

---

# THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

---

VOL. I—NUMBER 2

THE CRIMEAN DECLARATION—WORDS AND DEEDS . . . . .	<i>Editorial</i>
TARAS SHEVCHENKO AS A WORLD POET . . . . .	<i>C. A. Manning</i>
FREE UKRAINE IS VITAL TO LASTING PEACE . . . . .	<i>A. A. Granovsky</i>
HRUSHEVSKY, HISTORIAN OF UKRAINE . . . . .	<i>G. W. Simpson</i>
DUMBARTON OAKS AND UKRAINE . . . . .	<i>N. D. Czubytyj</i>
UKRAINIAN SOCIOLOGY AFTER THE FIRST WORLD WAR . . . . .	<i>J. S. Roucek</i>
IN RETROSPECT . . . . .	<i>S. Shumeyko</i>
BOOK REVIEWS—UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN AND BRITISH PERIODICALS—OBITUARIES	

---

*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
Crimean Declaration—Words and Deeds . . . . .	101
<i>Editorial</i>	
Taras Shevchenko as World Poet . . . . .	105
<i>Clarence A. Manning</i>	
Free Ukraine Is Vital to Lasting Peace . . . . .	117
<i>Alexander A. Granovsky</i>	
Hrushevsky, Historian of Ukraine . . . . .	132
<i>G. W. Simpson</i>	
Dumbarton Oaks and Ukraine . . . . .	140
<i>Nicholas D. Czubatyj</i>	
Ukrainian Sociology After the First World War . . . . .	152
<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	
In Retrospect . . . . .	164
<i>Stephen Shumeyko</i>	
<b>BOOK REVIEWS</b>	
People, Church and State in Russia by P. B. Andersen . . . . .	174
<i>Lev Dobriansky</i>	
The Time of Decision by Sumner Welles . . . . .	176
<i>Roman Olesnicky</i>	
Russia and Peace by Sir Bernard Pares . . . . .	178
<i>Nicholas D. Czubatyj</i>	
Ukraine the Submerged Nation by William Henry Chamberlin . . . . .	181
<i>Dr. Longin Cehelsky</i>	
The U. S. War Aims by Walter Lippmann . . . . .	184
<i>Roman Olesnicky</i>	
<b>UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN AND BRITISH PERIODICALS . . . . .</b>	<b>186</b>
Fortnightly, America, The New York Herald Tribune, Com- monweal, Polish Facts and Figures	
<b>OBITUARIES</b>	
Metropolitan Sheptitsky . . . . .	195
Alexander Koshetz . . . . .	198

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

---

**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."

**DR. ALEXANDER A. GRANOVSKY,** Professor of Entomology and Economic Zoology at the University of Minnesota and researcher in the Biological field. Born in East-Ukraine has lived in United States since 1913. A member of the U. S. Expeditionary Forces in France during First World War. Closely in touch with the Ukrainian Independence Movement since 1903 and for the last nine years the National President of the American Organization for the Rebirth of Ukraine.

**G. W. SIMPSON,** Professor and head of the Department of History in the University of Saskatchewan, Canada. He was born in Eastern Canada, where he attended the University of Saskatchewan. Subsequently he took post-graduate work in the University of Toronto, and in the University of London, England. His special field of interest is Eastern European history.

**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, Vicedirector of the Historical Department of Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv until 1939.

**JOSEPH S. ROUCEK, Ph.D.,** chairman, Department of Political Science and Sociology, Hofstra College, Hemstead, N. Y. Born in Czechoslovakia, educated at Charles University in Prague and American universities—University of California, New York University. Member of several learned societies. Author of "Contemporary Roumania and her problems," "Politics of the Balkans," "Contemporary World Politics" and others. Contributor to several American sociological journals.

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

## THE CRIMEAN DECLARATION— WORDS AND DEEDS

*Editorial*

"The establishment of order in Europe and the rebuilding of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of nazism and fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice. This is a principle of the Atlantic Charter—the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live—the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations . . ."

"By this declaration we reaffirm our faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, our pledge in the Declaration of the United Nations and our determination to build, in cooperation with other peace-loving nations world order under law, dedicated to peace, security, freedom and the general well-being of all mankind."

In reaffirming thus the Atlantic Charter the Crimean or Yalta agreement naturally affirms, too, that second section of it that provides for "no territorial changes that are not in accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned." Nevertheless, by its decision "that the eastern frontier of Poland should follow the Curzon line," the Crimean conference handed over to the Soviets all the territory east of that line, populated in the great majority by the Ukrainian and White Ruthenian peoples and the Baltic states. This was done in clear violation of the Atlantic Charter and against the will and wishes of about 90% of the population of the territories ceded to the Soviets.

Of course, no one can justly question the Curzon line as the eastern boundary of Poland proper. In fact, an even more exact line dividing the Polish and Ukrainian populations would run somewhat further to the west and include such an ancient Ukrainian city as Peremyshl. What is questioned here, is the arbitrary decision determining the fate of some 20 million Western Ukrainians, White Ruthenians and Baltic peoples without even going through the formality of consulting their "freely expressed wishes." What makes the decision all the more reprehensible is the fact that its chief author is a power

which, judging by its policies toward defenseless peoples, can hardly be considered other than an aggressor nation.

Ironically enough, the Crimean conference actually reaffirmed that which back in 1939 the western democracies roundly condemned, namely, the Hitler-Stalin agreement partitioning prewar Poland. Power politics are certainly now back on the international scene, a grave threat to the natural rights of peoples and to any prospects for a lasting peace. To be sure, one would hardly guess that from the wording of the Yalta agreement, which piously expresses the hope of establishing a "world order under law, dedicated to peace, security, freedom and the general well-being of all mankind."

What prospects there are of establishing such an order in Western Ukraine can be visualized quite easily by recalling the shocking events that took place there in 1939-1941 following its occupation by the Reds. The same and perhaps even worse is happening there now, and also in the Soviet-occupied Baltic states, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Poland. The most patriotic and democratic elements in these countries have been thrust outside the pale of law and denied by their Red masters even the most elementary rights.

Reports from various sources indicate clearly that in Western Ukraine itself the Red commissars are conducting a ruthless campaign either to exterminate Ukrainian national consciousness and life or to make it conform completely to Communist-Russian ideology. In this they are following the familiar pattern of their national policy in Soviet Ukraine proper, especially from the time (1930) when Stalin himself declared that for the Reds Ukrainian nationalism constituted a "grave danger." So now we read that Western Ukrainian institutions of a national cultural character are being shut down or destroyed, while patriotic Ukrainians, irrespective of their station in life, both the educated and the unlettered, any and all who have espoused the cause of Ukrainian freedom are being liquidated by execution, imprisonment or exile. Only recently, for example, the Overseas News Agency reported that approximately thirty Ukrainian Catholic priests were arrested in Eastern Galicia and that a large number of them were executed by the Reds. Earlier, among the Ukrainian scholars executed the names of Rev. Dr. Nicholas Conrad and Rev. Prof. Andrew Ischak figured prominently. Then there is the still earlier and pitiful case of the noted and aging Prof. Volodimir Starosolsky, who was exiled to Turkestan and died there together with his wife from want and hunger.

It is no wonder then that thousands of Ukrainian patriots, scholars

and leaders in Western Ukraine, who formerly had to endure the Nazi tyranny, are now going into hiding and fleeing from their native soil before the advance of the Reds and their commissars and political police. Well do they know what fate awaits them if they remain.

Western Ukraine, however, is not the only victim of the Crimean misinterpretation of the Atlantic Charter. White Ruthenia and the other Central European lands are in a similar plight.

As can be readily seen, there is now not even the slimmest opportunity of establishing in Eastern and Central Europe any of that order dedicated to peace, security and freedom of which the Yalta agreement speaks. Actually the peoples there are passing from under Nazi totalitarian rule to rule by Soviet totalitarianism—out of the frying pan into the fire.

The Polish plight is desperate too. Although the Poles have given the Ukrainians no cause for any friendly feeling toward them, but on the contrary have sorely abused and oppressed them, still the Ukrainians cannot help but appreciate the plight of the Poles who today find themselves under the rule of the "Lublin Provisional Government." The Ukrainians well remember how during their struggle for independence a quarter of a century ago the Reds established in Kharkiv a similar puppet government which slavishly obeyed the orders of its Kremlin masters and led Ukraine into enslavement and suffering.

The American people should recognize that Eastern and Central Europe under Soviet occupation is suffering a different kind of purge from the Western lands under Anglo American occupation. In France and Belgium we are informed through the normal press channels of the names of the collaborators and the specific crimes of which they are guilty. In the Soviet area newspapermen and even American officials are severely restricted in movement and we are left to subterranean news items, exactly as during the Nazi occupations. The difference is tremendous and it only adds to the anxiety felt by the truly democratic elements interested in these countries who have no doubt that non-communism is at home already being regarded as Fascism, as we see from the thundering at men in American public life by the government controlled Soviet press for opinions on Soviet policy.

The American acceptance of these Crimean agreements can only disappoint the millions of people who looked to the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms as the foundations of a new and better life. American idealism gave these people courage and hope during and after the First World War and has inspired them during the nightmare

of Nazi control and it is unfortunate that anything should arise to question the supreme value of the American spirit of democracy at this time.

Though hopes may be dashed, however the unconquerable spirit of man striving constantly for light and freedom can never be quelled, no matter how systematic and savage the repression by evil rulers may be. The Yalta decisions notwithstanding, liberty-loving peoples will continue their struggle for national freedom and democracy. And in their van will be the Ukrainians. To be sure, the struggle will disturb peace and order, just as do misrule and oppression. But that is something the framers of the Crimean agreement should have considered.

Still another feature of the Crimean conference worthy of attention is its decision providing for aid by the three big powers in the repatriation of war prisoners and civilians. That decision, ostensibly prompted by humanitarian motives, actually constitutes a grave threat to many Ukrainian war prisoners, impressed war workers as well as refugees in German-occupied territory, who when liberated from the Nazis would not want to be returned to Soviet occupied territories, for they well know the dire fate that awaits them there. They would rather prefer to live in a land free of the evils of totalitarian rule. Some form of an American founded committee, therefore, should be set up to look after the interests of these unfortunates and provide a haven for them. In reality they are political refugees, looking to the western democracies for a sanctuary. And America, they cannot help but remember, has always provided an asylum for the oppressed and the downtrodden of other lands.

Everything, however, rests now upon the forthcoming United Nations conference at San Francisco. We sincerely hope that that gathering will not act as a mere rubber stamp of the Crimean conference but explore the international situation anew and arrive at decisions of its own, founded upon a sincere desire to bring about the realization of the Atlantic Charter in its true and only spirit—the freedom and well-being of all mankind, security, and lasting peace.





## TARAS SHEVCHENKO AS A WORLD POET

By PROF. CLARENCE A. MANNING,

*Columbia University*

**T**ARAS SHEVCHENKO stands out in literature as the greatest poet of Ukraine. He won for himself so much love and respect among his compatriots that to-day three quarters of a century after his untimely death there is hardly a Ukrainian home, be it rich or poor, be it in any part of the Ukrainian lands or abroad, that does not contain a portrait of the great writer. Literary critics not only of Ukrainian but of other origin have hailed him as one of the masters of poetry and his fame is spreading constantly.

All this is true and more than that Shevchenko deserves to be grouped with world writers. This is not only because he represents to the full the spirit of his native land and of its people, but because he has also a message for all humanity. In an age that feels as never before the injustice and the sadness of the world, he can speak with a commanding voice and can give words of hope and of consolation for men everywhere.

Yet if we would undertake to measure what his influence can be, we must remember certain things. An author and especially a poet cannot appeal abroad to strangers for precisely those qualities which have won him fame at home. Translation invariably destroys a certain poetic charm that is inherent in the original verse of the poet and there are very poets who have been fortunate enough to secure an adequate rendering in a foreign tongue. This almost automatically hinders a proper appreciation of a foreign poet, especially if he is one of those tender spirits whose art is so closely connected with the music of his own language that the beauty vanishes at the first touch of the heavy hand of a translator.

There are others who are of more sturdy stock. The message that they have for their own people may be as beautiful, as delicate as can be imagined but there is in their works a quality of universality, there is a deep meaning that can be conveyed without too much loss into another

tongue, and even after many of the special beauties disappear there is a something that can still hold its appeal for men everywhere.

Shevchenko belongs to this second group. The tender music of his verse may be largely lost. It may be impossible to repeat in another language and in another system of metre that haunting charm that has endeared him to Ukrainians everywhere. His careful imitations of the Ukrainian folksongs may lose much in English or any other foreign tongue but the message which he was trying to give to his own people, his appreciation of their virtues and their defects, the aspirations which he was voicing for them still remain to inspire men in other lands and to picture to them the world which he was desirous of seeing for his own. Shevchenko as a world poet is going to live because at the very moment when he was setting out his ideals for his own people, he passed beyond their limits and spoke in universal terms about injustice and justice, about truth and humanity.

There may seem to be something paradoxical in all this. Nevertheless it is a strange fact that as we run over the list of those authors who have appealed to the continents and the centuries, we find that most of them were not consciously striving for a universal fame but they were aiming to represent the point of view of a relatively narrow society or class. Their vision did not lead to a denial of their surroundings but to a transcending of it. They were able to see the elements of the universal, of the spirit of humanity in the world around them, and men of other times and places grasped the idea which they were trying to convey and have loved them for it.

How does Shevchenko stand in this connection? He has hardly written a poem which does not deal directly or indirectly with the fate of his country. He was filled with the consciousness that when he was in St. Petersburg or in the desolate wastes of the steppes, he was a stranger in a strange land. His poetry is one long exposition of the beauty, of the history, of the tragedy of Ukraine, and he might seem at first sight to be only a poet of his people. Yet as we read him further, we see that he is dealing with even a greater subject than Ukraine and that is the fate of humanity with all of the varied emotions of the human heart.

He commenced his writing with the Kobzar and with the tales of the old Kozak past. He feels the thrill and admiration of all free humanity for that wild and turbulent life of the Zaporozhian Sich, that spirit of ordered liberty which alone can make free men work together for a

common cause. That is the spirit that underlies his picture of the Kozak victories, whether they were won against the Poles or the Turks. Free men who are willing to combine under an able leader are more than a match for the obedient slaves of a ruler, be he a crowned head or a self-appointed dictator. Hamaliya, Ivan Pidkova, sections of the Haydamaki, all breathe this truth and that is why Shevchenko when he lets his mind travel over the Ukrainian past glorifies the democratic manners of the hetmans and the Kozaks.

In *The Night of Taras*, we have this idea definitely expressed, when the leader is in momentary difficulty, for the Poles gathered in numbers:

But Taras called to the Kozaks,  
Asked them for their counsel;  
"Otamani and my comrades,  
Brothers dear and children!  
Give to me your wisest counsel,  
What can we accomplish?"

The power of the Sich in its early days was based on this frank recognition that the power of leadership cannot only be secured by formal appointment, that it rests with the individual free man and that that people are happy who are able to use the individual capabilities to the full. It is unfortunate that the trend of Shevchenko's development drew him away from the creation of more poems of this character. Humanity from the time of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have always loved and admired deeds of valor, of individual and collective heroism, of which the early history of the Kozaks was so full.

The exploits of the early Kozak leaders and followers, seeking freedom at the risk of their own lives are closely similar to the deeds of many of the American frontiersmen, the men who went out to spread the American way of life across a continent, and they were fortunate; while the Kozaks became bogged down in the task of adapting their organization to the standardized system around them, and their less clear-sighted descendants wrecked the work that was being undertaken, it does not detract from the pictures that Shevchenko gave and from his vision of what might have been. That does not mean that he dreamed of a return of the old days. He well knew from his observation of the life around

him that it would be impossible at any time in the near future to revive that old spirit but to every generation the old stories are always new and as long as man as man has not lost hope, so long will he read and admire in whatever language the writings of a poet who has this vision and this appreciation of human qualities.

All those men who in 1918 dared to dream and work for an independent Ukraine were fired by the spirit of Shevchenko. So too, even though they did not know him were those who in other lands had the same goals and the same purposes. Freedom is more important than life—that was the spirit of the Greeks at Marathon and Salamis, of the Americans at Valley Forge, of men engaged in the struggle for liberation everywhere, and the smug assurance that peace is the supreme goal stands in direct contradiction not only to the history of the Sich and the writings of Shevchenko but also to the conscience and the mind of all except willing slaves.

After his return from his visit to Ukraine in 1843, the poet turned aside from this path. He had been brought face to face with a reality so ghastly that he could not take refuge in the past. He felt that these poems, great as they were, were not applicable directly to the present, and during the years between 1843 and his arrest and exile, he was looking at the world around him. The form of his writings changed. The romantic glow of freedom by heroic combat disappeared and in its place there came a renewed emphasis on the needs of the present.

Shevchenko wasted no time in urging a partial amelioration of the lot of his compatriots. He appealed directly to the hearts and consciences of his readers. In no uncertain language, even at the risk of encountering difficulties from the censorship and the police, he spoke out against the meanness and the cruelty and the indifference of the ordinary man no less than against the tyranny of the tsars. Again he pitches his demands on the Ukrainian scene but his words have a far broader application than to one oppressed part of the Russian Empire. They have a message for the whole world.

Perhaps nowhere is this truth more strongly brought out than in "My Friendly Epistle to my dead, living and unborn countrymen in Ukraine and not in Ukraine." The poem is a condemnation of all those people who have sought for truth and justice and happiness by denying their own traditions and their own culture. It is equally severe on those

who would live in the past, boast of a few exploits of their ancestors and decline to act for themselves. In the very beginning, he says:

Look upon the quiet heavens,  
At your own dear country;  
Love with a sincere, true heart  
Such a mighty ruin!  
Break your chains and live as brothers!  
In a foreign country  
Do not seek and do not search for  
What is non-existent  
E'en in heaven and not only  
In a foreign country.  
In your home you'll find your justice  
And your strength and freedom!

He prefaces the poem with a voice from 1 St. John 4, 20, "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar." In the text and in the introduction which we have cited, Shevchenko puts his finger squarely on the fundamental evil of humanity. It would be possible for any society to rejuvenate itself, if it would face squarely the problems which confront it, if it would only seek in the better part of its traditions and in its deeper moral sense for the solution. Ukraine had fallen as much because of internal disunity and greed as because of outside pressure. Its sons had yielded to temptation to aggrandize themselves personally instead of working for the common good of all. It was so much easier, so much more alluring to believe that all would be well if they could only seek for Muscovite approval, if they could accept that culture and that point of view worked out by the foreign rulers, if they could only speak the fashionable jargon of the day and use it to blind their eyes to reality.

Shevchenko was no chauvinist, no foe of a foreign culture, as such.

Go to learn and study  
And the foreign knowledge master  
But don't spurn your own.

He had earlier begged his compatriots to look with kindness and respect upon the past but that was not only a pleasant picture, it was not only

something to recite in moments of relaxation. It was an obligation to live up to. It was a warning of the evils that had to be overcome if Ukraine was to be happy. Hence comes his conclusion:

Oh, embrace, my dearest brothers,  
 E'en your poorest brother;  
 Let the mother smile with pleasure.  
 She has long been weeping . . .  
 Let her bless her faithful children  
 With a fervent blessing!  
 Let her kiss her little children  
 With lips now unfettered.  
 Then the shame will be forgotten,  
 All the recent epochs,  
 And new glory will be rising,  
 Ukraina's glory!  
 Then the sun will shine eternal,  
 Quietly and sweetly . . .  
 Oh, embrace, my darling brothers,  
 That is what I beg you!

It is no easy road to happiness that Shevchenko points out. He calls for hard work, for a true moral and spiritual resurrection of his country. It is a simple idea and the mass of the reformers and the idealists and the friends of humanity could not accept such a simple solution. For them the hope of the future was to be found somewhere else. They thrilled to the glories of the past but they would not see why that past had vanished. They would not see that if the old Kozaks had been able to defeat Poland in battle, they had failed to create of themselves in their own home a lasting order. The men of the present day were no better. In their quest for education and a new and better order, they were committing even worse deeds than their ancestors who were guilty only of political anarchy. Now they are introducing a deeper spiritual anarchy in their desire to be modern.

Are these vices only confined to Ukraine of the nineteenth century? Have they not been characteristic of many lands and many ages? Are they not in fact the chief feature of the present day? For five years the world has been engaged in the most destructive war of history. Nation after nation has been overrun and devastated as was Ukraine and worse

and on the day of liberation in one land after another, there is a hope that the acceptance of an alien philosophy of the increase of civic strife, will somehow or other produce the millenium. It was the curse of Ukraine in 1919 even as it is of Europe and the world to-day, even as the keen eye of Shevchenko saw it in the middle of the last century. The whole Epistle, while it speaks of Ukraine and of Ukraine only, is applicable to the entire civilized world and it is one of those poems which can have a universal appeal and a universal message. The translation may be faulty, it may not be poetic as it is in the original but the ideas of the poet are not hampered either by metre or by language and they ring out their message wherever they are presented.

Shevchenko's condemnation of human greed and cruelty and lack of brotherhood are evident in almost every one of his major poems. Yet he feels a certain special bitterness whenever he comes to treat of the cruelty of the villagers to one another and this is especially true of their attitude toward a young girl who has sinned and is cast out by her own people. The father may be a Russian and usually is, for under the cruel conditions of the time, a girl who was seduced by one of the ruling class had little redress. Her own people were as stern to her as were the outsiders. Shevchenko with his sensitive soul quickly turned these cases into a glaring revelation of social injustice. It was the text of *Katerina* which he dedicated to the Russian poet Zhukovsky. His first love, a peasant girl Oksana, who befriended him when he was only thirteen years old, was herself a victim of the cruel law of the village and he never forgot her sad fate.

A firm believer in the sacredness of love, the poet could not restrain his indignation at all the abuses that were connected in the society of the time with love and marriage. His heart was perpetually torn by the revelation that in the quest for money and power, human beings doomed their own children to misery and worse. The story of the *Hired Woman (Naymichka)*, the poor woman who can only secure a living for her infant son by handing him over to a childless couple who are willing to hire her to care for him and who keeps the secret until she is on her deathbed, is another example of the injustice of the social order.

Shevchenko's feeling and his powerful pen again in this field elevate the subject from a narrow Ukrainian point of view to a consideration of all the problems of family life that exist anywhere. Perhaps in this field he is treading on a more common subject in world liter-

ature. Perhaps we can find more models for these tales and themes, for they are found in every modern literature but there is no one who has spoken out more clearly with his demand that family life and marriage should approach the ideal of mutual love, confidence and respect, than he has in many of his poems. Among the authors of the nineteenth century there are few who saw more clearly the evils of the narrowness of the village community than he did and with all his hatred of the foreign oppressors of his country, he still did not blind his eyes to the fact that there was much to be done before the day would come when evil would be wiped out of the life of his country.

Throughout his long period of exile, he returned to the same themes whenever he was able to break the prohibition against writing and painting that was imposed upon him by the orders of Nicholas I. He tried in prose and even now and then in Russian to handle the same theme which constantly preyed upon his mind.

When the poet returned broken from exile his writings took a new turn. He was not yet fully freed from army service, owing to the fact that he had been allowed to start on his return without the completion of all the necessary formalities, when he wrote the *Neophytes*, a story of the old Roman world and the persecutions of the early Christians. The comparison between the conditions in ancient Rome and those in modern Russia, between the Emperor Nero and Nicholas I were so striking that they terrified Kulish who was apprehensive lest the poem become the cause of more trouble for the broken poet. Yet if the average Ukrainian is going to draw these comparisons, the story has a universal appeal as all pictures of early Christianity can have. We need only think of the hold that such stories as *Quo Vadis* by Sienkiewicz or *Ben Hur* by Lew Wallace has to-day to appreciate the fact that the *Neophytes* has a broader appeal than Kulish and his friends first thought.

