>Nicholas D. Czubatyj</i>	
Ivan Franko . . . . .	251
<i>Stephen Shumeyko</i>	
In Support of the Cause of Freedom . . . . .	262
<i>Simon Demydchuk</i>	
Mykola Khvylovy—Communist and Patriot . . . . .	272
<i>Honore Evach</i>	
The Ukrainian Situation . . . . .	277
<i>Ukrainian-American St. Francisco Delegation</i>	
<b>BOOK REVIEWS</b>	
The Real Soviet Russia, by David J. Dallin . . . . .	283
<i>Lew Dobriansky</i>	
The Spirit of Russian Economics, by J. E. Normano . . . . .	286
<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	
Report on the Russians, by W. L. White—	
The World is Half Slave . . . . .	287
<i>Roman Olesnicky</i>	
Narys Istoriyi Ukrainy (Outline of the History of Ukraine)	
Collective Work . . . . .	291
<i>Nicholas D. Czubatyj</i>	
Baltic Essays, by Dr. A. Bilmanis . . . . .	293
<i>Dr. S. Demydchuk</i>	
UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN PERIODICALS . . . . .	295

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

---

**RHYS. J. DAVIES**, the Labour Member of British Parliament for the Westoughton Division of Lancashire, England, is one of the more interesting personalities in British politics. He is regarded as one of the leading authorities in Britain on the Social Insurance Schemes of Europe and a specialist in the post-World War I Polish-Ukrainian conflict.

**CLARENCE A. MANNING, Ph.D.**, Professor at Columbia University and Acting Executive Officer, Department of East European Languages. Specialist in Russian and Ukrainian Literatures, author of "Ukrainian Literature."

**WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN**, Foreign Correspondent in Soviet Union for the Christian Science Monitor 1922-1933, is the author of several works on the Soviet Union—"The Russian Enigma," "Ukraine, a Submerged Nation" and others. Editor of Russian Review and contributor to several American publications.

**NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ, Ph.D.**, Ukrainian Historian, former Professor of Greek-Catholic Theological Academy in Lviv, Western Ukraine until 1939, author of "Western Ukraine and Rome," "The Ukrainian Lands of Lithuanian Federation" and others, Vice-director of the Historical Department of Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv until 1939.

**STEPHEN SHUMEYKO**, President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Editor of the Ukrainian Weekly, Born in U.S.A.

**SIMON DEMYDCHUK, LL.D.**, coeditor of the Ukrainian-American daily "Svoboda."

**HONORE EVACH**, poet and literary editor of several Ukrainian Canadian newspapers.

## THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE AND UKRAINE

### *Editorial*

**A** QUESTION that is perplexing people throughout the world is whether there will be a peace conference. From time to time statesmen let drop remarks that specific problems related to the post-war world order will be settled at the peace conference, and yet no one appears to know for a certainty when such a conference will be held or whether it will be held at all.

Confronted with this uncertainty as to whether and when the peace conference will be held, representatives of neutral nations not invited to the San Francisco conference, as well as representatives of stateless peoples, made haste to attend it, determined to make full use of this international gathering, perhaps the first and last of its kind for some time to come, to promote their particular causes, or, to put it colloquially—to make hay while the sun shines. Among them, it is worth noting, were delegates of the nationally representative Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and also of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee.

The presence of these was but a manifestation of the great interest the UNCIO has aroused among native Ukrainians as well as those of Ukrainian extraction. As a people who have suffered from the war the most in the loss of human lives and property damage the Ukrainians naturally look forward to at least some improvement of their sore lot, and, of course, to the successful culmination of their centuries-old struggle for national independence which they have waged against any and all occupants of their native land. The San Francisco conference, although considerably limited in scope, gave them hope of some such improvement, even though the Soviet Ukrainian delegation there as a puppet of the Kremlin rulers can by no stretch of imagination be said to truly represent their will and wishes.

Despite the latter fact, Ukraine made itself strongly felt on the international scene by being admitted by the conference into the United Nations and thereby becoming a charter member of their security

organization. An intriguing aspect of this development is the fact that this was done on the motion of Molotov himself, head of the delegation of that regime which in 1919 warded upon the Ukrainian National Republic and deprived the Ukrainian people of their right to independent statehood.

Significantly enough, some of the delegates at the conference at first opposed the entry of Ukraine into the company of the United Nations on the ground that since Ukraine cannot act independently of Moscow it is not an independent state. They argued it would be establishing a bad precedent to admit into an international organization a mere province, or a member of a federation. If Ukraine can enter the ranks of the United Nations, they said, why then by the same token cannot any one of the forty eight states of the United States do likewise.

Here it should be borne in mind that these dissident delegates were not against Ukraine *per se*. They merely held that its present status was far from that sovereignty which would justify its inclusion in the United Nations membership. That they finally acceded, and unanimously, in inscribing the name of Ukraine in the roll of United Nations membership, was not so much due to assertions of Molotov that Ukraine was truly a sovereign nation and that it could exchange ambassadors, ministers and consuls with other nations, as to their general realization that the Ukrainian people, numbering well over 40 million people, excluding the ten million minorities' population, and occupying since the dawn of history a very productive and self-sustaining land, possess all the attributes and qualities necessary to national sovereignty. Chief among those attributes is the undying will to establish their free and independent state, as manifested by their several wars of liberation and the countless sacrifices they have paid on the altar of freedom. A final factor which must have influenced the delegates to vote for Ukraine's entry into the United Nations, was the heroism and sacrifices of the Ukrainian people (the Ukrainian loss in human lives is currently estimated at 25% of the entire population) and the great role they have played in the final defeat of Nazi Germany. And thus, the unanimous decision of the conference to accept Ukraine as a member of the United Nations was not proof of any particular confidence in Molotov but of the general conviction of the right of the Ukrainian people to become a sovereign nation.

Still all this does not dispel the enigmatic quality of Moscow's sponsorship of Ukraine's entry into the United Nations. After all, Soviet Russian policy toward Ukraine for the past quarter of a century has

been a constant and ruthless negation of the very right of the Ukrainian people to full statehood. Worse yet it deprived them of even those elementary rights which we in America take for granted.

The saga of Ukrainian suffering under Soviet misrule begins with the eclipse of the Ukrainian National Republic which rose into being upon the declaration of Ukrainian national independence (January 22, 1918) by the revolutionary parliament—Ukrainian Central Rada. This was followed exactly one year later (January 22, 1919) by the union of the Ukrainian National Republic and the Western Ukrainian Republic (which had arisen November 1, 1918) into one united, sovereign and democratic Ukrainian Republic. The Reds immediately attacked the Ukrainian republic, which, it is worth noting, found itself attacked also by the Poles, Denikin's Tsarist Russians and the Rumanians. At first the Red war upon Ukraine was ostensibly one for the introduction and preservation in Ukraine of the Soviet order, but its true character became revealed: a war against the sovereignty of the Ukrainian people.

The will among the Ukrainian people to be free and independent was so powerful then that willy-nilly the Reds, although daily becoming more victorious, had to give it serious consideration. Thus in setting up their puppet government at Kharkiv, in opposition to the democratic Ukrainian government at Kiev, they were compelled to proclaim the establishment of an independent Soviet Ukrainian republic. As a matter of fact, this "republic" had its diplomatic representation in the countries which recognized the Soviets then, such as Poland, Germany and Czechoslovakia. The separate identity of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic at that time is further attested by the fact that the Treaty of Riga was concluded between Poland on the one side and the Soviet Russian and the Soviet Ukrainian Republics on the other side, and that the text of the treaty was in three official languages, Russian, Ukrainian, and Polish. White Ruthenia did not enter into the picture then at all, although western White Ruthenian territory was ceded as a result of the treaty to Poland. White Ruthenia had by then been incorporated into the Russian S. S. R.

Despite this seeming separate diplomatic representation, the Ukrainian S. S. R. at that time was actually a fiction. Considerable evidence of this fact can be adduced here. Suffice it to point out by way of example that a Georgian, Comrade Stalin, was appointed (November 17, 1918) as the head of the Ukrainian S. S. R. Revolutionary Military Council: while a Russian, Comrade Molotov, was (from

November, 1920 to March 1921) General Secretary of the Communist Party in Ukraine, and as such the most powerful figure there during the Riga Treaty negotiations. Still from the formalistic viewpoint, the Ukrainian S. S. R. was a sovereign nation. Moscow had to keep that pretense in order to cope with the strong sentiment among the Ukrainians for national independence.

Nevertheless Moscow had by then a carefully prepared and guarded plan to liquidate the sovereignty of the Ukrainian S. S. R. This liquidation was to appear to stem directly from Ukraine itself. To that end all key positions in the republic were packed with Communist Party hacks carefully selected by Moscow. At first these puppets nearly overplayed their hand. At the Fourth All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets (Councils) in May, 1920 they went to the extent of passing this resolution: "Retaining its sovereign national constitution, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers itself a member of the All-Russian Soviet Socialist Federated Republic." Such zeal of its puppets in Ukraine alarmed Moscow, as the war between the Reds and the Petlura-led forces of the Ukrainian National Republic was still raging, while throughout the villages and towns of Ukraine anti-Russian-Bolshevik sentiment and revolts were spreading to a highly alarming degree. As a result, in signing the peace treaty with the now Soviet-occupied Kiev the Kremlin kept the more exuberant of its Russian followers in Ukraine in the background, and saw to it that the treaty itself between the Soviet republics of Ukraine and Russia spoke of a "military and economic alliance" between them.

The centralization of all Soviet power in Moscow continued nonetheless. In 1922 seemingly spontaneous agitation, actually sponsored by Moscow, began to be heard calling on all "independent Soviet republics" to renounce their independence and send their delegates to the All-Soviet Congress of Councils, which took place at the close of that year, and which led to the establishment of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. Still the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., adopted at the Second All-Soviet Congress in January, 1922, contained the phrase "the Union of Free Peoples of the Soviet States." That first constitution at least provided the individual republics considerable autonomy. Aside from the commissariats of foreign affairs, military matters, economic planning, and heavy industry (which were centralized in Moscow) the republics had still their own commissariats of internal affairs, courts of justice, education, and agriculture. At that time, too, the Communist Party itself was not as highly centralized as now. This period



may be considered as the peak of the cultural and economic development in Ukraine under Soviet rule.

This period of relative autonomy for Ukraine lasted, however, only about five years (1924-1929). Gradually Moscow centralized one commissariat after another and set up All-Soviet commissariats of internal affairs, justice, agriculture, etc. which took over the functions of the individual republic commissariats; heavy industry had been centralized some time before. Finally a new division of the U.S.S.R. into economic regions was made, completely ignoring the national boundaries of the Ukrainian S.S.R. and linking up a portion of it with the Russian S.S.R. In this manner Soviet Ukraine found itself at the outset of this war well-nigh completely stripped of even those attributes which spell *de jure* autonomy. In reality it had long ceased to be a state, for how could one call a province a state which, for instance, has no national police force of its own but is policed solely by the all-Soviet and all-powerful NKVD centered in and controlled solely by Moscow.

Summing it all up, it is clear that as a result of all this centralization Ukraine has become virtually a province of Russia. The fictitious restoration to the republics late in 1943 of their former control of foreign affairs and military affairs is of little real consequence, for what independent foreign policy is possible for them when they have not even a police force of their own and when every citizen of Ukraine can be haled to court in Moscow, tried, sentenced, jailed and executed there? Moreover, what freedom of action of any sort is possible there when all power is centered in the Communist Party?

In a word the main trend of Soviet policy in respect to Ukraine has been not toward decentralization but toward centralization. Therefore the action by Molotov in urging at San Francisco the recognition of Ukraine's status as a sovereign member of the United Nations is at first glance quite strange.

The explanation by some that it was prompted by a Soviet desire to have three votes in the General Assembly of the United Nations organization holds no water when one considers that the power of a single vote by any one of the Big Three puts into the pale the power of a combined number of votes by the smaller powers. Actually, an entirely different motive lies behind the action, one that is in consonance with the new imperialism of Moscow in Europe. It is designed simply to demonstrate to the world, particularly to the prospective members of the U.S.S.R., that the Soviets are planning to create a Soviet Commonwealth, somewhat on the order of the British commonwealth, and that

therefore no apprehension should be entertained concerning the expanding Soviet influence, especially when the Soviets on their own volition and through their own influence have aided the eternally revolutionary and highly nationalistic Ukraine in gaining international recognition as a nation and state.

To a lesser degree this move by Moscow is designed to strengthen its hand when time comes for the final international accounting for its annexation of Western Ukraine, Carpatho-Ukraine and White Ruthenia. It will be made to appear that these regions have at long last been restored to their "independent" mother countries. Finally the significance of the move will not be lost upon certain Asiatic peoples and colonies, particularly those of the British Empire, for whom Moscow is advocating "independence."

The least plausible theory for the move is the one advanced by Molotov himself. He would have it believed that it was intended to reward Ukraine for her heroic role and sacrifices in the defeat of Nazism. Undoubtedly if that were true, the Ukrainian people would welcome this change in Soviet national policy. Experience, however, has taught them to receive the honeyed words of Moscow with considerable scepticism. And what else could they do today when they are confronted by the sight of tens of thousands patriotic and democratic Western Ukrainians being forcibly shifted from "sovereign Ukraine" into the limitless wastes of Siberia, or when they recall that hundreds of these Western Ukrainians were recently executed by the Reds on the suspicion of espousing the cause of the freedom of their country. Nor can they remain unimpressed by the fact that hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians are fleeing westward to the American-British occupied territories, for they well know what fate awaits them as patriots back in what the San Francisco conference euphemistically termed the "sovereign Ukrainian republic."

What is the reaction to the San Francisco conference decision in respect to Ukraine among democratic Americans and Canadians of Ukrainian extraction? It is none other than a positive reaction. With striking unanimity all of them have wholeheartedly endorsed the action of UNCIO in restoring to the Ukrainians the international recognition they lost at the close of their war of liberation a quarter of a century ago. At the same time, however, all of them have expressed the devout wish that this formal sovereignty should be made real, that the Ukrainians should be allowed to become truly sovereign, spiritually, politic-

ally, culturally and economically, which today they are not and for which they must continue to struggle.

Bearing this fact in mind an observer who is objective enough to distinguish between Soviet stock-phrases and shibboleths, deeds and misdeeds, will readily understand why the Ukrainians are such ardent advocates of a Bill of National Rights for Stateless Peoples within the charter of the international organization. If they were a truly sovereign people there would no necessity for them to be such advocates as then they would not require any international guarantee of their national rights but would safeguard these rights themselves. Obviously in Eastern Europe a "sovereign" nation cannot do that. Its citizens are always liable to arrest, imprisonment or execution by an act of a foreign government, i.e. the government in Moscow.

As for the Soviet Ukrainian delegation at the conference, no one acquainted with the totalitarian nature of the Soviet regime can believe even for a moment that it truly represents the Ukrainian masses. Moreover, its leader, Manuilsky, a veteran Communist, although born in Ukraine, has lived most of his life in Russia proper and has constantly been identified with it, to the extent that in 1918 he represented Russia in the peace negotiations with the Ukrainian National Republic. As the last secretary of the formally-dissolved Comintern, Manuilsky is an outstanding exponent of international revolution, which is repugnant to Ukrainian ideology.



## SOME LESSONS OF THE EUROPEAN CONFLICT 1939-1945

by RHYS J. DAVIES

*Member of the British House of Commons*

**N**OW that the actual fighting is ended in Europe it is well that a commencement should be made in the preparation of a balance sheet to arrive at a Profit and Loss Account as it were, so that we may be provided with a picture, however dim, of the results of the most terrible war in the history of mankind. During the last five years or so we in Europe have passed through the darkest of all the dark ages; and the end of our difficulties is not yet; some of our troubles are only about to begin. There are whispers abroad already that Famine and Pestilence are in the offing; those twin enemies of man do not, of course, take the slightest notice of race, caste, creed or frontier. The recent drastic cuts in our own rations in Britain are ominous. How well we remember the influenza epidemic that swept our Continent at the close of the Great War of 1914-18, when it carried away in its trail millions of otherwise healthy people! Incidentally, we were told at the time on the best authority that the germ travelled westwards across Europe from Russia.

What, therefore, of the European Balance Sheet in June 1945? Each country ought to know its own losses in personnel; the casualty lists have been published both in Great Britain and America. The French people, too, will know their own figures. It is inconceivable, however, that the statistics for Germany and Russia could possibly be as easily come by; they must have been literally colossal on both sides.

Next to the prevention of Famine and Pestilence, one of the most urgent problems of Europe is the settling of the millions of people who have been driven from their homeland and who are stateless, and probably penniless too. The East has seen and tasted the West probably for the first time, and there is rumour afloat that the East prefers the West and does not desire to return. On the whole, of course, the West is a better place to live in than the East; that goes without saying.

Then it is proposed that millions more shall be forced from certain territories for political reasons and power politics to reside

permanently in areas where they would be just aliens. All that is to be done by way of punishment for the wrongs done by their leaders. Those who propose to do that however ought to know that the average persons from the humble homes in any country have nothing to do either with making War or Peace; governments take care that they alone shoulder that responsibility; they will not, as a rule, allow the ordinary person the slightest interference with their prerogatives in that connection. Anyway, unless the statesmen make a better Peace in Europe on this occasion than in 1919 then, the Third World War will come upon us sooner, and with greater violence, than the tragedy that has just ended.

The material damage caused by the War which began in 1939 can never be assessed; no amount of calculation by experts could achieve anything like an accurate figure in that connection. Our own experience in Britain warrants that statement; one short illustration will suffice as an explanation. A small London Hotel was totally destroyed by German bombs; the property was rented and the tenant secured a very decent livelihood in the business. The owner of the property will, of course, be compensated, but the tenant will receive nothing by way of payment for that intangible thing termed "good-will", which on occasions is of considerable cash value. There is, therefore, no calculation possible of losses of that kind which may easily have bankrupted tens of thousands all over Europe.

But what of the wider issues? Great Britain unsheathed the sword in September 1939 in order to safeguard Polish independence, but after over five years of Blood, Sweat, Toil and Tears, responsible Poles living in England will say that their country is left in the same precarious plight in 1945 as it was in 1939. Whether we agree or not, it is obvious that the object which Britain had ostensibly in view in declaring War against the Reich has not been achieved. It is true, of course, that Britain and America defeated Germany and its European satellites, but that was not the declared aim of the United Nations. Whatever else they may have intended to achieve in the European theatre of War they never anticipated making large patches of the Continent safe for Communism, which looks already like being the fact. Instead of an Influenza epidemic as in 1919 a political creed is traveling steadily from the East westwards in 1945.

One of the greatest calamities of this War, of course, is the complete abandonment of the promises that the United Nations were

determined to implement the provisions of the Atlantic Charter and Mr. Roosevelt's "Four Freedoms". If those were the real aims for which the War in Europe was being fought, and if the governments concerned were determined to adhere to those promises, then the unspeakable suffering of the peoples might not have been in vain. Now, however, there is no pretence that those promises are to be made good; the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms are already forgotten and the common folk everywhere feel that they have been deceived.

But the ugliest of all the tendencies that are now emerging is the idea that small nations are allowed to live just at the mercy of the big ones. "The Great Powers" hold the field, and they seem determined that they shall become greater still, but that can only be done at the expense of the rest. The Great Powers might, however, suffer a shock some day; they might over-reach themselves by playing the small nations as if they were Chess and in the long run come into conflict with each other in so doing. Then, they would most certainly suffer a greater shock still if they allowed a plebiscite to be taken of the several races over which they rule and let them determine of their own free will what form of government they desire. That goes, by the way, for all the races that inhabit the earth, whether under British, American, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, French, Dutch, Belgian or any other rule. There is an inalienable spirit in every race that it will not for ever submit to alien rule; and whether it takes a century or two to become free, they will fight for that freedom come what may. And the Great Powers had better learn that lesson before it is too late.

The decisions reached at the San Francisco Conference will not avail much to assist the small races in their desire for self-determination. The Great Powers are to be a law unto themselves; they are to discipline everybody else, but there is no provision, forsooth, to discipline them. It is just as if four of the principal officials of a Trade Union told their members out on strike that they must not do any black-legging, at the same time informing them that that rule does not, of course, apply to the officials; they can black-leg with impunity. That state of affairs cannot, of course, secure peace. Indeed it is the Great Powers that have too often been responsible for wars; some of them became Great because they successfully aggressed against the smaller races. Whilst, therefore, we must welcome any machinery

which aims at the establishment of Peace we must always be at liberty to amend the rules whereby Peace can be maintained.

There are many more lessons to be learnt from the European debacle, but the foregoing are among the few vital ones that have emerged and come to the surface already. It is more clear than ever that War settles nothing; it has the universal habit of creating more problems than it sets out to solve. Finally, it is still true that "Peace hath its victories no less renown than War."

## PAN-SLAVISM, ITS USE AND ABUSE

By PROF. CLARENCE A. MANNING

*Columbia University*

**O**F ALL the movements that have perplexed Europe and the world during the last centuries, none has been more real and yet intangible than that which has been variously labeled Pan-Slavism, the Slavonic Brotherhood, Slavonic cooperation, and in its most recent form is being directed by the Slavonic Congress in Moscow with a branch set up in the United States. The mere fact that there have been so many interpretations of the fundamental idea, so many variations in it, leads the student to believe that it cannot be dismissed carelessly, but at the same time the contrasting characters of its various sponsors cast doubt upon the real nature of the tendency. It may then be worth while to look at the idea and endeavor to form some estimate of its fundamental advantages and difficulties.

It is a surprising fact that of the great linguistic families of Europe, the Slavonic which is the most widespread and the most widely spoken is also the least diverse. It is not too much to say that it is the only group which has maintained a fundamental and a clear unity. It is far easier for a Ukrainian, a Russian, a Czech, a Pole, and a Southern Slav to talk together, each in his native language and to be mutually intelligible, than it is for a Frenchman, an Italian and a Spaniard, or an Englishman, a German, a Dutchman, and a Scandinavian. That is the basis of all ideas of Slavonic cooperation. It makes the existence of a Slav world something that is not only a matter of theory but of actual practical value.

Yet we must not overstress this fact. It is curious that the community of vocabulary exists most markedly in connection with the simpler concepts of life. The common Slavonic heritage has survived most clearly in the common words for food and drink, for moving about, for the ordinary activities of the common man. As one rises in the scale of intellectual interests, the differences become greater except in those cases where the different languages invoke the general international vocabulary based on the borrowing or translation of the words universally used



by mankind and drawn principally from the heritage of the Graeco-Roman word store. It would be idle to suggest that such words as telegraph and telephone, when they are found in the various Slavonic languages, are a proof of Slavonic solidarity and not a result of world contact.

