
THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

- INTRODUCING THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY *Editorial*
UKRAINE AND THE SOVIET NATIONALITY POLICY *William Henry Chamberlin*
THE NATIONAL REVOLUTION IN UKRAINE (1917-1919) *Nicholas D. Czubatyj*
THE DEMOCRATIC TREND OF UKRAINIAN LITERATURE *Clarence A. Manning*
THE UKRAINIAN AMERICANS *Stephen Shumeyko*
THE UKRAINIANS AND THE POLISH-RUSSIAN BORDER DISPUTE
Nicholas D. Czubatyj
THE PROBLEM OF UKRAINE IN PEACE-PLANNING LITERATURE *Roman Olesnicki*
UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN LIFE. BOOK REVIEWS. UKRAINICA IN AMERICAN
PERIODICALS

Published by UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA.

Edited by EDITORIAL BOARD
Managing Editor, NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ
Published by UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA
with support of contributions of Americans of Ukrainian descent.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introducing the Ukrainian Quarterly	5
<i>Editorial</i>	
The Ukraine and Soviet Nationality Policy	11
<i>William Henry Chamberlin</i>	
The National Revolution in Ukraine (1917-1919)	17
<i>Nicholas D. Czubatyj</i>	
The Democratic Trend of Ukrainian Literature	40
<i>Clarence A. Manning</i>	
The Ukrainian Americans	49
<i>Stephen Shumeyko</i>	
The Ukrainians and the Polish Russian Border Dispute	57
<i>Nicholas D. Czubatyj</i>	
The Problem of Ukraine in Recent American Peace-Planning Literature	72
<i>Roman J. Olesnicki</i>	
UKRAINIAN AMERICAN LIFE	
Ukrainian American Heroes of World War II	79
Ukrainians of America and Canada in Cooperation	81
BOOK REVIEWS	
"Istoriya Ukrainy", edited by Academy of Sciences of U.S.S.R.	85
<i>N. Czubatyj</i>	
The Road to Foreign Policy, by Hugh Gibson	86
<i>R. Olesnicki</i>	
Ukrainian Literature, by C. A. Manning	87
<i>N. Czubatyj</i>	
UKRAINICA IN AMERICAN PERIODICALS	
Journal of Central European Affairs	89
Russian Review	91
The National Geographic Magazine	93
Thought	95

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN, Foreign Correspondent in Soviet-Union for the Christian Science Monitor 1922-1933, is the author of well-known works on the Soviet Union. His latest book is "The Russian Enigma," Editor of Russian Review and contributor to several American publications.

NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ, Western Ukrainian historian, Professor of Greek-Catholic Theological Academy in L'viv until 1939, author of "Western Ukraine and Rome," "The Ukrainian Lands of Lithuanian Federation" and others; Vice-Director of Historical Department on Shevchenko Scientific Society in L'viv.

CLARENCE A. MANNING, Professor at Columbia University and Acting Executive Officer, Department of East European Languages. Specialist in Russian and Ukrainian Literatures.

STEPHEN SHUMEYKO, President of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Editor of Ukrainian Weekly.

ROMAN OLESNICKI, Consular attaché, Member of Executive Committee of the Western Ukrainian National Democratic Alliance.

INTRODUCING THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

A LASTING PEACE, which will give reasonable assurance that no third world war will break out again after some 25 years, can only be achieved if the new and presumably better world order to follow this war is based on the understanding and knowledge of true facts, unobscured by war propaganda. Overlooked or unsolved problems will not cease to exist merely because the world press and world diplomacy declined to bother with them. Such problems do exist and will continue to exist. If left unsettled now, during the present fluid conditions of the world, they may eventually erupt into another world conflagration.

Among the most important of such problems is that of Ukraine, particularly of the just and centuries-old aspirations to national freedom of the 45 million Ukrainian people. And yet comparatively very little is known of this problem in the outside world. It is as though some forces had conspired on both sides of the warring world, among both the Allies and the Axis, to obscure it. For example, early in this war, when Stalin had a pact with Hitler, the Allied press featured considerable truth concerning Ukraine. Now due to adroit communist propaganda about the so-called Ukrainian armies, about the blissful contentment of the Ukrainian people under the Soviets and about the existence of an "Ethnical Democracy" in the Soviet Union, Ukraine is beginning to appear to many Americans just as Russia portrays her: merely a geographic concept, a southern province of Russia.

The Poles likewise do not admit the existence of a Ukrainian problem. In this they are in accord with the Russians, with whom they would only divide the spoils of the Ukrainian land. Moreover, in such matters as the current Soviet-Polish border dispute, in which the most concerned are over 6 million Ukrainians, Polish propaganda virtually ignores their very existence as such.

If the existence of a Ukrainian problem were admitted, there would be no Russian-Polish boundary dispute. Poland has in fact no common boundary with Russia. Actually the quarrel does not concern boundaries, but Western Ukraine, the most vital and dynamic part of entire Ukraine, and the "Piedmont" of the Ukrainian national renaissance.

The Czechs are also reluctant to mention Ukraine. They are convinced that by a one-sided Moscow pact between Benes and Stalin they have disposed of the problem of Carpatho-Ukraine, that land which was forsaken

by the Czechs on the eve of this war, but nevertheless bravely fought for its independence against Hungary, the satellite of Hitler.

War propaganda admits no Ukrainian problem. Nevertheless, representing as it does the 45 million Ukrainian people it is very much alive, and awaits its just solution for the sake of future world peace. That peace suffered considerably 25 years ago when the Ukrainian problem was overlooked by the treaty-makers of Versailles. The authors of a world safe for democracy then placed Ukraine, a nation of democratic tendencies and tenaciously aspiring to independence, under the occupation of four neighboring powers: Russia, Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. This partitioning of Ukraine was not only against the clearly expressed will of its people, but also against the principles of President Wilson as to self determination—the doctrine which was to be the cornerstone of post-Versailles Europe.

After four years of ceaseless heroic resistance against foreign aggressors (1917 to 1921), the Ukrainian nation was finally subjugated. But it never consented to dismemberment of its own free will. The independent national status achieved during this struggle was cemented by numerous acts of statehood, all aiming at the goal of a fully sovereign nation. The twenty-year period of modern Ukrainian history following that struggle, is a period of revolutionary ferment and even open warfare against its conquerors.

Following the destruction of the regular armies of the Ukrainian National Republic, the major, or Eastern part of Ukraine came under the reign of Russia by the fictitious device of the creation of a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Ukrainian partisans fought this foreign occupation until as late as 1923. The fight for independence resulted in the complete destruction of practically all the nationally conscious educated classes and about 8 million common people. They perished because, among other reasons, a Ukrainian is by nature an individualist, freedom loving and religious, and he cannot possibly reconcile himself with the foreign spirit of Russian communism. This is true in spite of the fact that there are no Ukrainian capitalist or feudal classes, for they had become Russianized or Polonized generations ago, thus leaving the Ukrainians a people with a strongly pronounced tendency toward practical democracy.

The first ten years of Red Rule over Ukraine constitute an uninterrupted chain of crises and purges within the Communist Party of Ukraine and of a ruthless extermination of Ukrainian patriots. The opposition of the Commissar of Education, Shumsky, suppressed subsequently by Kremlin, rose up in protest against the Russification of Ukraine under the guise of solidifying the proletariat. The opposition of Volobuyev, a Russian from Ukraine, economist, famous journalist was directed against the economic

exploitation of Ukraine by Russia. The trial of members of the Association for the Liberation of Ukraine (1930), the suicide of the Commissar of Ukraine, M. Skrypnyk (1934), and of the Ukrainian Premier Lubchenko (1937) and of tens of other Ukrainian erstwhile communist leaders are ample proof that Ukraine instinctively and constantly resisted foreign rule. This compelled the Communist Party to undertake several purges in its Ukrainian division, and brought about finally the result that Moscow desired, namely, the turning of Ukraine into a mere geographic unit of Russia with a Russian, N. Chrushev as Premier and another practically Russian, Manuilsky, as Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the fictitious Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Incidentally, the self-same Chrushev is General Secretary of the only power in Ukraine, the communist party of Ukraine, the control of which was seized by the Russian minority of Ukraine.

Significantly enough, in this connection, is the fact that the Ukrainian S.S.R., the most productive and abundant member of the Soviet Union, is the only one which has had practically no increase in population during the twenty-odd years of Red Rule, in spite of the fact that Ukrainians constantly have one of the highest birth rates among the people of Europe.

The Red terror and Soviet propaganda notwithstanding, the Ukrainians still desire to become a really free nation. This is a demonstrable fact.

The treaty-makers of Versailles gave Western Ukraine to Poland, although this land is inhabited by the nationally most highly developed part of Ukrainians, who constitute an absolute majority there (66.4%). This they did after Western Ukraine succumbed in an unequal fight to the Polish Army which had been equipped by the Allies. Only after four years of bargaining however, did Poland finally get this land by the decision of the Council of Ambassadors in Paris in 1923.