It is the story of the young patrician Alcides who is converted to Christianity by the teachings of St. Peter and becomes a leader of the Christians. He is arrested by order of the Emperor Nero and taken to Rome to be martyred in the Coliseum. His mother is at first overwhelmed by the sentence but she is so impressed by his prayers and by his death that she too becomes a Christian.

The theme of the story might well have been given to Shevchenko by his former professor of painting Bryulov, for it fits into the general pictures of classical antiquity and of the early Christian Church that have always achieved popularity in the widest circles. Undoubtedly



there was in the mind of the poet a distinct reference to his own sufferings and those of his native land but the poem shows his detailed knowledge of the past, it shows the studies that he had undertaken at St. Petersburg, and it stands out as a fine example of its type of literature.

The same can be said of his attempt to retell in simple form the story of the Blessed Virgin, Mary. There is the same latent comparison with Ukraine and there are a few phrases that perhaps represent a rather strong deviation from the conventional ecclesiastical story, but it has a wide appeal and the non-Ukrainian reader can appreciate the sincerity and the desire of the poet to make his ideas accessible to all. It is a touching story which never is lacking in dignity or universality and is certainly far more worthy of wide distribution than are many of the other modern attempts to portray the sacred characters as human beings of a given period and to expound their motives and their ideas.

On the whole the later works of Shevchenko achieve a direct universality, they are less localized than were the poems written before the arrest and exile to the steppes. In this sense they represent a broadening and a deepening of Shevchenko's vision, even though they often lack that direct application to human affairs that marked his early work.

Thus we can well say that the fundamental ideas of Shevchenko on the serious subjects which he treated have quite consistently a far deeper and a broader meaning for humanity than they would have if we confined their import only to the Ukraine of his day and to his fellow countrymen. Yet we would be far wrong if we restricted his importance only to those poems which express some readily understood idea. By character and temperament Shevchenko hated every form of injustice and of wrong. He hated every form of slavery and throughout all of his poems, even those that are most broadly lyric in character, he expresses his desire that a time will come when truth and right will be supreme. At times he might have fits of depression and of doubt, but taking his poetry as a whole, we can consider it as an unchanging expression of his hopes and his beliefs. At times he may seem almost irreverent in his feeling that the present world order cannot be the expression of the will of God, unless God is a devil, but even there we can easily feel the tremendous moral sincerity of the man, his love for his fellow men and his zeal and ambition for them.

Of course in many of these poems which are truly lyrics as well as those which pertain to Ukraine, it often happens that the works lose their point and much of their charm in translation. It cannot fail to be

otherwise for that is the undeniable value of lyric poetry. It is in these poems that his superb mastery of the Ukrainian language comes out in all of its fullness and it is in these poems too that the limitations on the influence of a lyric poet become more prominent. Yet even a prose translation, bare and unadorned, cannot fail to express the idea that is uppermost in the mind of the singer. It is very rare, if ever, that Shevchenko achieves his effects by the use of needless verbiage, by a play on sounds as on a musical instrument. It is very rare that there is not some central idea that is clearly expressed in simple language, which is poetic in character, and which allows the foreign reader to understand something of the mood of the poet, something of his sincerity, and something of the idea that he was trying to express.

The main theme of his work is Ukraine and perhaps he sums it up nowhere better than in one of the poems written in prison in St. Petersburg while he was awaiting trial:

It makes no difference to me,  
If I shall live or not in Ukraine

and he concludes, speaking of the evil fate of his country:

That makes great difference to me.

It would be hard to find any poet whose works are so completely bound up with the fate of his own land but it is noticeable at the same time that Shevchenko is free from that chauvinistic patriotism that is blind to the faults of his native land. It may well be argued that under the conditions prevailing at the time, he could hardly be expected to develop an imperialistic attitude towards the world. There are no signs of his doing so, for his vision of Ukraine is that of a weeping widowed mother bereft of her children, who have gone after strange gods, but at the same time he is profoundly convinced that her only hope of salvation is a return to the essentials of humanity, a moral rejuvenation, a return to being a land where all men are brothers and where the sacred principles of morals and Christianity are uniformly and widely held.

It is this aspect of his patriotism that makes his work so significant for the rest of the world. The Ukraine which he pictures and of which he dreams is a Ukraine that will be truly a paradise on earth. The citizen of another country can wish nothing more than that his own land

may be moved with the same high feelings and rise to the same moral heights as those which Shevchenko postulates for his native land. It is this all towering aspiration of the poet for his country that makes his work harmonize with the best hopes and desires of men of good will everywhere.

Shevchenko nowhere outlines his views as to the nature of the new form of government that Ukraine is to have on the great day when it is restored to liberty. Radical critics have endeavored to cite his condemnation of the existing order as a sign that he was one with them. It is equally fair to point out that others of his friends and admirers were to be found among the more educated and the more tolerant and the more broadminded of the Russian conservatives. They could equally agree with him that a government founded on high and sincere moral principles would act justly and mercifully, whatever the external form might be.

To him that did not matter. All through his life he believed that Ukraine was to be a country where freedom and justice, charity and mercy, kindness and sympathy were to be the all important qualities. He begged for these, he pleaded for these, he scolded for these, and in this longing Shevchenko won for himself a high place in the literature that yearns for justice and right. The chords which he strikes find an answering echo in the hearts of all men and women who are aspiring to create a new and a better world, who are trying to eradicate evil and misery from among men and to create a truer and a better brotherhood.

Taras Shevchenko is a poet of Ukraine. Almost all of his adult life he was forced to live away from his beloved Dnipro, from its fields and steppes. Again and again he regrets that he will not die in Ukraine, that he cannot live there where hearts are kinder and nature is more beautiful than it is in the north. Yet at the same time with an almost never erring judgement, he puts his finger directly on those qualities that would make an ideal state. He is not at home when he describes evil deeds and those actions which led the country to its doom he reprobates and slurs over, even when they are necessary for his description of historical scenes. What he admires in this world are the finer sides of the Ukrainian character and history, those qualities of freedom and of independence that produced the Kozaks, those qualities that might have developed and created a great Ukrainian state that would have been a glory to the civilized world. That is why Shevchenko is the idol of the Ukrainian people and their unfailing guide in their aspirations for

independence. That is why too he has transcended the narrow sphere of a national poet and why he has to-day a real claim to the attention of the entire world. There are poets who pride themselves on being international, who speak for humanity, and who lose themselves in vagueness and in generalities. They usually end in being citizens neither of their own land nor of humanity. Shevchenko so fully felt himself a part of Ukraine, so fully was attached to his native soil, and so fully strove to make it worthy of a great future, that men the world over can read him and find in him that stamp of humanity, that emphasis on the qualities and the needs of their own community, their own nation, their own times, that they can look at him as a brother and a teacher. To-day, in the midst of a World War, when the ideals with which the world entered a crusade for righteousness are being replaced by vague generalities which cover only the denial of principles and the restoration of the balance of power, we need more than ever that feeling of brotherhood, that sense of moral values, that high determination to demand freedom and justice in the highest sense of the word that mark all of Shevchenko's poems and that made him one of the outstanding figures of the nineteenth century.

There are some poems of Shevchenko that are narrowly Ukrainian in scope that apply only to the conditions of his own time and place. There are poems that lose most of their value upon translation. Yet when we add these all together, they cannot be called the overwhelming part of his works. Rather Shevchenko lives at home and abroad on those poems which bear a message not only to the passing generation but to the world at large, and as the years pass the world will recognize more clearly his fundamental greatness, his ability to estimate the needs of humanity, man's craving for truth and right, and his desire for the good and the true. It is this side of his activity that Shevchenko offers to the world as his basis for world recognition, and unless the world turns its back upon the ideals which have elevated it from savagery and ignorance, he will surely receive it.

## FREE UKRAINE IS VITAL TO LASTING PEACE

By PROF. A. A. GRANOVSKY

*University of Minnesota*

"We Americans of today, together with our Allies, are passing through a period of supreme test. It is a test of our courage—of our resolve—of our wisdom—of our essential decency.

"If we meet that test—successfully and honorably—we shall perform a service of historic importance which men and women and children will honor throughout all time."

—FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

**T**HE FREEDOM of man has been the main inspiring motive of creative thought of leaders of mankind through the centuries, throughout the world. Our civilization, literature, arts, our laws, social and economic institutions, as well as scientific developments, have progressively striven to free man from his economic and political bondage. The history of every people of the world reveals continuous efforts in seeking freedom. The evolution of human progress and civic laws is dotted with world shaking events in the interest of human freedom, the natural rights of man, and his right of suffrage. Many a bitter battle has been fought to free a given people from encroachment upon its human, economic and political rights by more aggressive and stronger nations. Human liberty, the social and economic welfare of man have always been paramount in the history of mankind.

If we diligently and accurately analyze human progress and the diversified historic events of mankind, we will find that all men of integrity and ideals have devoted, with compelling preoccupation, all their lives and efforts to the welfare and political freedom of peoples in the harmonious community of independent nations. With the passage of time empires have been built and lost. The shape of states and their boundaries have been constantly revised toward the betterment of the peoples concerned, usually, in the long run, step by step, giving greater political freedom to formerly oppressed and enslaved national entities. The entire human progress has been in that general direction. Many attempts at autocratic rule and the control of other peoples by stronger neighboring nations in the historic past have eventually failed in every

case. From feudal and heterogeneous empires, the European continent has gradually developed into a series of national states. Those national states, which comprise homogeneous national entities, have proved to be the most stable. On the other hand, the mosaic states, composed of heterogeneous nationally conscious peoples, as a rule, have perpetually provided political dynamite and economic instability.

## I

The conglomerate empires of the historic past provide the best lessons for the future, for many political difficulties of the present are best explained by the errors of the past. Present events have deeply seated roots in the past, and they must be seriously considered in our exploratory approach in dealing with the problems confronting the better world order in the future. Upon objective reconnaissance it will be found that any attempt at the control of nationally conscious people by force, the striving to attain political uniformity of a state through conquest and denationalization have dismally failed in Europe. Even the Catholic Church, holding the faith of its believers across the national boundaries of states, at the height of her temporal power, failed in the past to attain the uniformity of its rule, and its temporal influence seriously declined, in spite of the fact that its believers throughout Europe recognized the religious authority of Rome. It is only necessary to mention that ancient Rome and Byzantium did not survive mainly because they could not justly rule the many heterogeneous peoples, belonging to their empires.

The former Ottoman Empire consisted of a diversity of peoples under alien rule. Its history provides one of the best illustrations of the inevitable course of historic events that are bound to take place in the future in many conglomerate states. The Turkish Empire has been disintegrated into its component national states within less than one hundred years. It has given rise to many independent or semi-dependent states in the Balkan peninsula and in Northern Africa. We no longer speak of Turkey as the "Sick Man of Europe," since she has been divested of the disturbing national elements that comprised her political entity in the past. We now look upon modern Turkey as a strong national state, which indeed has served as an important political factor and strategic balance in the present world struggle. This was brought about mainly by giving political freedom, even though against her will, to her former oppressed and subjugated peoples. Nationally homogene-

ous Turkey has thus been benefited and has become a strong, rejuvenated political state.

Similarly the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which for centuries played a dominant role in Europe, has completely disappeared within our memory, without even leaving its name on modern maps. Her disappearance from the map of Europe is definitely attributed to the factors related to the heterogeneous composition of that highly artificial mosaic state. To retain her might, her foreign rule was naturally based on oppression, while her diverse composition of nationally conscious peoples, constantly striving for freedom, contributed to her downfall.

At the end of World War I, out of the former Austrian Empire, several new national states arose, such as Czechoslovakia, independent Hungary, territorially enriched Rumania, and former Serbia under the name of Jugoslavia. Poland also received ethnically Polish Western Galicia and, to her own misfortune, the Ukrainian populated Eastern Galicia, which had formerly belonged to Austria. Thus Austria was stripped to a few German-speaking provinces which were later absorbed by greater Germany. The most significant fact arising out of this transformation is that the long oppressed and subdued peoples finally obtained their national freedom within their own political states out of a conglomerate empire. The records show that most of these newly formed states have made greater cultural, economic and social progress within their own national boundaries, as free nations, in less than twenty five years, than they had been able to make in the last thousand years under foreign rule.

In like manner, at the end of the First World War, the Russian Empire of the Tsars was internally forced by her subjugated peoples to give place to a series of national states, just as was Austria. In the throes of the civil strife of the Russian Revolution, various disfranchised peoples, in quick succession, declared their national independence from Russian political domination and oppression. Democratic, free national states of Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Ukraine, Belorus (White Ruthenia), Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaidzhan, Siberia, and Turkestan declared themselves sovereign states, with complete independence from the Muscovite Russia. It must be stressed that during the Revolution the claim to freedom by subjugated and stateless peoples was repeatedly guaranteed and affirmed by the present regime of Soviet Russia by such and similar declarations as "... We have suggested to all nations the way to open agreement on the principle of recognition

for each nation, great or small, advanced or backward, the right to free self-determination of its own fate" (Dec. 19, 1917). The Baltic States, Finland and Poland succeeded, with the aid of the Allies, in retaining their independence in the wake of Soviet Russia's revolution, while Ukraine, Belorus, Georgia and other peoples to the east again lost their independence under the might of Russian aggression and forceful military occupation. The national and political freedom of these peoples and their independent existence terminated, in spite of the sugar coated declarations by Soviet Russia to respect the self-determination of all peoples.

Nevertheless, here again, we witnessed the same process of strife for freedom of subjugated and stateless peoples who, in their noble struggle, enjoyed the sympathy of all free nations throughout the world. It is an indisputable fact that Finland and the Baltic States, and to a lesser degree Poland, were able to lift the level of economic existence of their populations, and to enjoy their freedom, as well as to develop their national culture for the benefit not only of their respective nationals, but for the enjoyment of the entire world. In a relatively short time they, as free peoples, were able to make this accomplishment, which they had not been able to make during all of the years they had existed as subjugated peoples under Russian rule. In spite of the much advertised economic and industrial progress in the Soviet Union, and considering all of the rich natural resources at Soviet Russia's disposal, and in spite of all of the political and economic regimentation of human resources, the level of economic life of the people under Soviet Russia could not favorably compare with that made by the peoples who had freed themselves from Russian domination. At the beginning of World War II the bulk of the Russian population was still walking barefooted and paid unbelievably high prices for essential food, if it could be obtained at all.

Just prior to the beginning of the Second World War, it will be recalled, that a similar historic process of liberation of subject peoples took place with the declaration of independence by Slovakia and Carpatho-Ukraine from Czechoslovakia in the middle of March 1939. The struggle of the Croatsians to free themselves from the Serbs in Jugoslavia was also intensified. It should not be forgotten, that at the very beginning of the present war, at the time of the partition of Poland, according to the honeymoon pact between Hitler and Stalin, in the first few days of September 1939, the Ukrainian people again, as on many



occasions before, expressed their will to freedom. Even under those most trying conditions, and between the mighty pincers of the German army from the west and the uninvited so-called Soviet Russian "liberation" from the east, the Ukrainians in Western Ukraine established autonomous home rule in many towns and villages, especially in the areas of Stanislaviv, Drohobich, and other sections of Eastern Galicia. And again, at the very beginning of the Russo-German war, the Ukrainian people in Lviv, defying both ruthless aggressors, proclaimed their national independence in Lviv, Western Ukraine on June 24, 1941. Even though this independence did not last more than a few days, and these attempts for true liberation in Carpatho-Ukraine and Western Ukraine were ruthlessly suppressed by the German and Russian armies, the fact remains that the stateless Ukrainian people have continued to strive for national statehood and freedom at every opportunity that international events have offered them. This irresistible movement to human freedom in the boundaries of their own national states, to all appearances, cannot be stopped by any aggression or amount of persecution and efforts at denationalization on the part of imperialistic and totalitarian states, regardless of their admittedly skillful policies and methods of domination over other peoples.

In the Near East we have also witnessed a similar process manifested in recent years by the emergence of independent Iraq and Syria, and the upswing of Jewish nationalists throughout the world for a national homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine. Neither has the Far East remained untouched by the liberation movements. The complexity of India's problem, the assertion by Asiatic peoples of their freedom in the East Indies, Korea, and other areas have also loomed large before the Allied statesmen, clamoring for just and equitable settlement of their rightful claims, in the near future, in the interest of human and national freedom, social and economic welfare of the world, as well as in the interest of lasting peace.

## II

The failure of the Versailles and subsequent treaties is traced primarily to the lack of adequate consideration of the right of peoples to their national freedom. In making new boundaries, large territories of diverse nationalities were arbitrarily included in the formation of new states,—thus making these newly created states politically unstable, pregnant with many explosive problems beyond their means of equit-

able solution. Conglomerate Poland, Rumania, Jugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, as well as the sprawling Soviet Union, by virtue of being mosaic states have provided, in recent years, numerous examples of abhorrent persecutions, sanguinary pacifications, economic and social inequalities, outright liquidations, forced labor in concentration camps and political deprivations of the merest of human rights of their own citizens of diverse non-ruling nationalities, in the area that have been either adjudged by treaties, or were conquered by military force of some of the above mentioned aggressor states. These areas indeed proved to be the most troublesome to deal with between the signing of the Treaty of Versailles and the outbreak of World War II. In fact they were instrumental in providing causes for starting the Second World War.

On the other hand the homogeneous national states have proved to be the most tranquil and have greatly contributed to the economic, social and political welfare of their own people and the world. The peaceful separation of Norway from Sweden in 1905, added a great deal to the happiness of the peoples concerned and to political tranquillity. There was no evidence of serious disturbances among the Scandinavian countries which are more nearly designed on ethnic principles. There was no political trouble or boundary disputes among the Baltic States, or between France and Belgium even though some of the fringes of their national states are not perfect, so far as the ethnic population is concerned. This very fact suggests that it is not so much the small ethnic islands which constitute minority problems, but the acquisition of large stretches of contiguous territory, belonging to neighboring peoples, that usually cause serious disputes and political boundary troubles, with all of the attendant measures of denationalization on one side, and the breeding of resentment and opposition on the other, which often produce underground and irredentist movements and open revolts. Certainly, these abnormal phenomena only tend to disturb peace and the fragile economic and political stability of the areas involved.

It is not so much true minority problems, consisting of unavoidable small isolated islands or thinly scattered alien populations, mostly in cities, that cause serious international concern, but the territorial conquests of the people which comprise the majority on their contiguous ethnic territory that provokes discontent and serious disturbances. Neither the ideas of the Nazi Aryan superiority as a "Herrenvolk" to rule the weaker peoples as slaves, nor the imperialist Russian rule of the

Bolshevik party with its communist ideology, can appeal to the neighboring nationally conscious peoples, who seek their own national liberty. Both of these states and a few others in Eastern Europe, consider themselves as a sort of "chosen people" to rule the enslaved nationalities with further aspirations to dominate the world. Both of these powers constitute true dangers not only to Europe but to the entire world. Their pathological and unreal missionism with imperialistic aggrandizement is a real threat to lasting peace. It seems that the problem of small ethnic islands of population could be fairly adjusted by reciprocal free-will repatriation of the nationals, who would prefer to make such adjustments. The Greek-Turkish repatriation of their nationals, some years ago, provides an excellent illustration, which proved to be successful. It is an entirely different question to attempt the complete annihilation of the so-called "minority" population on the territories, when they in reality represent the majority of the population, ruled by "Master race" minorities.

Regardless of the fact that the League of Nations accomplished a great deal in many of its social and economic endeavors, such as in the solution of labor problems, the improvement of public health and sanitation in many parts of the world, the regulation of the international opium trade, and other undeniable benefits to the world, nevertheless the League of Nations is looked upon as a failure. It is of interest that the eclipse of the League of Nations is popularly attributed to its inability to deal properly and justly with the political problems of aggression, involving human freedom and national rights of stateless nations. It will suffice just to mention a few of these explosive problems such as Wilno, Fiume, Memel, Danzig and Western Ukraine in Poland, the political conquest and economic mistreatment of Ukrainians by Russia, and similar conquests of Albania, Manchuria, Ethiopia and Carpatho-Ukraine. All of these are among the leading national dynamite areas on the continents of Europe, Africa and Asia that mainly contributed to its downfall. Doubtless, the trouble in these areas will continue, unless judiciously settled along the lines of the ethnic boundaries of each people. The League of Nations and its covenant failed to meet these crucial problems and the organization neglected to provide effective mechanism capable of dealing, not only with the weak, but with the most powerful and arrogant aggressor nations and to compel them to abide by international agreements. The League of Nations, either through its lack of courage or resolve, also failed to take appropriate

steps to create the necessary machinery for the solution, or at least the amelioration, of those political problems which seemingly do not enjoy judiciary status. It is apparent, that the main reasons for the disrepute of the League of Nations are traceable not to its failures in cultural and economic problems, but to its inability to deal with the problems involving the human liberties and national freedom of the oppressed and stateless peoples, who happen to be overrun and ruled by other aggressor nations.

### III

More sober reflection on the course of events during the last twenty five or thirty years brings all public spirited leaders to the vivid realization that the gruesome realities of the Second World War were brought upon humanity by the unsettled problems left from the First World War. Just as the First World War was started by a shot fired at Sarajevo by a member of a minority group, the shot which brought about thirteen million deaths, tremendous devastation of property and untold human suffering, so the Second World War has its many roots in the so-called minority questions, the problems of stateless nations and of aggression against weaker peoples.

Ukraine, as the largest stateless nation in Europe, is ruled by Russia as a colony. In many ways her colonial rule of Ukraine in Europe surpasses all the indignities committed upon colonial peoples in the darkest corners of the world. From 1918 on Soviet Russia, imbued with power, has aggressively trampled on the blood-stained land that was once beautiful and happy Ukraine. By the will of the Ukrainian people, Ukraine was proclaimed to be free in 1917 by the duly elected representatives of all social and economic strata on Ukrainian territory, organized in the Ukrainian Government of the Central Rada as a democratic Ukrainian National Republic. Ukraine subsequently lost her freedom by Russian aggression and the Russian colonial rule of Ukraine, naturally, produced underlying discontent and unrest among the wide masses of Ukrainian population. It also provided a breeding ground for the unrealistic hopes and aspirations of Hitler and his Nazi legions to wrest the rich Ukrainian territory for the German "Lebensraum," and to utilize Ukrainian human resources for slave labor. The quick succession of events ignited the flames for the war in Europe which rapidly spread into the enormous scope of World War II.

Had Ukraine been a free and independent strong nation, instead

of a colonial terra-incognita, Hitler more likely would have been hesitant and deterred in his attempt to start this conflagration. The lesson from these events must bear fruit in the future. Unless Ukraine is free at the end of this war, new bloodshed is inevitable.

Hitler was determined upon the permanent conquest of Ukraine and other territories for the German Reich, disregarding the national rights of the Ukrainian nation to its own freedom. However, he met the strongest opposition from the Ukrainian nation, which he had thought would be on his side. The very first opposition to his plans was offered by the Ukrainian nationalists in Carpatho-Ukraine as early as November, 1938, when other nations tried to appease Hitler, and again in March 1939, at the time when Mr. Benes, president of Czechoslovakia, surrendered the freedom of his state, and the Czech army did not fire a single shot in defense of its land. The freedom loving Ukrainians were not in the habit of bowing to aggressors and, when Hitler let his puppet Hungarian army march against Carpatho-Ukraine, the Hungarians and Hitler met with bitter armed resistance from the entire Ukrainian population of that most backward province of all the Ukrainian lands.