Side by side with this, there is a marked tendency among all the Slavs to lay especial emphasis upon local peculiarities and local dialectic words in an endeavor to strengthen the individual national feeling. The differences between Czech and Slovak, between Ukrainian and Russian are felt more keenly than are the equally great variations between the English language as spoken on various continents and the various efforts to make the writing of the Slavonic languages purely phonetic increase these centrifugal forces.

Yet despite this fact, the very similarity in common words leads men easily to believe in the possibility of a great Slavonic union. In the past we have seen the isolated city states of Greece with minor differences in language grow into a united country and culminate in the great Byzantine Empire which lasted for over one thousand years. The various German principalities have become one country. The Italian states of the Middle Ages have become a united Italy. The seven Anglo-Saxon kingdoms of England grew into one united state. Instance after instance can be cited and it seems only natural that out of the similar Slavonic languages there might ultimately develop a united Slavia, which would act as a unit. It is this vision and this train of reasoning that has inspired what we may well call the ideal and theoretical movement for Slavonic brotherhood.

This was the motive that inspired Jan Kollar in the early part of the nineteenth century to compose his series of sonnets, the *Daughter of Slava*, which was in turn the source of the entire group of Slavonic movements like the Society of Saint Cyril and Methodius in which Taras Shevchenko, Kostomariv, Kulish, and the leading Ukrainian patriots of Kiev took part in the forties. Vuk Karadjich in Serbia and many other of the leading Slavs of the same period sympathized with it and for some decades there was a strong agitation for it. Kollar, a Slovak writing in Czech, had been aroused during a period of study in Germany by the Romantic Pan-German movement which arose after the defeat of Napoleon. His mind carried him back to the days when the Slavonic world extended to the Elbe and then he dreamed of what might happen, if only the trend could be reversed and the Slavs could present to the whole of Europe the thrilling spectacle of a real brother-

hood that would extend from the Elbe to the Pacific Ocean. The leaders of the Lusatian Serbs in Germany, the last survivors of the once dominating population of eastern Germany, were equally stirred and they could write of the spacious native land of the Slavs which included two thirds of Europe and half of Asia.

This was a dream but from that moment on, there has never been a time when poets, philosophers, and dreamers have not sought in one way or another to bring that vision into reality. It was that hope in a small way that fired the leaders of the Slavonic Congress in Prague in 1848, even though it was almost entirely limited to the Slavs of the Hapsburg dominions. It was that spirit that in the renewed Czechoslovakia led the government to call together the Congress of Slav Geographers and Ethnographers in 1924 and to have read at the meeting the minutes of the Congress of 1848. It brought together in the interval between the Wars all those numerous conventions of Slavonic philologists, historians, scientists, lawyers, and journalists that were such an important factor in the intellectual life of the various countries. It inspired the expansion of Slavonic studies at the Charles University of Prague and the formation of Ukrainian and other schools in that city.

No one can question this view of the Slavonic brotherhood. The world can hardly conceive what a step toward world unity would be taken, if the Slavs could set an example of unity, if there could be developed a real United States of Slavia, which would throw its weight on the side of peace, prosperity, and harmonious relations. It would be a constructive and peaceful force without desire for conquest or aggression. If it succeeded, it would set an example to the Latin and the Germanic world and in Asia to the Turanians. It would inaugurate a new method of continental solidarity as momentous as the decision of the thirteen independent American states to form a new nation. It would facilitate commerce, it would eliminate national boundaries and reduce them merely to state lines, it would help education, and in fact there is hardly a field of constructive human effort which it would not benefit. Human imagination cannot grasp its potentialities for good and we can only applaud the idealists who have sought to bring it into effect.

This view of Pan-Slavism which finds its exponents in the noblest spirits of every one of the Slavonic lands is unfortunately not enough, for it is necessary to bring it into the field of practical activity. It is necessary to define more closely the form of administration that the new confederation is going to take. It is necessary to indicate the policies and the thoughts of the Slavs. The moment this is attempted, the Slav-

onic brotherhood passes into the sphere of practical politics, of actual life, and at that very moment difficulties begin.

The world is paying to-day a heavy price for the flood of books and propaganda which has been poured out by the idealists and the scholars of Germany in their efforts to define the great race. They started with laudable and even noble expressions of belief in the similarities existing between the populations of northwestern Europe. They went on to picture the achievements of the blond giants who were the bearers of Germanic civilization. Step by step, as they tried to work out a detailed program, they were led to the fantastic theories of a Hitler, a Goering, a Rosenberg, and a Goebbels, and to-day the entire civilized world shudders at the horrors and atrocities that have been perpetrated on innocent people in the name of a master race.

The believers in an ideal Pan-Slavism, when they step down from the mountain of vision and endeavor to create a practical program, are confronted with similar dangers. They are saved from a certain menace but they are brought face to face with the theory of a master language. They speak of Slavonic culture but to give that culture reality, they are forced to the architecture of the peasant house, to the Slav as he was or was conceived to be a thousand years ago before the coming of Christianity, before the days of Saint Cyril and Methodius, or they are compelled to accept a theoretical form of national psychology which may be more passive and less aggressive than the theoretical doctrine of the Pan-Germans, more democratic in content, but which is as little valid in definite practice.

After all, the Slavs are a group of people bound together only by linguistic similarity. No other key can be found under which they can be united. Among the Slavs are men and women of every physical type found in the Eurasian landmass. There are Nordics, Alpines, and Mediterraneans. There are people of the Central Asian stocks that finally merge into the Mongolian. There are representatives of Orthodox Christians, Roman Catholics, Protestants, Mohammedans, and Lamasists. There are people who have lived for centuries under the influence of Latin, Germanic, Byzantine and Turkish cultures. There are groups that are highly industrialized and there are others that are just emerging from the nomadic state. There are groups with an almost perfect record of literacy and there are others where illiteracy is the prevailing rule. It is difficult, if not impossible, to find a common denominator except in language and what unity there is to-day is but a common expression of the determination of men of every tongue and

language in Europe and Asia to unite against the fantastic claims to being a master race put out by the Germans and to the religio-political claims of Hirohito of Japan.

It is similarity of ideals and of culture that has served to bring together peoples who spoke related languages. It was the influence of the Greek games and of Homer which overcame the hostility between the Greek city states, and this was sealed by common experiences and perils. Dante and his *Divine Comedy* played an important role in creating a feeling of unity in Italy centuries before political unity became an acknowledged ideal. Chaucer and Shakespeare overcame any feelings of separatism in English after the Norman French and the Anglo-Saxons had fused. On the basis of common ideals Switzerland has survived as a multilingual state. Despite economic advantages, the Hapsburgs never welded their state together and even the Slavs within it were not able, despite linguistic similarity, to form a strong union and work together after the powerful hand of the monarchy was removed.

When we think in these terms, we see the difficulty of translating the ideal Slavonic brotherhood into reality. With the possible exception of Saints Cyril and Methodius there are no figures who are equally venerated throughout the Slavonic world. There are no poets, no writers who have won an international hearing, for even Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky are no more admired by the other Slavs than they are by civilized humanity. The Poles will not accept Shevchenko as the equal of Mickiewicz. The devotion of the Czechs to Jan Hus does not win the Slovaks. Nyegosh is not an overwhelming figure except in the Balkans. When there is a question of the higher culture, of the achievements of the mind and spirit, then the essence of the Slavonic union begins to disappear. The cleavages between the groups become more intense and the problem of unification becomes more serious.

It is sad but true that for one thousand years the Slav world has been torn and divided on all of the great cultural developments of the day. The struggle between the Latin and the Byzantine civilization was fought out on Slavonic soil and there has been many a bitter memory left in the minds of the people. The struggle between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants was fought out among the Slavs and while the Protestant wave receded among the Slovenes and the Poles, it remained strong among the Czechs but not the Slovaks. There came even a struggle between the Catholics of the Eastern and Latin rites, particularly in Galicia. Chivalry, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the French pseudo-classic period of the eighteenth century, the various develop-

ments of the nineteenth, all affected differently the different Slavonic groups and gave them varying cultures. Add to these the results of centuries of conflict in the quest for mastery and we will realize the latent hostilities and enmities that must be surmounted before the dream of a Slavonic brotherhood can be more than a pious hope.

This was recognized by the father of Pan-Slavism, the Croat Dominican monk, Yury Krizhanich, who journeyed to Moscow through Ukraine and Poland in the seventeenth century in an endeavor to persuade Tsar Alexey Mikhailovich to accept the Roman Catholic Church. He had worked out a plan of unifying the Slavs by making the Tsar the political head of all and of securing religious leadership for the Pope. He clearly saw that it would be necessary as a preliminary step to heal the religious disputes as a possible basis for making peace between Poland and Russia, between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholics of the Balkans. His idea seemed fantastic at the time and he paid for it by exile to Siberia. Modern thinkers may have varied in their estimation of the primary feuds that were to be abolished, but the real nature of the obstacles have not varied, and cannot be removed by the simple expedient of declaring the unity of the Slavonic against the Germanic world.

The mission of Krizhanich was a failure for he found at Moscow an attitude that was completely at variance with his own. The development of the Russian people had been very different from that of the other Slavonic peoples. From the time when these had definitely reached their present habitations, their history had largely been one of readjustment to conditions; prevailing among groups of approximately the same state of civilization. The object of both Kiev and Moscow was to expand their territory and dominion over non-Slavonic tribes. They had both to push their boundaries into the steppes and the forests. Successful as Kiev had been in this, it did not have the opportunities which later fell to Moscow of conquering and absorbing the less developed Finnic tribes. Later, Kiev passed into the Polish-Lithuanian state and Moscow fell for some centuries under the power of the Mongol Empire and the Golden Horde. The princes married the daughters of the Asiatic conquerors and there can be little doubt that the eastern influences and the imperial traditions which flourished in the east affected the thought of the Russians. Scholars may differ as to details but it is certain that the Russians developed an attitude toward life which was different from that of the other Slavs. Then with the liberation of the country and the marriage of Ivan III to Sofia Paleologue in the fifteenth

century, the idea of the Third Rome became deeply implanted in Russian thought and the proud traditions of Constantinople were transferred to the northern capital. The position of the Tsar was such that by the time of Alexey Mikhailovich, the Tsar felt himself definitely superior to his subjects. His will was law and he did not feel inclined to bind himself in any way toward any one on earth. The success of the country in securing control of Ukraine, of dividing Poland in the next century, the opportunity of acting as the big brother and protector to the Christians in the Ottoman Empire, and the growing power of the country after the reforms of Peter all combined to give the country the feeling that it was the supreme factor among the Slavs and at the same time increased its belief in its power as the great Orthodox country.

By the time of Pushkin this belief had grown even stronger. The poet was able to declare that all the Slavonic rivers had to run into the Russian sea. This gave rise to another type of Pan-Slavic feeling, which was reflected in the Slavophile movement, in the campaigns for securing control of the Straits and Central Asia, in the efforts to secure a foothold on the American continent in Alaska. Poets, writers, and thinkers spoke of Russia and the Slavs; they talked of their Slavonic heritage but at the same time they looked askance at the other Slavs. They valued the Orthodox of the Balkans as more or less poor relations whom they were supposed to aid and assist but they looked down upon the Roman Catholic Slavs as people who needed to be subjected to the beneficent culture which they were destined to furnish them.

It was this form of idea that impressed Western Europe with the menace of Pan-Slavism. It seemed to the people who came into contact with the Russians whether in Europe or Asia that Pan-Slavism was but another name for Pan-Russianism. It was this aspect which aroused the hostility of the other European countries to Russia. Undoubtedly there was in the country a great deal of unselfish love and respect for their Slavonic brothers but the writers who dealt with the problem of the mission of the Russian Empire undoubtedly thought only of Russia when they spoke of the Slavs.

Thus by the middle of the nineteenth century there was extant a political Russian Pan-Slavism, inspired and aided by the German aristocracy of the Baltic area which had been taken by Russia. This was in sharp contrast to that ideal Slavonic brotherhood which had been preached by Kollar. The contrast between the two conceptions was responsible for the stern treatment given to the members of the Society of Saints Cyril and Methodius and to Shevchenko.

It is extremely difficult to draw a sharp line in all cases between the two Slavonic movements. The experiences of the Poles and of the Ukrainians under Russian rule tended toward the elimination of all feelings for either tendency. The trend toward russification was so obvious that the population and the intellectual leaders alike were suspicious of anything that was done or said. National existence and the preservation of the language seemed to depend upon the assertion of national separatism, the magnifying of even the slightest-differences to keep from absorption in the great mass which was daily transforming into Russians a larger and larger proportion of non-Russian speaking and even non-Slav populations.

On the other hand, the Czechs living entirely within the Hapsburg Empire tended to cherish intellectual confidence in Russia. They might at times hope for assistance but even when the Russian armies invaded the Hapsburg lands to put down the Hungarian revolt of 1849, they brought no real aid to the Slavs of Austria-Hungary and did not make any important efforts to induce the Hapsburgs to improve their lot. Throughout the nineteenth century it is fair to say that the Western, non-Orthodox Slavs, when they thought of Russia, emphasized in their minds the ideal Slavonic brotherhood and could not hope for any intervention that would be of real assistance.

The Southern Slavs, the Serbs and the Bulgarians, in their subjection to the Turks, looked for the actual military assistance that Russia as the great Orthodox nation, protecting her lesser Orthodox brethren could give them. The Russian-Turkish wars which proceeded intermittently for two centuries gave the Serbs and the Bulgarians the hope that it would be through Russia that they would receive their freedom. They saw Western Europe protecting the Turks. They received gifts of money from Russia. Many of their young men and their ecclesiastical leaders were educated there. Uncle Ivan as he appeared in Balkan thought was far more the powerful rich uncle on whom they could materially depend than he was to the Western Slavs who could not fail to become suspicious of Russian policy. They viewed Pan-Slavism as a practical means of securing aid and liberation and not as a theoretical source of a better world.

Thus the three ideas, the ideal Pan-Slavism, the Russian desire for domination, and the desire for Russian aid in trouble coexisted throughout the century. They were really in conflict with one another and also with the anti-Russian feelings that were held by many Slavs and other races included within the Russian Empire. It is to this fact that must be

attributed much of the confusion as to the meaning of Pan-Slavism throughout the world.

The First World War brought about the downfall of the three empires of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia. Thanks to the principle of self-determination all the groups which had been included in these Empires declared their independence and strove against overwhelming odds to maintain it. All this could not fail to affect directly and immediately the various Slavonic movements.

For the first time in centuries Russia was no longer the powerful Slavonic state. It is hard to-day to realize the vacuum that that produced in Europe and Asia. Where but a few years before there had been a strong country sure of itself and of its policy, its voice was now confined to a handful of White leaders who alone presumed to speak for the unity of the country, the maintenance of the ideas of the past, and they were confronted with the need of foreign support against their Communist rivals and against the new governments which were formed by democratic principles out of the old Empire. The world was quite unable to formulate any policy in this crisis. The great powers almost simultaneously recognized the Whites and the new governments.

At the same time there was no agreement among these new governments and for precious months during which the new Europe was being formed, the succession states fought Whites, Communists and one another, all in the name of self-determination, the restoration of the old, and the creation of the new. The hope of the peaceable foundation of a new series of states gradually disappeared and there came clashes between Poland and Ukraine, Poland and Czechoslovakia, Poland and Lithuania, and so on. History served to prevent a settlement and when peace was finally restored, it was on lines quite different from what was planned or seemed likely.

The result was shown in the new forms of action. The ideal theories of a Slavonic brotherhood as outlined by Kollar, Shevchenko, and the men of that period seemed to be the only basis for continued work. Hence, as we have seen, this was favored and hence came the movements for Slavonic reciprocity and friendship. The Balkan states which had looked to Russia for assistance opened their arms to the Whites and declined to recognize the Communists.

The Communist situation was more complex. They were a militant group of internationalists, largely Russian in origin and Russian-speaking, who desired to head an international movement. They were not interested apparently in continuing the policy of the Russian Em-



pire but tremendously earnest about bringing all possible peoples into their new Communist International. Hence it came about that they regarded all the succession states which were not under Communist government as counter-revolutionary. They were as interested in creating a Communist government in Germany or Hungary as they were in Ukraine or Lithuania or Finland or Poland, but the support which the great powers arbitrarily gave to some states and refused to others that were less well known and the mutual rivalries of the new states allowed them to recover and organize as Soviet republics a large part of what had been the Russian empire. Once this was done, they were able to brand as counter-revolutionary any movement which was in opposition to the Communist pattern. The practical result, however theoreticians and legalists may argue, was the reestablishment of a Russian Communist hegemony over the entire area of the Soviet Union on such terms as the leaders desired. The populations of such areas as Ukraine which claimed local rights and peculiarities were severely punished, as were those groups that tried to maintain old Russian points of view that were displeasing to the new regime. Gradually populations were moved around, boundaries were changed at will, and there was a coordination of all institutions and a process of centralization that was in sharp contrast to the methods adopted for the acquisition of the territory. The result was however, the creation of a powerful state which was able to defend itself when Germany which had previously overrun and crushed all the lesser Slavonic states attacked in 1941.

The resulting situation again changed entirely the appearance of the Slavonic world. The governments of the states which had been overrun while Germany and the Soviet Union were still maintaining their non-aggression pact had been forced to take refuge in Great Britain. Those groups that were affiliated with the Communists had made their way to the Soviet Union and there soon after the outbreak of hostilities between Germany and the Soviet Union, the Slavonic Congress was organized.

It definitely appeared as a formal expression of the concepts of the ideal Slavonic brotherhood. The Slavonic world seemed united as the prey of the Nazi war machine and all nations were equal in their misery. It is small wonder that this Congress seemed the definite expression of all the hopes of the idealists. It did not seem possible that any force could resist Nazi Germany and the Congress early secured a wide approval from all except the most bitter and determined anti-Communists.

From the beginning, however, it avoided contact with the govern-

ments in exile. It naturally carried out the policy of the Soviet government which now found it expedient to emphasize its Slavonic affiliations. It encouraged its own partisan forces and as the Soviet armies advanced the power of the Communists increased. More and more the old Communist definitions of counter-revolutionary and fascist were brought to the fore and as one Slavonic state after another was liberated, it tended more and more to assume the Communist form in its internal organization and actions. For its part the Soviet Union was able to decentralize formally, always under the strict control of the Communist Party which still remains supreme in ideology and in system. Hence too it is that a Commissariat for Foreign Affairs can be set up in any Soviet Republic exactly as there is a Commissariat for Health or for Internal Trade. It still remains subject to the central authority for its power and approval, and any act can be overruled by the Union Commissariat.

It is too early to say what the fate of the liberated Slavonic countries is to be. Their new governments, as they have been announced, are strikingly similar in composition to many of the national republics just before they were absorbed within the Soviet Union: There are only a few straws in the wind. A representative of the Tito government in Yugoslavia has spoken fervently of the fact that the Slavs originally came from Russia and that their language must be reformed on Russian models. It is reported that Archbishop Stefan of the Bulgarian Church stated at the Slavonic Congress in liberated Sofia that the Bulgarians must all learn to use the language of Russia in their daily relations one with another. These may be exaggerated reports, they may have been made with an eye to gaining favor but they sound suspiciously like the declaration of Count Valuyev in 1863 that there is not, was not and never will be a Ukrainian language.

It is possible that for the first time in history the idealists and the philosophers of the Slavonic brotherhood are in full agreement with the official Russian Pan-Slavism, now turned into a Communist current. It is possible that this is but for the moment and that the Committee of Free German Officers may play its part in the final settlement of events. It is possible that there may be many other startling developments before peace is once again restored to the suffering Europe.

Slavonic Europe has been sacked and plundered, its population has been outraged and massacred during the last six years, and the screen of censorship still hangs over the entire area. We cannot tell what changes of population have taken place, what shifts of public opinion

have come to pass, what has been happening behind the veil. We can only say that the theories on the mutual relationship of the Slavs have varied enormously in the past years and centuries. They have swayed between democratic and republican ideas of a great confederation of brother nations held together by the mutual bond of an intelligible language and a frank demand for submission to the sovereign of Russia. They have alternated between demands for uniformity and the recognition of diversity. They have admitted differences in religion and in culture and they have denied them. It is possible that discord and division have been ended by the necessity of a world struggle against the Nazis. It is possible that the power of the Soviet Union has forced all into a permanent union. It is possible that the final answer is not yet given, that history is not yet over and that silence and agreement, as Shevchenko said, may be the result of force and not of happiness. It is futile to argue. The world is changing. It has changed in the last few years. Yet idealism and realism may not have finally merged and the changing principles of the last century may not have reached a permanent basis. We cannot tell. We only know that the Slavs for centuries have been seeking how to combine the culture of the East and West, the contrasts in religion and in modes of life, differences in world outlook, in history, and in economic development. Language, distinct but intelligible, has been the bond of union and such it will continue to be until mankind reaches a dull and respectable uniformity in a new world of law, order, monotony, and happiness.



## THE ISSUE OF UKRAINIAN NATIONHOOD

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

**T**HE ISSUE of selfdetermination for the people of the Ukraine was not directly on the agenda of the San Francisco Conference. Yet it was raised in indirect form by the decision of the conference to carry out a promise which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill had made to Marshal Stalin at Yalta. This promise was to the effect that the Soviet Union be given two additional votes in the Assembly of the projected world security organization, one for the Ukrainian, one for the Byelorussian (White Russian) Soviet Republic. The Ukrainian delegation has been seated and given the chairmanship of the commission of preamble, purposes and principles.

Ukrainian nationalists throughout the world will find satisfaction in this implicit recognition of the separate national identity of the Ukraine. Apart from the question of suffering in the war which was alleged as a reason for giving the Ukrainian and White Russian Soviet Republics special recognition, the Ukraine has the strongest reasons for claiming a seat in any assembly of the nations of the world.

The population of the Soviet Ukraine, according to the Soviet census of 1939, was about 31,000,000. As a result of the alteration in the boundaries of Poland which was foreshadowed by the Yalta agreement, and of the absorption of Northern Bukovina, part of Bessarabia and, probably, of Carpatho-Ukraine, which formerly belonged to Czechoslovakia, the present population of the Ukraine is in the neighborhood of forty million. It is the fifth state in Europe in population, after Russia, Germany, France and Italy. In population, in natural resources, in cultural achievement it compares favorably with many states which possess votes in the Assembly.