The government of Poland then drew up a careful plan for creating in this land from a 19.8% minority a Polish majority, by settling upon it colonists brought from Western Poland, and by the economical and cultural extermination of the Ukrainians. To cope with this colonization and economic exploitation the Ukrainians organized strong cooperative movements. Polish attacks on Ukrainian culture and education were countered with various programs for promoting adult education and establishing private schools. The Polish government tried other measures as well, such as the notorious "pacification" expeditions of troops, mass responsibility for individual acts of revolutionary nature, and, of course, concentration camps. The Ukrainian majority reacted by underground revolutionary action in

which the youth played the major part, and which was marked by numerous assassinations, mass trials and death sentences.

It is significant that in spite of the constant struggle of the Ukrainians against Polish oppression, the Western Ukrainians remained steadfastly anti-communist and considered themselves champions of Ukrainian independence and of the unification of all Ukrainian lands into one Ukrainian sovereign state. There was hardly another country in Europe where anti-communist feelings were stronger than in the semi-proletarian Western Ukraine. It was therefore a great tragedy that this land fell under the rule of the hated Soviet Russia when Stalin made friends with Hitler and Molotov signed a pact with Ribbentrop.

At the close of the first World War the Carpatho-Ukrainians, who had been under the feudal Hungarian rule for centuries, were nationally the least developed. Their delegates to the Parliament of Western Ukraine applied to themselves the term "wounded brothers." Nevertheless the new gospel of freedom preached far away by Woodrow Wilson reached them in their Carpathian villages and towns. As a result, the National Assembly of Carpatho-Ukraine in Hust decided (1919) to unite Carpatho-Ukraine with Western Ukraine and then together enter a United Independent Ukrainian Republic. Eventually Carpatho-Ukraine became part of the Czechoslovak Republic as an autonomous unit. Actually, however, the provisions of autonomy for Carpatho-Ukraine were not realized during the twenty years of Czechoslovak rule.

It is fair to concede, that under Czechoslovakian rule, especially during the lifetime of President Masaryk, the nationally undeveloped Carpatho-Ukrainians began to become self-reliant and independent. It is not strange, therefore, that when Czechoslovakia crumbled in 1939, the Carpatho-Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and fought for it against the Magyar aggressors, then as now the satellites of Hitler. Today, one wish remains supreme in Carpatho-Ukraine: to throw off the Hungarian yoke and unite with Ukraine in a free and independent nation.

The will of the Ukrainian people to become masters of their own land was disregarded by the Allied Powers at the close of World War I. This was the beginning of a tragedy for Ukraine which became part of today's world wide tragedy. Although the name of Ukraine is mentioned dozens of times daily there is never any admission of the fact that the denial of independence to this nation was one of the causes of this world conflagration. Only the subjugation of Ukraine by foreigners could produce in the mind of the author of "Mein Kampf" the plan of conquering this rich, politically a

no-man's land, and turning it into a colony to provide Lebensraum for the Germans.

The foreign occupation of Ukraine, and the Ukrainian resistance to it, made Hitler hopeful of an easy conquest, especially since he imagined that the oppressed Ukrainians would come to his aid when his Nazi hordes invaded Ukraine. In this Hitler was bitterly disillusioned for he had underestimated the national consciousness of the Ukrainian people. It never occurred to them that it was as profitable to exchange dependence on the Soviets or Poland for an unmasked anti-Slavic German dictatorship.

Furthermore, when in June 1941 Hitler attacked Russia and the Soviet troops began evacuating Lviw, the leader of the Ukrainian underground movement, Stephen Bandera, proclaimed (June 24) the revival of the Independent Ukrainian Republic which had been overthrown over a score of years ago. Two days later German troops occupied Lviw, arrested Bandera and his government, and sent them to concentration camps, where eventually Bandera is reported to have perished. This, however, did not crush the Ukrainian underground movement, which continued to operate against the Nazis and other occupants of Ukraine.

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that during the entire three years of German misrule in Ukraine the Nazis failed to find even one Ukrainian quisling who would collaborate with the Gauleiter of Ukraine, Dr. Erich Koch.

There is no doubt, but that the existence of a separate independent Ukrainian nation of 50 million people (this is the population figure of all Ukrainian territories including racial minorities) economically strong, with an outlet to the Black Sea, would have made even Hitler to consider his plan utopian. A natural alliance between Ukraine, Poland and other Central European countries would certainly have been strong enough to stop the pendulum of warring Nazism. Today the consequences of Ukraine's subjugation are painfully felt by Poland, Rumania, and other countries in that part of Europe. Likewise the consequences of the foolhardy failure of the Versailles treaty-makers to make a just settlement of the Ukrainian problem are today being borne by millions of American families whose sons have again to fight on the battlefields of Europe in order to correct the errors of Versailles.

Are these errors possible of correction? This is the problem which today confronts and interests not only native Americans and not only those Americans who have blood ties with Ukraine, but also millions of people in Eastern and Central Europe, who shudder at the prospect of "peace" and "order" being introduced to their lands by the dictatorship of Red

Russia. Unless the problem of Ukraine is settled this time in consultation and with the consent of a majority of the people of this key country, Ukraine will again become fertile ground for the seeds of a permanent revolt and resistance against the worst kind of extermination ever attempted upon a people. Neither of such possibilities is in consonance with the principles of the better future for which we are fighting and towards which we are aiming.

It is natural, that the Ukrainians in Europe would speak for themselves. But this they cannot do, for since the first day of the war they have been living under the most gruesome dictatorships known in history, Nazism and Russian Communism, where freedom of expression is unknown.

Around the problem of Ukraine, the solution of which is indispensable for an achievement of equilibrium and peace in Europe, a smoke screen of skillful and widely planned propaganda has been laid, the object of which is to blur the real picture of Europe, to the detriment of the peace of whole generations to come.

All truly freedom loving people have to realize that a new peace built on realities and not on war propaganda would be durable and beneficial to the safety of democracies. The responsibility for the future rests on the English speaking world. It is therefore a duty of those Americans who are of Ukrainian birth or descent and have, as the most recent group of immigrants, very strong ties with their brethren in Europe on the one hand, and through their new American homeland ties with the Anglo Saxon world on the other, to inform the world of the true state of Ukrainian affairs.

That is the main goal of and justification for the appearance of this Ukrainian Quarterly. It shall endeavor to present a picture of the real circumstances surrounding the people of Eastern and Central Europe, and to point out the existence of those dynamic forces which can easily cause a new war. Present day world problems are numerous; yet though the Ukrainian problem is the most important of them, is not the only unsolved problem of that part of the world. There are problems of White Ruthenia, the Baltic states, of the real independence of Poland, Rumania and the Balkan countries and the security of Turkey.

In our work we shall strive to be guided by the words of the gospel: ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make ye free.

BOARD OF EDITORS.

THE UKRAINE AND SOVIET NATIONALITY POLICY

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

THE CONDITIONS at the end of the First World War were remarkably favorable for the realization of the nationalist ambitions of the peoples of Eastern Europe. Three great empires that had formerly been all-powerful in this part of the world had broken up.

Russia was a scene of bitter civil war after the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks under the leadership of Lenin, and this made it easier for the non-Russian peoples along the western border of former Russia, for Poles, Finns, Estonians, Letts, Lithuanians, to assert their national independence. The polyglot Austro-Hungarian Empire dissolved completely under the impact of military defeat. The new state of Czechoslovakia arose in the northern part of what had been Austria-Hungary. The Southern Slavs of Croatia and Slovenia gravitated to Yugoslavia, the Italians of Trieste and the Trentino to Italy, the Rumanians of Transylvania to Rumania.

Of all the large people of Eastern Europe the Ukrainians alone were disappointed in the realization of their nationalist aspirations. This was not for lack of desire for freedom. There was a nationalist movement on both sides of the former Russian-Austrian frontier. L'viv and Kiev, two famous cultural centres in Ukrainian history, were for short periods of time under Ukrainian nationalist rule.

But the struggle for Ukrainian national independence was carried on under very unfavorable circumstances. In the part of Ukraine that had formerly been under Russian rule there was the chaotic, disintegrating influence of social revolution and its attendant propaganda. The distribution of the population in this part of the Ukraine, with the population far more solidly Ukrainian in the villages than in the cities and towns, tended to give the nationalist movement a guerrilla character.

In Eastern Galicia, where there was a strong Ukrainian nationalist sentiment, the Poles, supported with arms and supplies from abroad, proved militarily stronger than the Ukrainians. The half-hearted efforts of the Allied powers to obtain for the Ukrainians of Eastern Galicia some measure of autonomy and local self-government were frustrated by the negative attitude of the Polish Government.

So the Ukraine was again partitioned, as it had been in the seventeenth century, between Russia and Poland, with much the greater number of Ukrainians remaining under Soviet rule, but several million (the estimates vary from four and a half to seven million) being included in Poland, mainly in the provinces of Eastern Galicia, Polesia and Volhynia.