From that time on the Ukrainians continuously offered both passive and active resistance to the German invaders on Ukrainian territories and abroad. In fact, many months before the outbreak of the present war, the Ukrainian nationalists made it definitely known that they would fight against any invader who would attempt to conquer their historic and ethnic territory.

From the very beginning of the war, Ukrainian sympathies were on the side of the Allies, in spite of misleading and wilfully false propaganda widely circulated to the contrary. That is the reason why many prominent Ukrainian leaders in the Nationalist movement were either slain by the German Gestapo and their agents, or have died in concentration camps. Scores of prominent Ukrainian Nationalist leaders are now incarcerated as political offenders by the Nazis. The Ukrainian people on the entire stretches of their territory from the High Tatra Mountains and Poprad River to the Volga and the Caspian Sea gave no rest to the German legions. The entire Ukrainian population, old men, women and children organized in guerrilla warfare, effectively disrupted German communications, wrecked their supplies, and aided the organized Ukrainian armies in the final defeat of the Nazis on Ukrainian territory, pushing them back from Stalingrad to the Oder River. It is mainly the Ukrainian people and Ukrainian leadership of the Red Ar-

my, composed primarily of Ukrainian manhood, which has broken the military might of the German Army. It is the 1st, 2-nd, 3-rd and 4-th Ukrainian armies, as well as the 1st, 2-nd, and 3-rd White Ruthenian or Belorus armies that are fighting on the Eastern front, though the credit, through ignorance, is given to Great Russian military might. Yet, we do not hear of Muscovite armies fighting on the Eastern Front. It is rumored that the army of Soviet Russia proper is engaged in holding its colonial grip in the rear over the subdued and restless population of her various so-called constituent republics. It has been revealed that the peoples of the Baltic States, as well as the population of Western Ukraine, recently incorporated into the Soviet Empire, made definite declarations that they would fight to the death against both German and Russian aggression and rule, rather than to submit themselves to their domination.

Reliable information reveals that the Ukrainians have two formidable underground armies, one of which is over 60,000 strong operating in Eastern Ukraine and is led by a chieftain who calls himself "Taras Bulba." The other has been organized on the territory of Western Ukraine under the name of the Ukrainian Sharpshooters, (Sichovi Striltzi). Both of these armies are under Ukrainian Nationalist leadership fighting for Ukrainian independence. When, in the usual manner Soviet Russia invited "Taras Bulba" to join the Soviet forces, offering his army amnesty, he replied, "Our army is Ukrainian and serves only Ukraine."

As a measure of retaliation against the Ukrainian population, many nationally conscious Ukrainian leaders were either shot or placed in concentration camps while the Ukrainian masses were herded into forced labor by both German and Russian aggressors of Ukrainian territory. It is a known fact that the Government of Soviet Russia arrested thousands of Ukrainian intellectuals and leaders and exiled them into Kazakhstan and other Asiatic areas, driving out from Ukraine all constructive and creative elements. The German Nazi forces purged occupied Ukraine of all possible resistance elements, and also removed to the Reich many thousands of able bodied Ukrainian population for forced labor. All of these measures were definitely aimed at the complete annihilation of the Ukrainian people to prevent them from attaining their national aspirations of human and national freedom.

The devastation of Ukraine has been appalling. Her towns are reduced to ruins and rubble, the countryside is a shambles. It has su-

ferred irreparable damage from the military conquest by Germany and from Russia's scorched earth policy. It has been pillaged and robbed from end to end by the military invaders as they repeatedly swept back and forth over the prostrate land, both fighting for the conquest of territory and people that by no right belong to either of them. It is historically and ethnically Ukrainian territory, which has been populated, developed and defended for centuries by the Ukrainian people, and by all human and political rights it should belong to the Ukrainian nation as a national independent state, in friendly relations to the community of the other independent national states of the world. The Ukrainian population has suffered and endured more endless privations on their war torn territory, than have any other people in this war. Relatively, a very small area of the Russian ethnic territory proper was actually invaded by the Germans in their eastward push. The rights of the Ukrainian people to true independence cannot be questioned, just as the right to independence of liberated Poland, Belgium, France, Norway or the Netherlands cannot be doubted. Liberated Ukraine deserves equal recognition with all other liberated nations. Otherwise the entire political and economic structure of Europe and the world will again be based on fragile foundations, producing unrest among the people and offering invitations to future invaders, disrupting the economic and political security of the world and endangering the durability of peace.

Hitler's aspiration for the conquest is definitely based on the deprivation of individual liberty and national freedom of neighboring peoples. He has met the solid opposition of all truly liberal and nationally conscious progressive peoples and their statesmen. America was not in the war until Dec. 7, 1941, yet, the people and the Government of the United States unmistakably showed their sympathies and even offered tangible measures of support to the Allied side, prior to the formal entrance into the conflict. Not only that, but as early as August, 1941, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill made a significant pronouncement, known as the Atlantic Charter, the principles of which are not repudiated and cannot be interpreted as meaningless. This Declaration announced definite international principles to which the United States and subsequently the United Nations subscribed, including Soviet Russia and Poland. One of the most prominent principles of this Declaration bears upon the rights of people to select governments of their own choice by the will of the people themselves. This must be done without restraint and without interference from

aggressor nations or their pressure groups, aspiring to the conquest of the territories of the liberty-seeking, now enslaved nations. This definitely paves the way for the establishment of a free and independent Ukraine as a national state. Such a state will definitely promote firm foundations of world security and lasting peace.

#### IV

In approaching a long series of unsettled problems, left unsolved since the First World War, which have materially contributed to the causes of the Second World War, the question of the liberation of Ukraine looms as the major one. In fact, it is the key problem which leads to the solution of many other problems in Eastern Europe. In solving the Ukrainian problem we may automatically settle an entangled maze of European problems. Some of them, indeed, have been exceedingly disturbing. With the solution of the Ukrainian question, the waxing Russo-Polish boundary dispute would simply disappear. Politically informed people well realize that Russia has no common boundary with Poland. Hundreds of miles of Ukrainian and Belorus territory divide these two peoples, and the quarrel between the Poles and the Russians over a common boundary concerns territory which belongs to neither of them. Once the principles of freedom of the Ukrainian nation will be put into effect on an equality basis, comparable to the freedom of all other national states, this conflict about the fictitious demand on Ukrainian territory under various pretexts will be a clear case of aggression, no matter how we define the term. Other problems of Eastern Europe, connected with the demands made upon Ukrainian territory by her neighbors, will cease to exist, because Ukraine will be a unified, strong, independent nation, and not a "spoils" territory for which neighbors can quarrel.

In solving this important problem, naturally, new problems will arise. The major new problem in that area will be the one of aiding Ukraine to assume her proper economic and political position as a free nation, in that strategic and politically important geographic area. There is no doubt that democratic Ukraine of a fifty million population, occupying the second largest territory in Europe, with vast natural resources, is bound to become a cultural, political and economic center, to which many neighboring nations may gravitate without fear. Such a constellation of free nations in Eastern and Central Europe, which may include the Baltic and Scandinavian countries, respecting each other's



freedom, will be one of the best guarantees against aggression from two of the perpetual dangers in Europe imbued with their imperialistic aspirations. There could not be a firmer basis for effective security and lasting peace in Europe.

The Ukrainian question is not a minority problem. It is the problem of the rebirth of Ukraine as an independent nation. On this territory the Ukrainians constitute the majority, though ruled at present by a small minority of invaders. The Ukrainians according to historic, ethnic, statistical and other facts are the rightful claimants to this territory as theirs, where they have been residing from time immemorial.

A people of fifty millions of population cannot be considered as a small nation. They cannot justly be denied their national freedom, if many such smaller nations in Europe enjoy their national statehood, and have contributed to lasting peace in larger measures than some great states, which, according to historic accounts, have invariably erred on the aggressor side.

Since several states, bordering ethnic Ukraine, are clamoring to occupy, possess and exploit its rich territory and to enslave the vast population, the Ukrainian question cannot be considered as the domestic and internal problem of either Russia, Poland or any other aspirant to Ukrainian lands. It is an international problem of a major character, involving the very structure of lasting peace and security of nations. By virtue of being an international problem, it cannot be left to Soviet Russia for a future settlement of the "liberation" of Ukraine. It must be dealt with openly and justly, as "... a test of our courage—of our resolve—of our wisdom—of our essential decency" by international conciliation and by treaty decisions. Soviet Russia must certainly realize that the boundaries she is now establishing by aggression in Eastern Europe during the present hostilities can never be permanent. Several of these boundaries, which concern diverse national entities, have been constantly subject to reconsideration, and doubtless they will be reconsidered again after the war, if they are to survive without disrupting peace.

The history of the dynamic liberation movement by the Ukrainian masses repeatedly attests to the will of the people. They want to be governed by themselves, with their own consent, and not to endure brutal rule against their consent. It is certain that a democratic Ukrainian republic will be able to more adequately cope with the problems of

social, economic, political and cultural needs for the benefit of her people than could any possible aggressor nation ruling her by force. If the Ukrainian people should be denied their freedom, it will doubtless provide demoralizing influences on relations among nations. There will certainly be resurgent waves of resentment leading to major disturbances and political revolts. Above all, it will create permanent injustice for freedom loving people and will breed distrust and suspicion against the greater powers, and America in particular, in whose commitments the oppressed and disfranchised people have found the courage to nurture sublime faith.

The Ukrainians have helped to destroy the German menace. They gave all they could. They have given millions of lives. They have given the best of their efforts. They have suffered great pain, anxiety and devastation for the common cause. It is natural that they expect—not rewards, but common and equal rights to be free with other liberated nations, for they have fought for the principles of freedom and against aggression.

They want to share the responsibilities for the future world security and the maintenance of peace. In their gallant stand they have not only defeated the enemy and driven him from their own country but they have immeasurably aided the Allies.

The great Allied nations will dim their greatness if they, upon their victory, permit the rise of another threatening menace of conquest and brutal oppression of smaller and stateless nations. Unity among the greater nations and the ultimate success of avowed war aims lies in striving to greater human freedom and political equality among all of the peoples, irrespective of size and wealth, cultural and social developments. They all must enjoy the same national liberty with equal responsibilities for lasting peace and the welfare of man.

It is understood that Great Britain refused to grant the demands of Soviet Russia during the negotiations of 1939 for the occupation of the Baltic States, Finland, Eastern Poland and for a sphere of influence in the Balkans and elsewhere. The British moral standards of democracy and her courage did not permit the guarantee of such demands. Is it really possible that after the wanton destruction of property beyond estimation, the loss of millions of lives and the unbelievable human suffering which this war has brought about, that now either Great Britain or the United States, or any other nation can accede to these original demands of Soviet Russia with the idea either to appease her or

to condone the acts of her aggression? If so, it is certain that peace will not endure.

V

America has definite stakes in Europe. Our isolationism is dead. American participation in the war bids her take an active interest in the manifold European problems. Neither the people nor the Government of the United States can limit their interest in Europe to military victory alone. It will be a hollow glory. Our own security on the American continent, our freedom and our American way of life will be again endangered by attack from powerful European states if we, upon military victory, retreat from Europe. America has, in the wake of the war, both the political and economic problems of liberated peoples. These problems must be realistically and justly met. America with the aid of some of her Allies and liberty seeking peoples can inaugurate a regime of justice. America can "...perform a service of historic importance which men and women and children will honor throughout all time."

Among these problems free Ukraine is vital to lasting peace.

## HRUSHEVSKY, HISTORIAN OF UKRAINE

By PROF. G. W. SIMPSON

*University of Saskatchewan—Canada*

**I**N 1869 a little three-year-old Ukrainian boy arrived in the Caucasus mountains brought by his father, a school Director, who had received a position in that area. They had come from his birth place, Kholm, a city at the border lands between the Bug and Vistula rivers.

The boy was Mikhailo Hrushevsky. Sixty-five years later on the 26th November 1934 Mikhailo Hrushevsky, now a prematurely old man, broken in health and almost blind, died in the Caucasus where he had been taken in a last effort to restore the remnants of his strength. In the course of those sixty-five years Hrushevsky had risen to the pinnacle of success when in 1917 he had been elected President of the Ukrainian Central Rada, the governing body of his native Ukraine, as an unanimous tribute to his brilliant scholarship; and he had been dashed to the depths, for in the year preceding his death, famine and death stalked through the Dnieper lands, and Galicia still smarted from the wounds of Polish pacification. He died a lonely man out of touch with the sympathetic currents of thought that had once surrounded and warmed him. The final personal tragedy of his career did not however destroy the monumental influence of his work which continues to inspire and inform. The tenth anniversary of his death suggests that a review of his career and work may be undertaken with the advantage of a slightly longer perspective of time and with the benefit of the glaring light of current events.

Hrushevsky was born at a time when the Western world was being remoulded by the nationalist conception in political thought. In 1866 Italian unification was almost complete and the German unification was being cemented by blood and iron. The United States had just emerged from a conflict which decided that one nation, and not two, should arise from the central continental area of North America. In 1867 the Austrian Empire was refashioned under the compulsive force of Hungarian nationalism while far across the Atlantic the Dominion of Canada was formed, giving promise of a new nation to emerge from its colonial chrysalis. Not only did the nationality idea affect groups of people who

were well known in contemporary history but it began to filter through to large groups who had been submerged for centuries by alien rule, social oppression or imperial forms of government. The Czechs of Bohemia were recalling their past before those fateful events of 1618 which had brought about their eclipse. Rumanians and Serbs were animated by new hopes. The Polish masses writhing under social and political oppression continued to keep alive the idea of national consciousness. Five years before Hrushevsky's birth there had died the greatest of Ukrainian poets, T. Shevchenko, who in vivid, burning words had expressed the idea of the Ukraine freed politically and socially from Moscovite terror and landlord oppression. Everywhere political thought was becoming permeated by the nationalist conception and even resistance to the nationalist ideas of the submerged groups not infrequently derived its intensity from the heightened national consciousness of the dominant groups.

Hrushevsky received his secondary education in the Gymnasium of Tiflis, capital of Georgia. Georgia had been brought into the Russian Empire at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Its capital city still teemed with the remnants of oriental life and Hrushevsky's later interest in the influence of Arabic trade and culture on early Ukrainian history probably stems from the observations of a sensitive and intelligent boy in his formative years.

In 1886, at the age of twenty, Hrushevsky arrived in Kiev to attend the University. The University of Kiev had been established after the Polish Revolt of 1830-31, following the closing of the University of Vilna and Lyceum of Kremianets. It was meant to offset Polish influence in the Ukrainian areas now under Russia but which had formerly been attached to Poland. The University however had developed a life of its own. It had already played a notable part in the revival of intellectual life in Kiev. Through such distinguished scholars as Maksimovich and Drahomaniv attention had been drawn to the rich literary and historical resources of the Ukrainian people. When Hrushevsky arrived the outstanding authority in Ukrainian archaeology, ethnography and history was Volodimir Antonovich. Due to the policy of the Russian government which did not recognize the existence of a separate historical Ukrainian tradition or permit beyond narrow limits the printed use of the Ukrainian language, Antonovich was officially a lecturer in Russian history. Hrushevsky attended the lectures of Antonovich, and so attracted was the latter by the brilliance of the young student that for

him and several other selected students he gave special lectures on Ukrainian history in his own residence. In 1890 Hrushevsky completed his undergraduate course, writing his final theme on the subject "The History of the Kiev Lands from the Death of Jaroslav (1054) to the End of the Fourteenth Century." He continued research studies at the University till 1893 when he received his Master's standing which in Kiev was equivalent to the Doctor of Philosophy degree. His thesis was a detailed study of local government entitled "The Starostvo of Bar."<sup>1</sup>

While the Ukrainian national movement within Russia was being officially restricted to limited forms of cultural expression there was a growing revival of national consciousness among the Ukrainians in Galicia who were officially called Ruthenians. Here the chief opposition came from the Poles who tried to maintain political dominance in that area which had fallen to Austria in the first partition of Poland. For a time conflict had centered on the University of Lviv. In 1891 there was established at that institution a professorship of the History of Eastern Europe with special attention to Ukrainian History. In 1894 this chair was offered to Antonovich of the Kiev University who in declining recommended his brilliant student, Hrushevsky. The latter accepted the post in the same year.

For almost twenty years till the outbreak of the World War in 1914 Hrushevsky was intimately associated with the intellectual life of Galicia, and more than any other man promoted historical studies in the University of Lviv and in the Scientific Shevchenko Society, which he transformed in a true Western Ukrainian Academy of Science. For more than ten years till the outbreak of the Russian Revolution in 1905 his home was in Lviv. After 1905 when greater scope was given to Ukrainian scholars in Russia he divided his time between Kiev and Lviv.

When the war broke out in 1914 Hrushevsky was at his summer home in the Carpathian mountains of Galicia. He returned to Kiev. The Russian government which immediately on the outbreak of the War had suspended Ukrainian newspapers and closed all those Ukrainian institutions, which had had some freedom since the Revolution of 1905, arrested Hrushevsky. He was deported to the interior, first to Simbirsk and then to Kazan. Finally upon representations made by the

---

<sup>1</sup> Starostvo in old Poland was an administrative unit of royal estates or a territorial unit of public administration (county).

Russian Academy of Science he was allowed to live in Moscow and continue his historical work in the Moscow Archives.

The Revolution of March, 1917 made it possible for him once more to return to Kiev. Here political excitement was tremendous. The fall of the Tsars let loose all those forces which had been kept hitherto in restraint, forces strongly critical of social maladjustments, of army mismanagement, and Great Russian political predominance in the Ukraine. The excitement culminated in the calling of a huge convention in April attended by some fifteen hundred people representing all parties and shades of opinion in the Ukraine. The convention demanded immediate autonomy for the Ukraine and approved the setting up of a Central Rada (General Council) representing all parties, which would take over the function of government. Hrushevsky was elected President of the Rada. The scholar had now been elevated to the position of political leader. It was an extremely difficult task not only to find a common political program for all the parties of the Ukraine but also to negotiate a satisfactory arrangement with the Provisional Government of Russia which would give to the Ukraine the full autonomy it demanded. Hope for a satisfactory solution was dissipated by the overthrow in Petrograd of the Provisional Government by the Bolsheviks in November. The Bolsheviks refused to recognize the Central Rada and began to take steps for its overthrow. In January 22, 1918, the Central Rada proclaimed the complete independence of the Ukraine and Hrushevsky became President of the Ukrainian National Republic. Several weeks later a Treaty of Peace was signed with the Central Powers which recognized the new state. By now the Ukraine had become a veritable witch's caldron of boiling political passions. The Bolsheviks who had failed to get popular support were attempting the violent overthrow of the government, various political factions were pressing fiercely for acceptance of their programs, while the Central Powers poised on the frontier were greedily awaiting food from the rich Ukrainian lands. When the food was not forthcoming the German army took over the Ukraine, and on April 28th, 1918 forced its way into the Council Chamber of the Central Rada and despite the protest of its President, Hrushevsky, dispersed it. Hrushevsky was thus forced off the stage of political action. When the Germans were finally withdrawn following the great defeat in the West by the Allies in the fall of 1918 it was one of the former military officers in

Hrushevsky's government, Petlura, who emerged as the natural political leader.

During the fierce political and military storms which continued to rage for two years the hopes of the Ukrainians of establishing an independent Ukraine were frustrated. In 1920 Hrushevsky found refuge in Vienna where he established the Ukrainian Sociological Institute as a centre where he might once more continue his academic work. While he immersed himself in his beloved studies he felt very unhappy as a refugee scholar and in 1924 he decided to return to Kiev. The Communist authorities had somewhat relaxed their former rigid adherence to the policy of carrying out immediately the communization of all aspects of society according to their theory. Hrushevsky believed he might still serve his people along scholarly lines. Upon coming to Kiev he threw himself with his old time enthusiasm into the work of historical investigation, publishing, and institutional administration. The institutional focus of his work was the Historical Section of the Ukrainian Academy of Science. While Hrushevsky was interested in the sociological aspects of society he could not accept the Marxist interpretation of history. This attitude brought down upon his head the suspicion of the Communist administration as well as the jealousy of a host of scribblers who were busy rewriting history according to the caprices of the theoretical rigidities of an uncompromising political theory. This hostility increased with the intensification of the Communist program in the first Five Year's Plan in 1928-29. In 1930 Hrushevsky was arrested and interned in a small town near Moscow. He was even deprived of all opportunity to continue his historical research or to carry on correspondence with his friends. His health gradually broke down and he became almost blind. At the last moment he was sent to a home for Soviet scholars in Kislovodsk in the Caucasus mountains. Here he died on 26 November 1934. His body was brought back to Kiev where he was given a state funeral in recognition of his services as a scholar.

While death may bring to an end the activity of a political leader, a scholar has a sort of immortality of the printed word, which, in so far as it has the elements of truth, may continue to live, or even if buried or neglected, has the capacity of being resurrected under more favouring conditions. Hrushevsky was one of the great historians of the last generation. His industry was truly prodigious. In 1898 he began the publication of Vol. 1 of his monumental work, "The History of Ukraine-Rus:" Thirty-three years later appeared in print the second part of the ninth



volume which brought his history of the Ukrainian people up to the middle of the Seventeenth Century. It is a misfortune that Hrushevsky was unable to complete this history. Some of the material which he had assembled for the later volumes was destroyed when his private library was burned during the civil strife in 1918. In addition to the larger work Hrushevsky wrote a one-volume, *Outline of the History of Ukraine* in Russian in 1904, and in 1911 an *Illustrated History of the Ukraine* in Ukrainian. A German translation of the former appeared in 1916,<sup>2</sup> a French translation in 1920,<sup>3</sup> while an English translation of the latter was published in the United States in 1941.<sup>4</sup>

A great deal of Hrushevsky's scholarly work was done in connection with learned societies. When he came to Galicia as a young scholar he associated himself with the Shevchenko Society. This was a sort of literary society which had been established in 1873. When Hrushevsky became President in 1898 he transformed it into a veritable scientific academy. It was divided into three sections and had five commissions to investigate the various fields of knowledge. Between 1897 and 1913 Hrushevsky himself edited no less than 113 volumes of proceedings. Some 300 volumes were issued under the auspices of the Society in this period. In 1908 Hrushevsky established the Ukrainian Scientific Society in Kiev and in 1924 when he returned to Kiev he was associated with the Ukrainian Academy of Science. At the same time Hrushevsky was writing numerous articles to periodicals and delivering addresses on important occasions. Some one has estimated that up to 1928 Hrushevsky had written over seventeen hundred separate articles.

Even this did not exhaust his energies. Between 1916 and 1918 he published a *World History* in six volumes. While in Vienna (1920-23) he brought out a course in Sociology entitled "The Beginning of Social Order." About the time of his return to the Ukraine there began to appear his *History of Ukrainian Literature* which was finally expanded to five volumes (1923-1928).