However, while the Ukrainian claim to a seat in the Assembly is indisputably justified, there is a very wide gulf between the seating of a Soviet Ukrainian delegation and the realization of Ukrainian aspirations for independent nationhood. Even the method by which the Ukrainian delegation was seated did not suggest the triumphant vindication of the national right of a free people. Molotov, himself a Great Russian and a high official of the centralized Communist dictatorship,

has held the spotlight of attention and has done all the talking for the Soviet Union.

Representatives of selfgoverning British Dominions, notably Australia, have not been backward with suggestions on their own initiative and have not hesitated to take issue with the British Government on certain points. It would, or ought to be, a major sensation of the conference if any Ukrainian or White Russian delegates should sharply contradict Mr. Molotov.

Had Mr. Manuilsky, former active leader in the officially dissolved Communist International and head of the Ukrainian delegation at San Francisco, desired, he could have supplied the press with grim and significant information about the fate of prominent Ukrainians under Soviet occupation. Dmytro Levitsky, chairman of the Ukrainian National Democratic Party (UNDO) died in Russia as a result of the hardships which he had suffered in Russian prison. Volodymyr Tselevich, another prominent figure in this party, and a member of the Polish Seym, was executed. Other wellknown Ukrainian National Democrats who have disappeared as a sequel to Soviet occupation of Eastern Galicia are Ostap Lutsky, director of the Union of Ukrainian Cooperatives, Nicholas Malitsky, former Polish Senator, and Hrych Tershakovetz, Volodymyr Kuzmovich, Dmytro Velikanovich—members of the Polish Seym. Equally ruthless treatment has been meted out to Ukrainian Socialists who fell into the hands of the Soviet authorities. Ivan Kwasnytsa, Secretary General of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party, and Ivan Kushnir, secretary of the Trade-union Committee in Lviv, died in prison and two other prominent Ukrainian Social Democrats who have "disappeared" are Roman Dombchevsky and Rudolf Skibinsky. Another prominent Ukrainian Socialist victim of Communist terror was Professor Dr. Wolodymyr Starosolsky, who was banished to Kazakhstan with his wife and two children. Both Professor Starosolsky and his wife perished as a result of the hardships of their treatment. Among many ecclesiastics and priests who fell as victims of the Red terror were Rev. Professor Nicholas Conrad, dean of the Philosophical School of the Ukrainian Catholic Theological Academy in Lviv, and Rev. Prof. Andrew Ishchak, a professor in the same Academy. They were killed on the eve of the Soviet retreat from Eastern Galicia in 1941.

It is significant that when the late President Roosevelt decided to acquiesce in Stalin's demand for three votes in the Assembly he requested three votes for the United States, although there are no subdivisions of the United States along national or racial lines which would normally

serve as a basis for such a request. No such request was put forward in order to assure a United States "balance" against the five votes of the selfgoverning British Dominions, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Eire. The reason for the different reaction to Stalin's request is obvious. Under present conditions the extra votes nominally accorded to the Ukraine and to White Russia are in Moscow's pocket. The selfgoverning Dominions, on the other hand, may and sometimes do vote against Great Britain.

The grant of separate membership in the Assembly is the first dividend which the Soviet Government has gained from its abrupt announcement, early in 1944, that henceforward the constituent republics of the Soviet Union should possess control of foreign affairs and of military affairs. It was Molotov who made this suggestion in a speech in the Soviet Parliament. What was noteworthy and rather curious, in connection with a change that would have been extremely important, if it had been genuine, was the indifferent reaction of the audience. Molotov's proposal was adopted with virtually no debate or discussion. According to foreign correspondents who were present at this session of the Soviet Parliament, the deputies gave little indication of even reading, much less carefully studying the projected new legislation.

Before the outbreak of the Second World War there were eleven constituent Soviet Republics, Russia (which includes a good many autonomous republics and smaller nationality subdivisions), the Ukraine, White Russia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Tadjikistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenia. Five new Soviet Republics were organized as a result of territorial annexations which the Soviet Union carried out between 1939 and 1941, the Latvian, Estonian, Lithuanian, Moldavian and Karelo-Finnish. Soviet forms of government were imposed on the occupied Baltic Republics, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. The Moldavian Republic had formerly existed as a nationality subdivision of the Ukraine, but was elevated to the status of a constituent Republic after Bessarabia was taken from Rumania. The Karelo-Finnish Republic, smallest of all in population, was organized by fusing Soviet Karelia with territory which was taken from Finland after the Soviet-Finnish War of 1939-40.

Had each of these sixteen constituent republics been placed in independent charge of foreign and military affairs, a peaceful revolution would have been effected in the internal constitution of the Soviet regime. But there is no proof that any such independence has been realized. Diplomatic missions from the sixteen republics have not sought

admission to the capitals of foreign powers. Nor have foreign countries been invited, or even permitted to send diplomatic missions to the capitals of the republics. Some treaties, or conventions for the exchange of population have been concluded between the Ukrainian and White Russian Republics and the Soviet satellite Polish regime. But this has been merely a matter of formal approval of arrangements desired in Moscow by puppet regimes, each of which could and would make no move without the permission of Moscow.

It may be that the Soviet decision to press for extra votes for the Ukrainian and White Russian Republics was a recognition of latent nationalism in these countries. But only commentators who are entirely unacquainted with Soviet political realities could suggest that the decree of 1944, by a stroke of the pen, created for the Soviet Union a constitution comparable with that of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The dictatorship of the Communist Party must be liquidated before one can take very seriously the contention that the Soviet Union is a voluntary association of independent peoples. This dictatorship, by its very nature, makes for a maximum centralization of executive authority in Moscow.

The Communist Party developed along centralized authoritarian lines during the period of underground struggle against the Tsarist system. It retained and even intensified its dictatorial character after it became the sole legal party and consequently the ruling power in the Soviet Union after the Revolution. The Communist Party, according to the latest available statistics, numbers about 4,300,000 members and "candidates," applicants for membership on probation. This is a little over 2% of the population of the Soviet Union, including the territory annexed between 1939 and 1941, which is over 190,000,000, without making allowance either for natural growth of population or for war losses.

Stalin suggested the semi-military type of organization of the Communist Party when he declared, in a speech before the Party Central Committee on March 3, 1937:

"There are (in the Communist Party) three or four thousand leading executives. These, I might say, are our generals.

"There are thirty or forty thousand middle executives. These are our Party officers.

"Then there are one hundred or one hundred and fifty thousand

members of the junior Party commanding staff. These are, one may say, our Party non-commissioned officers."

If one should carry this analogy further, Stalin might be described as commander-in-chief of this strongly disciplined party, with a general staff in the Political Bureau, composed of his more trusted lieutenants and advisers. Now this one-party dictatorship, which is definitely run from the top down, and which heads up in Stalin, a ruler of unlimited and unquestioned authority, is clearly incompatible with any genuinely democratic federal organization of the Soviet Union.

One need only consider what the position of the British Commonwealth would be if there were only a single legal party in England and in all the selfgoverning Dominions, if every high official were necessarily a member of this party and if its higher council were located in London. In order to make the situation clearer and more striking, imagine that the authority of this party were reinforced by frequent and ruthless purges, that the Prime Minister and other high Cabinet officials in Canada and Australia had been summarily removed from office, put to death or sent into permanent exile on suspicion of being opposed to the policies of the ruling party. Under such conditions none would seriously argue that the countries of the Commonwealth were free to take independent steps in matters of foreign policy. This is the situation that prevails in the Soviet Union, that has prevailed since the establishment of the Soviet regime.

Two Prime Ministers of the Ukraine, Chubar and Bondarenko, disappeared mysteriously from public life and must be presumed dead or in some concentration camp. Another, Lubchenko, committed suicide, evidently in fear of arrest and trial. Other political casualties were Kossior, who was for some time Secretary of the Communist Party in the Ukraine, Postishev, Stalin's chief lieutenant in the Ukraine from 1933 until 1935, and a veteran Communist, Skrypnyk, who committed suicide for political reasons in the early thirties.

It is quite obvious that there can be no free federalism if even the highest officials in the constituent republics are liable to such summary liquidation. Although political terror has been especially severe in the Ukraine because of the persistence of nationalist sentiment, other republics, such as White Russia, Georgia, Uzbekistan, were subjected to similar purges.

So long as the system of centralized one-party dictatorship is maintained the existence of a nominally independent Commissariat of Foreign Affairs in the Ukraine is of minor political importance. The



head of such a Commissariat would, of course, be a Communist. Should he fail to carry out any party order, he would be promptly relieved of his post, not by the decision of the Ukrainian people, but by action of the higher Communist authorities in Moscow. For any serious deviation from Party discipline he would be liable to the fate that has overtaken so many former high Communist functionaries in the Ukraine.

While there is thus little reason to place high hopes on the reality of Ukrainian independence, it would be advisable for the United States, Great Britain and other Western powers to accept the profession at face value, to exchange diplomatic representatives and consuls, to stimulate commercial and cultural contacts. Foreign powers stand to gain, not to lose, by opening up more sources of information about every region in the Soviet Union, and especially about such an important and potentially rich country as the Ukraine. It may be that the very recognition of Ukrainian independence in foreign affairs will ultimately transform what is now window-dressing and illusion into something closer to reality. And the cause of peace and international understanding will be immensely served by the evolution of the present Communist centralized dictatorship into a looser association of peoples, with more self-government and autonomy.

If only for purposes of information it would be extremely valuable to maintain regular diplomatic and consular representation in such important cities as Kiev, Kharkiv, Odesa. We possess only the vaguest and most fragmentary information about what has happened in the Ukraine during the years of the war.

There seems to be some evidence that the great ordeal of war evoked some revival of Ukrainian national spirit, directed both against the Nazi racial overlords and the Communist political oppression. Alexander Kendrick, a former correspondent of "The Philadelphia Inquirer" in the Soviet Union, remarked in a recent book review that the death of General Vatutin was rumored to have been due to an attack by an Ukrainian nationalist. There have also been rumors of Ukrainian guerilla activity in Eastern Galicia for some time after the German forces were driven from this area.

One fact that is only too certain about the Ukraine is the tremendous suffering which must prevail after this region was a battleground of German and Soviet armies over so long a period. Kharkiv, for instance, changed hands four times, and this was true as regards some of the towns in the Donets Basin. There was a very considerable dispersion of the population, some being taken away to Central Asia by the

retreating Soviet authorities, while others were forcibly deported to Germany. A great work of rehabilitation and reconstruction is obviously needed. It is to be hoped that independent relief work by such agencies as the UNRRA and the International Red Cross will be feasible.

The war will have profound effects both on the Soviet Union and on the whole position of Eastern Europe; and the Ukraine will be affected by these developments. A huge area, inhabited by over one hundred million people and formerly composed of twelve states, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania, has come in large part under Soviet military occupation and entirely under strong Soviet political influence.

Soviet military occupation is seldom of a neutral character. In many cases, in the Baltic Republics, in Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, it has been clearly exercised either to promote territorial annexation or to weight the scales on behalf of a desired type of satellite government, in which Communist influence would be predominant.

Will the whole of Eastern Europe be gradually absorbed into the Soviet Union, thereby creating an enormous totalitarian state with a population of between 250 million and 300 million? Such a development would be portentous for the future peace and security of the world. But there is another possibility. The national individuality of the peoples concerned, including the Western Ukrainians, may react against rigid domination from Moscow and even exercise an influence for greater liberalism in the Soviet Union itself. It may be anticipated that the Soviet Ukrainians would not be unaffected by such a development.

The experience of these Soviet Ukrainians shows that recognition of nationality rights in the use of language in schools, newspapers, public business, while highly important, is not, by itself, enough to insure the development of a free and happy people. Ukrainians, like people of other nationalities, are first of all human beings. Where there is no recognition of human rights, of political and civil liberties, the granting of cultural autonomy is not adequate.

The Ukrainians have suffered much from nationalist oppression in the past and in the present. Yet one of the greatest tragedies in the history of the Ukrainian people was the so-called "liquidation of the kulaks as a class," followed by the great famine in the Soviet Ukraine in 1932-33. And this was not primarily an act of nationalist oppression,

exercised by Russians against Ukrainians. Liquidation of the kulaks and famine occurred in Russian regions and in other nationality republics, such as Kazakhstan.

This is only the most vivid of many illustrations of the unmistakable truth that human rights must be fully assured before a genuinely free Ukraine, such as Shevchenko dreamed of, can come into existence.

The centre of the Ukrainian nationalist movement was in Eastern Galicia, not in the Soviet Ukraine, during the period between the two wars. While Ukrainian nationalism led a harassed, precarious, oppressed existence under the Polish regime, it was simply stamped out by the Soviet political police. No non-Communist Ukrainian newspaper could be published in the Soviet Ukraine. The political enlargement of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic which is indicated by the incorporation of Eastern Galicia, Northern Bukovina and probably Carpatho-Ukraine is designed to eliminate the last remnants of an independent Ukrainian nationalism.

This design may be thwarted if genuine liberation movements arise after the war both in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe, with the creation of free institutions as their goal. All segments of the Ukrainian people will respond favorably to such movements. The Ukrainian people, as distinguished from the handpicked delegation that speaks in its name at San Francisco, would have everything to gain from a form of world organization strong enough not only to draw up, but to enforce an international bill of rights and liberties.

# SILVER JUBILEE OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

1918-1943

By NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ

**T**HE twenty five years of existence of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences cover a turbulent period of the struggle of the Ukrainian people for the right to develop culturally along their own traditional lines. In the autumn of 1943 the Academy observed its silver jubilee in Ufa, the capital of the Bashkir Soviet Republic, to which place its directors had been forced to flee before the Nazi advance in Ukraine. The jubilee was observed quite modestly and very little was said of the past history of the Academy for fear of irritating the national sentiments of the Ukrainians by reminding them of the time when the Academy was the highest scientific institution of the independent Ukrainian National Republic and of the way in which Moscow has been gradually liquidating its Ukrainian character. Such a reminder, the Kremlin feared, might slacken the valiant Ukrainian war effort in the defense of the U.S.S.R.

Today the Academy is re-establishing itself in Kiev and recovering from such distant places as East Prussia its records and sundry articles of value which the Nazis had looted. What this new period in the existence of the Academy holds in store for Ukrainian culture, is something that the near future should reveal.

In the course of its existence the Academy has changed its name three times and its by-laws five times, each time by order of the authorities. Its very name, as set forth above in the title, may not even be correct. It was called thusly until 1928, when it was renamed the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and now it has become a territorial Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic. For a Ukrainian this is but another indication of the Soviet policy of whitening away Ukrainian national rights to the point where Ukraine becomes a mere territorial adjunct of Russia proper, UNCIO recognition of Ukraine as "sovereign" notwithstanding. In its basic policies and personnel the Academy has also undergone radical changes at the "request" of the governmental authorities, and has thus lost its original

Ukrainian national character as well as a majority of its original members, some of whom have been dropped, others are in exile, and still others lie beneath the sod, victims of executions.

### **Ukrainian Scientific Studies Before the Founding of the Academy**

It was the dream of the Ukrainians to have their own Academy of Sciences for about a century before it was founded in 1918. Already in 1848 Galician Ukrainian scholars, taking advantage of the "Springtime of Nationalities" under the Austrian regime, established the *Matytsya* (МАТИЦЯ) scientific society. Since in Ukraine under Tsarist Russian occupation "winter" still prevailed for the Ukrainians, their scholars there were compelled to cloak their activities under the legal title of the Southwestern Branch of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society in Kiev. Three years later the true Ukrainian character of this Southwestern Branch was realized by the Russian authorities and they dissolved it. This was followed by an extreme repression of all Ukrainian culture and included a ban on printing in Ukrainian.

As a result the Ukrainian scholars of Russian Ukraine had their works published in Galicia under Austria, where in 1873 the Shevchenko Scientific Society was organized and for the next fifty years this served as the only center of Ukrainian scientific studies in the whole of Ukraine. Financially supported to a great extent by the Eastern (Russian) Ukrainians, the society became a veritable Ukrainian academy of sciences, although because of political circumstances it never was able to assume that name. Its period of the greatest development was at the time when it was headed (1896-1914) by Prof. Michael Hrushevsky, the greatest Ukrainian historian. Before it was closed by the Bolsheviks in 1939 the Shevchenko Society in Lwiw published over three hundred volumes of scholarly works, not to mention many publications associated with it.

Following the Russian Revolution of 1905 Hrushevsky founded in Kiev the Ukrainian Scientific Society, which, however, was unable to make any real progress on account of political repression. It was not until the Russian Revolution in 1917 and the rise of an independent Ukrainian republic that the Ukrainians were able to establish their own academy of sciences.

### **The Founding of the Academy in Kiev in 1918**

Immediately upon the outbreak of the Russian Revolution the Ukrainian Scientific Society in Kiev laid plans for the establishment of

the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Its actual establishment, however, could not take place before the hetmanate of Paul Skoropadsky. M. Wasylenko, Minister of Education, appointed a group of distinguished Ukrainian scholars and of Russian scholars living in Ukraine to act as a planning and by-law commission of the proposed academy. Its chairman was Volodimir Vernadsky, father of the well known historian of Russia, George Vernadsky of Yale University. Among other members of the commission were the historian D. Bahaliy, the agricultural professor M. Kashchenko, the sociologist B. Kistiyakivsky (the father of George Kistiyakivsky, chemist, of Harvard University), the physicist J. Kosonohov, the chemist A. Speransky, the orientalist A. Krymsky, the art historian H. Pavlutsky, the Kiev University rector E. Spectorosky, the engineer S. Timoshenko (now professor at Stanford University), the philologist E. Tymchenko, the economist M. Tuhon-Baranowsky, the geographer P. Tutkivsky, and S. Frankfurt, director of the experimental sugar producing farms of Russia.

V. Vernadsky desired to make the Academy as modern as possible. He patterned it after American institutions and wished it not only to be devoted to theoretical studies but also to the solution of the practical problems of Ukrainian national life. He directed that the first task of the Academy was the creation of facilities for research in the field of Ukrainian culture, which had been neglected a long time on account of the repression of Ukrainian life by Russia.

The work of preparing the by-laws of the Academy proceeded rapidly. In a few months, on November 14, the foundation of the Academy was officially authorized by a special edict of Hetman Skoropadsky. On November 26 the statute providing it appeared in the official State Journal of Ukraine, together with a list of its first active members.

At that time the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences had three departments: historico-philological, physico-mathematical, and social-economic. Each department was divided into various commissions. The historico-philological department was devoted primarily to purely Ukrainian studies and research, such as history, archeology, language, literature, ethnography, art, historical geography, church history, and culture in general.

The physico-mathematical department embraced not only the abstract sciences but also applied sciences within the sphere of medicine, natural science and technical subjects. The third department included sociology, economics and laws of Ukraine.

The Academy was self-governing although it was subject to the

head of the Ukrainian state. Its official language was Ukrainian. Still the author of a work had the right to have it published in either English, French, Italian or Latin. Interestingly enough, the by-laws commission, although it included several Russian members, did not make any provision for publishing research works in Russian. According to the by-laws, only in exceptional cases and by decision of the members could the academy publish a work in a language other than the above. This provision was purposely adopted to restrict the use of Russian which during Tsarist Russian times had been forced upon the people of Ukraine.

The history of the Academy can conveniently be divided into four periods: the period of war communism to 1922, the period of the Ukrainization of the Golden Age from 1922 to 1928, the period of Red absorption (communization) of the Academy from 1928-1931, and finally the period of de-Ukrainization of the Academy beginning with 1931.

#### The Period of Militant Communism (1918-22)

The Academy began its work at a momentous time in Ukraine. On November 27, 1918 the first constitutional convention of the Academy members took place, and Volodimir Vernadsky, geologist and a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, was elected president, and the orientalist and Ukrainian writer Agathonhel Krymsky, permanent secretary. Before the Academy could get into full swing, an anti-monarchical revolt by the Ukrainian Socialist parties ousted Skoropadsky, drove the Germans out of Ukraine, and led to the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic, with a five-man Directory at its head, dominated by the chief of the Ukrainian Army, Simon Petlura.

The young republic was immediately attacked by Soviet Russia and in a couple of months was largely occupied by the enemy with Kharkiv as the seat of a Red puppet government of a newly proclaimed Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic. In the Civil War that ensued the academy found it impossible to continue with its freshly launched activities.

In a short time Red terrorism dispersed most of the members, including its head, V. Vernadsky, who went abroad and then by Bolshevik consent settled in Moscow. He was succeeded as president of the Academy by Orest Levitsky, the venerable historian of Ukrainian culture, who soon thereafter died. The election of his successor, Mykola Wasylenko, the Minister of Education during the hetman period, was

not approved by the Bolshevik authorities in Kharkiv, so that a new president was "elected," the botanist W. Lypsky, who remained as such during the ensuing period of the Academy's existence.

The Soviet authorities pretended to recognize the Academy and to provide funds for its work. Actually, however, the funds granted to it were so small that they could not even cover the administrative expenses.

When Denikin captured Kiev (1919) the Academy was closed completely. When the Reds regained power they directed that new by-laws be drawn up for the Academy. These in effect abolished its autonomy and made it completely subject to the Communist Party in Ukraine. Marxism was accepted as the standard doctrine of the Academy, so that in reality the institution became a Communist propaganda center rather than a center of scholastic studies.

Nevertheless, because their struggle with the Ukrainian nationalist partisans was still continuing, the Reds found themselves unable to enforce all their Communizing decrees pertaining to the Academy, with the result that until 1928 the original constitution remained more or less in force. This situation was aided by the period of Ukrainization (1922-1928) of Soviet rule in Ukraine, and the Sovietization of the academy did not seriously commence until the policy of Ukrainization was terminated by the Kremlin.

### **The Golden Age of the Academy (1923-28)**

The Golden Age of the Academy rested actually on an illegal basis, as the governing body did not abide by the new constitution approved by the Ukrainian Soviet Commissariat of Education but continued to use the original constitution. This was only made possible, of course, by the fact that the Commissariat kept its eyes closed to what was going on, for among its Commissars were men, who, though Communists, were true Ukrainian patriots, and who were concerned with the cultural development of their kinsmen. Through their influence the Academy received fine and commodious quarters, a plentitude of funds, and, for its exclusive use, the printing shop of the now nationalized Pecherska Lavra Monastery.

Throughout all this period president Lypsky was the nominal president but the guiding spirit was Serhey Yefremov, a distinguished Ukrainian historian of literature and a true patriot. Together with A. Krymsky, he made the Academy a center of truly Ukrainian studies.

One of the first acts of the Academy during this Golden Age was



to summon from his exile abroad the leading Ukrainian historian and the president of the former Ukrainian National Republic, Prof. Michael Hrushevsky, who upon his return became the guiding spirit of the Academy, especially in its historical research. Attracted by the presence of this Nestor of Ukrainian historians, a large number of young historians added their labors to its extensive research in the field of Ukrainian history.