The Ukrainians have not been happy, either under Polish or under Soviet rule, although the causes of their grievances were somewhat different. In Poland there was nationalist oppression, discrimination against Ukrainian schools and churches, efforts to Polonize the population, ruthless repression of nationalist movements.

The oppression of the Ukrainians in the Soviet Union assumed more subtle and complex forms. On paper the Ukraine was recognized as a federated Soviet Republic, with its capital first in Kharkiv, later in Kiev. The Ukrainian language was used in newspapers, schools and courts.

But the Ukraine was not truly free, because Communist dictatorship prevailed there, as in other parts of the Soviet Union. Lenin's saying that "there could be any number of parties in Russia, but on condition that the Communist Party be in power and all the other parties—in jail" was thoroughly applied to the Ukraine.

Not only were all non-Communist political parties and groups forbidden, but the country was subjected to a ruthless control in politics, economics and cultural self-expression. There were, of course, no free elections. There were repeated instances when Ukrainian Communists who had reached the highest posts in the Soviet and Party organization were arrested and disappeared or committed suicide. A few names that might be mentioned in this connection are Chubar, Kossior, Petrovsky, Skripnik, Lubchenko, Bondarenko.

The Ukrainian peasants, more prosperous as a rule than the Russian, suffered relatively more than the Russian from such measures as the "liquidation of the kulaks as a class" and the political famine of 1932-33. Although the use of the Ukrainian language was free, the expression of thought was not free. All contacts with the West were cut off or rigidly censored. Ukrainian novels and poems were closely examined for indications of forbidden nationalist sentiments. Some well known writers, notably the novelist Khvylovy, were "liquidated" or driven to commit suicide by the hounding of the political police.

The Second World War has brought changes into the Ukrainian national situation and prospects. First there was the Soviet occupation of about two-fifths of the former territory of Poland, including the regions in which the Ukrainians were a considerable majority of the population. This

took place in the autumn of 1939. In the following year Northern Bukovina, with its considerable Ukrainian population, was taken from Rumania by threat of invasion. It was apparently Stalin's desire to bring all the Ukrainians under Soviet rule; and predominantly Ukrainian regions were declared part of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. This was done after a so-called plebiscite, carried out under Red Army occupation and without any facilities for voicing opposition to inclusion within the Soviet Union.

Information about what happened in the Western Ukraine during the period of Soviet occupation, from the autumn of 1939 until the summer of 1941, is meagre, because the Soviet authorities were not willing to permit foreign observers to visit the region. There is testimony, however, to the effect that foodstuffs and manufactured goods were quickly bought up by visitors from Russia, and that Soviet soldiers were amazed at the quantity of products which they found in the shops of Lwiw.

A new phase began in the summer of 1941. Hitler tore up his non-aggression pact with Stalin and the German armies rapidly overran all the regions which the Soviet Union had annexed in 1939 and 1940, including the Western Ukraine. Lwiw was one of the first large towns occupied by the Germans.

During the autumn of 1941 the German armies poured into the Soviet Ukraine. By November almost all the country was occupied. The Germans, overconfident of winning the victory by purely military means, made no effort to appeal to Ukrainian nationalist sentiment or to obtain the goodwill of the population. The Ukraine was not given even a semblance of self-government and a considerable area east of the River Dniester, including the important city of Odesa, was turned over to Rumanian administration.

A Soviet counter-offensive, aimed at the recapture of Kharkiv, in the spring of 1942 failed. For a time the area of German conquest was extended and by autumn the Germans had reached the high point of their advance, with their advanced forces on the Volga, at Stalingrad, and in the foothills of the Caucasus.

But the winter of 1942-43 marked a definite turn of the tide on the Eastern Front. An entire German army was cut off, surrounded, trapped and destroyed at Stalingrad. Soviet forces in February, 1943, retook Kharkiv and part of the Donets Basin, in Eastern Ukraine. The Germans mustered enough strength to launch a short, sharp counter-blow and regained Kharkiv. But this was the last German offensive action of any consequence in Russia.

A gigantic and prolonged Soviet offensive rolled on, with sporadic in-

terruptions, from July, 1943 until April, 1944. During this time the whole of the Soviet Ukraine was reconquered and there was some penetration of the Western Ukraine. Some of the larger towns in the latter region, such as Rivne and Ternopil, were in Soviet hands on the eve of the resumption of the Soviet offensive late in June. The Germans, however, were still holding L'viv.

With the imminent victory of the United Nations it would seem that the future fate of the Ukraine will be closely bound up with the Soviet Union. There has been little disposition on the part of the American and British Governments to challenge the Soviet annexations in Eastern Europe, although these annexations cannot be reconciled very convincingly either with the Atlantic Charter or with the treaties of non-aggression which the Soviet Union signed, on its own initiative, with Poland, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia during the thirties. There is little reason, therefore, to expect that there will be any foreign intervention on behalf of Ukrainian nationalism.

What is the prospect that a more tolerable regime will be established in the Soviet Ukraine after the end of the war? Interesting possibilities, but only possibilities are opened up by a decree of the Soviet Government early in 1944, providing that in the future the constituent Republics of the Union should possess their own Commissariats (Ministries) for the important subjects of Foreign Affairs and War.

The Soviet Union, it should be noted, is composed of eleven, or sixteen constituent republics, varying widely in area, population and economic importance, but theoretically all enjoying autonomy in local administration. Whether one considers eleven or sixteen the proper figure depends on whether one recognizes the legitimacy of the five Soviet Republics which were set up during 1939-1940, the Karelo-Finnish, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Moldavian.

The largest of these Republics as regards area, population and natural resources, is the Russian, which includes most of European Russia and stretches across Siberia all the way to the Pacific. Second in population and natural wealth is the Ukraine.

Up to the time of the promulgation of the above mentioned decree foreign affairs and military affairs were reserved for the central government. The announcement of what seemed to be a rather sweeping process of decentralization aroused wide comment, although it has been somewhat obscured by the rapid press of subsequent events.

Comment varied from the suspicious suggestion that the Soviet Union was trying to obtain for itself sixteen votes at the peace conference to

enthusiastic comparisons between the structure of the Soviet Union and of the British Commonwealth, made up of the self-governing parts of the British Empire: Great Britain, Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand.

I am inclined to doubt the validity of both these interpretations. The Soviet leaders are too shrewd and realistic to imagine that they could multiply the actual power of their country at the peace conference by a mere piece of constitutional sleight-of-hand.

Comparisons with the British Commonwealth are, to put it mildly, premature. For the Soviet Union is a highly centralized one-party dictatorship. The British Commonwealth is a loose association of countries that retain full independence in both domestic and foreign affairs.

One can recognize the difference between the two structures in an incident that occurred in the early part of 1944. Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, went to Toronto and made a plea for closer unity of action among the countries of the British Empire. Mr. Mackenzie King, the Canadian Prime Minister, politely but firmly took issue with Lord Halifax on this issue and even expressed regret that Lord Halifax should have delivered the Toronto speech.

When a Soviet Ambassador to Washington is thus publicly taken to task by a Soviet Prime Minister of the Ukraine, then, and not until then can the Soviet Union reasonably be likened to the British Commonwealth. Why is such a development impossible at the present time?

Because the Soviet Union is a regimented one-party dictatorship. The Communist Party is the steel framework that holds together the 170,000,000 people of many races, nationalities and languages who make up the population of the Soviet Union. Members of the Communist Party, bound by a common discipline, hold all the high executive positions, both in the political and in the economic life of the country.

A decree of the Political Bureau, highest steering Committee of the Party, made up of Stalin and his ten most trusted lieutenants and advisers, has all the force of law for the vast Soviet Union. Whatever his personal opinion may be, every Communist is bound to work for the success of any policy which is decreed by the Party leadership. If he transgresses this rule he is liable to expulsion from the Party, perhaps to a sterner penalty.

It can easily be realized that under such a system a legal grant of autonomy that would mark a tremendous change in the relations of democratic states may be a technical shift of minor importance. For it is obvious that under the Soviet system men who would rise to the high offices of War Commissar or Commissar for Foreign Affairs in the Ukraine, or White

Russia, or Georgia, or any of the other constituent Republics, would be Communists. Should they displease Stalin by any action they could be transferred immediately to some other work, without any consultation of the people of the country concerned. They might write diplomatic notes in the language of the national republics which they represent. But the dictation would always come from Moscow.

It is probable that the decision to transfer the control of foreign affairs and military affairs to the republics was motivated by several considerations of expediency. It provides a flexible framework for the association with the Soviet Union of states which might not be regarded as ripe for complete communism. It may also be interpreted as a bait held out to Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, offering them the hope that the second Soviet regime in those countries will give more concessions to national feeling than the first.

It would certainly be naive to interpret the new nationality policy as a charter of genuine decentralization and autonomy. It cannot be such a charter until the centralized Communist Party dictatorship is abandoned or substantially relaxed. But it would also be too dogmatic to assert that the system of one-party rule in the Soviet Union is necessarily eternal.