When one views this amazing quantity and range of productive

---

<sup>2</sup> *Geschichte der Ukraine von Michael Hruschewskyj. Teil 1. Lemberg 1916. Verlag des Bundes zur Befreiung der Ukraine, in Kommission fuer Den Buchhandel: Wilhelm Frick, Ges. m. b. H., Wien, 1., Graben 27.*

<sup>3</sup> *Abrégé de l'histoire de l'Ukraine par Michel Hrushevsky. Paris, M. Giard et E. Brière 16, rue Soufflot.*

<sup>4</sup> *A History of Ukraine* by Michael Hrushevsky. Edited by O. J. Frederiksen, Assistant Professor of History & Government in Miami University. Preface by George Vernadsky, Research associate in History in Yale University. Published for the Ukrainian National Association. New Haven. Yale University Press. 1941.

scholarship one begins to appreciate the profound respect which is paid to his memory by all Ukrainians, and by those interested in Eastern European history. In spite of the many sidedness of his interest there is a consistency in his philosophy of history and life which marks the truly great man.

He was regarded as the outstanding nationalist historian of the Ukraine. He was a nationalist but not in a narrow, intense chauvinistic sense. He felt profoundly the sense of common unity which binds groups of people together, and he was no less profoundly aware of the historic tradition which links one generation to preceding generations giving them a feeling of solidarity sufficient to unite them in fighting oppression, injustice, and attitudes of proud contempt. As applied to his own people he repudiated the idea that the Ukrainians were merely a heterogeneous group of people who had settled on the frontiers of the Russian Empire and had subsequently become incorporated in Russian society though they still spoke a peasant dialect and had picturesque festive costumes and merry or amusing folk songs. He repudiated the Imperial historical tradition that traced the unity of Russian history from the ancient city of Kiev through dynastic connection to Moscow and thereafter explained the imperialist policy of the Tsars as the simple reassembling of the former Russian lands. He insisted that there was continuity in the Ukrainian tradition which went back even beyond the days of the Kiev dynasty; that this tradition was revived in the Kozak period of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and that the dynastic imperialism of the Romanov Tsars and Empresses had no historic justification for the autocratic control which they imposed on an area which had had no political connection with Moscow for centuries. This was a bold assertion at a time when hardly anyone outside Russia had ever heard the word, "Ukraine," or any historian inside Russia thought of challenging Imperial historiography, or when the mass of the Ukrainians themselves, beyond the intellectuals, were barely conscious of their historic unity and past. Yet Hrushevsky sustained his thesis with such a wealth of illustration and proof, gathering about him groups of students and writers, and pouring forth the results of his studies in newspapers, periodicals and learned publications that gradually a changed attitude began to emerge. Hrushevsky was not alone in this movement for historical revision but he was the giant among them all.

It is typical of Hrushevsky's historical interpretation that he always kept in mind the great mass of the common people. Leaders might fail

or betray but the mass of the people remained with their own needs and common attitudes of mind. A great deal of his history is given over to describing the social and economic conditions of the people and in the history of the literature is shown how the people express themselves through fundamental forms of speech and literature. In his world history and course in sociology we see that Hrushevsky never lost sight of the fact that national groups do not exist for themselves alone, but as organic units they must fit in with the larger picture of the human family of nations.

In judging Hrushevsky's influence we must attribute to him a large share of the credit that by the time of the Revolution of 1905 the Ukrainian national movement had emerged into consciousness, that by 1917 it had become a dominant political current, and that even in defeat as a movement for independence it was still powerful enough to dictate the necessity of establishing the Ukraine as a separate unit in the Soviet political system. At a time when most English historians still under the influence of Imperial Russian historiography, persist in ignoring Hrushevsky, the Soviet Government authorizes the printing of *A History of the Ukraine*, which acknowledges its separate historical tradition, even though that tradition is colored by its Marxist interpretations. Hrushevsky, though dead, still lives.

There are some of Hrushevsky's friends and associates who are still alive and retain vivid impressions of the animated little man with his long beard turned to silver in his later years. They remember his quick step and ever-recurring friendly smile. They also recall his untiring energy. Even when presiding over a meeting he would turn to the correcting of his manuscripts during the dull speeches without losing the thread of argument, or the course of the proceedings. Most of all they remember his courage. He could have had a peaceful academic life but he chose the hard road of historical revision. He could have found refuge in Western Europe but he decided to return to his native land so alive with its historic memories, so fraught with tragedy for the common people. He could have accepted the orthodox theory of Communism but he preferred the broader road of freedom and humanity. So he died, as he had lived, fighting with the weapons of scholarship for what he believed to be the truth.

## DUMBARTON OAKS AND UKRAINE

By NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ

**“YOU HAVE** only to look at the world as it is today—weakened, fluid, desperately weary of war—to understand that the United States can play any part she chooses in the immense postwar struggle for reconstruction, order and peace . . . Unquestionably however the United States in her full-blown military strength is in a position to assert views much more firmly than she does.”

These are the words of the noted foreign correspondent, Anne O'Hare McCormick, late last November in a dispatch from Paris in which she summarized her observations on the present state of Europe.

“But,” she concluded, “the responsibility of the United States is the greatest of all, for the nations trust her to make a good peace.”

Mrs. McCormick's observation is well founded, for it is the deep conviction of the people of Europe that only American leadership will be capable of bringing order out of the chaos in Western Europe and of giving a true liberation to the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe. The collapse of Nazi tyranny alone, however, will be merely the first phase of the realization of European hopes for a better post-war world. There will yet remain the tremendous task of restoring to about one hundred million people of Central and Eastern Europe the freedom they have lost as a result of Communist Russian aggression. If that task remains undone then the post-war world order will not be improved or just, and the peace will not be lasting.

From Finland to the Black Sea democratic and freedom-loving peoples have been handed over to the tender mercies of the Communist dictatorship. Reports from Finland, the Baltic states, Ukraine, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia reveal the systematic liquidation by the Russian sponsored authorities of the finest patriotic and truly democratic elements of these nations. This is not because of any class warfare, as Communist or Communophile propaganda would have the world believe. It is simply a deadly struggle between the Russian Communist dictatorship and the defenders of the independence and democratic order of those nations. In the wake of the retreating Nazi tyrants there have come for these nations not the promised Four Free-

doms but arrests, executions, and the deportation of thousands of innocent persons, while the Nazi Quislings have been replaced by Communist Quislings. Such are the plain facts of the situation without the embellishment of pro-Soviet propaganda.

It is against this background that a plan was proposed at the Dumbarton Oaks conference for the establishment among the United Nations of an international organization dedicated to the preservation of post-war order and peace. In announcing the results of this conference, which lasted from late in August to early in October 1944, President Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, the then Secretary of State and the chairman of the conference, Edward R. Stettinius, urged all Americans as well as other peoples to express by way of constructive criticism their views on this projected plan for the creation of a new international organization.

In response to this and after the publication of the temporary charter of this United Nations organization a country-wide discussion commenced. Among those who have participated in it have been leaders from various walks of life, experts on international affairs, scholars, and ecclesiastics. Particularly noteworthy was the note of caution sounded by the Catholic episcopate of America.

A voice yet to be heard concerning the proposed international organization is that of the 45 million stateless Ukrainian people. They certainly are entitled to it, especially since they have made unusually great sacrifices to help in the crushing of the Nazi tyranny. A considerable part (approximately 25%) of the Ukrainian population has either perished or been driven out of its native land as a result of the war. The "scorched earth" policy has made Ukraine a veritable synonym of the devastation caused by it. Nevertheless, despite their great sacrifices and losses in human lives and property, the Ukrainians are emerging from the holocaust with no improvement in their national status. On the contrary, with the occupation of Western Ukraine by the Reds, that status is becoming increasingly worse.

The voice of Ukraine, it should be borne in mind, is neither the voice of Stalin, nor the voice of his overseer in Ukraine, the Russian Nikita Khrushchev, nor the voice of Stalin's veteran Comintern stooge, Manuilsky, the foreign affairs commissar of Ukraine. Therefore, as a native son of Western Ukraine, which was occupied by the Soviets against the will and wishes of its native population, and as one who lived there until the very outbreak of this war, this writer desires here on the free American soil to express what he considers to be the true

Ukrainian voice in regard to the proposed charter of a new international peace organization.

Among the views expressed thus far in this country concerning the Dumbarton Oaks conference there have been some who have doubted whether the time now is ripe for the creation of an international peace organization, especially since the basic principles of the peace which is to follow this war are still not clear. The number of unsolved complex international problems have by now accumulated to such an extent that they may yet transform this globe into a veritable prison house of nations, the keeper of which would be the proposed international "peace" organization. Moreover, there is also the danger that these controversial matters may generate enough explosive power to shatter the new world order that the proposed organization of the United Nations would be duty bound to preserve. On that account, some say, it would be more advisable to postpone the establishment of such a body until after the war, when the basic principles of the peace would become more crystallized.

It is doubtful, however, whether this course of action would better aid than the Dumbarton Oaks proposals with all of their limitations in the establishment of a better world order and a more lasting peace after the war. If delegates of the various nations attempted now to settle the various problems facing them, the proposed international organization might never come into being. Moreover such discussions might create differences which would spell disunity in the combined war effort of the United Nations. It would be better, therefore, to create the international peace organization as soon as possible and let its members attack the problems themselves. The fact that they would represent a majority of the nations would give their decisions a democratic and just character, for these decision will reflect the views of the greater part of the world.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals, therefore, should be welcomed as a step in the right direction; with the distinct reservation, however, that much remains to be done before it will lead to the establishment of the best possible post-war world order and the most lasting peace. Yet if the proposed world body is to be a staunch champion of peace and order it must, first of all, be founded on an equitable treatment of all peoples. It cannot be a mere instrument of power politics of several large countries. "No international organization will be able to maintain a peace which is unfair and unjust," says the statement of the American

Catholic Episcopate on the Dumbarton Oaks conference. "We must repudiate absolutely," it continues, "the tragic fallacies of power politics, with its balance of power, spheres of influences in a system of puppet governments."

Perhaps this word of caution is prompted by the fact that the Dumbarton proposals allow the suspicion that they are intended to build a world order not on any equitable basis but on that of the rule of the stronger. Thus although in chapter two of the proposed Charter there is stressed the sovereign equality of all the United Nations, it is in direct contradiction to chapter six, which provides for the establishment of the Security Council, which, judging by the powers granted to it, will actually control the United Nations organization, and which, significantly enough, will be composed of the representatives of the five great powers.

Moreover the Dumbarton Oaks proposals indicate by their very terminology that their main concern is not with nations but with states. It is the rights of states and not of nations that is accented in them, and this leaves the inescapable impression that the rights and interests of nations, of peoples were overlooked by the Oaks conference. Naturally it is well to look out for the rights of governments, but it should be borne in mind that governments do not always truly represent the people; some of them, as a matter of fact, are hostile to the people who are compelled to live under their domination.

From this viewpoint the proposed United Nations organization does not compare favorably with the former League of Nations, which was founded, at least in theory, on the principle of national self-determination. That principle was abandoned at the Moscow conference in the summer of 1943, so that the only basis left for the coming international organization is the power of the great nations.

### Cause of Downfall of League of Nations

An interesting sidelight on all this is that American adherents of the power politics feature of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, who largely have a pro-Soviet orientation, criticize the defunct League of Nations not for its truly weak features but for its basic principle of national self-determination, which undoubtedly is the finest and most vital doctrine of international order to emerge within the past several centuries.

In fact the main trouble with the post-Versailles order was the

failure of the Versailles settlement to implement systematically and justly President Wilson's principle of national self-determination. On the contrary, such newly established and favored states as Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, as well as the ally Italy, were given by the peace treaties larger or smaller fragments of neighboring peoples. The greatest defect of the Versailles system, however, was the denial of the right of self-determination to the forty million Ukrainian nation, and the resultant partition of Ukraine among the Soviets, Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. This enslavement of the Ukrainian people brought about chaotic conditions in Eastern Europe, while oppressed Ukraine became a magnet to draw to it Hitler's ill-starred invasion so as to carve out more "Lebensraum" for the "higher German race."

Within the League of Nations itself international immorality flourished. As Carl A. Berendsen, New Zealand minister to the United States, pointed out at a recent rally of the Metropolitan Opera Guild in New York City: "The League's failure was a moral failure. The League failed because its members lacked the courage and the sense to do right. The League failed because of a false and vicious idea that international morality differs in some way from individual morality.

"The League failed because far too many nations, in the conduct of their international relations, adopted the policy that a nation's pledged word is not necessarily its bond, that expediency pays better dividends than principles, that it is possible to serve individual national interests without regard to international equity, that we need not bother very much about our neighbors as long as we are all right, that it is both possible and right to save our babies by throwing somebody else's to the wolves."

The Ukrainians, better than anyone else, can well appreciate Mr. Berendsen's remarks, for they were the chief sufferers from this international political immorality.

Naturally this atmosphere of political immorality at the conferences of the League created among its members mutual distrust. Hence there was lacking among them that highly necessary sense of solidarity, a striving for the common good, as well as respect of the interests of one another.

Still another serious defect of the League was its lack of power to enforce its decisions and to compel aggressive nations to adhere to the principle of friendly mediation of their differences with their neighbors.

The newly-proposed international organization attempts to avoid



only this last defect of the now defunct League, by providing the Security Council with means of enforcing the decisions of the United Nations organization. On the other hand the tentative charter makes no attempt to dispel that atmosphere of immorality which characterized the League of Nations. No other conclusion is possible when one considers that the charter gives full control of the United Nations organization to a selective list of big powers, some of which are definitely imperialistically and aggressively minded. At the same time, judging by the mutual distrust that already exists among the great powers, even though the enemy has not been beaten yet, it is extremely improbable that the Security Council will be able to enforce any of its decisions, especially when they require a unanimous vote. In a word we have no reason to believe that the proposed international organization will be free from those moral faults to which Mr. Berendsen alluded.

#### **Lasting Peace Possible Only if Based on a Just World Order**

If we bear in mind the fact that certain nations are chronically inclined to disturb international peace, it would appear that the only method of dealing with them is to create such a post-war world order as would offer to would be aggressors the smallest opportunity of starting trouble with any prospect of success. Such a world order, however, can only be founded on contended peoples, an ideal condition, which of course, is very remote today. Sooner or later millions of downtrodden people will begin their struggle to overthrow this patently inequitable order which is gradually being imposed on them by the powers that be. The post-war system now being established by the Soviets in Central and Eastern Europe is a perfect breeding ground for new international intrigues and plots, for that system is not founded on the morality to which the post-Versailles system at least paid lip service.

The Dumbarton Oaks plan for the establishment of a new world organization presupposes that the international situation created by the present war and the accidental alliance of the Soviet Union with the western democracies is ideal, and that therefore it should be perpetuated. Actually the contrary is true. The rule by terror and force of the Soviets over millions of non-Russian peoples, particularly the Ukrainians, demands a revision of the current order in Eastern Europe. Instead, however, we find Soviet control there growing stronger and more rigid, whether directly or indirectly by Communophile puppet governments is beside the point. More and more non-Russian people are finding

themselves under Red domination, and this intolerable situation is daily growing more explosive in its potentialities.

All this merely indicates that the present-day European situation is far from that stability which is indispensable to lasting peace. It smoulders with unrest, which may break out into the flames of another great world conflagration. In addition, beyond the confines of Central and Eastern Europe there are issues at stake which may also constitute a threat to lasting post-war peace.

In the light of these growing problems and issues it is quite clear that a new world-wide peace organization cannot be an institution for the preservation of the status quo; on the contrary it must be a dynamic body, capable of making the necessary reforms to bring freedom, peace and neighborly relations to the peoples of the promised "better world" to come.

"Frankly it must recognize," the previously cited statement of the Catholic episcopate stresses, "that for nations as well as individuals life is not static. It must therefore provide in its charter for the revision of treaties in the interest of justice and the common good of the international community, as well as for the recognition of a people's coming of age in the family of nations."

### What Lesson Should We Draw from 19th Century History

Some present-day writers on international relations are inclined to idealize the peace and order established in Europe after the Napoleonic wars by the Vienna Congress of 1815, which established the hegemony of the "Holy Alliance" of Austria, Russia and Prussia. Although the next thirty odd years formed one of the most reactionary periods in European history until it ended in the Revolution of 1848 and its attendant Springtime of Nations, yet such writers seem to regard this period of peace founded upon the rule of force as worthy of emulation today.

Such a drawing of false conclusions from a shallow knowledge of the true historical processes is a plague of much of the current political literature. After all, the only similarity that exists between the period of the Vienna Congress and the present is that Napoleon's wars and retreat from Moscow bear some resemblance to Hitler's aggression and retreat from Moscow. Then as now, too, there was a fear that the aggressor might once more attempt some mad adventure and thus bring further

misery and suffering upon the innocents. That fear psychosis continued to exist even after Napoleon was safely imprisoned on St. Helena.

It was this fear psychosis that gave free rein to power politics throughout the continent, with Metternich as the "Gendarme of Europe." To be sure, some current writers like to regard that period as one of lasting peace. Anyone, however, who has some knowledge of the political thought and literature of the European countries of the time, knows very well that beneath the surface of this "lasting peace" the oppression (by imperialistic powers) of enslaved peoples continued unchecked, while on the other hand underground revolutionary movements among the downtrodden and the oppressed were at their strongest.

Italy, France, Germany, Greece, Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine and even the countries of the "Holy Alliance" of Austria, Prussia and Russia seethed with the activities of revolutionary societies, which set up as their common goal the overthrow of rule by force. In time these societies established amongst themselves throughout the whole of Europe a veritable brotherhood, with the result that a revolutionary from "Gendarme" Metternich's capital Vienna looked upon the revolutionary from Italy, or Poland or Hungary as his brother in spirit. One has merely to glance at Italian, Polish, Czech, Croatian, Ukrainian or other such literatures of the first half of the 19th century, to see to what white heat the "power politics of the Big Three" inflamed the nationalistic feelings of the downtrodden peoples of Europe. In some cases their hatred of the oppressors became transformed into a veritable religious cult. Finally, as was to be expected, the long pent up emotions and underground action erupted into the revolution of 1848. Its reverberations continued down through the years until the idea of power politics as a means of rule became generally detested throughout Europe and disappeared like snow beneath the rays of the spring sun of European liberalism.

The analogy is clear. What took place then as a result of power politics is bound to take place now if the power politics policy implicit in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is to be the basis of the proposed international peace organization. As a matter of fact the situation will even be worse at the present time, for national consciousness is no longer confined to the young and the more educated classes. Today it embraces the masses of common people, who are fully aware of their right to national sovereignty. For the proposed international set-up to

ignore this vital factor is to make lasting peace essentially impossible, and at the same time to offer an excellent opportunity to some future aggressor to find a host of allies among enslaved peoples throughout the world.

Thus in giving due credit to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a step forward in international relations, we must at the same time recognize the fact that these proposals are one-sided, that they ignore those objective factors which make lasting peace impossible. What might make it possible would be definite provisions within the proposals securing the liberties of nations and individuals. The proposals must be complemented in a manner which would make the United Nations peace organization exactly that, and not just an alliance of several powerful governments.

#### What Is Missing in the Dumbarton Proposals

The general lack of measures securing the fundamental rights of nations and individuals is the most serious shortcoming of the Dumbarton proposals. From the very time when at the Moscow conclave (1943) it was decided to ignore the principle of national self-determination in shaping of the post-war world, the international situation became fraught with the danger that the new nations which that principle brought into being over a quarter of a century ago, will find themselves much against their will in a plight like that of the stateless Ukrainian people, under foreign, and in some cases enemy rule and oppression. Future historians are bound to label this abandonment of Wilson's famous principle as a step backward by the civilized world. They are also likely to draw a very unfavorable comparison between it and the general progressive and democratic spirit which animated the efforts at the close of the last war to build a better world order. The designers of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals should have borne this constantly in mind and have taken into consideration the fate of stateless peoples under foreign rule as well as of those individuals who against their will find themselves living in totalitarian states. In other words, the proposals should have included a *Bill of Rights for Stateless Peoples and Individuals*.

Such a Bill of Rights for peoples would have as its object at least the preservation of the cultural and economic self-rule of foreign-ruled peoples, that is if circumstances do not allow them to enjoy national sovereignty. What makes such a bill all the more imperative for national

as well as religious minorities, is the fact that totalitarian rule with all its abuses of human rights is not likely to diminish with the close of this war; on the contrary it may become even more rampant. Moreover, such a Bill of Rights of Individuals could be a means of guaranteeing to minorities and individuals the Four Freedoms proclaimed by President Roosevelt.

The tentative charter of the international organization, therefore, should be complemented by a section providing for the defense of the rights of stateless peoples and individuals. Since the charter will have to be ratified by all the members of the United Nations organizations, their ratification of it would make such a section binding upon them. This of itself should obviate any imputation that the international organization would restrict state sovereign rights. The acceptance and ratification of the Bill of Rights by a state would be a prerequisite to its admission to the United Nations peace organization.

However, the inclusion of the Bill of Rights for Peoples and Individuals in the United Nation's charter would not of itself be a sufficient guarantee of these rights. As it is, such rights are already constitutionally guaranteed in some countries, while in USSR they are not respected. To strengthen the international guarantee of them the world peace organization should have, as Sumner Welles has wisely recommended, a Protective Council, which would act as a guardian of stateless peoples and individuals. Specifically the Council should be charged with the duty of seeing that the provisions of the Bill of Rights of Peoples and Individuals in the Charter are adhered to by the members of the United Nations. The council would be empowered to act even 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.

A second fundamental weakness of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is that they make no *provision for the revision of peace treaties* or for the rise of new nations without recourse to war. That is most regrettable. Anyone sincerely interested in the preservation of peace should accept the possibility of a change in the present world political order by peaceful means. Without the elimination of objective causes and without the

just settlement of differences by peaceable mediation, any thought of lasting peace becomes absurd.

The aspiration of a civilized people to become independent cannot be quelled forever, unless of course the United Nations become the most reactionary force in history, bound in principle to repress the natural right of a people to freedom. For that reason the charter of the new international organization must allow for the possibility of a peaceable revision of frontiers as well as the rise of new states on the territories of present countries, including members as well as non-members of the United Nations. There is no doubt but that the Ukrainian cause must be among the first to appear on the agenda of the United Nations peace organization.

Examining the Dumbarton Oaks proposals one cannot help but get the impression that they are motivated more by the political interests of the big powers than by any sense of international justice. That is apparently why the proposed Security Council is given power not only over the General Assembly but also over the International Court of Justice. This is in direct violation of international justice and morality, the lack of which caused the collapse of the League of Nations. The very placing of a political executive body over a court of justice completely destroys the latter's value and purpose of existence, as all its verdicts are then subject to approval by the political body. This certainly contravenes justice and the civilized order. Decisions of the International Court of Justice must be final, while the duty of the Security Council should be limited to the execution of these decisions.

In regard to the method of voting in the Security Council, the Dumbarton proposals are silent, because no agreement was reached on this subject. The conference, however, considered the proposition that all decisions of the Security Council require a unanimous vote of its five big members. In other words a veto of one power is sufficient to nullify the will of the other ten members. Since in matters relating to the preservation of peace it will be extremely difficult to get a unanimous vote, it would be far more practical to require only a two-thirds vote, as in the assembly. The solution of this controversy has probably been found at the Crimean Conference.

### Not All Violators of Peace Are Aggressors

Obviously the peace to come will not last long if it will not be based on realism and justice. This view is held by all religious groups

which have commented on the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. It is likewise held by all true liberals in this country and abroad, as witness the recent statement of the Liberal Party of America. Power politics are only ethical and successful when they are based on justice.