The Academy took on new life and boiled with activity. Within a short period (for this Golden Age lasted for six years) it published hundreds of volumes of scholastic works, the products of its members and commissions. Unfortunately there is no complete collection of them in the United States, not even in the Library of Congress in Washington. It seemed as if the Academy had been infused with an ardent desire to make up for the losses suffered by Ukrainian culture during the one hundred and fifty years of Ukraine's enslavement by Russia. Those six years demonstrated quite effectively what the talented Ukrainian people could contribute to world culture if they were given a chance to develop as a free nation.

There is hardly an academy which could have accomplished as much in six years as did the Ukrainian Academy. Its successes stirred the ambition of various scholarly research institutes in other parts of Ukraine, as in Kharkiv and Odesa, including the Institute of Marxism in Kharkiv. Encouraged by the Communist Party in Ukraine itself, they plunged into Ukrainian studies with the hope of "showing up" the Academy.

This cultural freedom in Soviet Ukraine had its effect upon the scholars of Western Ukraine under Poland. A close working relationship was gradually established between the Shevchenko Scientific Society in L'viv and the Academy in Kiev, and several prominent Western Ukrainian scholars moved to Soviet Ukraine, accompanied by several score of talented young students. Among them was the leading Ukrainian geographer, Stephen Rudnitsky, who became head of the Ukrainian Cartographic Institute in Kharkiv. Another was Mykola Chaykivsky, the mathematician and many others. No one appears to know their fate today. Most of the younger scholars who emigrated from Western Ukraine were graduates of the Ukrainian Secret University in L'viv, which was established when the Polish authorities refused to grant permission for the establishment of a legal Private Ukrainian University and refused for some time to allow students of Ukrainian nationality to enter the polonized University of L'viv.

Probably the only one of its kind in entire European history, the Ukrainian Secret University existed for four years (1920-24). Its faculty numbered around eighty, while its students were around 1500. The degrees which it granted were recognized by various Central European universities, including those of Vienna, Prague, Zagreb, Lublana, Brussels, and Berlin. The Polish government alone did not recognize them, and this disqualified the graduates of this secret Ukrainian university from practicing their professions at home. Consequently many of them had to emigrate to Soviet Ukraine.

The studies of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and of the research institutes of the Commissariat of Education of Soviet Ukraine were concentrated on humanistic subjects and Ukrainian economy, because of the backwardness of Ukraine in these fields. Historical studies of Ukraine were directed along lines of political and cultural history, with special emphasis on social and economic conditions, as was inevitable on account of the Communistic order in Ukraine.

The Academy likewise conducted thorough studies of the Ukrainian tongue, prepared a large Ukrainian dictionary, and also dictionaries of the terminology of law, technical, natural and medical sciences.

In general the methods used by the Academy were patterned after those used by the research scholars of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in L'viv, and were governed by the ideology of the Ukrainian independence movement. Ordinarily the author would preface his work with some phrases complimentary to the Soviet system and of its services to Ukrainian scientific thought, which at that time deserved to be complimented anyway, and then proceed with an exposition of his subject matter in the spirit of the Ukrainian national ideology.

Meanwhile the storm was gathering. That it did not break sooner was due to the presence in the Kharkiv government of such patriots, albeit veteran communists, as Hryenko, Shumsky and Skrypnyk. Eventually they found themselves in trouble. Russian Communists, the advocates of the complete centralization of the U.S.S.R., began to attack Ukrainian patriots within the Party for deviation from the Party line. Their trials were held in Moscow and the entire group headed by Shumsky, Commissar of Education, was found guilty of nationalism. Shumsky himself was expelled from the Party and banished to the barren wastes of north Russia. Another group to be purged within the Ukrainian Communist Party was that of Volubyev, who had been protesting against Moscow's economic exploitation of Ukraine.

By this time Stalin had also rid himself of the Trotskyites and was

beginning the "Stalin national policy" against non-Russian peoples, with Ukraine first on his list. The policy was simple: "national culture in form (language), socialist in essence." Since Moscow was the sole interpreter of socialism what took place then was quite natural. Ukrainian culture could retain its Ukrainian language but it would have to be Muscovite in essence. In time the native language of Ukraine had to retire to second place, and make way for the "language of the older Russian brother."

The Ukrainian Academy of Sciences began to be held up as an evil example of the results of sheltering non-communist and nationalistic elements. The fact that the Academy was still operating on the basis of the old constitution and not the new one drawn up by the Commissariat of Education in 1921 and ratified by the Council of Commissars of Ukraine in 1924, was seized as a pretext to denationalize it and to make Marxism its guiding light.

The first blows against the Academy fell upon the Ukrainian Commissariat of Education and the Council of Commissars of Ukraine, for tolerating the existence of such an unsocialistic institution which though financially supported by the state continued to devote itself to completely objective scientific studies.

Purged of Ukrainian patriots the Communist Party of Ukraine received orders from Moscow to swing the academy into line, and the dirty work began in 1928.

Secret Soviet records, when made public some day, may reveal whether it was through personal conviction or because of pressure from Moscow that Mykola Skrypnyk himself took over the task of communizing the Academy. The struggle between the Communists and the scholars of the Academy lasted for three years. It is now known that Skrypnyk, a personal friend of Lenin, was subsequently forced by Moscow to commit suicide (1934) because of his pro-Ukrainian sentiments. When in 1928 the writer of this article met Skrypnyk in a group of scholars gathered at the quarters of the Shevchenko Society in L'viv, Skrypnyk defended vehemently the introduction of Communistic ideas and practices into the Academy, and yet he left the distinct impression that he would defend just as vehemently the continued Ukrainization of the entire life of Ukraine, which had been Russianized to quite an extent during its century and a half of enslavement by Russia. In any event it is clear that this unusual individual died for defending the Ukrainization of Ukraine and for protesting against the Moscow-in-

stigated famine in Ukraine which took a human toll running into several millions lives (1932-33).

### **The Communization of the Academy (1928-1931)**

Early in 1928 a special commission of the Ukrainian Commissariat of Education conducted an investigation of the Academy and reported that from the socialistic viewpoint the Academy had shown itself to be of little value to the state. The commission recommended the dissolution of the governing body of the Academy; the enlargement of the new presidium and general council by the inclusion in them of representatives of the Commissariat of Education; the drawing up of a set of instructions governing the general trend of Academic activities; and the admission into Academy membership of Communists or at least of persons who would not be averse to the Sovietization of the Academy.

President Lypsky was removed from the presidency and under pressure from the Commissariat of Education the Academy elected as his successor Danylo K. Zabolotny, a prominent microbiologist. K. H. Vobly, a Russian economist in Ukraine, was elected vice-president. Although A. Krymsky was re-elected as secretary his election did not get the approval of the Commissariat of Education, which appointed A. Korchak-Chepurkivsky. The Commissariat likewise appointed two of its representatives as members of the presidium. In this manner the first wave of Communist influence entered the walls of the Academy. More were yet to come. In June 1929 the new presidium enlarged the membership of the Academy; not, however, in accordance with its constitution, i.e. by unanimous vote of its membership, but by "a socialistic method." Candidates for membership were put up the Communist Party, workers unions, factory organizations, clubs, etc. Naturally many of these candidates were not qualified in the least to be academy members and it was only due to the intervention of Skrypnyk that the Academy was not transformed then into a menagerie of Communist political agitators. The election gave the Academy thirty four new members, the majority of whom were Ukrainian scholars of repute, who hitherto had been working in the research institutes of the Commissariat of Education. Only six of the new members, one of whom was Skrypnyk, were Party members. Among the new members were three from Western Ukraine and two from abroad. On the latter account the change of name of the Academy to the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences was logical, as Ukrainians from the whole world were now represented in it. Skrypnyk is to be given credit for this, for although he

opened the Academy to Communists, yet on the other hand he made it truly nationally representative of the Ukrainian people.

The inclusion of these Communists spelled the beginning of the end of the Academy's Ukrainian character. The six established within the Academy a Communist Party Center which attracted to itself some opportunists among the younger scholars who thought that they could advance more rapidly in their careers if they curried the favor of the Communists. The Party Center set up as its main objectives—the continued reorganization of the Academy, the enlargement of its membership with Communists, the transformation of the Academy into a popular scientific institution in order to popularize scientific studies among the workers; and finally the introduction of dialectic materialism and Marxist methods into its research. In other words they desired to transform the Academy from a scientific institution into a Communist propaganda institution. Opposed to them, however, was a whole array of Academy members Ukrainians, Russians and Jews alike, whose sense of honor as scholars rebelled at the idea of debasing this sanctuary of scientific thought in Ukraine. Significantly enough Vobly, a Russian believer of the centralizing one and undivided Russia idea, saw eye to eye with the venerable Ukrainian leader, Prof. Hrushevsky, on the necessity of opposing Communist plans for the Academy. Realizing this significance of this opposition, the Communists decided to do away with the true Ukrainian scholars, for then it would be easier for them to handle the others. A fine opportunity to do this soon presented itself to them.

About the middle of December, 1929 President Zabolotny died. Although a believer in the Soviet system he was nonetheless a true scholar. His death was just the opportunity that the Communists in and out of the Academy were waiting. They engineered the election of a young doctor and an active Party man, Alexander A. Bohomolets, as president of the Academy. He had no scholastic reputation but was known for his Communist work as a member of the City Soviet of Kiev, and member of the Central Executive Committee of Ukraine and of the Central Committee of the U.S.S.R.

His election as president was facilitated by the fact that the leaders of the opposition to the Communists were at that time in jail, charged with anti-Soviet revolutionary activity. Among the first academicians to be arrested was the vice-president, Serhey Yefremov, Mykola Slabchenko, Mykola Klymenko and Mykola Wasylenko and others on various charges. Yefremov, Slabchenko and Klymenko were accused of being

members of a secret Union for the Liberation of Ukraine, while Wasylenko was charged with belonging to an anti-Soviet liberal-democratic organization. After their trials, Yefremov, Slabchenko, Klymenko, and a few other academicians were given long terms in prison, while the organizer of the Academy, Wasylenko, received a jail sentence of several years. In this manner the backbone of the opposition to the Communists in the Academy was broken. Those anti-Communists who remained in the Academy were cowed by what had happened to the colleagues. Naturally under such conditions the election of Al. Bohomolets went off without a hitch.

Still the anti-Communist bloc in the Academy did not pass out of existence, especially since most of the academicians were Ukrainians and true scholars and they had at their head M. Hrushevsky, the unchallenged dean of Ukrainian historians. It was therefore decided to liquidate Hrushevsky too. This was done by Bohomolets. He instituted in the Academy public trials of the academic activity of its members. The "trials" were held before assemblages of academicians as well as a public, consisting of workers, political agitators and anyone who happened to drop in. Hrushevsky and several other Ukrainians were thus tried. The Ukrainian academicians were charged with Ukrainian chauvinism, while the Russian academicians were charged with Russian imperialism. Actually their only "guilt" was in opposing the Communization of the Academy. The half-illiterate mob witnessing such farces would often take advantage of the opportunity to express criticism of the work of these world famous scholars. To what lengths the trials went can be seen from the following "verdict" of the "court" in the case of Hrushevsky: "The discussion exposed completely"—states an official publication—"the bourgeois and fascist essence of the scientific and political activity of the bourgeois representative of sciences, academician M. S. Hrushevsky. This discussion not only caused Hrushevsky to lose his halo of scientific infallibility, but it showed all the harm done to the proletariat and other laboring masses by the scholastic and political activity led by academician Hrushevsky. The discussion likewise revealed what that academician has done in the service of imperialism and the restoration of capitalism." As is well known, Hrushevsky was himself a socialist by conviction and at one time the leader of the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries (Party of Agrarian Socialists). Upon his return to Ukraine he engaged in no political activity whatsoever but devoted himself wholly to scholarly pursuits.

Eventually Hrushevsky was expelled from the Academy and ban-

ished to a place near Moscow where from privations and want he became blind. Only then was he sent to Kislovodsk in the Caucasus for a cure, but it was too late. He died there in 1935.

Hrushevsky's banishment and death was followed by concerted Red attacks upon the historical school and views of Hrushevsky, particularly the idea that the Ukrainians and the Russians were two separate peoples with separate historical traditions. Historians of the Hrushevsky school who had studied directly under him, were compelled to denounce him and his teachings. A group of them did that at one of the already mentioned public trials. Their decision read: "As a result of discussion a group of scholars, former students of M. S. Hrushevsky, having recognized the harm done by M. Hrushevsky has declared its desire to fight against him."

Such statements of self-abasement were made later by other former students of Hrushevsky and on the very pages of "Ukraina," the historical journal that he himself had established. They are a striking illustration of how the Soviet system can break a man's will and self-respect. Some of these former students of his managed to make some capital of their self-abasement, but most of them have disappeared from the Academy and from Ukrainian cultural life in general.

### De-Ukrainization of the Academy After 1931

The Ukrainian character of the Academy finally became a thing of the past when in 1930 President Bohomolets abolished the historical-philological department. It had been the most productive of all the Academy department with its purely Ukrainian studies. Most of its members disappeared from view soon after. A few were transferred to the social-economic department, which was formerly third and now second in order.

For several years after 1930 activity at the Academy was virtually at a standstill. Of the veteran academicians there remained only some Russians, among them even some whose sympathies were still with the old regime, such as Vobly. Nobody bothered them despite the fact that the mob trials had exposed their bourgeois activities and the prominent role they had played in advocating a Russian imperialistic policy in Ukraine. On the contrary it was their advocacy of imperialism that saved them for it was at a time when the Academy was being rapidly de-Ukrainized.

Within the Academy itself everyone feared for his head. Thus for a couple of years the Academy suspended all communications and

exchange of works and reports with the Western-Ukrainian Shevchenko Scientific Society in L'viv. Over a score of letters from the latter institution remained unanswered by the Academy. Finally after two years the "All Ukrainian Academy" sent a letter written in French to the Shevchenko Society through a Russian institute in Moscow. The Academy remained silent until 1932, during which time, for that matter, Ukraine was silent too, while a policy of Russification was being applied. Russian was made an official language in Ukraine on an equal basis with Ukrainian, and then soon thereafter it began to replace Ukrainian completely in the government, party, labor unions and all public life, while Ukrainian was used only in the villages.

The same happened in the Academy. Ukrainian as its official language was abolished so that now most of the Academy publications are in Russian and not Ukrainian. The Academy institutes devoted to language studies were no longer institutes devoted to the study and development of Ukrainian but, on the contrary, to its impoverishment and disuse. The history of the academic edition of the Ukrainian dictionary is very instructive. By order of the government a new edition appeared, but it was filled with Russian words. Nevertheless it did not please Moscow and its compilers were charged and tried for "setting up artificial barriers between Ukrainian and its brotherly Russian language and drawing them apart." A third edition of the dictionary was ordered, the first volume of which appeared during the present war (1942). The purpose behind all this is clear. It is an attempt to cause Ukrainian to lose its character as a separate language from Russian, the first step toward the liquidation of the national identity of the Ukrainian people. Slavic languages, it should be borne in mind, are more similar than the Roman languages.

The department of history in the Academy bore the brunt of the Russification. Hrushevsky's historical view concerning the separate national identities and histories of the Ukrainian, White Ruthenian and Russian people was condemned as heretical, notwithstanding the fact that all Ukrainian historians beyond the frontiers of Soviet Ukraine remain followers of Hrushevsky in this respect. Moreover, just as in the days of Tsarist Russia, the Kievan period of Ukrainian history now began to be called a period common to both Ukrainian and Russian history, although it is a historical fact that the Russians first made their appearance as a national entity during the 12th century, in the form of the embryonic Suzdal-Rostov principality and on the vast colonial stretches of the ancient Ukrainian Kievan state. This and other similar



historical truths, however, are today damned in the Soviet Ukraine as "bourgeois, fascistic, and Ukrainian chauvinism."

Also as during Tsarist times Ukrainian historical personages who endeavored to free Ukraine, such as the hetmans Vyhovsky, Doroshenko, and especially Mazepa, were politically anathematized by the Reds. In line with Stalin's instructions on how to write histories of Soviet peoples—which were printed by express order from Moscow in 1932 in Hrushevsky's former historical review "Ukraina"—historical writing in Soviet Ukraine has not hesitated in the least to distort and falsify Ukrainian history, in an attempt to hide the fact that the Ukrainians have constantly struggled to be free and independent.

Aside from their attempts to disprove the independent character of Ukrainian culture, the Ukrainian departments of the Academy have done very little else. Thus the former flourishing studies in the field of Ukrainian law and the economic history of Ukraine have been completely neglected since 1930. In a word, during the past nine years the Academy has contributed nothing of any real value to Ukrainian cultural studies. It has centered its attention well nigh entirely on the natural sciences, and even more on the technical sciences, needed by the Soviet state for its military armaments and for its continued economic exploitation of Ukraine.

The results here, it must be admitted, have been noteworthy, and some significant works have been published. Some of the academicians, including Bohomolets, can today take credit for important discoveries and inventions, valuable to the whole human race, especially to the peoples of the U.S.S.R. Yet this very fact has caused the Academy to become non-national, as it could readily do the same type of work elsewhere, be it in Tomsk, Siberia, Moscow, China or India. The very name of the Academy (which was changed about 1935), the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, shows that the Academy is no longer an academy of the Ukrainian people, a Ukrainian academy, but that it is a territorial academy of that section of the Soviet Union which is known as Ukraine. Neither its membership nor its site need be Ukrainian.

The silver jubilee of the Academy was observed during the second year of the Nazi-Soviet war. Its various institutes were scattered throughout Kazakhstan, on the borders of Mongolia, and elsewhere. From the statement issued on that occasion by the Academy's vice-president, A. A. Sapiegin, a Russian Communist, we learn that it possesses eighteen scientific research institutes and that three of them are partly devoted

to studies in Ukrainian culture. All the other institutes are real institutes of "socialist culture."

The published list of names of the academicians and research workers of the Academy appears to indicate that the majority of them are not Ukrainians but belong to the national minorities of Ukraine. There is a lack of truly academic works on Ukrainian subjects, as those which are published are rather of a popular nature. Works on natural and technical sciences, however, are not lacking in academic worth.

During the war, when the Nazis were menacing Moscow itself, some fine Ukrainian literary works appeared in Ukraine, written in a warm Ukrainian spirit, with some of them even bearing traces of Ukrainian national pride.

Whether this is but a temporary lessening of Soviet oppression in Ukraine brought on by the war, or whether it is of a lasting character, designed to establish more peaceful relationship between the Soviet authorities and the Ukrainian people, is something hard to determine as yet. In any event the future of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian S.S.R. is one of uncertainty. We sincerely hope that the future will allow this long-suffering Academy to become a real All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, in both its personnel and spirit.

## IVAN FRANKO

By STEPHEN SHUMEYKO

**A** WRITER of great fecundity, a poet second only to Taras Shevchenko—the Bard of Ukraine, a distinguished scholar, and a spiritual leader of his people, such was Ivan Franko to whose memory Ukrainians the world over pay tribute yearly in May, the month of his death in 1916. No real understanding of the strength and potentialities of Ukrainian national development is possible without some knowledge of this courageous man who influenced its course to a degree equalled by few men in modern times.

Such knowledge of Franko, however, can only be had when it is grounded on an understanding of the conditions characterizing the order of his day among his people. In the main the order was quite reactionary, tinged with romantic memories of bygone glories—when Ukraine was free. It made little effort to adjust itself to growing modern conditions and to eradicate the prevailing social, economic and injustices. Nor did it fully realize that only through self-reliance could the Ukrainian people eventually regain their national freedom; instead it looked toward the Russian tsar or the Austrian emperor and the latter's petted Polish ruling nobility for an improvement of their lot.

It was into such an order that Ivan Franko was born, in 1856, in the village of Nahuyevichi, Galicia, Western Ukraine, then under Austria-Hungary. Village and country life form the background of his youthful days. As a pupil in the local grammar school and subsequently in the nearby gymnasium, young Franko attracted some attention only by reason of his rarely polished shoes, soiled shirt, torn jacket, uncombed hair, and—highest rank in class. Poor, shy, sensitive, the lad found most of his relaxation in observing life about him and in omnivorous reading. Self-expression with him took the form of writing verses and simple prose.

Upon graduation from gymnasium Franko entered Lviv University. It was during this period that he began to correspond with Michael Drahomaniw, the Ukrainian scholar and publicist of European reputation who from abroad ardently propagated the adoption by his people

of the progressive ideas of the West. What Drahomaniw advocated struck a responsive chord within Franko and opened new horizons for him. He began to see with a clearer eye the failings of his people that permitted them to become prey to exploitation and mistreatment by their national oppressors. Likewise his warm sympathy was stirred by the sorry lot of the peasantry and the workers. He determined, therefore, to devote himself to the remedying of such conditions. And thus his writings at this time began to take on a new character, no longer just of a belle-mot, but of a double-edged sword, cutting the fetters of reaction and servitude and hewing the way to enlightenment, progress and liberty.

Before Franko had much opportunity of exercising this determination, he was arrested on suspicion of complicity of revolutionary activities, and though innocent he was imprisoned for nine months. He emerged from prison in the spring of 1878, outraged by the raw injustice inflicted upon him and the others whom he met while jailed. He was yet to suffer another cruel blow, in the form of ostracism by many of his countrymen, whose extreme conservatism caused them to look with hostility upon his alleged connections with radical circles. It was mostly among the youth that Franko found understanding and friendship. Nevertheless he was now at the crossroads. Either he was to repent his "sins" and become a "respectable" pillar of society, or else, as he later wrote, "join the ranks of the ostracized and find my company there." He chose the latter course.

Among his first acts in this direction was to take over with the aid of some young friends the publication of the periodical *Friend of the Community* (Hromadsky Druh), and rejuvenate it. The journal became the organ of progressive thought at that time. "With the lightheartedness of youth and the ardency of those who have nothing to lose, it flung its challenge to society," Franko later wrote. Practically everything in it was written in a provocative tone to society as it was then. Especially did it awaken response among the youth, for it was mainly their feelings that Franko expressed so well. What these feelings were, can be gleaned from his poem *The Stone Breakers* (Kameniarri), written in 1878. Basing it on an old legend telling how a tribe was imprisoned by Alexander the Great in a huge barren plain surrounded by impenetrable rocky mountains, and how it broke its way to freedom—Franko expresses in this poem the spirit and hopes that animated him and the Ukrainian youth of his day:

Each one of us believed that with our human power  
 We'd cut right through that cliff and crush the stone to dust,  
 That with our blood and bones, our last remaining dower,  
 We'd build a hardy highway over which the flower  
 Of hope and youth would come into this world—and must!