The present struggle against Germany has been a people's war for the Soviet Union in the sense that all the people have been drawn into it. This very fact may make it more difficult for the minority of organized Communists to maintain a monopoly of political power in the future. The prestige of the Red Army will be very high after the war; the Army leadership may crowd the Party bureaucracy for power.

Membership on an equal basis in a genuinely free federation of neighboring states would probably be the most hopeful solution of the Ukrainian national problem that is feasible in the near future. As can be seen from the example of the United States, there are advantages in large units of trade and production.

After the long and bitter experience of make-believe freedoms under Soviet rule Ukrainians cannot be too optimistic about the immediate realization of this ideal of a genuinely free federation. There would have to be convincing proofs of a change: a number of parties, newspapers expressing various points of view, clear indications that the Ukrainian people were choosing their own officials, without dictation from Moscow and terrorist pressure from the political police. But perhaps the long sought goal of Ukrainian freedom will be attained by a combination of the unceasing nationalist aspirations of the Ukrainians themselves and the working out of other progressive forces in the Soviet Union.

THE NATIONAL REVOLUTION IN UKRAINE, 1917—1919

By NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ

Ukrainian Independence Movement Centuries Old

THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE in their native land have demonstrated their desire to become an independent nation again and again, so dynamically and with such determination that there can be no doubt whatsoever as to their wishes. During the twenty years between the two World Wars, proof of this determination could be found in the hundreds of those who perished on the scaffold, the thousands who were shot against a wall, and the millions who were starved and exiled from their native land. Despite all these sacrifices, there is still no independent Ukraine today. In fact, there is not even a mention of the rights of this nation, although it is highly developed nationally and culturally and numbers forty-five million people. And yet there is much talk of the rights of nations far smaller than Ukraine. One of the most important of the unsolved world problems and certainly the most important unsolved problem of Europe, which is potentially explosive enough to produce a new world war, is being treated as "The fight for the border between Poland and Russia." Clever Russian and Polish propaganda has obscured the picture of the situation in Eastern Europe, regardless of the fact that the desire for self-government has become the heritage not of hundreds, not of thousands, but of millions of the sons of Ukraine. That desire is intense and overwhelming, for it is based on the rebirth of the glorious traditions of Ukrainian Kiev, a state which arose a thousand years ago.

In 1323, Pope John XX described the two Western Ukrainian rulers, Andrew and Lev as the "Antemurale Christianitatis," the defensive outpost of Christian civilization. Today, however, this land is treated like a voiceless waste on which the boundaries between Poland and Russia can be moved around without considering at all the views of those who have inhabited it from times immemorial.

During centuries of their knightly struggle in the defence of Christian civilization the Ukrainians developed an ardent love of freedom, for which they have always fought and which they have always regarded as the most priceless treasure of their lives. No wonder that back in the eighteenth cen-

ture the great Voltaire wrote that Ukraine always strives for liberty. He could not help but be impressed by the defense of Ukrainian independence against the Russians and the Poles by the Kozaks led by the Hetmans Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Ivan Mazepa, as well as the latter's successor Pylip Orlyk and his ideological adherents, the Mazepyntsy, with whom Voltaire became acquainted in France.

The Ukrainians love of freedom is truly mystical and it makes his life almost intolerable under the autocratic and despotic Russian rule. The Ukrainian democratic character has also been in constant conflict with the aristocratic mentality of the Poles.

The liberating slogans of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic developments, with which is associated the rebirth of many of the Slavic peoples, revived also the Ukrainian national movement which had been weakened by the national enslavement of the Ukrainians under Russia and Poland. The slogan of an independent Ukraine with equal rights for Ukraine in a proposed confederation of all Slavic nations, was proclaimed by Taras Shevchenko, the greatest poet of the country, and Mykola Kostomarov, the first modern Ukrainian historian, both of them the spiritual leaders of the so-called Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius in Kiev in 1846. "Ukraine lies in her grave," Kostomarov wrote, "but she is not dead, because her voice, the voice which called the entire Slavic land to freedom, has resounded in all the Slavic countries . . . Ukraine will awake . . . and Ukraine will be an independent republic in a Slavic confederation. Then all the nations will say, pointing to the place on the map where an independent Ukraine will appear: this is the stone which the builders rejected, and it has become the very cornerstone itself."

Before the outbreak of the first World War, the national ideal of Ukrainian independence was universal among the younger generation, regardless of the fact that the brutal power of Russia and Austria had almost destroyed the hope of its immediate realization. The so-called "Young Ukraine" in Austria and the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (RUP) in Russia were the representatives of this political ideal of modern Ukrainianism.

World War I Awakened Hopes of Ukrainians

One hundred years ago, when Poland, divided among Russia, Germany and Austria, was suffering in slavery, Adam Mickiewicz, the greatest Polish poet, penned in one of his works this prayer to God: "A terrible world war give to us, O Lord." Perhaps this is blasphemy, when every day Christians pray to God, "Preserve us from disease, hunger, fire and war, O Lord." We will not discuss this question but the phrase was and still is the expres-

sion of the political thought and the political desires of all of the eastern and central European nations which have been enlaved at various times by Russia, Germany, Austria and Turkey also. Why does this desire for war exist in the political thinking of these peoples, when they well know that every war of that sort is waged on their soil and brings material destruction to their lands?

The reason can be found in the fact that these people realize that the period of peace brings them only national death. Peace brings about a static situation during which it is possible to exterminate systematically subjugated peoples. War inaugurates a period of change and brings hope of liberation. This hope time and again has failed of realization but an enslaved people remain confident that the next war will remove the yoke of their oppressors.

The first World War was therefore welcomed by all of these peoples, among them the Ukrainians, with enthusiasm as a new spring of the peoples. All had rosy dreams that on the ruins of imperial Germany, Tsarist Russia, and decayed Austria, there would come into being a new world of free nations. Among the Ukrainian this was the universal conviction. Like the Poles, the Ukrainians under Austrian rule organized a volunteer legion, the Ukrainian Sichovi Striltsi, which was to fight against Russia, temporarily on the side of Austria. Why on the side of Austria and against Russia? Because the Ukrainians, as well as the Poles, believed that the main enemy of their people was Russia, whereas in Austria their national life was still tolerable. Did they intend to preserve Austria by doing this? Not at all. The Ukrainians as well as the Poles had the conviction that they had to create a national military force of their own, wherever it was possible, which would then be available at the favorable moment at the end of the war.

The Ukrainian Legion bore on its flags the slogan, "War against Russia for the freedom of the Ukrainian nation." The same slogan was accepted by the political organization of an all-Ukrainian character, the League for the Liberation of Ukraine, which was organized in Lviw at the very outset of the World War. Its membership consisted of Western Ukrainians under Austria and of political emigrés from Russia.

The Ukrainians under Russia at that time had only a secret organization—the Organization of Ukrainian Progressives. Its spiritual leader was the former professor of history at the Lviw State University, Michael Hrushevsky. Seeing that even in wartime the Russian government continued and even increased its persecution of the Ukrainian national movement, the Organization of Ukrainian Progressives announced the neutrality of

the Russian Ukrainians in the war. They looked upon the war as a conflict being waged to promote Russian imperialistic aims; still they thought that in the end it might become the means of liberating the Ukrainian nation. Ukrainian intellectuals as well as the ordinary soldiers in the Tsar's armies were certain that the war would spell an end for Tsarism. On its ruins, they thought, there would be created a democratic order and a Russia reorganized into a federation of equal national republic, among which would be also the Ukrainian. At that time, it should be borne in mind, only a small minority of Ukrainian nationalists in Russia had adopted a clear policy of absolute separation from Russia.

Among the majority of the Russian Ukrainians then there existed the false belief that only the Tsarist regime and the Russian reactionaries were against the freedom of the Ukrainian people, and that the Ukrainian people would quickly come to an understanding with a Russian democracy. The first months after the outbreak of the Russian revolution proved the fallacy of this idea and vindicated the minority who insisted upon full independence for the Ukrainians. The Russian democratic parties concealed their imperialistic policies with phrases regarding the community of interests of all Russian democracy, and said that these interests would be imperilled by a confederated Ukraine. The Bolsheviks voiced attractive phrases about the rights of every nation in Russia to self-determination and even separation, but, at the same time, their specialist in nationality affairs, Comrade Stalin, explained that this separation hinged upon whether or not it was harmful to the Communist party of the proletariat. Naturally the separation of wealthy Ukraine from centralistic Russia would always be harmful to the Communist Party of the proletariat in Russia, and therefore in practice the stand of the Communists did not differ in the slightest from that of the reactionaries.