It is true that the edge of the Oaks proposals is directed against the violators of international peace. Yet it should be borne in mind that not all violators of peace are aggressors. Peace may also be broken because of necessity by a people who in pursuit of their inalienable rights strike out for their national freedom, just as the American colonials did during the Revolutionary War. Would America then ever consent to send its sons in war against such "violators" of peace and thereby aid some tyrannical aggressor?

There is no sense in closing one's eyes to the possibility that the former and present conquests of the Soviet and the domination of some nations over colonial albeit civilized people may establish against them, and indirectly against the United Nations peace organization itself, an alliance of those who would fight for freedom of enslaved nations. Within the sphere of Soviet domination alone, such an alliance of enslaved peoples could easily attain the figure of one hundred million, including about 40 million Ukrainians, 23 million Poles, 10 million White Ruthenians, about 3 million each of the Finns, Lithuanians, Slovaks, 8 million Rumanians, 7 million Hungarians, 2½ million Latvians and 1½ million Estonians. And this does not complete the entire list. It is interesting to speculate on what the democratic members of the United Nations peace organization would do if peace were broken by a general uprising of this great bloc of peoples against Red tyranny to wrest from it their national freedom.

In the light of all this, it is very evident that those who are designing the shape of the post-war world order, have to bear the great responsibility of avoiding the creation of an international peace organization which not only would fail to secure lasting peace but also would make it possible for another titanic struggle to break out in about twenty years. They should bear in mind the words of the previously cited Anne O'Hare McCormick: "But the responsibility of the United States is the greatest of all, for the nations trust her to make a good peace."

And among those who trust are over 40 million Ukrainians in their native but now occupied by foreigners Ukraine and about 5 million Ukrainians abroad.

## UKRAINIAN SOCIOLOGY AFTER THE FIRST WORLD WAR<sup>1</sup>

By JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

*Hofstra College*

**T**HE WORLD WAR brought the downfall of the old Russian Tsarist régime and the revolution gave new perspectives and focusses to the cultural evolution of the Ukrainian nation. The year 1917 became the corner-stone of the history of Ukraine. With a special intensity the scientific social thought began to be investigated, instigated by the fact that the sociological problems which had been facing the nation already were now intensified by the revolution. We shall discuss specifically the sociological work which had been accomplished in Ukraine after the revolution.

### Sociological Work in Soviet Ukraine (1919-1930)

With the revolution came also the victory of sociology, that is, the acceptance of sociology as a science having an important task for the control in society. The centre of the sociological research was primarily the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences with its socio-economic and historico-philological sections and its special chair of sociology. In 1918 the chair was given to Dr. Bohdan Kistiyakivsky, but his sickness and death prevented him from publishing the results of his work. After an interval of more than ten years, his place was taken by a Marxist, Professor Semkovsky, and several associates who worked in that division.

The Division had special sections, which were interested in the questions which belonged to the field of sociology. The Ukrainian Demographic Institute, under Professor M. Ptucha, and several others (Pustokhod, Trachevsky, Korchak-Chepurkivsky, Masyutin, etc.) examined the bio-social process, natality, mortality, marriages, divorces, etc. The five published volumes of the Institute show the high level of the work. Of special interest are the studies of the director of the In-

---

<sup>1</sup> Parts of the material have been adopted from: Mykyta J. Sapoval "Soudoba ukrajinska sociologicka myslenska a prace" (Contemporary Ukrainian Sociological Thought and Work), III, *Sociologicka Revue*, 1932, Vol. III, No. 3-4, pp. 293-296; 1933, Vol. IV, No. 2-3, pp. 189-191; 1934, Vol. V, No. 1-3, pp. 70-75. Other material has been adopted from the above-mentioned *Sociological Review* and the contributions cited thereafter.



stitute, M. Ptucha, whose "The Number and Composition of the Inhabitants of Ukraine according to Sex and Age between the years 1897-1920" is just as well known as "The Mortality Rate in Russia and Ukraine" (Kharkiv, 1928).

In the "Works" of the Institute the following interesting researches appear: J. Korchak-Chepurkivsky's "The Town and Countryside in Ukraine from the Standpoint of Mortality"; P. Pustokhod's "Demographic Curiosities of the inhabitants of Ukraine from the beginning of the XX Century"; M. Trachevsky's "Nativity in Ukraine"; I. Kovalenko's "Suicide in Kharkiv." The Institute must also be credited with the "Inhabitants of Ukraine," with its analysis of the sex, age, education, and professional, social and racial composition of that country.

The Institute for the history of Ukraine under Professor M. Hrushevsky also included a sociological section (Prof. O. Hermaize, Prof. P. Klimenko) and the Cabinet of Primitive Culture under Miss Katherina Hrushevka. This body was especially interested in the problems of genetic sociology and has published since 1926 a special annual "Primitive Society." Of the numerous works published therein we ought especially to note P. Tutkivsky's "The Causes of the Invasion of Asiatic Barbarians of Europe," offering the theory of cosmic influences on the events of nations and society, and showing especially how, under the influence of heat waves which recur every four and a half centuries, the Asiatic nations kept turning to the West for expansion. K. Hrushevka's works are headed by the studies of "The Attempt of a Sociological Explanation of Folk Tales," "The Sociology of Old Age," and those of F. Savchenko by "Sociology in the Concepts of New French Democracy." His study on "Primitive Culture" covers the beginnings of culture in America, primitive thinking (based on the theories of Levy-Bruhl), the categories of primitive thinking, collectively in primitive poetry and, in addition to other topics, a study of the Ukrainian historical "duma." As M. Hrushevsky and his co-workers belong mostly to the school of Durkheim, the character of their works is given by that background.

The Ukrainian Institute of Marxism in Kharkiv had the following sections: (1) the philosophico-sociological; (2) economic; (3) historical; (4) for nationalities and racial problems; (5) and preparatory. The aim of the institution was examination of social processes and the preparation of educated Marxists; hence it was divided into sections for research and for education. It had its own periodical, published every

three months, "The Flag of Marxism," headed by the leader of the Institute, Prof. M. Popov. Since philosophical polemics with the opponents of "materialism" predominated, the sociological part of the periodical was poor.

The Ukrainian Research Scientific Institute of Pedagogy in Kharkiv worked in the field of socio-technics, and was interested in the examination of human behavior, its forms, environmental factors, etc. The research work was headed by Professor B. Protopopov. It published beginning with 1925 the "Ukrainian Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and Reflexology," the editorial board of which was composed of Professor M. Volobuyiv, O. Zaluzhny, O. Popov, and I. Sokolyansky, headed by Protopopov.

When we realize that a member of the Russian Academy, V. Bechterev, with I. Pavlov, belonged to the founders of the reflexology school and that by the term "collective reflexology" he designated sociology, the contributions of this group can be seen to cover mainly the field of sociology, and primarily educational sociology.

The Ukrainian Psycho-Neurological Institute of Kiev was interested in the reflexological research and pedagogical goals in general, and in building up general theories as to the mental life of man and the higher animals. There is no doubt that sociology seeks its material in collective reflexology for its generalizations, and that it is therefore necessary to pay attention to psychological research. "The Journal of Psychoneurology" under Professor Hakkebus was the organ of this Institute.

The work of the Ethnographical Society, the Geographical Society, and the Anthropological Society, and others included also subjects of a direct sociological character. For example, the three volumes of "Materials of Anthropology of Ukraine," edited by Dr. Nikolayev, have unusually interesting contents: volume one covers the Ukrainian children of school age; volume two, the national and social differences in the physical characters of the inhabitants of Ukraine; and volume three, the correlation of the physical characteristics. The influence of occupation, of location and language on the physical characteristics of individuals of various nationalities of Ukraine is well brought out. Some valuable sociological material can be found also in the first three volumes of "Criminal Anthropology and Court Medicine," published in Kharkiv, 1926-1928.

From the works of other social research scientists in Ukraine two works of Professor Serhiy Ostapenko deserve special attention. The

first is "The More Important Characteristics of the Ukrainian People in Comparison with Other Peoples" (Kamyanec-Podilsky 1920)—a demographic study of the country, in two parts: statics and dynamics of the main social groups of Ukraine. The other work, "The Energetics of Social Economics" (1925), is an attempt to explain the economic process of society and to develop some principles for the economic policies of Ukraine. The work of Ostapenko is the continuation of the attempt made by Dr. S. Podolinsky to explain the process of work.<sup>2</sup>

But that sociology is recognized as a valuable social science is evident from the fact that all the schools of the Soviet Union teach sociology.

### Sociological Work in Western Ukraine

On this subject we can speak only of Galicia, where the Ukrainian cultural-scientific work had been carried on with a good foundation. We cannot speak of any sociological work in Bukovina, Bessarabia, or Carpatho-Ukraine, because in these sections the cultural work has not been lifted above work in awaking nationalism or elementary ethnographic research.

The centrum of Ukrainian work in Galicia was the Scientific Society of Shevchenko (Naukove Tovarystvo im. Shevchenka), which celebrated in 1924 its 50th anniversary, and which published in its sections over 225 volumes. But sociology does not occupy the leading place in the activity of the Society; the first place is taken, so to speak, by the sociography of Ukraine.

The Sociological thought was born in the Society at the end of the 19th century in the Historico-Legal Section. The Statistical Commission began to publish its interesting studies in the field of social sciences and statistics.<sup>3</sup> Among them are not a few sociological studies, as the works of Dr. S. Dnistriansky, "National Statistics," containing the theory of the nation and the methodology of the study of social pheno-

---

<sup>2</sup> From the flood of numerous other works worth mentioning are: M. Voskresensky's "Organism and Environment" (1929); B. Jakubsky's "The Sociological Method in Literature" (Kiev, 1923); A. Kovalivsky's "The Question of the Economico-Social Method in Literature" (Kharkiv, 1926); N. Berkovsky's "Socialism in German Literary Science" (Critics, 1928, No. 9); O. Poltoracky's "Literary Sources. An Attempt at a Sociological Analysis" (1929); V. Frich's "The Sociology of Art" (1929). Numerous sociological studies are found in the periodical "Critics" (the sociology of art and literature), "Zitya i Revolucya," "Chervony Shlyak," etc. But this journalistic sociology is not of great sociological value.

<sup>3</sup> The sociological work of the Scientific Shevchenko Society in Lviv was described in "Ukrainian Sociology before 1914" by Jaroslav Chyz-Joseph S. Roucek, "Journal of Central European Affairs," Vol. 1, No. 1, April, 1941 (Boulder, Col.).

mena; Dr. V. Paneyko's "Rationalism and Realism in the Concept of Social Phenomena"; the works of Dr. M. Lozinsky and Dr. V. Ochrimovich in the sociography of the political process in Ukraine ("The Electoral Statistics in Galicia"); and Ochrimovich's valuable monograph, "Nationalities Statistics of Galicia." In addition there are studies of M. Hechter, M. Zaliznyak, V. Doroshenko, I. Baran, etc.

In the publications of the Legal Commission appear numerous sociological studies. In the "Legal Periodical" we find a study of Stanyslav Dnistryansky, entitled "Man and His Needs in the Legal System" (1899). It is an interesting attempt at the analysis of human needs, although viewed only from the juristic standpoint. In the third volume of the *Legal and Economic Journal* (1902) there was published the same author's sociological analysis of "The Customary Law and Social Ties," describing the social genesis of the law. The customary law is the proof that the law, as all norms of social behavior, is created in the daily social processes. The positive law is only a drop in the sea of sociological phenomena in the totality of social processes. In the same year Prof. Volodimir Starosolsky published "Contributions to the Theory of Sociology," where he formulated the tasks, the methods and the limitation of sociology.

In the Annual Yearbooks of the Legal Commission of 1925 and 1927 there were published two interesting works: Professor R. Lashchenko's historical and sociographical study, "The Common Courts in Ukraine, Their Origin, Competence and Institution," and Dr. K. Kovshevich's "Inductive Method in Legal Science"; the author considers jurisprudence a social phenomenon, a sociological discipline, based on biology, and suggests a mathematical method for the study of legal elements. Without sociology we cannot understand the legal phenomena and we shall build no science without them. The fundamental thesis of Kovshevich is really right, although his speculative philosophical proofs are weak.

The Scientific Shevchenko Society has published numerous other sociological works. Most of them are devoted to the problems of political and economic processes, the study of languages, literature and religion. We shall note here only the most important scientists, specializing in the study of social processes by the sociological method.

Professor S. Dnistryansky has published, in addition to the above-mentioned works, a series of valuable studies, some of which are important for sociology: "The Social Forms of Law" (in the Studies of the

Socio-Economical Section of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Vol. V-VI, 1927); "The Outline of the Theory of Law and State"; (The works of the Scientific Shevchenko Society, Vol. 138-141, 1925).

In the history of Ukrainian sociology S. Dnistryansky will surely be considered the first lawyer-sociologist who tried to build up his own theory of law as a social product. The source of law is a human group. Dnistryansky calls attention to the nearness of his concept of law to the theory of the Eugene Ehrlich, Professor of Czernivtsi, (*Die Grundlagung der Soziologie der Rechts*), but he emphasizes the independence of the origin of both theories.

Stammler's theory of society uses various material from Russian, German and French sources, and shows that sociology should free itself of the subjective-evaluating and ethnical-normative concepts; likewise it demands that it should become an objective, precise science describing the causal relationships between social phenomena. The task of sociology is only the knowledge of reality. He rejects the theories of organistic and subjective Russian sociologists, but admits the agreement between the psychologists and materialists in sociology when there is proven the interdependence of the psychic elements with their outer material factors. We regret that the author has not prepared his own system of sociology, but has limited himself to special sections of social life, as already indicated in the titles of his works. In his "Theory of the Nation" Starosolsky develops the old concept of Renan, that the nation is "une ame, un principe spirituel"; its foundation is an irrational will of the nation to live (the nation is conceived as "Gemeinschaft" in Toennies' spirit). The consequences of the voluntaristic subjectivism lead Starosolsky to the identification of the nation with the state, against which the Ukrainian historian and sociologist of the end of 19th century, M. Drahomaniv, had already protested.

An outstanding sociological worker in Galicia and a Marxist ex cathedra is Volodimir Levinsky, who wrote "The Nation and State" (1919) and "What is Politics?" (1923). After giving up any effort to establish his own definition of the nation, he analyses its two main elements: language and culture. "The language is the strongest cement of a nation," creating "Gemeinschaft"; where the latter exists there are mutual interests of a material character (the struggle for existence) and of a spiritual character (the struggle for its own type of culture). The consciousness of both interests unites in the national consciousness. But the author fails to notice that this consciousness is not specifically

nationalist. The evolution of a nation, according to Levinsky, under the influence of O. Bauer, is as follows: at first came the tribal nation (the nation of primitive communism), then came the class nation, which will change in a socialistic society into a classless nation. The state originated from wars and class domination. In the classless society there will be no state. In his "What is Politics?" he concludes that it is a struggle of social groups for existence in society. As a Marxist, Levin-sky popularizes the teachings of that group, but tries, in his discussions of the problems of nation and state, to create his own concepts and states his opposition to the old concepts of Marx, Engels, and their followers.

### Sociological Work of Ukrainian Émigrés (Up to 1930)

The first attempt to organize the Ukrainian sociological studies abroad was made in Vienna. Professor M. Hrushevsky, the great Ukrainian historian, was sociologically-minded. It was he who decided to build up the Ukrainian Sociological Institute. The plan was not realized, but Hrushevsky succeeded in having his books published. Only three works appeared: M. Hrushevsky's "Genetic Sociology" (1921), V. Starosolsky's "Theory of the Nation" (1922), and M. Shrah's "State and Socialistic Society" (1923); other works were either of a historical character or offered material on history and primitive culture.

Hrushevsky's "Genetic Sociology" is a highly valuable work. It is composed of three parts. The first surveys critically older theories of social evolution, and throws light on the plurality of the factors of social evolution, the principle of rhythms and the tendencies of social happenings. The second part deals with genetic sociology proper, and analyzes the transition from the animal to the human forms of associations, tribes, the economic and psychic factors of human associations, organized and non-organized groups, the origin of the domination of males, totemism and morality, religious organizations, the family; then follows the analysis of the tribal organization and the processes of its dissolution--the origin of property, of political government, the influences of wars, the genesis of classes etc. The third part of the book contains a short survey of Ukrainian works on genetic sociology (Ziber, Kovalevskv, Sumcov, Chernishev, Vovk, Ochrimovich).

Mykhaylo Hrushevsky was a pupil of the well known Ukrainian historian Volodymyr Antonovich. Hrushevsky became in 1894 Professor of Ukrainian History at the University of Lviv. From the very begin-

ning Hrushevsky followed the theory of Mykhaylo Drahomaniv that the study of human society must be based on the knowledge of its real characteristics. From that standpoint, Hrushevsky came to new methods, genetic and positivistic, in his historical works. He considered it the most important task to understand the life of the past periods, to live, to speak that life, to comprehend the soul of past generations and the forms of their relations, which appear as the result of its character formed under the influence of various factors.

In his monumental work, "Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi" (9 volumes were published, ending with the death of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, 1657), he pays a great deal of attention to the social relations, and comes to the conclusion that the democratic order is the only right and deeply rooted order in the life of the Ukrainian nation.

Immediately after his arrival in Lviv, Hrushevsky began to organize the Ukrainian scientific activities. He was president of the "Naukove Tovarystvo im. Shevchenka" and editor of the "Zapysok." He edited the works of the society, many of which contain a wealth of material for the sociologist. We must especially notice his three volumes of "Studiyi z polya suspilnykh nauk i statystyky" (1909-1912). World War I brought Hrushevsky into Ukraine; as a nationalist leader, he was sent into exile. The Revolution of 1917 liberated him, and he became the leader of the Ukrainian nationalist rejuvenation, as the first president of the Ukrainian People's Republic and its Central Council ("Centralna Rada"):<sup>4</sup>

But after the Reds took the Ukraine he had to go into exile. In 1919 he established the first Ukrainian Sociological Institute in Vienna. In his work "Pochatky hromadyanstva—genetychna sociologiya" (1921), as a follower of Durkheim, Hrushevsky describes the evolution of society from the primitive tribal state to the class society. He corrects some views of Morgan and Engels, and stresses that the state as a form of cooperation will not die, but will remain, even possibly in a different form, in the socialist society.

Among the other works of the Institute are valuable contributions to genetic sociology and material on the Ukrainian socialist movement. To them belong his "Z pochyniv ukraïnskoho socialistychnoho rukhu" (1922), "Z istoriyi religiyanoi dumky na Ukraïni" (1925). In Vienna, Hrushevsky also began his second life-work, "The History of Ukrainian

<sup>4</sup> Zivotko Arkadij, "In Memoriam Michajla Hrushevskoho," *Sociologicka Revue*, 1935, Vol. VI, No. 1-2, pp. 90-92.

Literature" (5 volumes published). In the introduction the author emphasizes the concept of the history of literature from the sociological standpoint. "The literary creations have their greatest importance not as facts of social life, but as a key to the understanding of the social life in general, in the different steps of evolution, either of individual nations or whole groups of nations, races, and finally the whole humanity. When the history of literature is studied from that standpoint, it becomes of the greatest importance. Not the evolution of the tongue, composition, and the forms as they appear in the works of writers, but the expression as a function of social life, the reflection of its real existence, the mutual relations of the creator and his social environment, these are important, these are what men should recognize in literature." Hence Hrushevsky believes that the duty of the historian of literature is to examine the poetical creation as a social function of the various steps of the evolution of the nation, to know what this function is in the total life of society and how it relates to that life. These views led Hrushevsky to the sociological explanation of the history of literature in general.

After his return to Ukraine in 1924, Hrushevsky directed the work of the historical section of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev. Its cultural-historical committees, with the cabinet of primitive culture and the committee for historical research, took over certain functions of the Viennese Sociological Institute. After 1930 he was removed from the Academy, exiled and died in the Caucasus (1934).

An entirely different conception of an ideal order for society in general and Ukrainians in particular is held by Vyacheslav Lypynsky.<sup>5</sup> It finds eloquent expression in his "Letters to My Fellow Husbandmen," published in "The Agricultural Ukraine" journal (Vienna, 1920-21). In it Lypynsky takes the stand that national development must have its roots in settled peoples and not nomads. Intellectuals, political leaders, etc. Lypynsky regards as modern nomads; therefore, in his opinion the only way in which society can attain the peak of its development and statehood is to base itself primarily on the productive classes, —on the agricultural class and then on the industrial and labor classes. The intellectuals in his opinion are but an appendage to the latter classes.

Since the evolution of a people into full nationhood is dependent

---

<sup>5</sup> The section about sociological views of Ukrainian monarchists led by V. Lypynsky is supplemented by the editor N. Czubatyj.



upon the productive—agricultural and industrial classes, Lypynsky maintains that the latter are able to control the government and take the responsibility for the nation. Lypynsky's class rule or classocracy should be ideal. He rejects parliamentary democracy because in his opinion, it does not give adequate representation to the majority of the nation or to the two productive classes which he regards as being the very pillars of organized society. Worse yet, leadership in parliamentary democracy is vested mostly in the nomad-intellectuals, and the professional politicians, and their value to society goes no further than the amount of intellect they can furnish it.

The parliamentary system, therefore, should be replaced by one composed of representatives of those classes which produce food and goods—by classocracy. On that account he favors systems like the corporate Catholic systems of Austria before Hitler occupation and Salazar's Portugal.

Drawing a comparison between a well managed farm and a well ordered state, Lypynsky claims the latter can be at its best only if it is governed by a hereditary ruler, a monarch, responsible for his rule only to his conscience, his dynasty and to history. Free Ukraine is envisioned by him as a monarchical state with a hereditary hetman at the helm, and a legislature composed of representatives of the agricultural and industrial classes. Aristocracy would be the backbone of its administration and armed forces. But that aristocracy, however, is not to be of the usual hereditary type, for which Lypynsky has little use, regarding some of its self-willed and egoistic elements as veritable ochlocrats. On the contrary, the aristocracy which he sees as playing an important role in his ideal Ukrainian state is to be composed only of those individuals who by sheer talent and hard work coupled with character and a sense of responsibility have forged to the front.

In this respect Lypynsky has adopted a view similar to that held by Plato that a state should be governed by philosophers, modernizing it, however, to make it conform to the present-day democratic character of society. Thus Lypynsky can see a true aristocrat in his neighbor, a common Ukrainian farmer, who finding his home menaced with destruction at the hands of a bolshevized mob during the last revolution, made haste to save first of all his library and died in defense of cultural values.

Lypynsky's "Letters to My Fellow Husbandmen," it is worth noting, exerted a great influence on the formation of sociological thought of the

entire Ukrainian anti-Socialist camp, after the First World War, especially among the Ukrainian Monarchists, Nationalists and Catholic Democrats.

• • •

When the Czechoslovak government took over the care of the Ukrainian immigrants, the immigrant committee (Ukrainsky Hromadsky Komitet), headed by Shapoval, worked out a great plan for Ukrainian cultural work, according to which there were founded two high institutions of learning: the Ukrainian Agricultural Academy in Podebrady and the Ukrainian Pedagogical Institute of M. Drahomaniv, in Prague. In addition to the two technical faculties, the Agricultural Academy also was given a socio-economic faculty, with chairs of theoretical sociology, social politics, social hygiene, statistics, etc., together with a number of specialists who lectured on their subjects from the sociological standpoint. In the "Journal" (Vistnik) of the Academy (Vol. I, 1927) we find a number of sociological articles. Docent O. Bochkovsky lectured on theoretical sociology and had a special course in "nationology"; his "National Government" in 1920, and "Nationology and Natiography" are interested in the problem of the nation. The author approaches the views of Prof. V. Starosolsky, but instead of voluntarism, emphasizes the rational-emotional moment in the emergence of nationalities. According to him, the nationology examines the genetics and dynamics, while the natiography, the statistics of the nation. This distinction—"logy" and "graphy" is in contrast to the common acceptance of both terms. L. Bich, Professor of the Agricultural Academy, published in 1924 the "Urban Self-Administration," which is the first important work in Ukrainian literature, on the phenomenon of the city.