And thus we go ahead in body one united  
 By that one almighty thought, that infant of the brain,  
 What if we are curst and by the world condemned!  
 We're breaking through that wall to free the truth we've sighted,  
 That happiness may come—when none of us remain.

(Translated by W. Semenyina)

Though ending thus in a slightly bitter tone, the poem clearly demonstrates that the youth then had no illusions on how long it would take to bring about a new order in the land. Likewise it showed the youth's determination to sacrifice all, even life itself, in the cause of true and worthy ideals.

This poem was soon followed by a novelette, *Boa Constrictor*, in which Franko dealt with the economic exploitation of inhabitants of the town of Borislav during the transformation from the agricultural to the industrial system in that district.

His realistic approach to the problems of the day made Franko a marked man in the eyes of the authorities. In 1880, he was again arrested and imprisoned, this time for three months, after which he was released for lack of any specific charges and incriminating evidence against him. Hounded by police and unable to find remunerative work, the young writer nearly perished of starvation following his release, being saved in the nick of time by a friend.

The year 1890 is important in the life and works of Franko, for the considerable amount of lyrics he wrote then showed him to be a poet of unusual talent and originality. That year too he produced his famous *Eternal Revolutionist* (*Vichny Revolutsioner*), whose verses vividly portray the unconquerable, flaming spirit of the younger generation of his day in their fight for freedom. This inspiring message to the people was soon followed by his prize-winning historical novel, *Zakhar Berkut*, which though dealing with 13th century Ukrainians is nonetheless a penetrating study and commentary upon the social conditions of his time, yet so romanticised that it could be likened to a sugar coated pill that society swallowed without being aware of its real ingredients until they began to be digested within its social organism.

Through such and other mediums, Franko began to play a definite role in shaping progressive thought among his people. Conservatism,

however, was too deeply rooted among them, and the more progress he made, the stronger the opposition against him and his ideas grew. Soon it came to pass that he was denied an opportunity of making a living among his people; to be sure, such opportunities were very few then, as the national rulers of the Ukrainians discriminated against them at every step. As a result, Franko accepted an offer to become assistant-editor of a Polish newspaper. His new position enabled him now to speak his mind frankly concerning those elements in Ukrainian life that weakened it. At the same time it led him to realize how vain were the hopes of Polish-Ukrainian collaboration. As he later wrote: "At the close of the 19th century, when the Ukrainian younger generation broke all ties that bound them to their elders, and some of them transferred their activities to Polish newspapers—without ceasing, however, to labor in behalf their Ukrainian ideals—the change of terrain for them brought with it a new idea: the possibility of compromise and united efforts between Ukrainian and Polish radical and progressive circles for the attainment of mutual goals; especially the overthrow of the landed and reactionary ruling classes within the country . . . It took ten years before these Ukrainian idealists finally realized that there was nothing they could gain from the Poles and that only by sowing one's own fields can one win his daily bread."

These "ten years of serfdom" (1887-97) which Franko spent working for the Poles, were most unfortunate for him, as they seriously hindered his development as a writer of Ukrainian poetry and prose. Yet it should not be supposed that during these ten years Franko completely "broke the Ukrainian pen," for it was during this time that he wrote, among other works, *The Landlord's Jest* (Pansky Zharti), a narrative poem which one of his severest critics characterized as "monumentum aere perennius," and which movingly describes the abuses suffered under serfdom that existed in Galicia till 1848. During this period, too, he wrote the *Death of Cain* (Smert' Kayina), a poem that was little understood at that time, but which endeavored to discover the true value of life, finding it in the harmonious existence within the person of two main elements: emotion and reason. Shortly afterwards, Franko wrote a cycle of poetry known as *Jewish Melodies* (Zhydivsky Melodiyi). By it he showed himself to be the first Western Ukrainian writer who really made an effort to understand the Jews. Hitherto, the Jew in Ukrainian literature, as well as in popular conception, was the tavern keeper, who together with the grasping landlord kept the Ukrainian peasant in endless poverty; and there was reason enough for this

conception. Franko was well aware of this type and portrayed it in some of his writings. Yet he also realized that there were many Jews who were being exploited and who suffered just as much as the downtrodden peasants. It is upon the life and hardships of the latter class of Jews that his Jewish Melodies are based. One of the most poignant of them is *Surka*, a tale of a Jewish mother.

About this time, Franko was imprisoned for the third time. This was done by the Polish-dominated authorities, during election time, in an attempt to prevent the possible election of progressive candidates for representatives, among whom was Franko. As in previous times, he was again released on account of the lack of charges against him. While in prison, he managed to write his *Prison Sonnets* (Turemni Soneti).

Upon his emergence to freedom, Franko clearly saw that his endeavors and those of his associates had not been in vain. A definite awakening among the people was now visible. The peasantry was beginning to play an unprecedented role in the political life of the country. Mass meetings were being held throughout the land, expressive of the growing rebellion among the masses against reaction and foreign rule, and demanding a broader suffrage, freedom of the press, reforms in the system of taxation, and more advanced agrarian policies. New leaders were appearing, too, most of them of peasant stock.

But rising above them all was he, Franko, the guiding spirit of this new movement. Upon him rested the confidence and hopes of the Ukrainian progressives, and upon him, too, of course, fell the brunt of attack from all sides, from the authorities, the reactionary muscophiles (i.e. those who favored closer cultural and political affinity with Russia), from the conservative Ukrainian "populists," and from all other dominating elements that saw in him danger to themselves. Undeterred by these attacks, Franko kept exhorting his countrymen to struggle for their rights. Likewise from beneath his prolific pen the flow of various literary works continued uninterruptedly, among them being a fine collection of short stories entitled *By the Sweat of One's Brow* (V poti Chola), which pictured "real people whom I knew, true facts that I saw or heard," and which can rightfully be considered as autobiographical. He also produced at this time several books for children, of which the most popular was a version of the epic, *Reynold the Fox* (Lys Mykyta).

In 1893 Franko published the second edition of his poems, *From Heights and Depths* (Z Vershyn i Nyzyn), which was met with considerable enthusiasm. The collection definitely showed that Franko's

poetry compared favorably with the best of other countries. His beautiful stanzas and flowing rhythms intertwined to form truly artistic creations, with none of the stock situations and over-colored images of most of his predecessors. From the linguistic viewpoint also, the second edition was significant in that it clearly demonstrated Franko's mounting success in fashioning the popular speech of the people into a truly worthwhile literary medium, in place of the previously fashionable but now wholly inadequate Church-Slavonic language.

All this output of literary works together with his publicistic and public activities, did not prevent Franko from pursuing his formal studies. In 1894 he received his Ph.D. from the University of Vienna. He had expected that this degree would enable him to realize his long cherished ambition to teach at Lviw University. When the chair in Ukrainian literature became vacant there, the faculty recommended him for it. This recommendation was virtually equivalent to a direct appointment, for the state universities then had complete autonomy. Great was Franko's disappointment and equally great was the popular indignation, therefore, when it was learned that the Polish governor of Galicia, Count Badeni, had prevented the confirmation of this faculty recommendation by the Imperial Government. It is said that some of Franko's own conservative countrymen also had a hand in this. "For God's sake!" one of them is reported to have exclaimed, "How can you permit that man to teach at the university! Why, just look at the tattered coat he wears!"

This rank injustice to Franko had quite a boomerang effect upon his enemies, for it brought him many new supporters and friends, even from the older generation. The latter were gradually becoming appreciative of his ideas and talents. His continued unsparing criticism of them, however, kept this appreciation at low ebb. Nevertheless, his leadership became more and more recognized, especially when he began to remove himself from active political life, with its attendant friction, and lead the people by sheer force of his principles, ability and personality.

In 1896, Franko wrote his immortal *Withered Leaves* (*Zivyaie Lystia*), a series of short poems, subjective in tone, each of an individual character, yet all linked by the theme of unrequited love. He divided it into three garlands. The first expresses a cry of pain. The second constitutes resignation to pain and makes a cult of it; here Franko attains the heights of lyricism, creating poetry of unusual intensity of emotion, mostly of a melancholy nature. The third garland represents liberation



from pain, wherein the poet, goaded beyond all endurance by the pangs of unrequited love, bows before Buddha and aspires to emerge from the turmoil and torment of Samsara to the shores of that quietude and freedom of all conditions of existence—Nirvana. Such final apathy was strange for Franko, but quite understandable in the light of his sufferings. This symbolic bow to Buddha, however, brought down on Franko's head a storm of criticism, especially from the clergy, with the result that for a while Franko was bereft of some of his growing popularity.

More philosophical and moralizing in tone, was *My Emerald* (Miy Izmarahd—1898), a sundry collection of poetry, bound into an organic whole not by any one religious or aesthetic dogma, but by a diaphonic combination of the emotional and intellectual tendencies. A good many of these verses were written under great difficulty, in a darkened room with closed and paining eyes. "Perhaps this physical and spiritual suffering of mine," wrote the poet in the foreword, "has left its mark upon the physiognomy of this book. For in sickness a man wants to be treated very gently, and as a result he becomes gentle and tolerant himself. He becomes imbued with deep yet delicate feelings, a desire to love and feel grateful to someone, to press close and trustingly to such a person, like a child to its parents. I do not know how much such feelings have found reflection in this book, but I do know that I wanted to make of it a work that would be clearly moralistic in tone. It is certain, of course, that my morality is markedly different from that catechistic and dogmatic morality which among us is customarily advanced as the only Christian morality . . . If from these poems there enters into your heart at least one drop of goodness, gentleness and tolerance not only for opposing doctrines and opinions but for human mistakes, failings and sins as well, then this work shall not have been in vain . . ." What follows this foreword, however, does not at all times agree with this expressed intention. Perhaps this is because various parts of it were written at different times. Nevertheless, with all its varying moods—of gentleness, of sympathy for the suffering, of scepticism and irony, of despairing reflections upon the conditions of that time—*My Emerald* is a valuable addition to Ukrainian literature.

At about this time there appeared on the Ukrainian cultural horizon a new monthly, the *Literary-Scientific Messenger* (Literaturno-Naukovy Vistnyk); patterned on West European models and comparing most favorably with them. Accepting an invitation to join its editorial staff, Franko helped to make this journal not only a veritable treasure trove of Ukrainian literary achievements of that period, but also a

scholarly review encompassing a wide range of subjects based on Ukrainian national, cultural, political, economical and social development. Worth noting in this connection is that Franko enriched Ukrainian literature with many translations, especially from English and German.

What hold Franko had obtained by this time on his people, was clearly illustrated in the autumn of 1898 when various Ukrainian organizations and parties united to celebrate the quarter-century jubilee of his literary career. One such celebration was held in Lviw, ancient capital of Western Ukraine. Among the many gifts he received there was a book of 127 pages containing naught else than the titles of his numerous works, Ukrainian, Polish, and German. Many eulogies were showered upon him on this occasion. When all had finished, Franko rose and delivered a brief address, famous to this day on account of the insight it gives into his character and motives.

"At the very outset," he began, "I wish to express my thanks to all those who arranged this affair and who are taking part in it, especially the youth."

"I also desire to take this opportunity of thanking my opponents too. Throughout the twenty-five years of my work, fate has provided me with plenty of them. By their opposition they have spurred me onward, never allowing me to lag. Since I realize very well the importance of struggle in human progress, I feel very grateful to them, and have the highest respect for those who fought me fairly.

"As I cast my eyes about this large and illustrious assemblage, I ask myself: what is the reason behind it? It certainly cannot be my person. For I do not regard myself as any highly talented individual, or any sort of a hero, or any kind of a great man."

"As a son of the soil, nourished on the coarse fare of the peasant, I felt it to be my duty to devote my life's work to the cause of the common people. Raised in a hard school, already as a child I adopted two mandates: the obligation of duty, and the necessity of unremitting toil.

"While yet a child I also perceived that our peasants could obtain nothing without working hard for it. Later I realized that the same is true of us as a nation, that we should not expect any favors from anyone. Only that which we shall win by dint of our own efforts, will truly be ours.

"I attached the greatest importance to the winning of elementary human rights, for I realized that a people winning these basic rights would thereby win for themselves their national rights.

"In all my activity, I sought to be neither a poet, nor a scholar, nor a publicist; above all, I sought to be a man.

"I have been charged with diffusing my work and activities, with leaping from one line of endeavor to another. That is true, and a direct result of my aspiration to be a real man, an enlightened man, a man for whom no basic problems of existence is a stranger . . . I tried to encompass the whole round of human interests and experiences. Perhaps this lack of concentration harmed me as a writer, nevertheless among us there is a greater need for such as myself, engaged in building the foundations of a finer and nobler life.

"Undoubtedly I have made mistakes; but that is natural of anyone who strives to accomplish something. Today I look upon these mistakes with equanimity, for I know that for both me and others they serve as warnings and as lessons in wisdom.

"I care not if my name perishes," he concluded, "as long as the Ukrainian nation grows and flourishes."

This, in essence, was the basis of Franko's philosophy of life and work. By it he guided himself to the very end.

Its public pronouncement at the celebration honoring him, was well-nigh concurrent with the people's full realization of it, so that now he encountered practically none of the bitter opposition of former years. He could now press unhindered towards the attainment of his aims. The fecundity of his talents, as a result, became all the more great. His accomplishments in the field of scholarly work and research, for example, were not only instrumental in winning numerous honors at home and abroad, but also, with the collaboration of Prof. Michael Hrushevsky—famous historian and president of the later-day Ukrainian National Republic—in gaining due recognition throughout Europe for the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Meanwhile his writings continued to enrich Ukrainian literature with fresh poetry—*Semper Tiro*, new novels—*Crossed Paths* (*Perekhrestni Stezhki*), and short stories—*The Khoma With and the Khoma Without a Heart* (*Khoma z Sertsem i Khoma bez Sertsia*), *The Thorn in the Foot* (*Teren v Nozi*), *Patrimony* (*Batkivshchyna*), and *The Jay's Wing* (*Soychyne Krylo*).

During this period, too, Franko produced (in 1905) what is generally considered to be perhaps his finest work, the semi-autobiographical *Moses* (*Moisey*), a poem regarded by many as being worthy to stand besides the great creations of world literature. Through the medium of the Biblical Moses, Franko poignantly portrays in this poem his own bitter struggle to lead his people into the promised land of

progress and national freedom. Outside the stirring prologue, which it is said was written overnight, the poem could well be divided into two parts: the physical and the spiritual, the first portraying the material obstacles he had to overcome and the second the spiritual struggles he had to wage. The poem reveals the chief characteristic of Franko, the power which enabled him to sacrifice all for a cause, and that was his love for his people and his trust in them even in the darkest moments of his life, his confidence that in the end their resurrection will come.

And so, in every manner possible Franko pursued his labors dedicated entirely to the progress and freedom of his country-men. Yet as the years advanced, he contemplated the frightening possibility that he would not finish his work in time. The thought would cause him to plunge into feverish activity. Still he was unable to accomplish as much as his ardent spirit demanded of him. This was partly because of the dire financial straits in which he usually found himself, and then, when rescued from them by several gifts raised by public subscription, because of domestic unhappiness. His wife, who bore him four children, had become subject to nervous attacks, which greatly interfered with his creative work. But this misfortune was comparatively small to the one that followed. In 1908 he fell victim to a malady that steadily sapped his life away and brought about his death eight years later (May 28, 1916). The illness took away the use of his hands, and also made him subject to psychopathic disturbances, which caused him to hear what he described as voices of spirits. His sturdy peasant constitution, however, together with his indomitable will, caused him to resist this array of misfortune to the very end. When, for instance, there was no one about to whom he could dictate, he would take a pencil in his fist and scrawl out his verse and prose in big capitals. It seemed as if some unseen power was driving him to the completion of his life work, for the amount of literary work he produced in the closing years of his life, when the malady had practically disabled him, is truly amazing.

Just before the outbreak of the World War, in 1913, the Ukrainian people, together with many eminent foreigners, united once more to honor his work. It was very fortunate that they did give this chance to Franko to see that his work had not been in vain, that his people, like the stone-breakers of his early poem, were hewing their way out of servitude and oppression. For the remaining years of his life coincided with one of the blackest periods of Ukraine's history. Following the outbreak of the war, both Russia and Austria-Hungary imposed upon

the Ukrainians a rule far more harsh and suppressive than ever before. It seemed for awhile that all the national gains the Ukrainians had made up to this time had been nullified as a result. But as it turned out, this was the darkest part of the night just before dawn, before the collapse of both imperialistic oppressors and the rise of the Ukrainian free and united republic. This republic, as is known, lasted but several years, and collapsed before the combined might of her many powerful enemies and the decisions made against her at Versailles.

Franko, however, did not live long enough to witness those inspiring days when after centuries of foreign misrule his people attained for awhile that which he had predicted. Nor was he fated to see how this brief renewal of their ancient liberties gave them a new lease upon life and the determination to win permanent freedom in the near future. He missed all this, for he died in the spring of 1916, conscious to the very end, his death hastened by the sufferings inflicted upon him as a result of the Russian occupation of his native land.

And thus passed away a great Ukrainian, a man who did so much to awaken in his countrymen an appreciation of their heritage and a consciousness of their destiny, and a man who could justly say unto them:

"I have given you my life and all it meant  
With an unshatterable zeal;  
You will progress through centuries to bear  
The imprint of my inner seal."

~

.

## IN SUPPORT OF THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM

By SIMON DEMYDCHUK

**A**T ITS very start the United Nations Conference on International Organization held at San Francisco wrote one important chapter in the history of Ukraine. It was decided that the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic be admitted as a charter member of the United Nations. By virtue of this decision national recognition was given to Ukraine. However this was but a matter of form. Actually there is no sovereign Ukrainian state. If there was, then certainly champions of Ukrainian freedom the world over would have by now ceased their efforts on Ukraine's behalf. But they have not. On that account the struggle for Ukraine's liberty continues. And among those who are lending their best efforts to it are Americans of Ukrainian extraction.

It can be unhesitatingly stated however here that no other ethnic group in America has to overcome as many obstacles in public life as do the Ukrainians. This is due to the fact that the present Bolshevist regime in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics inherited from the old Russian Tsarist regime its traditional anti-Ukrainian policy and has continued to execute it with all modern forms of force, and propaganda, directed toward stamping out the smouldering fires of desire for a free and independent Ukrainian national life.

Not only the local brand of Communists but Moscow itself has obstructed Ukrainian American efforts, even of a purely cultural variety. Back in the summer of 1938 when the widely representative Ukrainian American Exposition Association began preparations to present a program of Ukrainian songs and dances at the New York World's Fair, after having first, of course, obtained permission from the Fair authorities, the Soviet Embassy itself moved heaven and earth, even exerting pressure on the State Department, to prevent the staging of that program. Fair officials, sympathetic to the Ukrainian American program, found themselves in a most unenviable spot. Finally, despite the pressure, the program was held.

Communist opposition in this country has not been confined only to vilification and Soviet Embassy "interventions." It has also taken on the form of force and intimidation. Let us, by way of example, look back to the notorious Soviet-sponsored famine in Ukraine in the early

30's, which took a shocking toll of lives running into several millions. News of it was suppressed at that time by Soviet propoganda. Since then, thanks to several conscientious American newsmen, such as William Henry Chamberlin, it has become a matter of quite common knowledge.

When first reports of the famine reached this country via unimpeachable channels of news distribution, the Ukrainian Americans immediately took action. Throughout the various communities in which they live between New York and Chicago, they arranged various protest demonstrations, rallies and parades. It is here that the Soviet brand of terrorism made its appearance in this country. Organized gangs of Communist hoodlums, for example, attacked the Ukrainian marchers with clubs, brass-knuckles and stones, and the marchers were forced to defend themselves in well-nigh battle formations with the aid of the police.

Thus, as can be seen from the above, at every step of the way Ukrainian Americans are hindered or prevented from exercising their right of freedom of expression, and the right to espouse the noble cause of freedom and independence for their long-enslaved and suffering kinsmen. Nevertheless, they remain undiscouraged and full of faith in the American sense of fair-play.

Their action to help free Ukraine first attracted public notice here back in 1915, when as raw immigrants they sent their representatives to a national congress at historic Cooper Union in New York City (October 30-31). At that time they were being strongly opposed by Tsarist Russian agents. At that time, on account of the conditions prevalent then, the Ukrainian demands were rather modest. They found expression in the memorandum which the Ukrainian American congress sent to the Department of State at Washington and which read as follows:

"The ultimate goal of the Ukrainians is the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state which would comprise the Ukrainians now inhabiting the countries of Eastern Europe, but realizing that this ultimate aim may not be accomplished in the near future, and not unmindful of the present day conditions, which present problems of immediate importance, they demand that in Austria-Hungary the Ukrainian territory be organized into a self-governing province on the federal lines, where the Ukrainian population, not dominated by the Poles or their aristocracy, shall solve its own national and economic problems.

"They demand also that Russian Ukraine, in fulfillment of the treaty of Pereyaslav, which is now in the statute books of Russia and has not been abrogated, be granted autonomy."

Besides this, the immigrants concentrated their efforts on collecting funds for the relief of Ukrainian war sufferers in war-torn Europe. Here they had some success. Through the influence of Congressman James Hamill and Senator Henry Cabot Lodge both the House and the Senate passed a joint resolution, which was approved by President Wilson on March 2, 1917, in which it was—

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that in view of the wretchedness, misery and privation which these people [Ukrainians] are enduring, the President of the United States be respectfully requested to designate and appoint a day on which the citizens of this country may give expression to their sympathy by contributing to the funds now being raised for the relief of the Ruthenians [Ukrainians] in the belligerent countries."

In compliance with this resolution President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed April 21, 1917 as a day for contributing funds for the aid of the stricken Ukrainians; that day became known as the "Ukrainian Day in America." Funds raised on that day amounted to \$84,463.97.

In the midst of the preparations for the Ukrainian Day, the United States declared war on the Central Powers (April 6, 1917). This was the turning point for Ukrainian action in this country. Although most of the Ukrainian immigrants were as yet non-citizens, they all did their utmost in support of America's war effort. In return they expected at least some measure of understanding of their action on behalf of their kinsmen in Ukraine. Wilson's Fourteen Points proclaiming the right of national self-determination gave them added incentive. Likewise the stirrings of submerged peoples in Europe to regain their former national liberties showed the immigrants here that great events were impending, that now was the time to come to the support of their kinsmen in servitude. The years 1917-1922 were marked in this country by unprecedented activity in this direction, not only by the Ukrainian ethnic group but also by other ethnic groups whose co-nationals on the other side needed their help. This activity began to attain its greatest proportions when the stirring news arrived that tsarist Russia had collapsed and Russian Ukraine had transformed itself into the Ukrainian National Republic (Jan. 22, 1918) and later that Austria-Hungary had also collapsed and that Austrian but Polish-dominated Ukraine had transformed itself into the Western Ukrainian Republic (Nov. 1, 1918); and, finally, that those two republics had united themselves into one indivisible and independent Ukrainian National Republic (Jan. 22, 1919).