Thus it was no wonder that after a few months of the Russian revolution, when "the holiday of the revolution ended and the weekdays arrived," as expressed by Professor Hrushevsky, president of the Ukraine Revolutionary Parliament, all the Ukrainian political groups quickly abandoned their former federalistic program for Ukraine and began to advocate the platform of full independence. The fall of Austria at the end of the war enabled the Austrian Ukraine to unite with Eastern Ukraine and to realize not only the ideal of independence, but also the ideal of a United Ukrainian Democratic Republic.

The New Gospel from over the Sea

Out of the tumult of the Russian revolution there rang out a call for

the self-determination of nations everywhere. Sometimes this call was sincere but at other times it was uttered with a hypocritical purpose.

At the peak of the revolution, there came to Ukraine tidings from America, through the fighting fronts, that President Wilson had drafted a new order for the post-war world and that it was based upon the self-determination of peoples. Americans can scarcely imagine the tremendous reaction aroused by this American definition of the new world order. It gave diplomatic aid to the subjugated peoples, it spoke for them. The principles of President Wilson likewise gave the young Ukrainian Republic the hope that it had gained through them strong international support and a legal foundation, from the international point of view, for its existence.

The words of President Wilson gave not only a greater self-confidence to the Ukrainian national revolution in Eastern Ukraine, but they also revived hope in the hearts of the Ukrainians under Austria that the time was not far off when all Ukrainians would be able to unite into one democratic Ukrainian nation. The new gospel from over the seas sounded in the Carpathian mountains. It entered into the lowly cabin of the Carpathian shepherd and the woodchopper, who had been rendered culturally backward by centuries of Hungarian oppression. These "nationally crippled brothers" also assembled at mass meetings called to enable them to voice their opinions about their future, because the American President permitted them to do so. The new political gospel of President Wilson shattered all the old claims of the antiquated historical rights of the Russians, the Poles and the Hungarians to rule over the Ukrainian land, even though their domination has lasted for centuries.

It was fascinating to see the great influence which the American ideas of President Wilson had. Is this understood by those Americans of today who lightly speak of the right of self-determination of peoples, the product of the American spirit? The right of self-determination may die in its land of birth, in America, but it will never perish in Ukraine. Today that right is the fundamental political principle of Ukrainians, White Ruthenians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Finns, and dozens of other peoples throughout the world. Any other solution than that of self-determination they regard and will continue to regard as unjust, and they will feel that it will have to be changed during the next world war.

The Social Revolution in Russia and the National Revolution in Ukraine

There is no people upon whom literature has apparently had so great an influence in the development of national aspirations as the Ukrainians.

It was for a good reason that the Russian Tsarist regime in 1876 forbade the printing of anything in the Ukrainian language. The works of Taras Shevchenko, the greatest Ukrainian poet, certainly had such an influence. There are not many poets in the world who have been made the object of such a semi-religious cult as that which Shevchenko enjoys among his countrymen. Wherever in the world there is a group of Ukrainians, always in the month of March, usually on the anniversary of his death, March tenth, they remember the poet with special ceremonies, which are usually begun with the singing of the Testament of this national prophet. The Testament ends with the following verses:

Bury me, be done with me
Rise and break your chain,
Water your new liberty
With blood for rain.
Then, in the mighty family
Of all men that are free,
Maybe sometimes very softly
You will speak of me.

(Translated by E. L. VOYNICH)

The Russian Tsarist government completely forbade the commemoration of Shevchenko but this only fostered the secret cult of the poet. The Soviet government was more practical, for it did not forbid the cult of Shevchenko but it deleted from his writings their anti-Russian trends and their aspirations for independence, and made of Shevchenko a semi-communist, just as it did of the greatest Western Ukrainian poet, Ivan Franko.

Through a strange coincidence the Great Russian Revolution began on the anniversary of Shevchenko's death in Petrograd. On the next day, March 11, the first regiment which passed over to the side of the revolution was the Volhynian regiment, composed of Ukrainians. A day later the Tsarist regime fell. On one of the next days the first public Shevchenko holiday in Petrograd was arranged by the many thousands of the Ukrainian colony there. A huge parade was held on the boulevards of the Tsarist capital and at its head was carried an enormous portrait of Shevchenko. The Testament of the national prophet was sung by the Petrograd Ukrainian kneeling on one of the boulevards. This was a definite indication that Russia had entered not only on the road of a social revolution but also upon a no less dangerous national revolution. Among the revolting peoples of the Russian empire, Ukraine occupied the first and leading place.

An attempt was made to stem the wave of national revolution in Russia

by the first Russian revolutionary government under Prince Lvov and then by the socialistic government of Kerensky, first by concessions and then by threats. The Bolshevik government resorted to terrorism. Nevertheless the Ukrainian national revolution from the first days flowed in a broad stream over the heads of the Provisional Government of Russia. The Ukrainian national movement was given dynamic force and seriousness by the millions of Ukrainian soldiers in the Russian army, who immediately placed themselves at the command of its political leadership.

The organization of a Ukrainian autonomous government was initiated by the previously secret political organization, the Organization of Ukrainian Progressives, which had an understanding with the Ukrainian Socialist parties in Kiev. The revolution in Ukraine became moderate in character because it tried to be not only national but also social in character. The independent Nationalists headed by Attorney Mikhnovsky, Dr. Lutzenko and others, were forced at the outset to remain in the background. Gradually they came out into the open when all attempts to realize the Ukrainian national aspirations within the framework of a Russian consideration proved hopeless because of the resistance of Russian democracy itself. Then the majority of the Ukrainian socialists joined them in their political program of complete independence for Ukraine.

Acting promptly in the first days of the revolution, the Organization of Ukrainian Progressives in Kiev created a Committee or Council composed of representatives of the peasants and of the army, entitled *Ukrainska Centralna Rada* (Ukrainian Central Council). In order to have a broader democratic foundation, the Rada called an All-Ukrainian National Congress in Kiev April 5-7, 1917. 1,900 delegates, of all walks of life and from all sections of Ukraine, took part. The Congress elected a new executive body for the Ukrainian Central Rada, or, to be exact, it added to the existing Rada new delegates representing the workers, the peasants and the army. It also established the political program of the Ukrainian people in Russia, which demanded the reorganization of the country into a federation of states, among which Ukraine would occupy her proper place. In this manner, the Ukrainian Central Rada became the Ukrainian Revolutionary Parliament.

It was not so easy to carry into effect the resolutions of the All-National Congress. The civil administration and the army control were in the hands of the Russians who after the Revolution became largely democratic in character, but who had no intention of obeying the Ukrainian Central Rada. They heeded the orders of the Russian Provisional Government in

Petrograd. Here and there the orders of the Central Rada were executed by Ukrainians in the administration and in the army, but by no means did the Rada have complete governmental control.

The Central Rada might have remained as a civil organ for a considerable time, had it not been for the actions of the Ukrainian army both at the front and in the rear. As the Russian Revolution began to spread through the army, a relaxation of discipline ensued. For the Ukrainian soldiers the revolution became the means of carrying out a national revolution in the army, and the general lowering of discipline facilitated their actions. Regiments which were mainly composed of Ukrainians began to Ukrainize themselves. The soldiers chose Ukrainian officers and introduced the Ukrainian language into their units. Where there was only a minority of Ukrainians, they demanded transfer to definite Ukrainian units and went on to demand the formation of Ukrainian armies.

In order to coordinate this movement, the more active officers and soldiers decided to summon a Ukrainian Military Convention in Kiev. The popularity of the Ukrainian National Revolution among army men was shown by the fact that barely ten days after the All-Ukrainian National Congress, the First Ukrainian Military Convention took place in Kiev, with almost seven hundred delegates from the front and rear as representatives of about one million Ukrainian soldiers.

These men, hardened by three years of war, expressed their opinions to the Russian Provisional Government somewhat more firmly than did the Central Rada. The resolutions of the Convention demanded the continuation of the war against Germany and Austria, and opposed the subversive propaganda of the Bolsheviks, who advised the soldiers to leave the front. They also demanded the creation of a Ukrainian army and navy as a stable basis for the political structure proposed by the Central Rada. Likewise the Convention created a permanent Ukrainian Military Committee. It should be borne in mind here that, inspired by the spirit of the national aspirations, the Ukrainian units at that time were the most disciplined in the Russian army and navy.

Feeling that now it had real power behind it, the Ukrainian Central Rada demanded from the Russian Provisional Government in Petrograd a reorganization of Russia on a federated basis and the creation of a Ukrainian army and navy. This demand was rejected by the Russian government, the majority of the members of which were liberal democrats.

The atmosphere in Kiev became very tense. The Rada realized that it would have to measure its strength with Russian revolutionary forces. When Petrograd refused the demand of the Rada, its president, Prof. M. Hru-

shevsky, summoned the Rada and, after having read the reply of the Russian government, declared: "*The holiday of the Revolution has ended; a dangerous era is approaching.*" The Central Rada directed its representatives in the provinces to strengthen their organizational work, and not to provoke the still strong Russian administration in Ukraine. However, to demonstrate its strength to the Russian Provisional Government, it called a Second Military Convention. The two old antagonists, Kiev and Moscow, had again taken up positions against each other, although it seemed at the time that they were united by the common aims of the social revolution in Russia.