Prof. Eichelman lectured on sociology in the Ukrainian Pedagogical Institute where the subject was compulsory. The same specialist lectured in the Ukrainian Free University of Prague.

In the fall of 1924, M. J. Shapoval founded the Ukrainian Sociological Institute of Prague. It was divided into three sections: (1) the Division of Theoretical Sociology, economics, law and politics, under Shapoval; (2) the Division of "narodoznavstvo" and culture with the section of "Narodoznavstvo" and the creations of social processes, under Prof. Bilecky. (3) the Division of Popularization (The National University), under Prof. N. Hrihoriyiv. The degree of doctor of sociology was granted after two years of post-graduate studies in a seminar, the

passing of examinations on theoretical sociology and a special field, and the presentation of an acceptable thesis.

Among the works of the Institute was the periodical "Suspilstvo" (Society), which contained, among others, the contributions of E. S. Bogardus, L. von Wiese, Ch. Elwood, St. Chapin, O. Sorokin, R. Michels, M. Shapoval, V. Petrov, etc. Among its published books we can note: Prof. Kobylansky's "Suggestion and Hypnosis in Individual and Collective Life," S. Rusova "Social Pedagogy," E. Chalupny's "The Outline of the System of Sociology," M. Shapoval, "The Principles of Democracy of T. G. Masaryk," "Ukrainian Sociology," "The Country and the City," "General Sociology," etc.

In conclusion, the Ukrainian sociological thought around 1932 was following several directions. The representatives of the "spirit" were still heard from here and there; against them were those supporting the "materialistic" approach; monists and pluralists were well-represented. Kiev was the centrum of the followers of Durkheim, Kharkiv of Marxism and reflexology, emigrants tending to favor reflexology and behaviorism. Representatives of eclectic idealism could also be found there.

• • •

Prof. Roucek's article covers Ukrainian sociology up to about 1932. Since then some interesting trends have developed, particularly among the Catholic Democrats, as represented primarily by Prof. Mikola Konrad<sup>6</sup> in his work "Sociology" and by the Rev. Dr. Gabriel Kostelnick. The former applies to the Ukrainian scene the sociological thoughts of papal bulls—*Rerum Novarum* of Leo XIII and the *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pius XI. Dr. Kostelnick develops an original approach to the practical democracy of the common man, criticizing the sociological views of Drahomaniv. Ukrainian nationalistic sociology leans towards totalitarianism by setting the state above all else, with its Mikola Sciborsky dwelling mostly upon agrarian problems and Vikul on the relations between the Church and State, etc. (Editor).

<sup>6</sup> Rev. Mikola Konrad, Ph.D., professor of sociology and dean of Philosophical School at the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Theological Academy in Lviv was executed by the Reds during the first occupation of Western Ukraine in 1941.

## IN RETROSPECT

By STEPHEN SHUMEYKO

**B**EING the submerged nation, as William Henry Chamberlin so aptly dubs them in his recent book on Ukraine,<sup>1</sup> the Ukrainian people find it difficult to break into print with the true story concerning them. Most always what is said or written about them is by those other than themselves, usually the Russians and the Poles,—who, as is to be expected, release only that news about them which suits them, and color it to blend with their long acknowledged hostility to Ukrainian national aspirations.

Realizing that their kinsmen in Ukraine lack freedom of expression, and what they do manage to say there is distorted by those who do or would rule over them, Americans of Ukrainian descent, removed from their kinsmen at most by one generation, have taken upon themselves the task of making better known the truth concerning them. To be sure, the facilities at their disposal for this task are puny compared with those who have at their disposal embassies, legations, governments-in-exile and propaganda bureaus. Nevertheless, though they are going against the tide in this and other respects, Americans of Ukrainian origin remain undiscouraged and continue their efforts to aid their kinsmen in Ukraine to win their national freedom.

The Ukrainian Quarterly represents one such effort. Since this is only its second number, it is worth commenting here on several events pertaining to the Ukrainian situation which transpired during the past year.

### Hitler's Fiasco in Ukraine

Hitler's military debacle in Ukraine last year followed closely on the heels of his political fiasco there. Even if he had the slimmest opportunity of capitalizing on the notorious Soviet misrule in Ukraine, and on the centuries-old Ukrainian movement for freedom, he lost that opportunity by his "amazingly awkward eastern policy" whereby he "played into Stalin's hand one trump card after the other."

The quoted words are from *Behind the Steel Wall*<sup>2</sup> written last

<sup>1</sup> The Ukraine: A Submerged Nation, by William Henry Chamberlin. Macmillan, 91 pages. \$1.75.

<sup>2</sup> Viking Press. In Canada—Macmillan.

year by Arvid Freborg, crack correspondent of Stockholm's leading paper, *Svenska Dagbladet*, who was in Berlin from early in 1941 through the summer of 1943. His is added testimony to the well established fact that the Nazis had "no idea how to exploit Ukrainian nationalism." Freborg claims this was entirely the fault of the Nazi Party. For, he says, German military leaders had studied Napoleon's campaign and Kaiser Wilhelm's war in the East and had come to the conclusion that it was imperative to win the Ukrainians for Germany against Moscow. Led by Field Marshall von Brauchitsch the German military had set up plans for the establishment of a sovereign Ukrainian state with its own army and in alliance with Germany in the event of a Russo-German conflict.

At first it looked like the plan would work, Freborg writes. Following German occupation, it was reported "that Ukrainians by the scores of thousands deserted from the Soviet forces to join the National Ukrainian Army which, propaganda maintained, the Germans had set up. But to the great astonishment of Ukraine, the plan never materialized. On the contrary, most of the conquered Ukraine was put under German civil government and parcelled out to the Party. At the head of it was Erich Koch, the Gauleiter from East Prussia, whose nickname was 'the Hangman of the Ukraine.' To the jubilation of Moscow, Koch cleaned out the Nationalists."

Freborg says that an informed German explained this to him as follows: "Since we ourselves plan to take over the entire Ukrainian territory after the war, naturally no Ukrainian nationalism can be allowed to grow up." Under such conditions, Freborg continues, "it is readily understandable why the German eastern policy was a fiasco. But that was not enough. The administration succeeded in whipping up among the Ukrainians a real hatred for Germany. Masses of Ukrainian nationalists were shot—after having been betrayed, it is said, by Russians whom the Germans had taken into their service. Among these men were former OGPU agents.

"It is significant," Freborg notes, "that a large partisan force has sprung up in the Ukraine under the leadership of a Ukrainian officer calling himself Taras Bulba, who directs his activities against both the Russians and the Germans. But the Russians also have large partisan forces there. They have not been slow to exploit Nazi mistakes and the U.S.S.R. now presents itself as a liberator of the Ukrainian people from the German yoke."

### Moscow's "Russianizing" Policy in Ukraine

Evidently in keeping with its role as "liberator" of the Ukrainian people, Moscow has of late relaxed somewhat its traditional policy of not recognizing the Ukrainians as a separate nationality.

The policy was inaugurated by Peter I. It was his ambition as well as that of his successors to create by a centralizing and levelling process a great Russian Empire, peopled by one homogeneous ethnic and lingual Russian people. And so we find Catherine II writing in her secret instructions to the senate president, A. M. Viazemsky, that it was necessary to uproot in Ukraine the "immoral idea that they (the Ukrainians) are a nation completely different from ours" and to fight "against their false and improper republican ideas." Thus began a campaign, marked by heavy-handed oppression, to eradicate the various national differences existing between the Russians and the Ukrainian. It also included the prohibition of the Ukrainian language for any literary purposes. At the same time, using all possible agencies, including her historians, Russia sedulously fostered the impression, both within and outside her borders, that the Ukrainians were but "Little Russians," a member of the Russian family, while the Ukrainian language was but a dialect of the Russian tongue.

When the Soviets came into power they found that despite severe Tsarist oppression and denationalization, Ukrainian national consciousness was higher than ever. Moreover it had been one of the chief forces behind the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic. And though the latter collapsed before the combined might of its enemies, it remained an inspiration to the Ukrainian people. So until their hold was firmly established upon Ukraine, and to partially offset their violent political repression and economic exploitation of it, for awhile the Soviets allowed the Ukrainians certain cultural concessions. But even these concessions were illusory, for everything had to conform to Communist ideology. Finally, however, in the early 1930's—preceding the fatal Moscow-directed famine in Ukraine whose toll ran into several millions—the Soviets abandoned their Ukrainization policy and reverted to the traditional Russianizing policy there.

As a result, very little was heard of Ukraine or Ukrainians under Kremlin rule. It was all "Russia" and "Russians."

### Recent "Recognition" of Ukrainians

Of late, however, Kremlin propaganda has taken on a new turn.

Its press handouts contain an increasing number of references to Ukraine and Ukrainians, which find their reflection on the pages of our American press. Likewise there is special praise in them for the valiant way in which the Ukrainians have battled the Nazis.

It is interesting to speculate upon the purposes of this "recognition" of the Ukrainians. Several explanations suggest themselves. First, it may be intended to demonstrate to world opinion that the people of pre-war Polish-occupied Western Ukraine—the center of the Soviet-Polish border dispute—are of the same race and nationality as those of Soviet Ukraine proper; ergo, the Polish claims to Western Ukraine are unfounded and the western Ukrainians ought to remain reunited with the eastern Ukrainians, under Soviet rule. Secondly, it may be intended to persuade world opinion that the Ukrainians are enthusiastic about Soviet "freedom" and "democracy," and that in driving the Nazis out of Ukraine they were striving to preserve Soviet rule and order, and, of course, the "Union" as well; consequently, any talk of a free and independent Ukraine, no matter how convincing, is just so much foreign intrigue and bosh. Finally, the purpose of this Moscow "recognition" of the Ukrainians may be an attempt to persuade them that with their national identity officially "acknowledged" by the Soviets and with certain linguistic and cultural "concessions" granted them, they ought to be satisfied, happy and even merry under the benign Stalin rule.

Though such propaganda may delude the naive or the misinformed, it cannot obscure the realities of the situation: that, for example, the Soviet Russian regime cruelly mistreated the Ukrainians before the war; that in the early 1930's it deliberately used a famine, the toll of which ran into several million lives, to break down Ukrainian opposition to Soviet policies; and that, as Harold Denny, former Moscow correspondent of the *New York Times*, wrote before the war, "Ukraine has been the field of a strong nationalist movement from the beginning of the revolution." Finally, as was written in the London published *Contemporary Review* back in October, 1941—

"The conflict which broke out in 1939 in Europe, Totalitarianism versus Democracy, gave the hope to the Ukrainians of some possibility of seeing their country and people free again in some not too distant future. Whoever the Ukrainians may be and wherever they may be found, they all have one main desire: to see their freedom restored, not only on paper, but in fact."

### **Why Stalin Refused to Part with Western Ukraine**

All this is known among the well informed. Stalin, a realist, is well acquainted with the dynamic qualities of the centuries-old Ukrainian national movement. Back in 1934, at the 17th congress of the Communist Part, he warned against it and called it a "grave danger." He has combatted it with all the force at his disposal. And now, on its account, he is resolved to retain Western Ukraine which before the war was under Poland and which last year the Soviets reoccupied after having lost it to the Nazis when the latter attacked them and broke up the 1939 Soviet-Nazi agreement partitioning pre-war Poland and giving Western Ukraine to the Reds.

As Anne O'Hare McCormick wrote in her New York Times column a year ago, the "Ukrainian question is perhaps the strongest reason for the claim of the Soviet Union to the territory east of the so-called Curzon line (because) Stalin is resolved not to have any possible springboards for Ukrainian independence movements on the border of the Soviet Ukraine."

That is why now, following the Yalta conference, Stalin must be quite a contented man. For his hold upon Western Ukraine has been made secure by the Curzon line decision made at the conference. Now he has all of Ukraine in his grip. To be sure, there is still the small Carpatho Ukraine, but he is bound to get it eventually, in one form or another.

Now with practically all of Ukraine under Kremlin rule, the Ukrainian problem is definitely an internal Soviet problem, to be dealt with in any manner that Kremlin sees fit. No longer is there Ukrainian territory of any appreciable size upon which Ukrainian national life can exist today free of Moscow control. Eastern Galicia itself, the core of Western Ukraine and the Piedmont of the Ukrainian independence movement, is now firmly in Soviet hands. Behind the impenetrable barriers which the Red rulers have erected between their domains and the outside world, they will once more, as they did before the war, liquidate, purge, imprison, and starve those Ukrainians who aspire to national freedom, and who know from history and bitter experience that under Moscow domination there can never be a free Ukraine.

### **Ukrainians Tougher and More Determined Today**

To be sure, this time the traditional anti-Ukrainian policies of Moscow are likely to encounter far greater opposition than was possible



before the war. For, as Edgar Snow recently wrote from Kiev in the *Saturday Evening Post* ("Ukraine Pays the Bill"), though the whole titanic struggle in Eastern Europe is dismissed by some as "the Russian glory," still "in all truth and in many costly ways (it) has been first of all a Ukrainian war." The Ukrainians have fought too much and suffered too much in this war not to have emerged from it a tougher and more determined people.

The Ukrainian peasant himself, before the war browbeaten, terrorized and starved by the commissars and the OGPU, is today no ordinary man. Today he is a battle-scarred veteran of Stalingrad, of the bloody campaigns on the steppes, in the Western Ukraine, and now on the approaches to Berlin. Today, too, he is probably feeling a resurgence within himself of the old Kozak spirit and glory.

Moreover, if as it is generally recognized, the nationalism of the Russian today is on the rise, so by the same token is the nationalism of this Ukrainian, even though Moscow has done its best to stifle it in him.

All this the framers of the Yalta agreement should have borne in mind, together with its very probable repercussions on post-war peace in Eastern Europe. As the situation stands today, prospects of post-war peace and order there rest on very shaky foundations.

### Hopeless Polish Propaganda

While on this subject of the Soviet-Polish dispute over the ultimate fate of Western Ukraine, worth considering is the Polish angle of it. They have taken the stand that Western Ukraine is really Eastern Poland, inhabited by Poles. At least that is what has appeared in their propaganda. To be sure, there are many among them who can be considered as die-hards, i.e. they still stubbornly refuse to acknowledge the very existence of the Ukrainians as such. A more sober section of the Poles, however, no doubt realizes very well that Western Ukraine is not Polish but Ukrainian. Probably they would be willing to admit the fact. But to do so would be to play directly into the hands of the Soviets. For the latter are simply saying that the western Ukrainians should be allowed to live with the eastern Ukrainians. So the Poles simply ignore that fact and playing on the misinformation in this country of the true issues involved in Eastern Europe, they completely ignore the very existence of the western Ukrainians, and that about 25% of pre-war Poland's territory is not Polish but Ukrainian, inhabited by well over six million Ukrainians. And that is true not only of the run-of-the-mill

propagandists but of the former Prime Minister of the Polish-government-in-exile, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk himself.

Writing in the August 12, 1944 number of Collier's weekly magazine, Mikolajczyk pleaded "The Case for Poland" very movingly, and coming down to the Soviet-Polish border dispute, which actually involves Western Ukraine, he solemnly invoked the Atlantic Charter that "there shall be no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned." In the same breath, however, he expressly referred to Western Ukraine as Eastern Poland, and to the Ukrainians who dwell there in by far the great majority as—Poles. What is more, nowhere in his entire article did he even refer to the Ukrainians or Ukraine as such. He simply ignored them.

Certainly in the Soviet-Polish border dispute the Ukrainians are "the people concerned" most. Certainly, if the principles of the Atlantic Charter are to prevail, the Ukrainians should be given the opportunity of freely expressing their wishes on any proposed territorial changes. They should be given the chance to say whether they would prefer Polish rule or Soviet rule, or whether they would prefer to revive their independent democratic Ukrainian National Republic of a quarter of a century ago.

But neither the Poles nor the Soviets show the least sign of allowing the principles over which this war is being fought to be applied to the Ukrainian nation. For they well know that if given the chance the Ukrainians there would declare for national independence. And so today we have the sight of the Soviet rulers making a great show of the fictitious Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic—which is not a republic, as it is dominated by Kremlin and in it there is no individual and national liberty but only totalitarian rule and oppression.

And so we also have the sight of the Poles—today engaged in an unprincipled propaganda drive aimed at creating the impression abroad that the Ukrainians are not in the least involved in the Soviet-Polish border dispute, and, in fact, that there are no Ukrainians in that vital region at all.

#### **Ukrainian American Appeal to President Roosevelt**

Seeing their kinsmen in Ukraine gagged or misrepresented by those who rule or would rule them, Americans of Ukrainians descent have from time to time appealed to Washington to take cognizance of the plight of the Ukrainians and to intercede on their behalf, just as it has done in the case of other oppressed nationality groups in Europe.

One such appeal was dispatched to President Roosevelt last October by Stephen Shumeyko, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. Its text follows:

Mr. President:

Deeply concerned as you are with securing peace in post-war Europe, you received last Wednesday, October 11, the Memorial Committee of the Polish American Congress and listened to its view on, among other things, the future eastern boundaries of Poland.

Since before the war, the eastern boundaries of Poland embraced Western Ukraine with its some seven million Ukrainian population, we believe that for the same reason that you heard the Polish American delegation you will likewise give heed to the Ukrainian American view on those boundaries, as expressed below by the undersigned Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which represents communities, organizations and parishes throughout the country composed of both older and younger generation Americans of Ukrainian descent, the older generation being born and raised in Western Ukraine and the younger generation here in America.

At the very outset we are obliged to call your attention to a very important fact which, judging by press reports, the Polish American delegation unconscionably and completely ignored in its inferential references to the current Soviet-Polish border dispute. That fact is that the preponderant majority of the population involved in the Soviet-Polish border dispute is neither Polish, as the Polish delegation would have it appear, nor Russian, but purely Ukrainian, approximately seven million in number, and an integral part of the over 40 million Ukrainian nation which before the war was mostly under Soviet or Polish occupation.

Although it is their fate that hinges on the outcome of the border dispute and although actually they are a third and certainly the most important party to it, these seven million Western Ukrainians are denied, by those who rule them, or by those who pretend to speak for them, the slightest opportunity of freely expressing their will in the matter. Obviously that is contrary to the Atlantic Charter which clearly and unmistakably lays down as a principle the right of a people to determine their political destiny.

May we respectfully remind you, Mr. President, that denial to the Western Ukrainian population involved in the Soviet-Polish border

dispute of the right to express their will concerning it, will make impossible any just and permanent settlement of the dispute.

Moreover, it will leave the post-war situation there fraught with considerable danger to peace, for a people who are bartered away by the powers that be without the slightest regard to their wishes and rights are bound to be restive. Pre-war history of the Ukrainian people under both Soviet and Polish domination abounds with evidence of such restiveness, especially in times when the foreign occupants of their native land subjected the Ukrainians to oppression and "pacifications" in Western Ukraine and to purges, forced labor, and terrible man-made famines in Eastern Ukraine. Similar evidence can also be found during the recent period of Nazi occupation of Ukraine when the Ukrainian people constantly fought against and harassed their brutal occupants and did not produce from their midst even a single quisling.

Since, however, the Ukrainians over there are denied an opportunity to express their sentiments concerning their post-war fate, and since, moreover, Polish propaganda virtually ignores the very existence of the Ukrainians as such, while Communist propaganda would have the world believe that the Ukrainians under Soviet rule are a happy and contented lot, we, their American kinsmen, removed from them at most by one generation and in the great majority of cases bound to them by family ties, are conscience-bound to speak out in their behalf, as we have so often done in the past.

Accordingly we earnestly petition you, Mr. President, to recommend to the Allied conferences in Washington, London, and Moscow on matters relating to the Soviet-Polish border dispute that, in order to promote peace and security in post-war Eastern Europe, a plebiscite be held in the territory involved in the dispute, namely, Western Ukraine, for the purpose of determining the true wishes of the population therein on the question of their national allegiance.

In order, however, that the proposed plebiscite in Western Ukraine be fair and convincing, in order that, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, it constitute "the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned," we respectfully suggest that it be held without the presence of Soviet or Polish troops or police, and with local order to be maintained by a United Nations police force, recruited from nationals of countries that have no direct interest in the outcome of the vote.

It is our deep conviction, based on our intimate knowledge of our kinsmen and relatives in Western Ukraine, that the plebiscite we pro-

pose would clearly reveal that the Ukrainians there prefer neither Polish nor Soviet Russian rule, but only free and independent Ukrainian rule. And this they would attain only if they would be permitted to reassert their centuries-old freedom-loving traditions by invoking the historic Act of November 1, 1918 establishing the Western Ukrainian Republic, and the historic Act of January 22, 1919, uniting their republic with the Ukrainian National Republic, and proceed as then, twenty-five years ago, to unite themselves with their fellow kinsmen of Eastern Ukraine and establish, within Ukrainian ethnographic boundaries and embodying the entire 40 million Ukrainian nation, a free and independent and sovereign Ukrainian national state, founded on the traditionally Ukrainian democratic principles, and living in peace, security, and close economic collaboration with the neighboring states.

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



## BOOK REVIEWS

**PEOPLE, CHURCH AND STATE IN MODERN RUSSIA** by *Paul B. Anderson*, pp. 240. *The Macmillan Co., New York, 1944.*

In what purports to be an analytical examination rather than an historical presentation of the relationships between the people, church, and state in contemporary "Russia", it becomes manifestly clear that the author in his obviously sincere striving for impartiality and objectivity is prepared to sacrifice inner meaning for the outer word, the inward spirit for the outward flesh. This general comment is best justified by his unqualified and somewhat naive reliance on such verbal constructs as the traditional version of "Russian" history, the Soviet Constitution of 1936, the Atlantic Charter, and similar fabrications of hidden motives.

The ultimate aim of this eloquent work is to provide a basis of understanding whereby foreign nations can receive in a spirit of confidence and goodwill the people and government of the Soviet Union. This is to be achieved approximately through a sympathetic knowledge of the institutional fabric of the Soviet state. The noble purpose of such an approach, which is typical of most recent American interpretations of the Soviet Union, is irreproachable, and the author painstakingly supplies considerable documentary evidence to realize his aims in the most authoritative manner possible. The chief weakness of his approach, however, lies in the fact that the charitable nature of his aims exceeds in power the critical evaluation of the material he employs.

Firstly, the title of this work is in reality a misnomer. Evidently bred in the old Russian version of East European history, the author literally confuses the Ukrainian people with the Russian (p. 166), this despite the corrective scholarship of liberal Russian thinkers themselves and the official recognition given by the Soviet government to the cultural and national distinctiveness of the Ukrainian people. This characteristic failure on the part of American interpreters of the Soviet Union to distinguish historically and culturally the peoples of this state has produced nothing but a heap of inaccuracies and untruths which only time and education will erase. The analytic part of this work is discolored by the same misinterpretation.