Since up to that time Ukrainian action in this country had been conducted by several rival groups, they made a decision to iron out some of their differences and coordinate their efforts. As a result, at the Ukrainian National Conference held in New York City on November 11, 1918 a joint Ukrainian National Committee was established, charged with the task of coordinating and giving direction to Ukrainian American efforts on behalf of a free Ukraine.

This national committee, however, did not represent the left-wing Ukrainian Federation in the United States, nevertheless both groups worked toward the common aim of supporting the Ukrainian republic.

Since it required funds to operate, the Ukrainian National Committee issued an appeal for them, and this brought a substantial reply in form of about \$150,000 in contributions. A publicity bureau of the committee busied itself in preparing press releases, as well as memoranda and messages to the government, foreign embassies and governments, and organizations of various sorts. This bureau, located in New York City, had a branch in Washington. The committee also established contacts with Ukrainian organizations abroad. One of the prime achievements of the committee was its securing of the services of Congressman James Hamill of New Jersey to act as its representative, together with the committee vice-president Dr. Cyril Bilyk, at the Paris Peace Conference.

To gain added strength, the Ukrainian National Committee made a common cause with the representatives of the Baltic peoples in this country. Together they established the League of Estonians, Letts, Lithuanians, and Ukrainians (in May, 1919). At its national congress held in New York City on September 16-17, the league declared its principal objects to be:

"1. To aid the American people and the American Government in reaching a better understanding of the political, economic and social conditions in Eastern Europe.

"2. To induce the United States Government and the principal Allied and Associated Powers to recognize the sovereignty (newly-established) of the Republics of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Ukraine, and to accord to each of them all the territory to which it is justly entitled.

"3. To aid in protecting the four republics from the aggression and invasion of Polish and German imperialists and from Bolshevists.

"4. To further trade and commerce between the United States and the Republics of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Ukraine."

The League succeeded in securing the assistance of Mr. Robert Caldwell, the president of the American Mid-European Association, created by the efforts of the Czech leader, Professor Thomas Masaryk. As a result on August 29, 1919 a hearing was held before the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. At this hearing representatives of each of the four nationalities laid the cases of their respective countries before the committee, while their counsel, Mr. George Gordon Battle, made a strong plea for a Senatorial recommendation to the State Department that it recognize the republics of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Ukraine.

An incident at the league's congress in New York worth recalling now, was the reading of a telegram by Vincent F. Jankovski (representing the Lithuanian group) from Congressman Fiorello H. LaGuardia of New York City, in which he stated: ". . . Our four sister republics should be recognized without delay. While that is not up to the House of Representatives I shall this day introduce a bill providing appropriations for the maintenance of legations in those countries, thereby expressing the sympathy of the House and readiness to act. Long live the New Republics."

All this work by the Ukrainian National Committee, and by the Ukrainian American group as a whole, was unable to stave off the impending doom of the Ukrainian republic. From all sides its enemies converged upon it: Bolsheviks, Denikin's armies, Poles and Rumanians; and internally it was beset by lack of war materiel and typhus. The climax came when despite the principle of self-determination, the Peace Conference of Versailles authorized the Poles (June 25, 1919) to occupy Western Ukraine with the forces of General Haller, organized and equipped by French and American aid. Then, following the Russian-Polish war, the Riga Treaty (1921) partitioned Ukraine between the two countries, leaving the Ukrainians only the slim hope that Polish occupation of Western Ukraine, particularly Eastern Galicia, might yet be disapproved by the Supreme Council of the Paris Peace Conference.

Disillusioned by this callous contravention of the principle of national self-determination, the Ukrainian Americans nevertheless commenced vigorous action to make American public opinion aware of the wrong that had been done to Ukraine. Mass rallies and parades were held and appeals dispatched to Washington and other capitals. These urged the termination of foreign military occupation of the Ukrainian soil, since, according to the Treaty of St. Germain, the Polish

boundaries were not yet settled and the now-famous Curzon Line was recommended then as a possible boundary between Poland and Western Ukraine. They demanded the reestablishment of the Western Ukrainian Republic, composed of the Ukrainian territory occupied by Poland.

During this time the president of the Ukrainian National Committee, who was also the Administrator of the Ukrainian Catholic Diocese in America, Msgr. Peter Poniatishin, called on the Secretary of State Robert Lansing, and later on the new Secretary, Charles Evans Hughes, as well as on some members of the Congressional Committee for Foreign Affairs.

In response to his appeals, he was advised by them to restrict the Ukrainian demand to that of mere autonomy for Western Ukraine, which was contrary to the general sentiment of the Ukrainians throughout the whole world.

Undiscouraged by such advice the Ukrainian Americans continued to protest against Polish occupation of Western Ukraine and the approval of it by the Allied Supreme Council. They likewise protested against the Bolshevik absorption of Eastern Ukraine, although they realized that neither the American government nor any of the Allied governments had the slightest influence upon the Reds.

Mass meetings of protest continued to be held throughout the country, especially during 1922. Some of the largest of them took place in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Chicago and New York. The White House as well as the embassies of the Allied Powers in Washington were picketed by groups of girls attired in colorful Ukrainian native costumes. In Philadelphia delegates of citizens' organizations from ten different states met (Jan. 10, 1922) and called upon their government to help save the land of their origin from brutal foreign occupation. A petition pleading the Ukrainian case and signed by 3,000 persons was sent to our Department of State and the Allied embassies. Still another petition, bearing 14,000 signatures, was dispatched to the Allied Council of Ambassadors at Cannes, France, which had replaced the Supreme Council of the Paris Peace Conference.

In June, 1922 delegates of the Ukrainian League of American Citizens and Veterans convened in Washington and at an audience with Secretary of State Charles Evan Hughes their representatives presented to him an appropriate memorandum which subsequently was presented to President Harding. At the same time a hearing before the U. S. Senate Committee for Foreign Relations for the Ukrainian demands was granted. Various protests were lodged with the Allied Conference at the

Hague, held in June of that year, warning of the consequences to European peace of Polish occupation of Western Ukraine.

All these measures, however, did not prevent imperialistically-minded Poland from retaining its grip on Western Ukraine as part of its spoils of war, for by the infamous decision of the Council of Embassadors of March 14, 1923 Polish occupation of Western Ukraine was approved.

The ink had scarcely dried on this document actually approving aggression, when Polish abuses of elementary Ukrainian rights caused a new wave of protests to rise among Ukrainian Americans.

Meanwhile a change had occurred within Ukrainian American life. The Ukrainian National Committee, after having been denounced for failure to have helped to secure a free Ukraine, was replaced by a new coalition of organizations, composed at first of national fraternal societies and later including also other national and local societies—called "Obyednanye"—The United Ukrainian Organizations of the United States. It was created at a Ukrainian American Congress in Philadelphia, October 26, 1922. In its span of life it outlasted all previous national congress organizations, 18 years in all, finally yielding its leadership, on account of changing conditions and the outbreak of the present war, to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

There was hardly an event of any importance in Ukrainian American life with which the Obyednanye was not connected, directly or indirectly. Thus it was in the van of all Ukrainian American protests against the oppression of Ukrainians in their native but foreign occupied land of Ukraine by the Bolsheviks, the Poles, Rumanians, and even the Czechs. It led the protests against the infamous Polish "pacification" of Ukrainian villages in the early 1930's, and against the even more infamous and inhuman Soviet-made famine in Ukraine, the toll of which ran into several millions of lives. Its action, however, was not confined to protests, as it also endeavored to bring relief and succor to the suffering Ukrainians over there; but to no avail, as the Red rulers of the Ukrainians would not allow any relief to reach them. During its existence, too, the "Obyednanye" collected some 400,000 dollars, which it sent to European Ukrainians to support their cultural and educational institutions as well as their struggle for national freedom.

Immediately after the first World War some new immigrants organized an avowed revolutionary Organization for the Rebirth of Ukraine. It collected funds to keep up national spirit mostly among the

Ukrainian emigrants in Europe and published its monthly magazine, *The Trident*.

Aside from this purely Ukrainian American action on behalf a free Ukraine, there was at one time similar action conducted at Washington by special diplomatic missions of the government-in-exile of the Ukrainian National Republic conducted by Julian Bachinsky, Dr. Longin Cehelsky, and finally by Dr. Luke Myshuha (1918-1923). A Loan for the Defense of Ukraine was floated and it brought a sum sufficient to maintain Ukrainian political missions in various parts of the world.

The action was not all political either. In the early 1920's there came to these shores the world famous Ukrainian National Chorus under the direction of the equally famous Professor Alexander Koshetz. Its great American tour was sponsored by Max Rabinoff, manager of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. Some prominent critics declared it to be the finest chorus ever heard in this country. Besides acquainting the American public with the rich legacy of songs possessed by the Ukrainians, it likewise gave them an insight into their centuries-old struggle for national freedom.

In their efforts to acquaint their fellow Americans with the plight of their kinsmen in Ukraine, the Ukrainian Americans even went to the extent of arranging lectures on Ukraine in this country by two members of the British Parliament visiting here, who had already demonstrated their sympathies for the Ukrainian people. They were the Hon. Rennie Smith, who toured here in 1931-32, and the Hon. Rhys Davies, who came here in 1937. It was they who declared, in response to a message from a Ukrainian American group, that "you will have to be wise as serpents to help your people in the best."

For a time, too, efforts were made to convene an All-World Congress of Ukrainians which would elect a presidium to coordinate and direct on a world-wide scale political action on behalf the Ukrainians. The imminent world war interfered with further preparation for it.

The outbreak of the present war immediately caused the Ukrainian Americans to realize that they would have to redouble their activities and coordinate them, primarily to help support America's rising war effort and secondly to help their kinsmen free themselves. Accordingly, in May, 1940 a great Ukrainian American Congress was held at Washington, at which delegates from all parts of America unanimously stressed in appropriate resolutions the necessity for a free and independent Ukraine, encompassing all Ukrainian ethnographic territories.

It is worth noting in this connection that at that Washington congress the twenty senators and congressmen who addressed it—among them being Senators Davis, Guffey and Maloney, and Representatives Boland, Voorhis, O'Day, Sabath—likewise declared themselves in favor of the establishment of a free and independent Ukraine. At the same time they praised the Ukrainian Americans for having assumed the obligation and privilege of being spokesmen and champions of the cause of their gagged and suffering kinsmen in Ukraine.

Composed then of representatives of the four leading Ukrainian fraternal societies in this country, namely, the Ukrainian National Association, the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association, the Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics, and the Ukrainian National Aid Association, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America was transformed at the second Ukrainian American congress, held in Philadelphia, January, 1944, into a national committee based on community representation, in which form it now exists.

Today the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is directing and coordinating Ukrainian American efforts on behalf a free Ukraine. To that end it engages in various activities. It sent a delegation to the United Conference on International Organization at San Francisco.

Another important Ukrainian American organization striving to alleviate the sufferings of the Ukrainian people in their native but foreign occupied land is the United Ukrainian American Relief Committee with headquarters in Philadelphia. Its principal purpose is to help the Ukrainian war sufferers and refugees in and outside of Ukraine who need food and shelter or who, as Ukrainian patriots, are opposed to all and any forms of totalitarianism and as a consequence are faced with the danger of being imprisoned or exterminated if they are compelled to return to Ukraine.

All this time efforts were being made to remedy the deplorable situation arising here from the lack of even elementary literature on the Ukrainian people, their culture and aspirations. To that end books and pamphlets were published by Ukrainian American societies like "Ukraine, the land and its people," an introduction to its geography, by Prof. Stephen Rudnitsky, published by Ukrainian Alliance of America. Among them could be cited Obyednanye's "Polish Atrocities in Ukraine" and "Famine in Ukraine" published in the early 1930's. Various periodicals appeared too, including *The Ukrainian Weekly* (published since 1933), *The Trident* a monthly (1937-1940), *Ukrainian Life* a monthly (1938-1941), and lastly this *Ukrainian Quarterly*.

Through the efforts of the Cultural Committee of the Ukrainian National Association, there have also appeared within recent years the following books: *History of Ukraine* by Prof. Michael Hrushevsky (Yale University Press), *Bohdan, Hetman of Ukraine*, by Prof. George Vernadsky (Yale Press), *Ukrainian Literature* by Prof. Clarence A. Manning, and others.

These publications, as well as numerous other books, brochures and printed matter of all sorts are gradually giving American public opinion some opportunity to learn why the Ukrainian cause is right and just, and why Ukrainian Americans have since their arrival here been striving in all fields of endeavor and in spite of all hindrances and discouragements to help their oppressed kinsmen in war-torn and foreign-occupied Ukraine to win that freedom, which their American kinsmen are so fortunate in having here in this "land of Washington"—as they are wont to call it fondly.



## MYKOLA KHVYLOVY—COMMUNIST AND PATRIOT

By HONORE EWACH

**S**INCE the suicide in 1933 of Mykola Khvylovy, foremost of the modern writers of the Soviet Ukraine, there has been no end of controversy among Ukrainians about his political creed. No one doubts that Khvylovy was the leading Soviet Ukrainian writer of his time. The real question is whether he was a Ukrainian nationalist or both a Ukrainian nationalist and a communist. A thorough reading of his works leaves one without a doubt that Khvylovy was a sincere Ukrainian patriot. But was he also a communist? Again his works prove to us that if he was a communist he certainly was not a Russophile communist. Nor was he the so-called international type of communist, but rather he was a special type of communist growing on the Ukrainian soil.

In reading Khvylovy's works one has to remember that their author was always under the strict surveillance of the bolshevist secret police. He had to weigh every word he wrote or else he would have been "liquidated" at the very start of his career and not, as it turned out to be, after years of productive literary work. He was a close observer, a man of fine esthetic taste and of first rate literary talent. He likewise was clever and resourceful. So he used all possible avenues to convey to his countrymen a very urgent message: beware of the Russian peril under Red cover.

Mykola Khvylovy was born in 1893 in the province of Kharkiv, Ukraine. His father was a very poor laborer, a real proletarian. So Mykola had very little regular schooling. Yet he read books so diligently that eventually his self-education surpassed in scope and depth the education of many a college graduate cum laude. He read all that Russia, France, England, America, Germany, Ukraine, and other countries had to offer in literature. Of course, he read most of the world classics in either Russian or Ukrainian translations. Some of them he read in French, as his works show he knew that language, too. For a time he was a common laborer, like his father. During the First World War, in 1914-1916, he served in the army.

It was in 1917, in the first year of the Russian Revolution, that his first works appeared in print. He began his literary career as a lyric poet. Later he wrote most of his works in prose. Yet his prose



works are so permeated with a lyrical element that they seem more like poems than stories. "The Blue Etudes," his first book of short stories, came off the press in 1923. A year later, "The Autumn," his second book of short stories, was published. His longest novel, "The Wild-Snipes," appeared in part in the magazine "Vaplite," the literary organ of the "Free Academy of the Proletarian Literature" (Vilna Akademia Proletarskoyi Literatury).

It evoked consternation among the communists and was denounced as an anti-communist work. This was in 1927. As a member of the Communist Party of Ukraine Khvylovy was forced to announce in public that he had erred in his works concerning the Party. Threatened with punishment he had to destroy the second part of his "Wild-Snipes," which was then still in manuscript form. He had to give his consent for its destruction. Again and again Khvylovy was forced to make new "confessions" of his so-called Party errors, till finally, it is claimed, Khvylovy committed suicide in 1933. Perhaps he was ordered by the Party to shoot himself, or, if he did away with himself of his own volition, he evidently did it because he could no longer continue to renounce his most sacred beliefs. Perhaps he died because he was sick and tired to death of living any longer amidst the misery and oppression introduced into Ukraine by the Bolsheviks.

The most productive period in the literary career of Khvylovy was during the so-called Ukrainization of Soviet Ukraine (1923-29), which coincided more or less with the NEP in the economic field. It came into being when the Reds realized that the struggle they were still waging with the Ukrainian nationalistic partisans would continue indefinitely unless Soviet policy in Ukraine was somewhat relaxed. During this period Ukrainian patriots gradually made their way into key positions. Many of them wanted Ukraine to be Communistic but first of all Ukrainian. They began to de-russify Ukraine and introduce the Ukrainian tongue as the official state language to be used on all occasions and in the various governmental and cultural institutions, as well as within the Party itself.

This Ukrainization took on a mass character when it received the official sanction of the Communist Party of Ukraine during the plenary session of its Central Executive Committee in 1925. The meeting adopted the following resolution: "The task of solidifying the ties between the workers and the peasants and of strengthening the proletarian dictatorship in Ukraine requires the exertion of every possible effort by

the entire Party to master the Ukrainian language and to Ukrainize internal Party activity." At the same time the Party also declared itself in favor of an "independent development of Ukrainian culture and the appearance of all creative powers of the Ukrainian people."

During this time the Ukrainian Commissariat of Education was headed by Hrynko, Shumsky and by Mykola Skrypnyk, all veteran Communists but real Ukrainians at the same time. Under their aegis Ukrainian studies and literature began to flourish. Two hitherto separate literary societies, "Pluh," devoted to peasantry, and "Hart," devoted to the industrialized proletariat, united themselves into the Free Academy of Proletarian Literature in Kharkiv, which had as its organ the magazine *Vaplite*. S. Pylypenko, Paul Tychyna and Mykola Khvylovy were its outstanding figures. Of them all Khvylovy was the most striking personality and the most original writer.

Soon, however, he found himself in trouble, attacked from two sides. One group, composed of orthodox Communists, charged him with lacking faith in the messianic role of Communism. Another group, consisting of Russian Communists, attacked him on account of his Ukrainian patriotism.

Moscow became truly alarmed when Khvylovy issued his Literary Manifesto in which he called upon the Ukrainian writers of Soviet Ukraine not to imitate Russian literary trends and not to seek inspiration in Russian culture because, as he said, it lacked healthy elements. Instead, he recommended, they should guide themselves by the psychology and literary styles of Western Europe. "Turn our backs to Moscow and our faces to Western Europe," was the rallying cry of Khvylovy's manifesto, and, eventually, the cause of his downfall and tragic end.

The attacks upon him increased in savage intensity, together with demands that he repent and retract his "false nationalistic ideas." As could be expected, he was forced to make such retractions but he continued to adhere in his work to the general line of his ideas. While the Ukrainization period lasted, it was still possible for him to continue to write. But when reaction set in (1930) when Soviet policy in Ukraine became once more anti-Ukrainian. With the attendant destruction of nationalistic elements in literature and other fields, Khvylovy found it impossible to continue writing. He became an object of persecution from all sides. Since he was not an opportunist but possessed a character as strong as the muscles of the Ukrainian worker, it was inevitable that he would soon meet his end. He did, in 1935.

In 1937 a volume of Mykola Khvylovy's Selected Works was pub-

lished by the Ukrayinska Knyhospilka at Lviv. Let us briefly examine its contents. In the short story "Solonsky Yar" we catch a glimpse of a destructive struggle going on between two villages, the communist dominated village of Mlynky and the rebellious nationalist village of Solonsky Yar. Incited by propaganda, the inhabitants of both villages wantonly destroy each other's possessions. The story is intended to portray the negative side of the communist revolution—a practical struggle among the Ukrainians.

In the short story "Baraky, shcho za Mistom" we get another glimpse of the nightmare of the revolution. We see two communist sympathizers in a town under White Guard rule seizing their victims and burying them alive, forcing them to crawl into a common grave filled with partly decayed bodies.

In "Shlakhethne Hnizdo" we discern what went on in Khvylovy's mind. He shows us an old patriarchal couple living on a farm near the Barrow of the Swedes, that is, somewhere near Poltava, where the Swedes and their allies, the Ukrainian forces of Hetman Mazepa, fought against the dark forces of Russia in 1709. As the old man looks at his and at the same "not his" green sprouts of early wheat in the fields we observe that in reality Khvylovy is portraying here the plight of Ukraine, which is Ukrainian and yet not in the real possession of the Ukrainians. Then he adds for those who can understand his symbolism a message in brackets, saying: "Ukraine is sprouting up, too. Oh, how I love Ukraine, in a youthful and practical manner!" Poor Khvylovy tried his best to tell his countrymen of his love for Ukraine, and of Ukraine's desire to be free and independent. It is quite evident that Khvylovy was a follower of a spiritual leader of the Ukrainian independence movement, Hetman Ivan Mazepa, a person of historic importance, and yet anathematized by both tsarist and communist Russians. He had the same dream as Mazepa, for he desired to see Ukraine free of Russia's domination.

In "Ya" (Romantyka) a disillusioned chief of the Cheka tells how he shot to death his own mother in the wild orgy of murders committed by his degenerate comrade-members of the Communist Party. In the name of something vague and abstract he commits matricide while his better part, his heart and emotions, beat with tender love for all that his dear mother symbolizes to him. A man with a degenerate type of skull, a potential criminal, is the grim guard and executioner of the half illiterate and ignorant workingmen who grimly execute all the orders

given to them by their Soviets, composed of educated criminals.

In "Na Ozero" we find a lovely sketch in the manner of Turgenev about a Communist sportsman going with his dog on a hunting trip to an out-of-the-way little farm somewhere in Ukraine where everything is still as it was before the revolution in 1917. There the hero feels that he is at home, far away from the nightmares of the Communist regime.

But it is in his longest novelette "The Wild-Snipes," published for the first time in 1927, that Khvylovy confesses quite openly his disillusionment in the Communist revolution. We find the hero of the story, Dmytro Karamazov, a prominent Communist official, spending his two summer months of vacation somewhere in the southern part of Ukraine and falling in love with a pretty girl of mature years, by the name of Aglaya, who is also vacationing there. It is Aglaya who tells us that she got interested in Karamazov, when they met casually on a steamboat for the first time some time ago, on account of his confessed desire to see his own people, the Ukrainians, reborn as an independent and progressive nation. Karamazov, still feeling that he is a Party man and a Communist official, is afraid to own up openly that he is really disillusioned in the work of the Communist system. Aglaya, however, is not afraid to lead his thoughts to final and logical conclusions. From the hints Karamazov drops, it becomes clear to us that he has no more faith, that he no longer believes it would be possible to make out of his own country, Ukraine, an independent and progressive nation without an adequate number of well-educated intellectuals, such as they have in Western Europe. Later on Aglaya tells us that Karamazov at first really believed in the Communist ideology, but when he saw that ideology applied to actual life he realized that he had to do with men who had very little intelligence and practical education and who really bungled whatever they did. He found out that almost all the Russian internationalistic Communists were at heart as imperialistic in regard to other peoples in the USSR as were their predecessors, the Tsar and his pan-Russian nationalistic imperialists. So why shouldn't he care as much for his own country and people, for Ukraine and Ukrainians, as the Russian Reds care for Russia and Russians?