June 23, 1917—Opening of the Ukrainian National Revolution

In Petrograd, the Provisional Government appreciated the seriousness of the situation, although it did not realize the Ukrainian strength. Kerensky, Minister of War, obviously under the pressure of the liberal democrats, forbade the meeting of the Second Military Convention which was to be held in the second half of June. The prohibition was sent to all parts of the front and to all the camps at a time when any form of prohibition was regarded by the masses of the soldiers as counter-revolutionary. It was a good illustration of the failure of Kerensky to understand the spirit of the time.

No Ukrainian propaganda then would have achieved so brilliant a success as this attack on the Second Ukrainian Military Convention by the Minister of War of Revolutionary Russia. From all sections of the front, ranging from Pskov to the Black Sea, from every camp of European Russia, from both of the navies, Ukrainian soldiers and sailors streamed to their national convention. They proceeded unmolested for no commander of the Russian forces dared to carry out the order of the Minister of War and stop them.

The following description of the Convention was published by the local Russian newspaper in Kiev, the *Kievskaya Mysl* (Kievan Thought): "It was a hot day. The entrance to the National Home was guarded by soldiers who permitted no one to pass. Everywhere there were large crowds of soldiers, sailors in white blouses and here and there an occasional civilian. Since all the delegates had not yet arrived, the convention was postponed to the afternoon. The people kept coming and coming with more soldiers and more sailors. Among the arriving delegates were also many officers. Almost half of the delegates bore military decorations on their chests as well as the Order of St. George. There were even some who had their tunics decorated with all grades of the Cross of St. George. Involuntarily you en-

joyed the tall statures and the free movements of the sailors. The browned youth gave the impression that they were moulded of bronze, and involuntarily you were captivated, involuntarily you were infected with the prevailing sentiment. Everywhere there were improvised meetings on the square . . . 'Moscovia has been throttling us, for three hundred years it has been throttling us,' you heard from the crowd. Here and there a Ukrainian volunteer spoke harshly: 'The Russian democracy is against us; it is against Ukraine.'

"In front of the Museum, where the admission cards were obtainable, there was a veritable sea of soldiers. The line stretched far along the street, far, far downhill to the First Gymnasium. 'So they have forbidden this Convention! See how the people are gathering like clouds,' gaily stated a powerful looking soldier.

"At five o'clock in the afternoon, the National Home was filled to overflowing. There was not enough room even for all the delegates, so guests were not permitted to enter. The theatre, from top to bottom, was filled with men, soldiers, officers, and sailors. On the stage was the presiding committee. The obedience and discipline were exemplary."

Such was the description of the Second Ukrainian Military Convention by a reporter of a Russian newspaper which was unfriendly to Ukraine. The Convention turned into a tremendous demonstration for the creation of a Ukrainian state within the framework of a Russian confederation. At the same time it gave full support to the Central Rada. Its success gave more weight to the decisions of the Rada.

The Convention was attended by 2,308 delegates, representing 1,600,000 Ukrainians under arms in the army and navy. The resolutions adopted by the Convention called upon that the Ukrainian Central Rada to ignore Petrograd and set up its own government in Ukraine. Its wording was as follows: "*It is suggested that our supreme representative body, the Ukrainian Central Rada, should no longer confer with the Russian Government and that it should instantly begin the strengthening of organization throughout the country in agreement with the national minorities.*"

The first day of the Military Convention, after the adoption of such resolutions, ended on the historic Square of St. Sophia in Kiev, in which are located some of the most valuable monuments of Ukraine of nine hundred years ago. An observer thus describes the scene. "From the bell tower of the Cathedral of St. Sophia Raphael bell rang out loudly and it was joined by the smaller bells with their peals. The entire square, already darkened in the twilight, presented a most unusual appearance. Tens of thousands of people crowded it from the Cathedral of St. Sophia to the Monastery of

St. Michael. Directly under the monument of Khmelnitsky an evening service was held. The Ukrainianized Regiment of Bohdan Khmelnitsky fell on its knees to a man. All knelt. In the twilight steel bayonets bristled over the heads of the kneeling soldiers. Then passionate speeches rang out: 'Brother Ukrainians! We have sworn once . . . We shall swear again that without the self-government for our mother Ukraine we will not return to our units. Swear! 'We swear!' and the very air shook from the unanimous exclamation which tore from all breasts. With a great clamor the people rose to their feet. In the darkness a command was given and the marchers moved off in step. A song resounded:

... We will prove that we are brothers of the Kozak race.
... Again brother Kozaks fate will smile upon us. . .
... And both soul and body we will sacrifice for freedom.

(Fragments of the Ukrainian National Hymn)

It seemed as if the thousand-year old streets of Kiev were recalling an ancient dream."

The Military Convention was not yet over. It decided not to leave Kiev until the Ukrainian Central Rada was transformed into a state organ of a Federated Ukraine despite the will to the contrary of Petrograd. This the Ukrainian soldiers and sailors demanded of the Central Rada.

Feeling that the decisive moment had at last arrived, the Rada entered upon the path of a national revolution against Russia (June 23, 1917) by proclaiming the first official act of the Ukrainian State, the First Universal.

Back in the days of the Ukrainian Kozak State of the 17th and 18th centuries, when the occasion warranted it the Hetman of Ukraine would issue as head of the state a Universal to the people. These Universals were similar to Western European ordinances and had the force of law. Now the Ukrainian Central Rada returned the old tradition and issued its First Universal to the Ukrainian people as the first law of the revolutionary re-birth of the Ukrainian Nation. By this act, the Ukrainian people regarded themselves as a sovereign nation which was to decide its own fate.

On the second day of the Military Convention, the famous writer Volodymyr Vynnychenko, as Vice President of the Central Rada came forward on the platform of the hall and read the Universal which was addressed:

"To all Ukrainians in Ukraine and outside Ukraine."

"Ukrainian people!" proclaimed the Universal. "Nation of peasants, workers and laborers! By your will, you have designated us, the Ukrainian

Central Rada, as the guardian of the rights and freedom of the Ukrainian land.

"Your representatives have expressed their will in this phrase, 'Let *Ukraine be Free!* Because of that fact, we, the Central Rada, are issuing this Universal to our entire nation and declare—*From this day on, we ourselves will create our own life!*'"

"The thunder of joy and happiness and enthusiasm reached the point of ecstasy," writes Vynnychenko himself. The entire theatre with its delegates, its public and the correspondents of various newspapers and with an extraordinarily strong, soul-stirring chorus, sang the great Testament of Shevchenko:

Bury me but rise again:
Break the chains you bear.
With the foeman's purple blood
Wash your freedom fair.

"The sunburned faces, marked with scars of battle and lines of pain, contorted themselves into expressions of ecstatic happiness. . . . Some wept, leaning their heads on the backs of the chairs; others gritted their teeth to keep from crying out in their emotion." After hundreds of years of enslavement under Russia, the Ukrainians had at last spoken out in their own language. They had proclaimed themselves as a sovereign nation. The natural consequence was the formation of the First Ukrainian government, the Council of the General Secretaries.

The Russian Government Recognizes Federated Ukrainian State

The First Universal changed the Ukrainian Central Rada from a body representing Ukrainian parties and communities into the national government of Ukraine. The Rada became the first Ukrainian Revolutionary Parliament. The executive power was taken over by the General Secretariat, as the first Ukrainian ministry under the premiership of Volodymyr Vynnychenko. This produced a deep impression in Petrograd and among the Russian democrats in Ukraine. Although the Russian government and the political parties were most antagonistic to this step, the situation was favorable for Ukraine. The Russian army was disintegrating; the reactionaries from the right and the Bolsheviks from the left were rising to overthrow the Russian democratic government. An armed revolution in Ukraine could only weaken further the already seriously weakened position of the Provisional Government. As a result, the socialist ministers took the responsi-

bility of making concessions to Ukraine. Three Russian socialist ministers, Terebchenko, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Kerensky, Minister of War, and the influential Tseretelli, Minister without Portfolio, came to Kiev from Petrograd to confer with the Rada.

The very arrival of the Russian Ministers in Kiev was a great victory for the Rada. The conference passed off without difficulty. The Russian ministers recognized recent situations as produced by the revolution. The Central Rada and the General Secretariat promised to cooperate loyally with the Russian government as the government of a federated state. The agreement was announced by the Ukrainian government in the Second Universal.

The result of the agreement was the addition to the Rada of representatives of the national minorities in Ukraine, Russians, Jews and Poles, and the acceptance by them of places in the General Secretariat. The national minorities received cultural autonomy and each had its own Secretary for matters pertaining to its nationality.