Secondly, although the author's factual treatment of the developments in the Russian Church immediately prior to and after the Revolution is highly revealing and informative, especially concerning the reform movement and the Bolshevik persecutions, his interpretative generalizations prove to be exceedingly shallow and almost artificially contrived. Fully cognizant of the doctrinal irreconcilability between a Christian Church and a Marxist state, he nevertheless declares that "the state is the unquestioned master, but both Church and people find themselves peculiarly integrated into the very life of the state (p. 231)." It requires little imagination to perceive that the temporary "unity" of people, church, and state in the Soviet Union today has been produced by Nazi Germany and not by any internal reconciliation between church and state. If the Russian Church is to remain true to the teachings of Christ and Orthodox philosophy which elevate the sacred freedom of the individual persons above all else, no amount of verbal sophistry can possibly establish grounds of rapprochement between the Orthodox Church and a collectivist Marxist government that openly teaches the submergence of the individual in the collective whole. The two cannot as such function side by side in a period of time, a major point which the author refuses to recognize.

A third point worthy of mention is the author's truly naive dependence on the text of the Soviet Constitution of 1936, to which he refers almost religiously time and time again. But here, too, fact gives the lie to the word. Any government predicated on a planned socialist economy, which experientially, as in Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, has necessarily led to the deprivation of personal freedom, labor battalions, political dictatorship in a one-party system, and the multiple activities of ruthless totalitarian suppression, can hardly be regarded as democratic in function, although it may appear so, as the German Reichstag, in form. The author is fully aware of this, but to convey the best favorable impression possible, he evidently chooses to indulge in word-juggling when he refers to the "Freedoms in the Soviet Constitution" as "conditional". Such intellectual concessions do not contribute to a frank understanding of the totalitarian Soviet Union.

Finally, this entire mode of thought, aiming to harmonize the relationships of the people and Church and state in the Soviet Union, reaches its climax when the author endeavors to externalize his theme by establishing a common ground between the Soviet Union and its war-time allies in his correlation of the Soviet Constitution and the Atlantic Charter. In a real sense he is correct inasmuch as both con-

stitute an idealistic facade for the time-worn play of power politics as events in Europe so well demonstrate today. His striking unrealism illuminates solely the idealistic affinity that exists between the two verbal groups of words heaps. Perhaps at no point does the unrealistic tenor of the author's treatment crystallize itself than here. Apparently, similar to his lack of concern for the political and economic actualities of the Soviet state, the rape of Finland, the general submergence of small nations, and the progressing formation of power-politic spheres of influence in Europe by the allies are also of no importance to Mr. Anderson.

Permeated as his general treatment is with the Christian spirit of conciliation and charity, it remains essentially weak due to his failure to uphold Christian thinking by always relating word and deed. Only in this manner can a firm basis of understanding for human harmony be achieved. This attempt fails to produce it.

*Lev Dobriansky*  
New York University

"THE TIME FOR DECISION" by *Sumner Welles*, Harper & Bros.  
1944. \$3.00, 431 pp.

This is undoubtedly the most expert book written on the subject of U. S. foreign policy. And little wonder, having been written not by only a diplomat, but a "diplomat's diplomat", Mr. Welles's career being long, diversified and successful, and what is most important: very consequential and confidential during the crucial years from before the war up to only a little over a year ago.

Much revealing material is presented on the subject of inter-American relations and the Good Neighbor Policy, and it would be well for some other author to elaborate this subject so as to give Mr. Welles full credit for the major part which he played in them, the credit for which, out of modesty, he passes on to others. His greatest skill as a diplomat comes to light in the chapter "My Mission to Europe: 1940", for although the mission was unsuccessful in accomplishment—neither the President, nor Mr. Welles himself believed it could accomplish a termination of the war—nevertheless Mr. Welles gathered so much first hand and first class material on his voyage, that it may be deemed the most successful fact and trend gathering mission undertaken by an American diplomat since Benjamin Franklin.

Being a good diplomat, Mr. Welles is a very cold realist, and although he attributes much sentimentalism and idealism to the Ameri-



can people and their public opinion, he himself is never carried away from the path of necessity by feeling. This brings us to the most important chapter of book from the viewpoint of Ukrainians: "The Constructive Power of the U. S. S. R." The title itself implies an "a priori" benign attitude toward the Soviet Union and most of its undertakings, since it is an ally for whom and with whom a better understanding is sought by the author in the interest of the future peace. One may venture the statement that on this subject Mr. Welles is least qualified to speak since he has had no first hand experience with anything Russian, with the exception of Ambassador Oumansky.

For this reason much historical and factual material on the Soviet Union and its component nationalities is distorted. For example on p. 311 Mr. Welles states that by the Treaty of Riga "much of the Ukraine was wrested from her," forgetting to mention that the most important and most populous part, i. e. Galicia, had never before been a part of any Russia. Likewise in enumerating on the same page the various countries which seceded from Russia (or "provinces" as he calls them) Mr. Welles never mentions a word about Ukraine's armed struggle for freedom during the years 1917-1921. In fact, Mr. Welles mentions Ukraine only twice in his whole book, once as just quoted, and the second time on p. 320 in connection with "The German Army's perpetual ambition to rob Russia of the Ukraine". This latter problem is certainly of the category on which more light should have been shed in the interest of acquainting American opinion with internal conditions of the Soviet Union. While it is true that Germany has for a long time had imperialistic designs on Ukraine, it is also true, that Germany would not be the first one to rob Ukraine. Ukraine has in the first place been robbed by Russia, and from its only rightful owners, the Ukrainians themselves, therefore all subsequent plans of conquest of Ukraine must be termed as "robbing the robber."

From Mr. Welles's appraisal of the Soviet Union and its future, there is no hope for the Ukrainians to assert themselves as a nation at all. On the contrary, he predicts that Pan-Slavism, as an instrument of Russian foreign policy will soon again play an important part. This is as much as to say that all Slavonic people of Europe will be forced to join the Soviet Union, where they will be forcibly russified under the renascent Russian nationalism. If such prospects are in conformity with the Atlantic Charter, or if they are anything better than the peace after World War I brought Europe, then God help the next generation.

*Roman Olesnicki.*

**RUSSIA AND THE PEACE**, by Sir Bernard Pares. 293 pp. Macmillan. New York, 1944.

In his preface to *Russia and the Peace* Sir Bernard Pares dedicates the book to the Hon. Joseph E. Davies, for having with the aid of his *Mission to Moscow* "opened that door" to a better understanding of the Soviets. In his own book Pares attempts to open that door still wider. He does this from the strong conviction that to British imperial power and interests the support of the victorious and powerful Russia is indispensable. Obsessed as he is with this idea he sacrifices in his latest work all the scholarliness and objectiveness that one naturally would expect of him.

In the twenty three chapters of his book, Pares touches upon practically every issue and problem that might create distrust and misunderstanding between Soviet Russia and the Anglo-Saxon democratic world. Among them are the danger of the spread of Communism, the Soviet anti-religious policies, and also the Soviet enslavement of nationalities. He considers, too, the grave problem involved in the struggle of the Ukrainian people for national freedom. All of them, however, problems and issues alike, he decides in favor of the dictatorial Soviet regime, and attempts to quiet Anglo-Saxon doubts with the assurance that they all have been "settled."

There is no question but that Pares knows Russia better than the average British scholar or statesman; nevertheless his views on Russia are definitely one-sided. For though he has had wide acquaintance with the Tsarist and then the Soviet ruling caste, he actually has had no real contacts with the non-Russian masses within the domains of the Soviet state, although he mentions the masses, the peasants throughout his book very often. As a result he cannot really appreciate the importance of the nationality problems of both Tsarist and Red Russia. This is the weakest feature of his book.

When this reviewer, son of a Western Ukrainian farmer and an eyewitness of the 1914 Russian invasion of Galicia and of the unparalleled Russian oppression of the Ukrainian people, reads in Sir Bernard's book that Western Ukraine is populated by "Russian peasants" and that the invading Russian armies in 1914 brought with them a "spirit of liberation," he is torn between amusement and sorrow that such misinformation is peddled about in these highly crucial times to Anglo-Saxon readers.

Sir Bernard punctuates the text of his book with various historical

references and arguments. His views on Eastern European history, however, are definitely out of date and replete with the anachronisms of the official Tsarist Russian historiography. Moreover some of his historical deductions are so ambiguous or vague that it is hard to determine exactly what position he is taking.

Thus after reading the book one gets the impression that in line with the reactionary Russian historians of Tsarist times Sir Pares does not consider the Ukrainians and White Russians as independent nationalities but as Russians all. Yet in some places he brings out not only that the Ukrainians are different from the Russians but also that they are the true descendants of the old Kievan Rus. Then, to add to the confusion, he reverts to the archaic idea of the one and indivisible Russia and proceeds to identify the ancient Ukrainian Kievan State Rus of the ninth to the fourteenth centuries with the medieval Muscovy and modern Russia.

Now when some journalist or dabbler in historical writing confuses Rus with Russia, he can be forgiven; but certainly not if he is a professional historian, who should know that the two terms are not identical, that from the old Kievan Rus came not modern Russia but Ukraine, and that "Rusin" is not a Russian but actually a Ukrainian.

For the beginnings of Russia, i.e. Muscovy, Sir Bernard fails to go back to the Suzdal-Muscovian principality, as do the modern Russian historians (Presniakov, etc.). Instead he searches for them in Kiev on the Dnieper, merely because the first dynasty of the Suzdal-Muscovian principality of Russia came from Rus-Ukraine. If this procedure were followed in the case of English history, one would begin the latter in Germany, Denmark and France, from which the first English dynasties came in that order.

Strangely enough in his references to the Russian history of the 14-17th centuries Pares does not call the ancestors then of the present-day Russians by their proper name, one by which they were then exclusively known among their contemporaries—Muscovites. Certainly the author well knows that Muscovy became Russia when Peter I named it so, with the intention of seizing from Poland the Ukrainian and White Ruthenian lands which had once belonged to the Ukrainian Kievan Rus.

Pares is also guilty in his book of following the long outmoded Russian theory of migrations, inaugurated by the Russian historian Pogodin of the 19th century, that the Muscovites or the Russians are

descended from an intermingling of the Finnish and Ukrainian races, the latter of whom, Pogodin held, had migrated northward from Ukraine during the Tartar invasions of the 13th century. Anthropological researches have refuted Pogodin's assumption quite some time ago.

Without any basis, too, is the assertion of Pares that the term "Ruthenian" is of rather recent German origin. On the contrary, the term can be found in the 12th, and 13th centuries and later in the Latin chronicles of all of Western Europe and not of Germany exclusively. For example, the Hungarian chronicles of the 12th century refer to the Carpathians as "Alpes Ruthenorum," while the English chronicles of the 13th century, such as the *Chronica Burtonensis* and *Chronica Mathei Pares (Parisiensis)* designate the Ukrainians as Rutheni, f. i. Petrus Archiepiscopus Ruthenus. In thousand of Western European documents Ukrainians and White Ruthenians of the Middle Ages appear under the name "Rutheni."

Only a lack of space prevents us from pointing out here the many historical mistatements to be found in "Russia and the Peace." Suffice it to point out here, however, that no Soviet historian of any repute today holds to the views of Sir Bernard Pares; on the contrary, all of them regard Ukraine as having its own independent prehistory and historical traditions. Moreover, unlike Pares they do not look upon Ukraine as some "borderland" of Muscovy (or of Poland).

In all fairness, however, it should be stated here that where Pares does not dwell upon Russian imperialism or upon the Russian-oppressed nationalities, his views are sound, based on academic knowledge and personal observation. Thus he is correct in concluding that Soviet Russia is no longer a communistic state, but that it is now a Russian nationalistic state with a socialistic economic order, in other words, a Russian truly national-socialist state. He is correct too in his conclusion that the current Soviet truce with the Church is genuine. To be sure, the truce is only with the Russian Orthodox Church, as that is the only Church that can serve Russian nationalistic interests well.

In his effort to open the door to a better understanding and a warmer appreciation of the Russians, Pares cites in the book the friendship to Russia and Russians in the past of such Englishmen as Giles Fletcher and Harold William Wallace. In this connection it is worth noting that as early as the 12th century the Ukrainians, too, had Anglo Saxon friends, such as those Scottish members of the Benedictine Order who were then laboring in Kiev. Of Scotch descent, too, was Colonel

Chechil, a famed Kozak leader and patriot. During the abortive revolt of Hetman Ivan Mazepa against the Russian rule of Ukraine in 1708, Chechil defended the capital of the Hetman Baturin against the troops of Peter I to the very end, until he was captured and quartered. Many other such instances of Anglo-Saxon interest in Ukrainians and their struggle for freedom could be cited.

*Nicholas D. Czubytyj*

**THE UKRAINE: A SUBMERGED NATION**, by *William Henry Chamberlin*, with index 99 pp., Macmillan, New York, 1944.

In his review of this book by Mr. Chamberlin in *The New York Times*, Bertram Wolfe summarized his otherwise complimentary judgment of it by declaring it to be not untimely even if unfashionable. Meanwhile a *New York Herald Tribune* critic, Foster Rhea Dulles,, concluded his review of the book with the blunt remark that through it Mr. Chamberlin "is creating a new and somewhat unreal issue which, if it were widely taken up, would only cause further distrust between Soviet Russia and the United States.

I can well understand why one gentleman calls it unfashionable and the other as unreal in the issue raised in it. In all truth Ukraine is like that proverbial skeleton in the closet, about which no one wants to talk, for the case of Ukraine is a vivid example of the yawning chasm that exists between the sonorous phrases of statesmen about democracy and liberation of enslaved nations and their actual policies which condemn a liberty-loving people to further enslavement.

"Unfashionable" or "unreal" though the Ukrainian issue may be labelled, however, the fact remains, as Mr. Chamberlin indicates, that the ghost of a bruised and shackled Ukraine will hover over the international council tables, a vivid reminder of the fact that although one form of tyranny has been destroyed, it has been at the cost of elevation of another form of tyranny. And who dares to challenge the latter over the fate of its chief victim—the Ukrainians, "a submerged nation"? Who will dare to speak on behalf those "crazy" nationalists, those younger and older men and women, both the lettered and unlettered, clergymen, teachers, writers, cooperatists, students, peasants who by the hundreds of thousands have mercilessly been driven from their homeland into forced labor and exile in the frozen north, the Siberian marshy forests, or the Turkestan deserts, there to perish sooner or later?

Though statesmen engrossed with the saving of all humanity for

freedom and democracy do not dare to raise the Ukrainian issue, Mr. Chamberlin does. A native American of the old-fashioned liberal, democratic type, who hates sham and hypocrisy and refuses to compromise with tyrants masquerading as liberators, Mr. Chamberlin takes up the cudgel for the Ukrainians. He knows them well, too. A keen and experienced observer he has travelled through Ukraine, together with his wife, who is a native of that country. And in connection with his studies and writings on East European affairs, which have made him an outstanding authority in this field, he has delved into much of what has been written about the Ukrainians in various languages. The result of his first hand observations and study is this excellent book on Ukraine.

It is not propaganda; not an "enthusiastic espousal" of Ukrainian nationalism, as it seems to be in the eyes of Mr. Dulles. No Ukrainian patriot, for example, will subscribe to the final conclusion of Mr. Chamberlin which visualizes the future of Ukraine as a free and really sovereign state in a liberal, truly democratic federation with Russia and the other Soviets republics. For every intelligent Ukrainian knows that such a truly democratic Russia is at best a utopian dream.

Democracy, liberalism and the tolerance of the Western World are products of about 2500 years of evolution. They were conceived in ancient Athens and Rome, even in the books of Moses and the Prophets. They were developed in the medieval days of chivalry and by free burghers. They were expounded by Reformators—Hussites, Huegenots, Pilgrims, by philosophers of the 17th and 18th centuries, by the truly great and idealistic revolutions of Europe and America. Ukraine fell heir to this evolution through her intercourse with the ancient Hellenic world, with the Normans, with Rome and the Western Reformation, with Poland, Bohemia, Germany, Italy and their universities up to the close of the 18th century when Ukraine was finally incorporated into the Russian empire.

No such evolution, however, took place in Muscovy, a typical Asiatic despotic state, up to the 19th century. Democracy and tolerance are not born overnight, not even over one generation. It takes generations and centuries to cause them to flower. Consequently not even a Kerensky or Miliukov would agree to a really free Ukrainian state—albeit in federation with Russia.

Therefore the characteristically American idea of Mr. Chamberlin of a free federation of truly free Soviet states is utopian. It would be

easier to establish a separate, entirely independent Ukrainian national state, than to achieve any real freedom and sovereignty in a union with Muscovy (Russia proper.)

From the purely literary viewpoint I cannot help but express my admiration for Mr. Chamberlin's mastery of a vast amount of Ukrainian historical material, of his compact arrangement of this material within the dimensions of less than ninety pages, and of the penlightness with which he presents this material to the reader. Moreover, in reading it one cannot escape the impression that the author is writing directly from personal observation and experience.

In his appraisal of Ukrainian history the author infers that as a peasant race the Ukrainians are somewhat handicapped as state-builders. And yet universal history is not lacking of examples of rural populations in that rôle. Spartans, Romans, the Boers of South Africa, and even the founders of the United States of America were originally farmer peoples who laid the foundations of their states. On the other hand, there is no denying the difficulties inherent in such a process, especially when the rising state, as was the case with Ukraine several times, is threatened with extinction at the hands of powerful greedy neighbors.

It should be remembered that when Bohdan Khmelnytsky succeeded in the 17th century in establishing the Ukrainian Kozak State, it was because he had aiding him two state-minded classes: landed Kozak yeomanry, used to self-rule and well organized militarily, and a numerous class of still existing Ukrainian nobility which had not as yet allowed itself to become denationalized for the sake of royal privileges and the like. Bohdan himself was descended of nobility, and almost all of his collaborators belonged to it, including colonels, generals, ministers and justices. One of the most popular figures of Ukrainian folk songs, Colonel Moroz-Morozenko, a Kozak chieftain was a son of a governor in the service of the Polish monarch while he himself was a Doctor of Laws of Paduan University and a former Polish senator. Another great Ukrainian leader, Ivan Mazepa, who attempted to free his country from Russian domination, was also of noble blood, being descended of the ancient family of Koledynskys. Paul Skoropadsky's hetmandom of the year 1918 was an attempt to base the Ukrainian state on a similar foundation.

*Dr. Longin Cehelsky.*

U. S. WAR AIMS, by Walter Lippmann. Little, Brown & Co., 235 pp. \$1.50.

The plans and aims outlined in Walter Lippmann's "U. S. War Aims" might as well have been entitled "Peace Plans for the World," because the book does not in any way propose to tell how to conduct and end the war successfully. It rather takes as a certain premise the fact that the war is almost already won, and proposes to clear in the mind of the reader, what the war aims of the United States (and Allies) have been, and under what circumstances there will not again arise a necessity to formulate new war aims. As, however, the ultimate aim of any war is to arrive at peace, so Mr. Lippmann's thesis in calling plans for achieving and maintaining peace "War Aims" must be deemed correct.

These war aims are defined in the shortest and most lucid chapter of the book: "XII. war aims, then and now." They are compressed into just six points, the brief mention of which will give the reader an idea of how Mr. Lippmann proposes to solve the problem of peace. They are for the United States to: 1. Consolidate the existing strategic and diplomatic connections of the Atlantic Community. 2. Recognize the strategic system of the Russian Orbit, making known to the Soviet government the dependence of world organization on their maintaining at home the democratic principles which they wish to advance abroad. 3. Recognize China as the center of a strategic system in East Asia. 4. Recognize that the Moslem and Hindu nations will in due time form their own regional systems. 5. Prevent Japan from ever holding the balance of power in Asia, and Germany in Europe. 6. Extinguish the war parties and protect the peace parties, by making the defeat irrevocable and the peace acceptable.

The above summary proves that Mr. Lippmann is one of the few political writers who does not indulge in toying with the idea of definite balance-of-power system, as do many others, fondly reminiscing in the Congress of Vienna of 1815 and its political aftermath in Europe.

Although Mr. Lippman does not hold out much hope for small states' independence, especially in Europe, being of the opinion that such states are possible only within the orbit of the Atlantic Community, where "facts of international life conform with the Atlantic Charter," nevertheless he would not permit the Soviet Union to do just as it pleases, even within the so called "Russian Orbit." The second point of the above-mentioned war aims, which deals exclusively with the Soviet Union, makes it explicit that "collaboration in a general world



organization will be true and free, or restricted and dubious, depending upon how far the member states—particularly the most powerful ones—maintain at home the democratic liberties which they wish to see advanced abroad." This must be admitted to be a bold statement addressed to the Soviet Union, and coupled with Mr. Lippmann's assertion elsewhere that: "democratic provisions of the constitution have never yet been made operative in Soviet Russia," we can hope that post-war collaboration with the Soviet Union will be made contingent upon this Soviet Union making all provisions of its constitution operative. Including the provision carried in all Soviet constitutions no matter how many times changed, that "the autonomous Soviet Ukrainian Republic has all rights of a sovereign State, including the right of secession from the Soviet Union."

*R. Olesnicki*



## UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN AND BRITISH PERIODICALS

THE FORTNIGHTLY, London, September, 1944. "The U. S. S. R.: Empire or Common-Wealth?" by Walter I. Kolarz.

"Russia cannot be measured by the common rule, which means by European Standards." This idea expressed by Mr. Kolarz is a password to the proper understanding of all problems of the Soviet Union. In his frank "Report on the Russians" William H. White makes a similar observation, when confronted with statements by a Soviet official to the effect that the Soviet Union enjoys an ideal freedom of the press. Similar thoughts likely strike the minds of American diplomats when they exchange views on Soviet democracy with Mr. Molotoff.

All Soviet freedoms: of the press, religion, democracy and Soviet federation are of one type. They are Russian and cannot be measured by European standards, just as neither the Soviet constitution of 1936 nor the widening of the republics' autonomies of 1943 can be measured by that standard or taken literally. Mr. Kolarz's analysis of the Soviet Union arrives at conclusions which resemble those of other competent observers of the Soviet Union like W. H. Chamberlin, Max Eastman, Wm. L. White, namely, that in spite of superficial federative forms, the Soviet Union is at core a completely centralized state organism. The cementing factor in this centralization is the Communist party. Hence economics are planned on "All-Union" scale. Russian culture is predominant in the whole Union in spite of concessions in favor of local national groups. "What looked at from a distance"—says the author—"seems to be 'Karelian,' 'Moldavian,' or 'Kazakh,' is in reality Russian."

This Soviet policy naturally caused the fiercest conflict in Ukraine, where national consciousness attained the highest level of all Soviet nations. It is pertinent to quote the author on this subject extensively. "In the course of a prolonged and very hard struggle between 1928 and 1937 Ukrainian political and cultural life was purged of all anti-Russian tendencies and finally . . . the Ukraine was placed under leaders whose reliability from an All-Union point of view, was beyond question. All attempts aiming at a super-Ukrainization of the Soviet Ukraine and elimination of the Russian language even when its use was justified and

advantageous, were completely checked. It was also insured that the Ukrainian and White Russian languages should not borrow too many expressions from the West Slavonic languages and that Russian or international expressions should be adopted . . . All contrary trends in White Russian and Ukrainian scientific life were stamped out as counter-revolutionary."

Otherwise Mr. Kolarz acknowledges the Communists' help in promoting the cultures of various nations in the Soviet Union. An explanation on this subject is due, however, throwing more light on the non-European standards of Russia: Moscow permits the growth of cultures of nations on a low level of civilization and of those lacking traditions of independence, but at the same time it retards and pollutes the cultures of nations who have traditions of greatness and independence. The former cannot be of danger to the totality of the Soviet Union, the latter could become dangerous. Therefore Ukraine, White Ruthenia, old and cultured Uzbekistan are exposed to the suppression of their independent national cultures, as they could grow into dangerous competitors of the official leading Russian culture. Such are the real components of "ethnic democracy," which is a frequent topic of conversation of statesmen and politicians (American included) who are either ignorant of, or confused as to, a different standard of all measures and ideas, when applied to Russia.