It is no wonder then that the pan-Russian Communists made Khvylovy's life unbearable until his tragic end. To us Khvylovy is equally a symbol of the cultural life of the Ukrainian people under the Red rule of Moscow. In the fictitious Ukrainian Soviet Republic the Ukrainian people do not possess any possibilities developing of their culture freely and in harmony with their liberty-loving traditions.

## THE UKRAINIAN SITUATION

### Text of the Memorandum to the American Delegation at the United Nations Conference on International Organization

*Presented by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America Delegation  
at the San Francisco Conference*

**T**HE Ukrainian Congress Committee of America represents Americans of Ukrainian descent together with their leading national organizations, churches, institutions, clubs and societies in most communities throughout the United States. It was originally established at the first Ukrainian American Congress, held in Washington, D.C., May 1940, and attended by 700 delegates representing over 2,000 national and local societies and organizations, and reorganized at the second, also widely representative, Ukrainian American Congress held in Philadelphia, Pa., in January 1944.

It is the conviction of the undersigned delegation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America at the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco that at this time when our country is dedicated to the task of helping to establish at the San Francisco Conference a general international security organization, it is the duty of Americans of Old World background to give their government officials and delegates to the Conference the benefit of their special knowledge concerning the land of their origin or descent. In this manner the American approach at the Conference to the problems of post-war Europe will be based on a keen awareness of all the factors and latent forces involved.

### No True Ukrainian Representation at UNCIO

This duty is especially felt by Americans of Ukrainian extraction, as practically all of Ukraine today is under the rule of Soviet Russia. Forcibly deprived of the national independence it enjoyed immediately following the last war, as well as during several earlier periods in her turbulent historic past, Ukraine today has no truly representative government in Ukraine or any other true form of national representation of its own, either at home or abroad to speak for her.

As a result, at the United Nations Conference on International

Organization at San Francisco the 45 million Ukrainian nation has no voice.

To be sure, there is present now at the Conference a delegation from the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. But anyone acquainted with the totalitarian nature of the Soviet Union—where there is a notorious lack of freedom of expression, and where everyone must act as a puppet of the Kremlin rulers—must perforce realize that under such circumstances the Soviet Ukrainian delegation is unable to express the true sentiments and aspirations of the Ukrainian people. Consequently there is no true Ukrainian national representation at this International Conference.

Realizing that their kinsmen in Ukraine lack freedom of expression, and what they do manage to say is distorted by those who do or would rule over them, Americans of Ukrainian descent, removed from their kinsmen in Ukraine at most by one generation, have invested the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America with the duty of making better known the truth concerning their kinsmen in Ukraine, particularly in regard to their national sentiments and aspirations.

The Ukrainian national aspirations have always gravitated toward the ideal of a free and independent Ukraine. For centuries that has been the supreme ideal of the Ukrainian people, and for centuries they have fought, bled, and sacrificed in its cause. At times they have been successful. Thus, resurrecting the glories of their mighty Kievan empire of the 10-13th centuries, and of the Kozak republic their world famous warriors of that name set up in the 17th century, the Ukrainian people rose upon the collapse of the Tsarist Russian and the Austro-Hungarian empires and established the Ukrainian National Republic. Although that republic eventually collapsed before the superior might of its enemies, mainly the Reds and Poles, it remains to this day an undying inspiration to the present and future generations of those to whom the cause of Ukrainian freedom is dear.

When the present world war broke out and the Soviet rulers of Ukraine were in an unholy alliance with the Nazis, the Ukrainian people hoped that out of it there would emerge some opportunity for them to strike out for their freedom. They hopefully looked to the democracies, particularly to America—to which they were especially bound by their traditional idealization of George Washington and by their reliance upon Woodrow Wilson's principle of national self-determination—to give them at least moral support when they made their bid for freedom. For a while prospects of gaining such moral support

did not appear too dark to them. At the already cited Ukrainian American Congress, in Washington, D. C., May 1940, twenty United States Senators and Congressmen vouched for the justice of the Ukrainian cause and espoused the centuries-old ideal of a free and independent Ukraine.

Eventually, however, events took a different turn. Nazi Germany attacked its erstwhile ally, the Soviet Union, and the latter became our gallant ally. Much as they abhorred totalitarian Soviet rule, which had decimated them by many millions, the Ukrainians were outraged to find their native land invaded and defiled by another totalitarian power, Nazi Germany. Making a common cause with those who have always sorely oppressed them, they rose against the foul invader and in the armed forces and ranks of the partisans they drove the Nazis out of Ukraine. In doing this, it should be borne in mind, they suffered the most of any European nation in the loss of human lives and property damage.

And yet, though they fought in the cause of freedom, today the Ukrainian people find themselves, despite their heroism and sacrifices, once more in national thralldom. This is true not only of the overwhelming majority of them who before the war were under Soviet Russia but also of those seven odd million of them who before the war were under Poland and who by virtue of the Curzon line decision at Yalta now find themselves under Soviet rule.

### **Ukraine—"Sore Spot of Eastern Europe"**

The net result of it is that Ukraine has once more become "the sore spot of Eastern Europe." Once again the national aspirations of the Ukrainian people are running counter to the attempts of their alien and ruthless rulers to quell them. Once more, as before the war, there will be in Ukraine a singular lack of that peace, freedom, justice, and democracy in the cause of which the great conflict in Europe was waged.

Reports from reliable sources clearly indicate that in Western Ukraine itself the Soviet commissars are conducting a ruthless campaign either to exterminate Ukrainian national consciousness and national life or make it conform completely to Communist-Russian ideology. In this they are following the familiar pattern of their national policy in Soviet Ukraine proper, including man-made famines, purges, and executions, especially from the time (1930) when Stalin himself publicly declared that for the Reds Ukrainian nationalism constitutes a "grave danger." Western Ukrainian institutions of a national cultural character

are being shut down or destroyed, while patriotic and democratically-minded Ukrainians, irrespective of their station in life, both the educated and the unlettered, any and all who have espoused the cause of the Ukrainian freedom, are being liquidated by execution, imprisonment or deportation.

This tragic state of affairs in Ukraine is bound to continue as long as the Ukrainian nation remains under foreign domination. The only proper and just solution of the Ukrainian problem would be to allow the Ukrainian people to reassert their centuries-old freedom-loving traditions and reestablish their Ukrainian National Republic of over a quarter of a century ago, founded on the traditionally Ukrainian democratic principles, and living in peace, security and close economic collaboration with neighboring states.

### **National Independence Only Just Solution of Ukrainian Problem**

It is our sincere and well-founded conviction that the unbreakable and centuries-old will to control their national destinies and live their own life would be again clearly demonstrated by our Ukrainian kinsmen in their war-ravaged native but foreign-occupied land if they were to get the opportunity to express their will and wishes in the matter freely and without alien coercion or interference.

We repeat, the establishment of a free and independent Ukrainian state on Ukrainian ethnographic territories and embodying the 45 million Ukrainian population, is the only just and proper solution of the Ukrainian problem, and an indispensable element to lasting peace in Eastern Europe. Otherwise Ukraine will continue to be "the sore spot in Eastern Europe," constantly seething with unrest and discontent, and ever a magnet to would-be conquerors who would exploit the unrest for their ends and thereby plunge the continent and the world into another great bloody war.

Since, however, the agenda of the San Francisco Conference appears to preclude any possibility of even discussing the natural right of the Ukrainian people to national independence, the least that can be done at the Conference is to take into consideration the fate of the stateless peoples under foreign rule, especially of those who find themselves living in totalitarian states, particularly the Ukrainians. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals, in which the proposed international organization is outlined, should be amended so as to include a Bill of National Rights and Sovereign Equality for Stateless Peoples.



### **Bill of National Rights for Stateless Peoples**

Such a bill of National Rights for Stateless Peoples would have as its objective not only the preservation of the cultural and economic self-rule of foreign-ruled peoples, notably the Ukrainians, but also the opportunity of attaining by peaceful methods their sovereign equality with other nations. What makes such a bill all the more imperative is the fact that totalitarian rule in Eastern Europe with all its abuses of human rights is not likely to diminish now that the war in Europe is over; on the contrary, it may become even more rampant. Moreover, such a bill could be a means of guaranteeing to nations the Four Freedoms proclaimed by our late President Roosevelt and in the Atlantic Charter.

### **Protective Council**

The inclusion, however, of the Bill of National Rights for Stateless Peoples in the charter of the international peace organization would not of itself be a sufficient guarantee of those rights. To strengthen the international guarantee of them the world peace and security organization should have a Protective Council, which would act as a guardian of stateless peoples, charged with the duty of seeing that the provisions of the Bill of National Rights for Stateless Peoples in the charter are adhered to by the members of the international organization. The Council would be even empowered to act on its own initiative, without requiring any formal bill of complaint, for the experience of the years following the last war has shown that in totalitarian or semi-totalitarian countries where rule by force and terror is an established method and where the authorities do as they please, it is often extremely difficult, in fact dangerous, for those who would seek redress from an international body to make any charges against their misrulers.

### **Revision of Peace Treaties**

Another measure worth giving serious attention at the United Nations Conference on International Organization would be one providing for the revision of peace treaties or for the rise of independent states without recourse to war. Anyone sincerely interested in the preservation of peace should accept the possibility of a change in the present world political order by peaceful means. After all, the aspirations of civilized albeit submerged people, particularly the Ukrainians, to become independent cannot be quelled forever, unless, of course, the

proposed international security organization becomes a reactionary force, bound in principle to oppose any natural right of a people to freedom. For that reason the final charter of the proposed international organization being drawn up at the San Francisco conference should allow for the possibility of a peaceable revision of frontiers as well as the rise of new states on the territories of present countries.

We sincerely hope that in formulating plans for a permanent international security organization the San Francisco Conference will give serious consideration to the measures proposed above and designed to ameliorate the conditions which are a breeding ground of unrest and revolts in Ukraine, and a constant danger to lasting peace and security in that part of the globe. To the end, Sirs, we earnestly petition your kind support.

**UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA**

*Delegation at United Nations Conference  
on International Organization in San Francisco*

**STEPHEN SHUMEYKO  
BOHDAN KATAMAY  
PROF. ALEXANDER GRANOVSKY  
IVAN PETRUSHEVICH**



## BOOK REVIEWS

**THE REAL SOVIET RUSSIA**, by David J. Dallin, translated by Joseph Shaplen, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1944, pp. 260.

"Klyukva," the Russian name for a small cranberry bush, which has come to connote, for many a Russian, foreign misrepresentation of and misinformation about Russia as a result of a French visitor's description of the bush to his countrymen as a plant with an expansive foliage, is the main target of Mr. Dallin's factually-equipped attack in this valuable work. The author's random illustrations of the superfluity of "klyukva" that the mushroom growth of self-styled "experts," analysts," and "correspondents" has produced prior and during this war furnish the reader literary amusement which simultaneously affords a worthwhile appreciation of the basic ignorance of the countless many of such "authorities" concerning Russia generally, in addition to the acutely limited opportunities granted them by perennial government censors to learn more of the conditions prevailing there.

Mr. Dallin, a socialist, with a native background of Russia and an evident scholarly competence, comes well prepared to the task of dissipating many of the fanciful notions concerning the Soviet Union that especially the pro-Soviet propaganda necessitated by the war has concocted in the interest of "unity." The main strength of this exposition lies in the author's trained capacity to present the conditions and developments in the Soviet society as forming a consistent pattern determined expediently by a nucleus of totalitarian managers who, similar to the Nazi elite, constitute the General Staff of the Communist Party. The factual material marshalled by the author to buttress stubbornly the chief points of this analysis admirably certifies his erudite familiarity with basic sources.

His work would be completely effective, however, had the precise sources of his information been specified in page footnotes rather than generally enumerated per chapter in the appendix. Moreover, as the title indicates, an accurate conveyance of the international conflicts within the Soviet Union is glaringly wanting, this probably due to the circumscribed historical education received by Mr. Dallin and others in Russia, for even Trotsky in his day was pitifully unaware of historical Ukrainian claims to independent government. Finally, accurate and

comprehensive as the book is, for the average American reader, unacquainted by virtue of his own democratic institutions with pervasive government despotism, it would seem to exaggerate at many points by want of a perspective on the part of the reader, which can be acquired only by reading Russian history and the works of Marx, Plekhanov, Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin. In a word, a full appreciation of the accurate but seemingly shocking disclosures of this book presupposes a breadth of vision which only a first-hand knowledge of the above can provide, and to this extent Dallin's contribution must be deemed somewhat advanced.

The integrated pattern of Soviet policy, both domestic and foreign, is cogently portrayed in the interdependent relationships of the vital points brought out in this compact volume. First and foremost is the fundamental fact that here is a vast totalitarian organization, identical in numerous essential respects with the late Nazi system, which is founded upon ruthless suppression of democratic opposition and the capricious dictates of a Marxist elite. And no amount of hypocritical current propaganda can whitewash it. Within this frame of reference the author convincingly dispels the current misconception fabricated for foreign consumption that the Soviet oligarchy has finally repudiated its revolutionary communist ideology in the face of resurgent patriotic, nationalist, and religious manifestations, that it has undergone a "Thermidorian" period of peaceful evolution and relief from revolutionary stress. The continuance of political persecutions, purges, forced labor, and arbitrary collectivization, the re-intensification of ideological warfare beginning in 1942 to the present, as signified by the revival of study of the "History of the Communist Party, Brief Course" which points to the ultimate "victory of Communism throughout the world," belie such an erroneous interpretation. The early deviations from this planned course significantly paralleled the advance of Hitler's armies into the Soviet Union, but once this was reversed, that course was quickly resumed, reinforced in the meantime by the skillful incorporation of patriotic, nationalist, and religious fervors in the plan of the Party.

In support of this contention the author discounts the differences between Stalinism and Trotskyism concerning international communism by demonstrating that many of the proposals of the latter—rapid industrialization, collectivization, forced labor—were adopted by the former to solidify the base of future world revolution in the Soviet Union. "Neither Stalin nor anyone else had the power to conjure up the

spirit of revolution from beneath the earth of Europe at that time (1920's) while other quite different political ideas dominated the situation." Had Trotsky been in power, the events of the 30's would have not been dissimilar. "Stalin is the Lenin of today."

The fluctuations of the state's attitude toward religion reflect further the opportunist policy of the Marxist clique at the Kremlin. After the violent religious persecutions of 1923, 1931-33, and 1937-39, the Soviet government is now being represented as always having been tolerant of religion. Even our late President Roosevelt had said as much. Yet it is important to note that following each wave of persecution, temporary moderation of state anti-religious activity was predicated upon political expediency: that of 1923, by its "serious consequences to Soviet Russia's relations with England; that of 1931-33, by the Soviet Government's support of the League of Nations; that of 1937-39, by the "compromise with the Russian peasantry"; and now, by the religious populations in the Balkans and the power of the Vatican.

The remainder of the remarkable work depicts the present structure of Soviet society with its dictatorship "over" the proletariat which, from an internal viewpoint, further confirms the author's main thesis that the revolution is not yet ended. Again, apparent deviations from Marxist principles, e. g. classless society, are regarded by the Party as momentary as Stalin's distinction between socialism and ideal communism in 1936 indicates. The Party principles of state economy and the concentration of all power in one party to prevent a feared restoration of private individual economy are still vigorously extolled. The politically purposeful method of collectivization is still advanced to reduce the politically unreliable peasantry into an obedient proletarian mass in city environs. The fluctuations in policy, marked by recurring purges, of the Party toward the feared intellectuals who constitute both the main but bulky class in the state's bureaucratic machine and the chief problem since agitation for internal change would emerge from this group rather than the inert labouring class further demonstrate the tortuous line of ideological warfare undertaken by the Politbureau. Mr. Dallin's penetrating analyses of the low standard of living in the Union, the necessity of extensive female labor, the non-communist forces fighting a successful war made possible by indispensable Anglo-American aid, the extensive forced labor and concentration camps that show the Nazis as amateurs in the game, the inner workings of the despotic elite in the army of the Communist Party, and the hated omnipresence of the Russian Gestapo, the NKVD, serve to dispel decisively the fan-

tasies harboring in many a gullible Anglo-American mind. In this he makes an invaluable contribution.

As the author states in his preface, "Unlike Foreign Offices and State Departments, the active molders of public opinion have not only the right but the duty to scrutinize and to analyze without resort to conventionalism. They fail in the performance of their duty if they do not penetrate deeper into the meaning of contemporary history, do not perceive difficulties and dangers, but confine themselves merely to 'healthy optimism.' From the optimistic to the ridiculous is only a short step." The ridiculous will inevitably confront the democratic Anglo-American nations should they persist in their expedient campaign to exhibit their anomalous totalitarian partner as democratic while in identical Nazi-like fashion it maintains a single ruthless party, an oppressive censorship, a NKVD, countless concentration camps, liquidation campaigns, and the subjugation of Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Polish, Ukrainian, Georgian and other peoples to come. With Germany, the only organizing force of this artificial alliance, done, the time is now come to call a spade a spade, to dispense with the propagandistic rubbish and—"Klyukva"!

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY  
New York University

**THE SPIRIT OF RUSSIAN ECONOMICS**, by J. F. Normano, New York, John Day Co., 1945, pp. xiv, 170. \$2.00.

In spite of its deficiencies, this little volume is a compact survey of the influences which have played upon Russian economic thought—English, French, German, and above all, those of Russia herself—down to the present moment. It is a historical study of philosophical, social, and political currents in Russia since the end of the 18th century, as especially in Russia they are inseparable from economic ideas. The author's conclusions are "that in the historical fugue of the evolution of economic ideas in Russia, Bolshevism became a last chord whose harmony crowns the musical fugue. A retrospective analysis of Bolshevism after a quarter of a century of its existence plainly discloses its traditionalism. In its loves and hatreds, longings and recollections, hopes and disappointments, in its words and deeds, Bolshevism is a natural continuation of the Russian intellectual and moral climate; it is the culmination of the economic ideas germinating in Russian soil in the hundred years preceding the Russian Revolution" (p. xi).

This pro-Communist approach will be, of course, questioned by those unwilling to accept this thesis. Normano, in fact, makes no aim whatever to present both sides of such controversial points, although one cannot admire too much the skill with which the mosaic is put together out of its thousand details. The meaning of the picture—the rather forced conclusion—is another matter. Then, the reader will not find here, for instance, a history of Russian theories of business cycles, in spite of their importance to economic theory. The word Ukrainian does not appear on a single page of the book, and one is amazed to realize that M. Hrushevsky, N. Slabchenko, Volodimir Tuhon-Baranovsky, Vol. Levinsky, and other Ukrainians, whose contributions to Russian economics are not unimportant, do not exist for the author.

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK  
Hofstra College

## THE WORLD IS HALF SLAVE

REPORT ON THE RUSSIANS, by W. L. White, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1945, 309 pp. \$2.50.

A book like W. L. White's "Report on the Russians," and the controversy raging over it, is possible only because the world today is still half slave and half free. And this despite the victory achieved over Nazism. Which part of the world is slave need not be pointed out, but whether we want to let the world stay that way, and whether it will be possible for it to so endure depends upon whether we shall be willing to listen to voices of the truth like W. L. White's or to those who wish to hush him. Were the world all slave, Mr. White's book would not reach the light of day, for who would dare make fun of Stalin's statues in a world enslaved by the Soviet system? Were it on the other hand all free, most of the facts which make Mr. White's book both interesting and controversial would not be there to make a report on. For the basic thing which Mr. White shows us (perhaps even unwittingly) is the difference between our free and Russia's slave world.

Why is it therefore that all the reds, pinks, fellow-travellers and perverse liberals are shouting at Mr. White words like: "lies, ignorance, fascism, calumnies, smells, etc., etc."? The answer is simple enough: the non-existent Comintern has decided to kill or stifle anything which might reveal to the world a bit of truth about the

Soviet Union. And just because Mr. White was able enough to discover and willing enough to report about 10% of the truth about the Soviet Union, the local pinks, who reveal themselves to be nothing but a branch for America of the NKVD, are out to get his scalp. When this reviewer says that Mr. White reveals 10% of the truth about the Soviet Union, he does not wish in any way to imply that Mr. White has deliberately withheld or distorted the remaining 90% of the facts, but taking into consideration the fact that he was a participant of a Soviet Government organized tour under constant surveillance of NKVD men, and having the facilities of only Intourist or NKVD interpreters, he simply could not even get a glimpse at the remaining 90% of the truth about the Soviet Union. In the event, however, that Mr. White did hear and see more than he reported, it is to be hoped that now, with the Soviet Union no more a war ally of the United States, Mr. White will publish such facts which he might have withheld not wishing to strain relations between allies in wartime.

Since being branded a "fascist liar" is the best badge for truthfulness and conscientiousness that can be pinned on anyone reporting on the Soviet Union, little wonder therefore that the more articles are printed and costly pamphlets published by so called liberals denouncing Mr. White and his "Report," the more the people of America get interested in it. In fact, Mr. White might be thankful to all these red pressure groups for helping keep his book high on the best seller list, and conversely Ukrainians and other people oppressed by the Soviets are glad that thanks to these red attacks on Mr. White, more Americans get an inkling of the truth about the Soviet Union through his book, than could otherwise have been hoped.