The Ukrainian government then proceeded to work out a temporary constitution for the country—the *Statute of Ukraine*. It defined the territory strictly on ethnographical lines, stabilized the powers of the Ukrainian Diet, the Central Rada and the Ukrainian government, the General Secretariat. The Statute of Ukraine visualized the participation of Ukrainian representatives in the All-Russian Constituent Assembly, but provided that prior to this meeting there would be held a Ukrainian Constitutional Convention to decide the state character of Ukraine in the Russian Federation. This matter was not referred to the All-Russian Constituent Assembly. The Statute was sent to the Russian central government, as a supplement to the former agreement, for its approval.

The Kiev agreement between the Russian socialist ministers and the Ukrainian Central Rada, however, participated a crisis in the Russian cabinet. In protest the liberal democratic ministers resigned from the cabinet. Kerensky then formed a purely socialist government, but day by day the internal chaos in Russia increased.

In the middle of July there broke out in Petrograd the first Bolshevik uprising against the Provisional Government. It was suppressed; as a result the power of the Russian reactionary movement was increased and subsequently it found expression in the uprising of General Kornilov. The government did not know upon whom it could rely, the uncertain socialist elements who were Bolshevized, or upon the reactionaries. In the end the latter again managed to secure ascendancy.

It was under such circumstances that the Russian Provisional Govern-

ment deliberated upon the agreement with Ukraine and the Statute of Ukraine. The reactionaries won and the government rejected the Statute of Ukraine and in its place it issued Instructions for the General Secretariat, which cut the Ukrainian territory in half and retained for Russia the important industrial and mining regions of southeastern Ukraine and an entrance to the Black Sea. It also reduced the power of the Secretaries.

The Central Rada did not react strongly to this rejection by the Provisional Government and continued its work of organization until the Bolsheviks seized the power in Russia and replaced the Provisional Government with the Soviet of People's Commissars (November 7, 1917).

The transfer of the government of Russia from the democratic Provisional Government to the Soviet of People's Commissars somewhat cleared up the doubtful situation which had involved Ukraine, thanks to the instructions of Kerensky. The Soviet government, under the leadership of Lenin together with Trotsky, the Commissar for War, and Stalin, the Commissar for Nationalities, verbally adopted a very liberal attitude toward Ukraine. It recognized the right of Ukraine to self-determination and even to separation from Russia, but, in fact, it differed in no way from the attitude of the liberal democracy, which refused Ukraine all rights, even autonomy. Side by side with the glowing phrases about the right of Ukraine to separate, there appeared a demand for the formation of a Soviet government in Ukraine, that is, a full centralization of Russia under the rule of the Communist Party.

The accession to power of the Bolsheviks forced Ukraine to take a serious step in the direction of full independence. It liquidated the Russian administration in Ukraine and the Central Rada and the General Secretariat became the supreme authority over the Ukrainian people.

After the change in Russia, there broke out in Ukraine a conflict between the Russian Bolsheviks and all the Russian revolutionary anti-Bolshevik groups. The Central Rada, remaining neutral in this struggle between Russian factions, took advantage of the situation and with the aid of its loyal armies seized the entire military and administrative power in Ukraine. Thus the Central Rada and the General Secretariat became masters of the situation and the Russian anti-Bolshevik groups came under its protection and commenced to cooperate with the Ukrainian Government.

Ukraine Becomes a Ukrainian National Republic

These events together with the incomprehensible Bolshevik propaganda against the Ukrainian Central Rada forced Ukraine to announce her pre-

cise status. On November 20, 1917, the Central Rada issued the *Third Universal* which emphasized definitely the international position of Ukraine. With this Ukraine formally proclaimed herself a Ukrainian National Republic. She severed herself from Soviet Russia, that is she ceased to recognize any form of power wielded by the Soviet of People's Commissars which made her a de facto independent nation. The Third Universal envisioned the formation of a federation of equal nations in Russia, and it proposed a radical agrarian reform for the peasants and an eight hour work day for the workers. Likewise it announced cultural autonomy for all the national minorities in the country.

Simultaneously the Central Rada set the election for the Ukrainian Constituent Assembly for January 9, 1918, and appointed the first meeting of it for the following January 22.

"Ukrainian people and all minority nations in Ukraine," the Third Universal proclaimed, "A serious and dangerous hour has fallen upon the lands of the Russian Republic. In the cities of the north a bloody civil war is being waged. There is no central government; anarchy, disorder and ruin are spreading over the entire country. Our land also is in danger. Without a powerful, unified, national government, Ukraine can also fall into the abyss of civil revolution, bloodshed, and decadence. . . . *From today, Ukraine becomes the Ukrainian National Republic.*

It is to be noted that there is an ambiguity in this phrase. The phrase used, "Ukrainska Narodna Respublika," meant to the conservatives National, to the leftist parties People's—such as used in the Soviet designation of People's Commissars. The meaning of the word 'narod' includes the two meanings. The supporters of all groups agreed upon the word, which had become a slogan wherever the Russian revolutionary movement penetrated.

At this time Ukraine was almost the only part of the former Russia where order reigned and personal safety was assured. In all neighboring regions an insane communistic war was being waged, accompanied by thousands of executions. Following the first attempted Bolshevik uprising in Kiev, the Ukrainian government disarmed the military units which had fallen under the influence of the Bolsheviks, in order to protect itself from any surprises on the part of the Bolsheviks, especially since the Soviet of People's Commissars had allowed it to be clearly understood that it would never tolerate in Ukraine any authority other than that of the Soviets and had begun a fierce propaganda against the Central Rada by declaring that it was bourgeois in character.

The action against the Ukrainian Central Rada, as is stated in the re-

recently published Soviet History of Ukraine,* was directed by the Russian Commissar of Nationalities, Joseph Stalin. He induced the Executive Committee of the local Kiev Soviet (Council) of Peasants, Workers, and Soldiers, under the leadership of the non-Ukrainian communists Ivanov and Horowitz, to call an All-Ukrainian Convention of Soviets (December 17, 1917). This was to precede the elections for the Ukrainian Constituent Assembly in order to produce a coup d'état, to overthrow the government of the Central Rada and to proclaim the government of the Soviets in Ukraine. At the same time the Russian Communist Government of People's Commissars prepared a forty-eight hour ultimatum to Ukraine for the unfriendly acts of the Ukrainian Rada toward the Russian Soviets.

The Ukrainian government did not forbid the meeting of the All-Ukrainian Convention of Councils but it took care that at the meeting there would be true delegates of the peasants, workers and soldiers. The meeting proved clearly that Bolshevism in Ukraine was an external intrigue of the Russian government against the independence of Ukraine. Of the 2,000 delegates, only 150 delegates (and the majority of these were non-Ukrainian) took a stand against the Central Rada. The overwhelming majority announced full loyalty to the Central Rada. The meeting therefore became an enthusiastic demonstration for the independent government of Ukraine.

This historic conference of the Ukrainian Councils at which the Bolsheviks suffered such an inglorious defeat, adopted the following resolution: "The meeting of the Ukrainian Councils emphasizes its definite decision that the Central Rada in its further work stand solidly on guard over the achievement of the revolution, spreading and deepening without halt the revolutionary activity to safeguard the class interests of a laboring democracy and call together without delay the Ukrainian Constituent Assembly, which alone can reveal the true will of all democratic Ukraine. The meeting of the Councils of Peasants, Workers and Soldiers' Delegates of Ukraine in this manner expresses to the Ukrainian Central Rada its full confidence and promises it its absolute support. . . . "On paper," continues the resolution, "the Soviet of People's Commissars seemingly recognizes the right of a nation to self-determination and even to separation but only in words. In fact the government of Commissars brutally attempts to interfere in the activities of the Ukrainian government which executes the will of the legislative organ of the Ukrainian Central Rada. What sort of self-determination is this? It is certain the Commissars will permit self-determination only

* Published 1941, by Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian S.S.R.

to their own party; all other groups and peoples (nations) they, like the Tsarist regime, desire to keep under their domination by force of arms. But the Ukrainian people did not cast off the Tsarist yoke only to take upon themselves the yoke of the Commissars."

As we look back with a historical perspective on this resolution of the meeting of the Ukrainian Councils of December 17, 1917, after twenty-seven years of Russian Bolshevik rule over Ukraine, we can only admire the awareness of the Ukrainian, peasant, workers and soldier as to the actual intentions of the Russian Bolsheviks toward Ukraine. The Russian Bolsheviks, directed in this incident by Stalin, played their cards at the meeting of the Ukrainian Councils (Soviets) and this time they ignominiously lost the play. Force became their last resort.

The small minority at the Ukrainian Councils (Soviets) Conference, some 150 delegates, only about 7.5% of the total number attending it, led by the Russian Sergiev (Artem) from the Don Basin, Ivanov of Kiev, and Horowitz, left Kiev, moved to Kharkiv, on the border of Red Russia, and there opened their own conference of Soviets and proclaimed themselves as the All-Ukrainian Councils Conference. There they decided to overthrow the government of the Central Rada, proclaimed Ukraine a Soviet Republic, chose their own executive officers, and named themselves a Rada of People's Secretaries, and not of Commissars, so as to confuse the people by a name similar to that of the Ukrainian Secretaries—Ministers. This was a government of quislings, a puppet government in the hands of the Russian Soviet of People's Commissars. It carried out most assiduously the wishes of the Commissars and was for the most part dependent upon the support of the Russian Army.