• • •

The January 1945 issue of the same magazine contains "The Problem of Poland" by Sir I. A. R. Marriot, touching upon the question of the Polish-Russian boundary dispute. The author upholds Poland's claims, stating that the line proposed by Poland "was virtually identical with the line of the 1793 partition, leaving to Russia all . . . that was indisputably Russian." One can seriously question whether the 2nd Treaty of Poland's partition between Russia and Prussia took into consideration such a fine point that territories east of the then established boundary were "indisputably Russian" and west of same "disputable." Both sides of this boundary were then as now Ukrainian and White Ruthenian soil. The author further repeats an erroneous statement, that in 1920 Pilsudski waged a war of intervention against the Reds on behalf of the Whites, whereas it is a matter of historical fact that Pilsudski's Poland undertook the "March on Kiev" as an ally of independent democratic Ukraine.

• • •

The AMERICA's January 20, 1945 issue contains an article by R. A. Graham "Moscow Answers 'America's' Questions."

The answers are by Mr. Polyansky, Chairman of the Soviet Committee for all religious non-orthodox affairs, to questions previously published by "America" regarding the Catholic Faith in the Soviet Union. The answers were given to the Moscow representative of the Religious News Service. It would appear that there functions in Lviv a Ukrainian Catholic Seminary with an enrollment of 250 students. As there is no mention of any other theological school on territories of the Galician Province, it seems that the Soviets have dispensed with the other two Ukrainian Catholic Seminaries in Stanyslaviv and Peremyshl.

• • •

THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE, January 16, 1945, "Poland and the Atlantic Charter," by Walter Lippmann.

Mr. Lippmann who worked close to President Wilson at the time of his famous Fourteen Points, now proposes to scrap even the Atlantic Charter. In his own words he wishes to find a "constructive solution of the Polish problem, because no one has even ventured to indicate how it is to be settled." Unfortunately Mr. Lippmann has this time ventured into a field, where he displays a lack of knowledge of the most elementary facts. Mr. Lippmann calls Galicia, which is the main object of the Polish-Russian dispute "predominantly Russian territory." Authoritative statistics show the Russians to number 0.2% of the population, as against 68.3% of Ukrainians. This territory did not belong to Russia at any time, therefore it is ludicrous to talk of Russian "losing" or "recovering" this territory, which from the time of Poland's first partition in 1772 belonged to Austria until 1918, when the Ukrainian populace putting into practical effect Wilson's principles of self-determination seized power and established the Western Ukrainian Republic.

Most astonishing of all is that Mr. Lippmann opposes a just and democratic solution of the problem by plebiscite, claiming that: "there are few who are optimistic enough to think that the issue could be settled by a plebiscite in which the great majority of the eligible voters would be almost illiterate peasants who never participated in government or became used to do business of expressing their will at the ballot box." Mr. Lippmann is free to advocate an undemocratic solution of the Western Ukrainian problem by permitting Russia to occupy it by force, but this freedom does not include misinforming his American

readers with absurd statements. In order to be able to attempt a constructive solution of any problem, elementary facts of such problem must be mastered by the one making the attempt. Mr. Lippmann being apparently unacquainted with such basic facts and figures, we shall try to supply him with the most important of them.

a) Prior to the outbreak of the present war illiteracy in Western Ukraine was under 25%.

b) The Western Ukrainians were enfranchised in 1848 and have since then taken part in electing their local and state administration, therefore in three years they will celebrate a centenary of exercising their citizens' duties (if Russia will permit such a celebration).

c) There were in 1939 in Western Ukraine about 6500 cultural and educational societies (4500 Ukrainian, 1500 Polish and 500 Hebrew), most of them housed in their own buildings erected from voluntary contributions of peasants and workmen.

d) There were in 1939 about 7000 co-operative societies in Western Ukraine (5000 Ukrainian, 2000 Polish and Jewish) which organized the economic development of the region on sound democratic principles. Ukrainian cooperatives developed a high volume of export business, establishing firm relations with British markets, thanks to the high standards of their products.

e) Toward the end of World War I the Western Ukrainians gave tangible proof to their ability of expressing their will by creating a state organism out of the chaos of 1918, in the form of the Western Ukrainian Republic which during its existence was an island of order in this part of turbulent Europe. The Army of Western Ukraine, although almost unequipped was able to wage war on two fronts, against the Poles in the West and Communists (Reds) in the East, and though defeated by the superior allied equipped army of general Haller, was yet able to liberate Kiev from the Bolsheviks in 1919.



In connection with the foregoing comments on Mr. Lippmann's recent views, it would be well to quote some excerpts from an editorial in *THE CATHOLIC WORLD*, February 1945: "It seems incredible that one who collaborated on the Fourteen Points should come to speak of the principle of self-determination as an inducement to anarchy and chaos." And further: "He repudiated the idealistic principles which he had helped to formulate for Woodrow Wilson."

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, who stands for adherence to principles of morality in deciding international problems likewise criticises Mr. Lippmann for his abjuration of the intent and meaning of the Atlantic Charter.

• • •

Mr. Edgar Snow, famous for his reports from inside Russia, gives us one of the most penetrating and revealing reports in "Ukraine Pays the Bill," in *SATURDAY EVENING POST*, January 27, 1945. Here Mr. Snow tells the world in full and for the first time the all important fact heretofore completely overlooked, that the brunt of Russia's struggle against Germany was and is being borne by Ukraine. In other words, Ukraine pays the bill and Russia takes the credit. In spite of her tremendous sacrifices, Ukraine has no prospect of bettering her fate in the postwar world, being doomed to continue dragging out her existence under the yoke of Russian communism. It must be pointed out to Mr. Snow's special credit, that he makes a clear distinction between Russians and Ukrainians, as between two separate nations, a fact so far overlooked by many American journalists, by some out of ignorance, by some out of political purpose. Mr. Snow not only distinguishes Ukrainians from Russians, but is furthermore able to point out the boundaries of Ukraine from the Carpathians to the river Don.

The high points of Mr. Snow's factual material are: Ukraine lost about 25% of her population, which would amount to about 10 million people killed or scattered from the Atlantic through Europe and Siberia to the Pacific. Ukraine's material losses are even higher: her entire industrial plant is in ruins, her agriculture depleted of manpower, animal power and machinery, which were either transported to Siberia by Russians or to Germany by the Nazis. According to Mr. Snow's estimate the entire Soviet Union's material losses thus far in this war can be computed at 50 billion dollars, of which 40 billion is Ukraine's bill, and the remaining 10 billion Russia's and all the other Soviet Republics'.

Mr. Snow deserves warm thanks from the Ukrainian people for telling the world that it was their sacrifice which contributed most to the breaking of the Nazi tyranny. How little attention has been paid to this contribution by Ukraine can best be seen from the fact that today's world powers engaged in power politics have failed to apply the principles of the Atlantic Charter to Ukraine, forcibly annexing

Western Ukraine to the Soviet Union without giving the people a chance to express their willingness to be thus annexed.

THE COMMONWEAL of August 11, 1944 carries an article *Russia Pro and Con* by Waldemar Gurian, a professor of Notre Dame University, known as the author of the study, "Bolshevism: Theory and Practice." The theme of the article is that cooperation among U. S. A., Britain and the Soviet Union is possible. The author persistently identifies the Soviet Union with Russia, for reasons known to himself, as after the recent annexations the number of Russians in the Soviet Union has fallen to 49% of the increased alien populations. His term "Russian masses" does not make clear whether it refers to masses of Russian nationals, or masses of the whole Union. The author gives the Soviets credit for unifying the Western Ukrainians with others in the Union in spite of the local population's dissatisfaction with being forcibly annexed to the U.S.S.R.

The weakest spot of this article is its failure to see the national problems in the Soviet Union, especially of the most important Ukrainian problem, thus creating a rather vague picture of this partner of U.S.A. and Britain.

Among the timely observations of the author is that Communism is no longer a menace to capitalistic countries. The place of Communism has been taken over by Russian nationalism, which follows the path of Peter the Great rather than Lenin. Russian expansion in Europe was always achieved in agreement with Germany [pro Russian policies of Frederick the Great, Bismarck]. We might add that Russian nationalism inspires nationalisms in other peoples, and in order to keep them under control Russia cannot become democratic, but must remain an autocracy as she has been for the past 800 years.

**POLISH FACTS AND FIGURES.** Polish Government Information Center, New York, N. Y. 1944.

We have before us a series of propaganda pamphlets issued fortnightly, each containing one specific subject in each issue.

The Ukrainian Quarterly does not, and will not concern itself with publications of a purely propagandistic nature. In this case, however, an exception must be made, as "Polish Facts and Figures" in one of the latest issues (No. 13, December 10, 1944) quotes The Ukrainian Quarterly, and would therefore create an impression that it projects

its material objectively. The quotation taken from *The Ukrainian Quarterly* concerns anti-communist feelings in Galicia, and has hardly any connection with what the Polish Government wants Americans to believe about the City of Lviv (Lwow).

One of the first statements of the reviewed issue says: "Lwow had been founded in 1240 as a stronghold on the warpath of the Tatar hordes. Ever since 1340 the province of Lwow had been united with Poland." Our Polish "informants" forget to mention by whom the city was founded, and for what purpose. Therefore we shall supplement the missing information: it was founded by the Western Ukrainian King Daniel and named for his son Leo. The capital of the Western Ukrainian Kingdom being then Halycz, about 100 miles east of Lviv, it is obvious that the new fortress city could serve not only as a stronghold against the Tatars, who came from the East, but against a western enemy too, and there was but one force threatening from the West, and that was Poland, which finally succeeded in capturing the city and province in 1340.

Polish officialdom seems to have rid itself of one long used pet argument, viz. that Ukrainians and everything for which they stand are an Austrian invention. Nevertheless traces of this line of thought are apparent in the statement, "They (the Austrians) found it helpful to foment the discord between the Poles and Ukrainians who demanded that Galicia should be divided in two autonomous provinces: one Polish and one Ukrainian." This statement would be correct if its authors had not forgotten to add, that even after Austria granted Galicia autonomy in 1867, the province was ruled exclusively by Poles, and whenever by appealing over the heads of the local overlords the Ukrainians wrested some insignificant concession from the Hapsburg Crown, like a school, or a few local judgeships, all Poles would cry out that Austria was inciting the Ukrainians against them.

Again, mentioning the armed conflict between Ukrainians and Poles for Galicia in 1918-1919 "Facts and Figures" gives us only part of the truth, but not all of it. The Ukrainian seizure of power in Galicia, after the disintegration of the Austrian Empire in 1918, is termed "a conflict staged by (Austria), an enemy common to the Poles and Ukrainians alike." And further it is said that the war with Ukrainians was terminated after a three weeks' struggle. Both statements are only halftruths. The Ukrainians seized power in Galicia in accordance with President Wilson principles of self-determination. They had "beaten



the Poles to the punch", because they had cleverer political leaders, who foresaw the doom of Germany and Austria as early as October 1918, and accordingly planned everything in detail for a coup, which was successfully carried off during the night of October 31st—November 1st 1918, to the limitless astonishment of the Poles. Not only did the Austrian authorities not hand over freely any war material etc. to the Ukrainians, but the Ukrainians had to threaten the use of force against Count von Huyn, the Austrian Governor of Galicia, before he signed a document relinquishing his office.

The war between the Poles and Ukrainians lasted for nine months and not for three weeks. After the first three weeks the Ukrainian Army and authorities left Lviv, but laid siege to it, and this was lifted only on Easter Sunday, 1919, after the Poles, claiming falsely to the Allies in Paris that they were fighting Bolsheviks, secured war material, and permission to use the American equipped Haller's Army against the Ukrainians. This was the end of the fight for Lviv, but the war in Galicia lasted until July 1919.

The second number of "Polish Facts and Figures" of March 25, 1944 elaborates on the "Polish-Russian" controversy. As sufficient material denying Poland's claim to a common boundary with Russia, and therefore any existence of a Polish-Russian boundary dispute has been published in the previous issue of this quarterly, the details therefore need no repetition.

However, No. 2 of "Polish Facts and Figures" contains on page 15 a deliberate mis-statement, which must here be exposed. This mis-statement reads "It should be emphasized that the terms 'Western Ukraine' and 'Western White Russia' had never before been used nor were they even known to the local population. They were arbitrarily introduced by the Soviet authorities which, following their illegal occupation, had divided Eastern Poland into two parts: Western White Russia to the north and Western Ukraine to the south."

If it is true that the term "Western Ukraine" was coined by the Soviets only in 1939, then perhaps the Polish Information Center will answer the following questions:

1) Was not the name of the nation with which Poland was at war in 1918 and 1919 "The Republic of Western Ukraine"?

2) Was not the name of the nation which on January 22, 1919 entered into formal union with the Ukrainian Republic at Kiev "The Republic of Western Ukraine"?

3) Was not the name "Western Ukraine" used on currency and postage stamps of the Western Ukrainian Republic in 1918-1919?

4) Could not the editor of "Facts and Figures" look into scientific publications of Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, 1917, where he would find the historical research work "Western Ukraine and Rome in 13th Century" by Nicholas Czubytyj, editor of *Ukrainian Quarterly*?

5) Was not the term Western Ukraine and Western Ukrainians used almost exclusively (with the permission of the Polish censors) by the Galician Ukrainians to designate their country and themselves during the Polish occupation of that land from 1919 to 1939? For proof of the last statement, the Polish Information Center may glance random at any Ukrainian newspaper, periodical, published in Poland between 1919 and 1939, or the 1934 Ukrainian Encyclopedia.



## OBITUARIES

### METROPOLITAN SHEPTITSKY

Ukraine has lost a man who will go down in history as one of her greatest sons. Churchman, patriot, humanitarian, whose life-long defense of the right and just transcended all party and religious lines, Metropolitan Andrew Sheptitsky, primate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, was reported by the Tass agency of Moscow to have died last November 4 in Soviet-occupied L'viv, at the age of 79. Although the report did not give the cause of his death, it may have been due to the fact that for the past thirteen years he had been partly paralyzed from the waist down by arthritis.

Sheptitsky was an internationally well known figure. Visiting notables, including foreign press correspondents, sought him out and wrote about him extensively. Among them was Anne O'Hare McCormick, the distinguished foreign correspondent of the New York Times. Back in 1939 when a later-disproved report was circulated that Sheptitsky had been executed by the Reds, whom he had always strongly opposed both as a Ukrainian ecclesiastic and patriot, McCormick wrote an inspired column about him in the Times. Her description of him is a classic:

Even chained to a chair, he looked a giant [he was about seven feet tall]. A shock of white hair was flung back from a leonine face lighted by eyes that flashed with indignation mellowed by compassion and crackling humor. He was a militant Ukrainian, head and soul of the movement, though the Poles charged bitterly that he was a Pole, who fought the "Polonization" policy of the government, particularly the parcelization of land which was driving the Ukrainian peasants from their villages. He was also a militant churchman who fought with equal spirit the "Latinization" of his people by his fellow-churchmen.

Eastern rite or not, there was nothing Russian or Greek or Byzantine in the mentality of this fighting Archbishop. He was a man of the world, and decidedly of the Western world, once a soldier in the Austrian Army, in his youth a friend of Franz

Joseph, a prisoner of the Russians, a prisoner of the Poles, a great scholar, a great adventurer, a great noble who stripped himself of everything to educate and help the dispossessed among his own people. His old soutane was threadbare, and there was nothing in his chilly and shabby "palace" but books. "Don't ask me questions about the situation here," he cried. "Go across the courtyard and talk to the peasants from the villages." They were there by the hundreds, crowding the basement rooms of the baroque cathedral, miserable and benumbed families driven from their homes, they said, and saved from starving by the Archbishop's daily hand-out of bread and soup.

These people and the poor peasants along the eastern border who had once been part of Russia and belonged to the Orthodox Church, may have welcomed the Soviet armies and the new parcelization of land in their favor. But Lwiw and the Western Ukraine, except for three years of occupation during the World War (I), were never incorporated in Russia, and Ukrainian opposition to the Poles was mild compared to their dread of Soviet occupation.

Referring to the Nazi-Soviet partition of Poland, when the Soviets occupied Western Ukraine, Mrs. McCormick continued:

Perhaps he (Sheptitsky) laughed at the little commissars who saw to it that their "Ukrainian brothers" will hear no more of independence. He could be witty even in English, and that was something in Lwiw . . . he was one of those unconquerable spirits, burning like a flame in his cold room, that one touches once and never forgets. What he was cannot be killed. In the travail and inner conflict which was part of the tragedy of Poland, he was tearing down to build up. "If we can survive this ordeal," he said, "one day we shall achieve unity in diversity."

Among other noteworthy descriptions of Archbishop Sheptitsky which appeared in the American press, that of Catherine de Hueck in the *Commonweal* is especially arresting. While in Europe before the war started, she made a special trip to Lwiw "to interview the old and beloved Bishop of the Ukrainian people." A portion of her description follows:

I rang the bell and asked diffidently if his Excellency would give me an appointment. The young man at the door ushered me into a small parlor, furnished with the utmost simplicity, and

went away to find out. Why was it that my mind suddenly traversed and came to rest on the grey hills of Umbria? Why did I see before my eyes the figure of the Poverallo of Assisi? Something in the poverty and simplicity of the palace brought him to my mind, for I know that Count Sheptitsky was very wealthy in his own right. Later my guess was confirmed by an old peasant woman, whom I asked why everything was so poor and shabby. She answered, "Oh, did you not know? His Grace never spends anything on himself, his comfort or food, it all goes to his poor and many works of mercy . . ."

The young man came back and informed me that his Grace would see me at once. A little overwhelmed at such graciousness, I followed him upstairs, to behold again everywhere the same simplicity, nay, poverty, that I already had observed. At last a big green baize door opened and I was ushered into a very large room the walls of which were all covered with books, and the two big windows of which overlooked the city. By one of them at a desk piled high with papers and correspondence sat the Bishop.

The first thing I noticed were his eyes — incredibly young and alive they looked in his lined face. A crown of thick white hair surrounded his high forehead, the same vigorous white hair was in his beard that fell over his collar. His whole face radiated charm, simplicity and to me sanctity. He apologized for his inability to rise; he had been, he said, paralyzed from the waist down, for many years now . . .

The interview dealt with the role the Eastern Rite of the Catholic Church could play in "bringing back the Schismatics." He further acknowledged Polish persecution of Ukrainians and the Polish destruction of Ukrainian Orthodox churches [against which he himself strongly protested in a special pastoral letter, August, 1938, which the Polish authorities suppressed], as well as the Polish demands, that both the service and singing in Ukrainian churches should be carried on in Polish instead of the traditional old Slavonic. Finally, he vigorously affirmed that he had done all in his power to keep his people from Soviet contamination.

It was getting late; but before taking my leave, I begged him for a blessing and his photograph. He graciously granted both,

adding his autograph to the picture. As I stood for the last time in the framework of the great baize door, he bade me "God speed" . . .

Through the large curtainless windows the sun was setting in a glory of red and gold all over the old city, its rays touching gently a shelf of old books, reflecting slantwise in the white halo of the Bishop's hair, turning it to flaming silver . . . Again the thought of St. Francis of Assisi came to me. I felt I had met a Saint . . . little did I know that I had received the blessing of perhaps a future martyr.

### ALEXANDER KOSHETZ

Terpsichore, the mythological Muse of Music, must have her head bowed in grief, for one of her most devoted disciples, Professor Alexander Koshetz, is no longer among the living. World famous as Ukrainian choral conductor, a talented composer, and greatly beloved by the countless singers who sang in his choruses, Koshetz died September 21 last in Winnipeg, Canada. He was 69 years of age. Death struck the venerable choral conductor just as he had completed teaching music at the Higher Educational Courses given annually at Winnipeg for Canadian Ukrainian youth.

Dr. Alexander Koshetz was born in Ukraine. While attending the Theological Academy in Kiev he also studied music under Lubomirsky at the Lysenko School of Music. Upon his graduation from the academy as a "Candidate" (Ph. D.), Koshetz taught history at several colleges. Later he was appointed professor at the Lysenko school, then a member of the Directory of the Boyan Choral Society of Kiev, professor of choral music at the Kiev Conservatory, professor at the Pedagogical Institute in the Caucasus, director of the famous St. Volodimir University Students Chorus, director of the St. Olga University Ladies Chorus, orchestra director of the famed Ukrainian National Theatre of Mikola Sadowsky in Kiev, choral and orchestral director of the Kiev Municipal Opera Company, chairman of the Music Department of the Ministry of Education of the Ukrainian National Republic, founder of the Ukrainian Ethnographic Cabinet in the same Department, and finally director of the famous Ukrainian National Chorus with which he made a triumphant tour throughout the world (1919-24).

Many American critics regarded his chorus as the finest ever heard

in this country. Typical of the press comments upon its extensive American tour is the following, taken from the November, 1922, issue of *The Nation* weekly (New York) :

"The praise that preceded the chorus from all the musical centers of Europe seemed excessive until one heard it, until one saw Alexander Koshetz with his extraordinarily living hands mould the sounds, as a sculptor moulds pliant clay. Here was the noblest and austere and most stringently moral thing in the world-perfection. The chorus is a human organ, an instrument of incomparable precision and incomparable expressiveness. It can rustle like the leaves of the forest; it can be lyrical as a lark at dawn; it can be sonorous as thunder over mountains."

Ukrainian songs composed and arranged by Koshetz were, before the last war, published by Idzikovsky of Kiev and Orenstein of Leipzig. Here in America a number of them, "Songs of the Ukraine," have been published by the Witmark Educational Publications of New York. He also arranged many melodies drawn from other nations, such as the American "Suzanna" and "Old Folks at Home." The singing of the latter number by the Ukrainian National Chorus at its Washington concert won from the critic of the *Washington Herald*, (November 3, 1923) very high praise.

A few years before the outbreak of the present war Koshetz made several appearances as a conductor of a mass chorus composed of about 300 young Americans of Ukrainian descent, members of various Ukrainian choruses in the New York Metropolitan area. One such concert was presented at Town Hall (1935), and another at Carnegie Hall (1936), in New York City. Concerning the first, the *New York Sun* critic wrote:

"The vigor and fervor he (Koshetz) brought from this chorus, are qualities rarely encountered in our concert halls." Concerning the second concert, the *New York Herald Tribune* critic wrote that its a capella singing recalled "the notable performances given by the touring Ukrainian National Chorus under Professor Koshetz' direction in the early 1920's . . ."

Concerning the same Carnegie Hall concert, the *New York World Telegram* wrote of the singing as being "memorable," and the music "of a fascinatingly modal character, little if any of which can have been heard here in public before."

In the summer of 1939 Koshetz appeared with a mass chorus of 500 singers at the American Ukrainian Folk Festival at the New York World's Fair.

Several months before his death there appeared the "Hear Ukraine Sing" album of choral recordings of Ukrainian folk and religious songs made by a chorus under the direction of Koshetz.

For his labors in Ukrainian music, Koshetz was awarded before the war an honorary degree of Doctor of Philosophy by the Free Ukrainian University in Prague. In December, 1936, many celebrations were held throughout the country in honor of the 40th anniversary of his entrance into the field of music.

S. S.