Mr. White, with his keen reportorial insight saw and heard more during his six weeks' journey through the land of the Soviets than his hosts intended. They were, nevertheless, to a certain extent successful in obscuring some problems before him, notably the most thorny one of all Russia's problems, that of Ukraine. This is evident from some statements in the "Report" as e.g. on page 171: "There always has been an independence movement in the Ukraine, although the two races are now closer than they ever have been." Or on page 173: "There is however, no doubt that the Russian (as distinguished from other peoples in the Soviet Union) have borne the brunt of the war." And further from the fact that the only territory within the Soviet Union on which Mr. White did not meet any representatives of the local populace is Ukraine. The American group's visit to Ukraine was con-



fined solely to the American airfield near Poltava and contacts were maintained only with the usual escorts, the Russian ground personnel (and German bombs). Mr. White's not entirely clear attitude towards the problems of Ukraine require some comment. If as Mr. White observes, there has always been an independence movement in Ukraine, then when and why did it suddenly disappear, making room for closer than ever relations between Ukrainians and Russians? It is understandable, as a matter of course to those who know the democratic spirit inherent for centuries in the Ukrainian people, that Ukrainians did not on the whole fall for Hitler's clumsy fishing for Quislings in Ukraine. But Mr. White unfortunately deals with the whole matter in a scant few sentences, where he might have elaborated more fully on such a revealing utterance as (p. 172) "in some areas the Quislings were fighting both the Wehrmacht and the Red Army." Mr. White insults all freedom loving Ukrainians by thoughtlessly throwing the word "Quisling" around, but surely without intent (or maybe with the intent of Moscow), because were Mr. White given a chance he would quickly have discovered that those Ukrainians were simply once again fighting hopelessly for their independence, and treating both oppressors, i.e. the Wehrmacht and the Red Army with as many bullets and rifles as they could muster. Then perhaps a parallel between Ukraine and Finland or Mihailovich's Chetniks would have been formulated by Mr. White. Finally, the matter of who bore the brunt of Germany's invasion seems to have been superficially treated by Mr. White, since it has been proved quite conclusively by Mr. Edgar Snow (Saturday Evening Post, January 27, 1945, see also Ukrainian Quarterly, February 1945) in his "Ukraine Pays the Bill" that Ukraine has paid about 80% of the Soviet Union's bill for the war in damage, loss of wealth, loss of productive capacity and loss of manpower. It seems hard to imagine how this situation could have escaped Mr. White's attention, and if it did, why did he ignore Mr. Snow's findings giving instead credit to the Russians for bearing most of the suffering and material damage inflicted by the Germans.

To be sure, some basic facts about Ukraine and Ukrainians did not escape Mr. White's keen sense of justice and truth despite the ever-present alertness of Soviet officials around him. He notices for example the far greater orderliness and aesthetic consciousness of the Ukrainians as compared with the Russians. Even Ukrainians exiled to Siberia keep their houses clean, plant flowers in their front gardens and whitewash their picket fences, while the Russians are content to live in drab un-

painted grey log structures. This observation may provide one of the clues to Russia's domination of Ukraine: while the Russians living a drab and simple life forge arms and think of conquest, Ukrainians beautify their homes and dream of poetry and flowers . . .

Mr. White deserves special credit for revealing the real facts behind the revival of religion in the Soviet Union. He arrives at the core of the problem with a phenomenal swiftness and directness, which is basically this: the Germans, as part of their plan to desovietize the Soviets and blunt the edge of the hostility of the population, brought with them (notably to Ukraine) priests, vestments and all religious paraphernalia, reopened all closed churches and gave freedom of worship. This phase of German propaganda was (as it was bound to be) in the main successful. As Mr. White says: "whispers were going all over Russia. Not only was it popular with the older people, but many of the young were joining the Germans." In order to counteract this whispering campaign, the alert Soviet Government suspended its propaganda of Godlessness (giving as reason the paper shortage) and by stages restored a measure of freedom of religion all over the Soviet Union. Russian Church leaders were quick to respond, and aiming at a recovery of the Russian Orthodox Church's pre-1917 position as a co-governing body of the State, the Archimandrites and Metropolitans have taken oaths of allegiance to Stalin and his system. This has put both parties where each of them wanted to be: the Russian Orthodox Church is again thriving and hoping to regain its full powers and the Communist Party has gained another pillar of support. We might inform Mr. White that this state of affairs has already had its repercussions in this country, where many orthodox churches, Russian as well as non-Russian, heretofore indifferent in political matters have begun to flock under the protective wing of those Orthodox bishops who have made amends with Stalin, and are being used to further pro-Soviet propaganda.

One final word to Mr. White: all of us who work for the betterment of the status of Ukraine are thankful for his telling America the truth about Russia being a country of slavery. Mr. White's many observations on the similarity of Russian and Prussian totalitarian institutions and customs are revealing in that they remind the free and freedom loving people of America of the fact that the Russian regime described by the late President Roosevelt in 1939 as the most ruthless dictatorship on earth, has not changed, nor shown promise of a change.

ROMAN OLESNICKI

**NARYS ISTORIYI UKRAINY (Outline of the History of Ukraine)**, by K. Vobly, K. Huslysty, V. Dyadychenko, F. Los, M. Petrovsky, L. Slavin, M. Suprunenko, F. Sherstiuk. Collective work edited by Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian S.S.R., 1942. 212 pages.

During the period of German occupation of Ukraine, the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic published in the Bashkirian capital Ufa a new edition of the History of Ukraine. This was barely a year and a half after the first edition had appeared. What was the reason for such precipitancy in putting out another edition? After all, the first edition had been written by a group of historians loyal to the core to the Soviet regime. The Institute of Marx, Engels and Lenin had given it its full approval and the most exacting critics had declared that the work was written in a truly orthodox marxist spirit, without the slightest sign of any Ukrainian nationalist tendencies, and that it would remain for many years for the Communists, both young and old, in Ukraine as a standard work on the history of Ukraine. What then had happened that a new and vastly revised edition appeared so soon? The answer lies in the innate Communist quality of making anything and everything, including historical writing, conform completely to the exigencies of the Soviet situation at any given time.

The first edition of the Soviet history of Ukraine, it should be borne in mind, had appeared during the halcyon months in 1941 when, politically speaking, Hitler and Stalin were bosom friends. The prevailing opinion in the U.S.S.R. then was that America, England and France were "bourgeois states provoking imperialistic wars," while Nazi Germany was a friendly neighbor. At that time too Stalin looked with tolerance upon Hitler's Nazism and similarly Hitler regarded tolerantly Stalin's Comintern. The 1941 edition of the Soviet history of Ukraine even contained the avowal by Stalin upon Lenin's death that with the aid of the Comintern he would continue to incite a world revolution as long as he lived.

• The situation changed completely within the space of a few months, as by his attack upon the Soviets Hitler became transformed from a friend of the Reds to a fascist monster, while soon thereafter the Comintern went formally out of existence. Bourgeois imperialists now became democracies and friendly allies. Obviously, the recently published history of Ukraine had to be revised to conform to the new situation. It needed, for example, to be more Ukrainized in order to raise the morale of the now embattled Ukrainians. Evidently that is why the

new edition appeared, in Ufa, in 1942, entitled "Outline of the History of Ukraine."

Although the new edition is far from being objective it clearly reflects the new era in Soviet external and internal affairs. At the time it was being published, Hitler's armies were converging on Moscow and the help of those "bourgeois imperialists" and, of course, of American lend lease was desperately needed. Moreover, the loyalty of Ukraine had to be assured in the face of the grave danger threatening the entire Soviet Union. Accordingly the Comintern was dissolved and about three-fourths of the material in the first edition dealing with Communist activity and Stalin's oath at Lenin's funeral is deleted in the second edition. Some concessions are made in it even to the Ukrainian national independence movement itself, although outright nationalists are dubbed in it as "fascists and supporters of Hitler." These concessions to Ukraine found expression in other fields as well. Alexander Korneichuk, a Ukrainian, became Vice-Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the USSR and soon after the Foreign Commissar of Ukraine. The rigid restrictions binding Ukrainian writers now became somewhat relaxed, so that now they were able to write in a truer Ukrainian spirit.

Generally speaking the Ufa edition holds that the ancient Kievan state, Rus'-Ukraina, was a state common to the Ukrainians, the Russians and the White Ruthenians, a theory held by no Ukrainian historian, except those bound by Pan-Russian ideology. The separation of these three nationalities, according to the Ufa work, was supposed to have begun during the 14 and 15 centuries. Ukrainian historiography holds, however, that the ancient Kievan state was Ukrainiah, and that at that time the territories of the present-day Russians and White Ruthenians were merely its territories, which later, through a process similar to that undergone by the Roman provinces, evolved into states—Russian and White Ruthenian. This decentralization started as early as the 12th century, in form of the secession of the Suzdal-Rostov, i.e. Muscovian, principality.

Tendentious too is the view expressed in the Ufa edition that the Ukrainian people have always aspired to a union with the Russian people, which is contrary to historical evidence. The first union of a portion of Ukraine with Russia, during Hetman Khmel'nitsky's time (1654) was necessitated by the war with Poland. The failure of Muscovy to respect the terms of that treaty (Pereyaslav) and its constant whittling away of Ukrainian national rights soon arrayed against Moscow the entire Ukrainian people, despite their war with Poland.

Muscovian annexation of remaining Ukrainian territories after the Polish war was perpetrated as much against the will and wishes of the Ukrainian people as was the recent Soviet annexation of Western Ukraine. Ukraine, it should be borne in mind, and as Voltaire stressed in the 18th century, "has always aspired to freedom." In the light of this pro-Russian character of the Ufa edition of the history of Ukraine it is only natural to expect that it would falsify such Ukrainian historical personages as Ivan Bohun or Hetman Ivan Mazeppa.

This tendentiousness extends to the post World War I Ukrainian struggle for national freedom against Poland as well as against Russia. The history of this period is likewise juggled around and its truth perverted.

The volume is rather small, 212 pages in all. On its positive side it contains much informative data on Ukrainian archeology and economy and the spiritual cultural attributes of the Ukrainian people. There are also references in it to the heroism of the Ukrainian people and their contributions to world civilization, admissions no doubt made in order not to antagonize the Ukrainian people in the moment of dire peril.

N. D. CZUBATYJ

BALTIC ESSAYS, by Dr. Alfred Bilmanis, published by the Latvian Legation, Washington, D. C., 1945. 267 pages.

"The Baltic Sea has a certain analogy with the Mediterranean: it separates and at the same time it unites the riparian Baltic countries—Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Russia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland" writes the author starting his revelation of the "Struggle over Baltic Domination." In approximately 45 comprehensive essays of Dr. Bilmanis, the reader finds rich material for the study of the history and the situation of the Baltic States, now an object of the Soviet Government's contention as being voluntary partners of the U.S.S.R.

In the article on "The Baltic States and Russian Imperialism," the reader is being reminded that the Russians, of whom Lenin was a typical representative, were most active in creating the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, the kernel of the U.S.S.R. The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic conquered one after another—the Ukraine, White Ruthenia, the Caucasian Republics and the Far Eastern Republic, all of which had separated from the Soviets, and sovietized them in their own fashion.

The Baltic peoples were the first to feel the efforts of the renewed Soviet Russian imperialism, and at present the Russian Bolsheviks are

considering as their primary mission a union of all Slavs under their guidance. "This is"—says the writer—"only a different aspect of the old Russian imperialism, with the same old Patriarchate of Moscow as a tool of national policy."

Soviet Russia, according to the writer's opinion, chose as the most propitious moment for its action against the Baltic States the period when Germany was at deadly grips with France. The day after the fall of Paris, on June 14, 1940, without any pretense of law or justice, Soviet Russia presented an ultimatum to Lithuania, in which it accused Lithuania and other Baltic States of military conspiracy against the U.S.S.R. On June 16, 1940, ultimatums were issued to Latvia and Estonia, containing the completely unfounded accusations to the effect that the Baltic general staffs were plotting against the U.S.S.R.

The Bolsheviks then bluntly asked free passage for troops and for the establishment of "pro-Soviet governments." Simultaneously with the issuance of the ultimatum, the Red army was on the move into Latvia and Estonia. "Thus Soviet Russia"—the reader is informed—"committed herself to open, ruthless, unprovoked aggression—as it is defined in the Convention to Define the Aggression (July 3, 1933), a convention which the U.S.S.R. had itself proposed to Baltic States."

The above sample is indicative of the methods meted out by Soviet Russia to her neighbors in her lust for conquest, described in the book. Taking the book as a whole it may be regarded as an indictment of the Soviet Government before the International Court of Justice created at the San Francisco U.N.C.I.O., at which Soviet Russia played such an important role.

DR. S. DEMYDCHUK



## UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN PERIODICALS

REVIEW OF POLITICS, January and April 1945.

The January issue of the Notre Dame University Quarterly "Review of Politics" edited by Prof. Waldemar Gurian contains an interesting article by Roman Jakobson "The Beginnings of National Self-Determination in Europe." Its main theme is the church and national policy of SS. Cyril and Methodius in the Slavonic world which centered itself in the Great Moravian State of the 9th Century. The author states that these Slav apostles were in the vanguard of the creation of national languages for the people whom they converted. The statement is true insofar as the liturgical Church-Slavonic language took up a position of resistance against the then traditional church languages: Latin which was being promoted by the Germans, and Greek by the Byzantines. It must be borne in mind, however, that as soon as Slavonic became the official church language and replaced Latin in Eastern Europe, it retarded the development of national languages. Proof of this can be found in the fact that Church-Slavonic was for a long time the literary language not only of Ukrainians and Russians, but as late as the 17th century of the Rumanians, who after all belong to the Roman group. The Church-Slavonic served as an instrument of cultural domination of Ukrainian Kiev over Eastern Europe during the period of centuries. Later this same language performed the same service for Moscow.

The author places the beginnings of national self-determination as far back as the 9th century, but, as far as Eastern Europe is concerned, for some unknown reason he does not seem to recognize any national group except the Russians; this in spite of the fact that other peoples, like the Ukrainians and Byeloruthenians, asserted themselves nationally many times, and most notably during the Russian revolution of 1917. Moreover, the author considers the Russian monk Stephen Permsky of the 14th century and the Ukrainian Metropolitan of Kiev Illarion of the 11th century as both the same kind of "Russians." From this it is apparent that a study of national self-determination requires first of all a study of the nations concerned.

The April issue of the above quarterly brings a revealing article by its editor, Prof. W. Gurian: "Russia and Peace." This thorough

article throws a realistic light on relations between the western democracies and the Soviet Union. Our country is diametrically divided in its concept of relations with Russia, as some Americans consider cooperation with the Soviets impossible, while others hold a view too optimistic. Prof. Gurian is of the opinion that cooperation with Russia should be tried if war against her is to be avoided, though this cooperation entails the taking of many chances.

Soviet Russia of today is a nationalistic and militaristic State governed by a totalitarian regime. The Communist Soviet regime is incompatible with freedom. "Stalin," says the author, "differs from Lenin only by using methods which are more cynical and more immoral." In the same way Stalin's kind of flirtation with the Orthodox Church has in its aims special purposes of Soviet internal and external politics, and does not necessarily mean a change of attitude towards religion in general. Prof. Gurian justly condemns and exposes the whole myth about ethnic democracy in the Soviet Union. What Poland experiences today, Ukraine experienced before. To quote Prof. Gurian: "Poles were not alone in claiming that their distrust of all Russian demands was justified by an experience which started centuries before the communistic regime. For Ukrainian nationalists Moscow's rule was the peak of injustice and the clearest violation of the right of national self-determination." The author also refers to an article by N. Czubyj, "The Modern Ukrainian Nationalist Movement," printed in the *Journal of Central European Affairs* [October 1944], and states: "This traditional distrust of the Russian barbaric giant—more Asiatic than European and representing the brutal power of elementary masses, who were threatening civilization by their weight and not by their superiority—has been intensified by the fear of Communism." The author is of the opinion that "The Red Army is perhaps as much overestimated today as it was underestimated before 1941 . . . The Soviet propaganda and the Red Army are more attractive from a distance than when experienced in direct contact."

●

#### THE KERYX, 1945

Two annual issues have already appeared of *THE KERYX* (Herald), organ of St. Basil's Ukrainian Catholic College of Stamford, Conn. The last issue contains three studies of sociological subjects, as well as articles on English literature, history of the Ukrainian Church and rites. A praiseworthy venture is the attempt of J. Shary to give in the sketch



"The Return of Petro Zapp" a novelette on the theme of Ukrainians fight for liberation twenty five years ago. "The Keryx" magazine leaves upon the reader a good impression and gives testimony to a high standard of studies of the youth at St. Basil's College.

**THE THOUGHT, March, 1945**

The March 1945 issue of **THOUGHT**, a quarterly published by Fordham University, has an article on "Europe and the Atlantic Community" by Professor Ross Hoffman. In it the author concurs with Walter Lippman in seeing the necessity of America acquiescing to the existence of an Eurasian community under the protection of the Soviet Union. Such a community, he says, should be counterbalanced by a natural Atlantic community guided by the Anglo-Saxon states. A question arises here as to where to place the boundary line of these communities: on the eastern or the western border of Germany? Perhaps on the eastern border of Poland? Perhaps even further eastward, to include all of Europe? In that last event a further question would arise: where is the cultural and spiritual boundary of Europe? What should bind the nations of the Atlantic community spiritually is their common western European civilization, the roots of which extend back to ancient Rome. Professor Hoffman has touched a subject very thoroughly examined by Ukrainian literature of the past twenty five years. This is the question: whether Ukraine belongs to Europe or to Muscovite Eurasia? This question was posed by the Ukrainian communist author M. Khvylovy, as well as Yuriy Lypa a Ukrainian Orthodox but belonging to the Catholic group of writers in his work "The Destination of Ukraine." Ukrainian authors who worked outside of the borders of the Soviet Union and enjoyed comparative freedom of expression came to the unanimous conclusion that Ukraine, by virtue of her centuries old traditions, is culturally a part of western Europe and its civilization. Hence freedom-loving and Europeanized Kiev could never see eye to eye with Eurasian Moscow and vice versa.

Therefore, the boundaries of the Atlantic community should be extended eastward to include Ukraine, Byeloruthenia and the Black Sea basin.

Unfortunately, these are only theoretical conjectures. Professor Hoffman thinks in terms of an Atlantic community in actual existence, because today, when Soviet Russia has planted a post in Berlin, she has by far crossed the eastern boundaries of western Europe. Therefore the

author proposes that the Atlantic community comprise only western European nations and the United States. Between this Atlantic and the Eurasian communities there should appear a bloc of nations. The most natural one would be a Baltic-Black Sea bloc, with Ukraine and Poland as its main pillars. Dr. Hoffman does not take such a bloc into consideration but a much smaller one. The Soviet attitude toward any such blocs has always been hostile. And with today's actual sway of the Soviets in Central Europe there is no prospect of organizing such a bloc. Who should initiate and organize a Central European bloc? The author does not answer this question. If a vacuum would occur, it would present a unique chance for Germany to resurge and become the organizer of this bloc, which would again put the safety of the Atlantic community and even the world in jeopardy.

#### THE AMERICAN REVIEW OF THE SOVIET UNION, May, 1945

The American Review of the Soviet Union is a publication of The American Russian Institute in New York, a non-political organization aiming at disseminating factual information about the USSR. The latest issue (May 1945) reveals interesting material in Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming's article, "Rebuilding the Dnepr Dam." Many unknown facts come to light here illustrating the fate of *Dniprelstan*, the jewel of Ukrainian industry. The author was an eyewitness to certain stages of reconstruction of this dam and informs us at first hand of the extent of damage done to it by this war. The first demolition took place during 1941 when the Soviet Army, was scorching the earth in its retreat. The second and more thorough demolition was planned by the Germans, but a too hasty retreat did not permit full destruction. The dam and its hydroelectric power plant can be rebuilt in two years, the writer says. Repairs on *Dniprelstan* are already in progress under the direction of Innocent Kandalov. 8000 workmen and a staff of engineers are employed. 65% of the "manpower" are women recruited from neighboring collective farms. For lack of sufficient tools and machinery most of the work is done by hand, men and women working a minimum of 11 hours per day. It is expected to get one generator and turbine to supply electric power by December 1945. All nine main turbo-generators will produce over 3 billion kilowatt-hours of electric power by 1947. The first three turbines and generators were supplied by the United States. Maj. Gen. Fleming insists on calling this giant of Ukra-

inian industry by its Russian name "Dneprostroi" instead of the proper and accepted Ukrainian name "Dniprelstan."

Just as the whole economic life of Ukraine is under control from Moscow, so is this industrial giant of Ukraine under the management of a Russian, Kandalow. But the hard working laborers with an 11-hour day are Ukrainian women and men from the neighboring kolkhozes.

AMERICA, May 12, June 2, 1945

The editor of the well known Catholic weekly AMERICA John La Forge, wrote in its May 12, 1945 that "World Freedom Demands Human Rights." In this thus titled article the writer dwells on the subject of a Charter for the UNCIO, and practical aspects of the rights of human beings to freedom. A bill of human rights finally found its way into the Charter (after many ups and downs) but practice is not always consistent with provisions of the bill. The author specifically refers to the right of freedom to former prisoners of war. Thus, a prisoner of war should not be compelled to return to his homeland if he does not choose to. In support Mr. La Forge quotes the Catholic Episcopate: "If they are reluctant to return to their homelands it is largely because they cannot look forward to the enjoyment of fundamental human rights under the new tyrannies in control. This is a matter of extreme urgency for the world of today and bearing on the preservation of the pillars of our civilization. The sanctified claim to asylum has always been one of the basic rights of human freedom.

The June 2 number of AMERICA contains a reply by Mr. I. Polyansky, chairman of the Soviet Council on Affairs of Religious cults to the questions propounded by Rev. Robert Graham, America's contributing editor.

In reply to a question whether a priest can travel and preach freely in the USSR if he does not engage in political activity, Mr. Polyansky stated that, "The question of a Catholic priest traveling from one area of Russia to another is not a simple one. It is a rule in every religious organization that its leading personnel travel as far as is required by their position. For instance, the bishop travels through his diocese, a priest in the village or town area where his church is located. It is not customary for a bishop to enter the area of activities of another bishop, since his work would conflict with another. However, one may conceive of cases where invitation are extended but this is something else."

Needless to say the position of a priest in the Soviet Union would be extremely precarious. There "freedom of religion" has an entirely different meaning from what it has outside Soviet borders.

**REVIEW OF RELIGION, March, 1945**

**THE REVIEW OF RELIGION, March, 1945**, the journal published by Columbia University Press, contains a reminiscence by Prof. C. A. Manning: "Archbishop Andrey Sheptytsky." Prof. Manning portrays a silhouette of the Church leader of the Western Ukrainians who died on Nov. 1, 1945. The author stresses the fact that Archbishop Sheptytsky was a great church reformator and national leader. "He was not only a statesman, but a great religious thinker and reformator." Especially significant was the attitude of the Archbishop towards the Orthodox whom he wished to reconcile with the Catholic Church by meeting their demands whenever possible. According to Archbishop Sheptytsky, all privileges enjoyed by Eastern Christians up to the 9th century, should be left to them intact. Professor Manning concludes that Andrey Sheptytsky had more friends among the Orthodox than among Catholics, many of the latter not being in accordance with his profound thoughts.