On the very same day as the Kiev conference of the Ukrainian Councils, which turned out so unsuccessfully for the Bolsheviks, (December 17, 1917), the Russian Government of Commissars presented the government of Ukraine with a forty-eight hour ultimatum and demanded those conditions which, as a foreign government, it had no right to call for. This ultimatum was designed only to cover the military attack of the Russian Bolsheviks on Ukraine, to come to the aid of its puppet government in Kharkiv. "In the first days of January, 1918," says the Bolshevik History of Ukraine, "bands of Kharkiv and Don Basin Red Guards (Russified Ukrainians), Red Cossacks, Petrograd and Moscow Red Guardists, began the primary military actions against the counter-revolutionary Central Rada." The Russian Bolsheviks invaded Ukraine not only to aid the quisling Ukrainians, but also to stave off starvation, because in Petrograd and Moscow there was actual starvation brought about by the anarchy created by the Soviet rule.

Ukraine, an Independent Nation, January 22, 1918

A year had barely passed when it became obvious that the proper Ukrainian policy was not that propagated by the socialist majority of the Central Rada, which dreamed of a federal union with Russia, but that of the minority which had demanded from the very outbreak of the revolution in Russia a Ukrainian nation completely independent of Russia and which had the support of the masses of the Ukrainian military who had demanded a separate Ukrainian government. Before ten months had passed, Ukraine proclaimed its complete independence. It was an act which should have been done on the first day of the Russian Revolution, (March 11, 1917).

The Russian communist armies, under the command of Muraviev, advanced from the north on Kiev. The way was prepared for them by a swarm of Bolshevik propagandists. A goodly number of people allowed themselves to be deceived, largely through the fault of the Ukrainian government, which, supporting the freedom of speech won by the revolution, tolerated the Red propagandists, who were openly urging the people to betray their country and to rise against their government. War ensued between Ukraine and Russia and also between Ukraine and the Central Powers. Bolshevik propaganda reached the army fighting against Germany and Austria and the Ukrainian front army began to disintegrate. In addition, millions of deserting Russian soldiers started to return home, through Ukraine.

France and England made strong efforts to keep Ukraine in the war against Germany. They sent representatives from their military headquarters—General Tabouis for the French and General Picton Bagge for the English—to collaborate with the Ukrainian government as duly accredited representatives. Likewise they recognized the Rada as the *de facto* government of Ukraine. Yet it was impossible for Ukraine to continue the war. The *de facto* recognition of the young Ukrainian nation by the great powers of France and England would have been a tremendous diplomatic success, if times had been more settled. The foreign missions arrived at exactly the moment when the Russian Bolshevik hordes were moving on Kiev and the Soviet of People's Commissars had arranged an armistice with the Central Powers and was beginning peace conferences in Brest. There was serious danger that Ukraine would not only be completely overrun by the Bolshevik armies, but also that the Central Powers would recognize the domination of the Russian Soviets even over Ukraine.

The Ukrainian government was thus forced to stop the war against the Central Powers and to make a peace necessary for the defense of the Ukrain-

ian nation. In the first days of January, 1918, the government of the Ukrainian Central Rada sent a delegation to Brest-Litovsk, first in order to prevent the Russian Soviet of People's Commissars from speaking also in the name of Ukraine, and secondly, to make peace, in the name of Ukraine, with the Central Powers.

The logic of events thus demanded that Ukraine proclaim itself de jure independent and free from Russian rule, because only thus could it put forward the right to carry on independent negotiations and to make a separate peace without the approval of Russia. *Accordingly the Ukrainian Central Rada issued, on January 22, 1918, a Fourth Universal in which it declared Ukraine a completely independent nation.*

"People of Ukraine," announced the Universal, "by your power, desire and words there has been created on Ukrainian soil a free Ukrainian National Republic. There has been realized the old dream of our fathers, who struggled for the freedom and rights of the working people. In a difficult hour, the freedom of Ukraine has been born. . . . Meanwhile the Petrograd government of the People's Commissars has declared war on Ukraine in order to bring the free Ukrainian Republic back under its jurisdiction, and it is sending into our lands its armies, the Red Guard of the Bolsheviki. . . . *From today, the Ukrainian National Republic becomes the Independent, Free, Sovereign, State of the Ukrainian People.*"

The peace made at Brest-Litovsk between Ukraine and the Central Powers on February 9, 1918, brought calm at least from the side of the Central Powers. The other peace made at Brest-Litovsk between Russia and the Central Powers laid upon the Soviet of People's Commissars in Russia the obligation to recognize Ukraine as an independent nation and also to make peace with her.

Democratic Ukraine was too weak to be able to defend itself with her own power against Communistic Russia and therefore she was compelled to ask the aid of Austria and Germany against Russian Bolshevism. This aid was sent with all the conflicts and complexities that usually accompany foreign aid. The Germans began to interfere with the internal affairs of Ukraine. This brought about conflict with the Central Rada. Then with the aid of the Germans the conservative elements took over the government and introduced the monarchistic reign of the Hetman Paul Skoropadsky, a descendant of one of the last of the old Hetmans. The fall of the Central Powers naturally ended his unpopular rule, and the government of the Ukrainian democratic parties was restored.

The Independent Western Ukrainian National Republic

From the very outbreak of the Russian revolution the Austrian Ukrainians lived on... for the scanty news of Ukrainian revolutionary activity which came through the front from Kiev to L'viv through the thick veil of Austrian censorship. The news was usually garbled and incomplete, especially whenever it concerned the relations of the Entente nations and Ukraine.

Western Ukrainian youth turned with all their souls and interest toward the Dnieper and concerned themselves only with all-Ukrainian affairs. The policy of the Austrian government toward Ukraine no longer was of interest to them. It seemed to them that the dependence of West Ukraine upon Austria was fast ebbing.

One day in January, 1918, rumor sped through L'viv that a delegation from the Ukrainian government to the peace conference at Brest-Litovsk was to pass that day through L'viv. The delegation had purposely chosen the longer route through L'viv in order to have the opportunity to meet with the political leaders of the Western Ukrainians and to hear their desires, which they intended to introduce at the conferences between Ukraine and Austria. The maximum demand of the Austrian Ukrainians was for the union of the entire Ukrainian nation; the minimum demand was for the segregation of the Ukrainian lands within the boundaries of Austria into a separate autonomous province.

The Galician Ukrainians regarded the declaration of the independence of Ukraine on January 22, 1918 as a natural step, and they had found it difficult to understand the proposed plans of federation which had been previously talked about. They were preparing to join in a common Ukrainian fatherland, when, in the fall of 1918, after America entered the war, it became evident that the fall of Austria was imminent.

The Austrian Ukrainians knew that the Poles had in the army and among the youth a secret organization, the Polish Military Organization, which was preparing to play its part on the day of the downfall of Austria. Therefore the Ukrainian officers of the Austrian army, especially those stationed on Ukrainian territory, formed in turn a secret organization of their own, the Ukrainian Military Committee, which established relations with the Ukrainian Legion. In October, Austria was disintegrating.

On October 18, 1918, in L'viv the Western Ukrainian Constituent Assembly convened and decided to create, in accordance with Wilson's self-determination principle, for all the Ukrainian lands of Austria-Hungary—Galicia, Bukovina, and Carpathian Ukraine—the Western Ukrainian na-

tion. Delegates from all three regions attended this convention and on the next day the decisions of the leaders were proclaimed publicly to the Ukrainian masses.

From the 19th of October on, the Western Ukrainians and the Poles awaited the decisive moment when Austria would collapse. The Poles claimed Galician Ukraine, thereby flouting the principle of Wilson as expressed in the thirteenth of his Fourteen Points that there should be created an independent Poland on the soil clearly inhabited by a Polish majority. This article gave the Ukrainians moral self-assurance but it did not remove the danger to Ukrainian Galicia, because the Polish Liquidating Committee in Krakow openly asserted that it would appear in Lviw to seize the government of Ukrainian Galicia from Austrian hands.

The Ukrainians, however, outwitted the wily Poles. At dawn of November 1, 1918 Ukrainian units of the Austrian army in Lviw, directed by the Ukrainian Military Committee, became masters of Lviw and of all of Galician Ukraine. From the tower of the Lviw City Hall flew the Ukrainian yellow and blue national flag. The Austrian Ukrainians realized their right of self-determination by establishing the Western Ukrainian National Republic as an independent nation. Bukovina, after several days of Ukrainian government, was occupied by Rumanian armies; Carpatho-Ukraine was held by the Hungarians and then it fell under the rule of the Czechs.

It may be asked why the Western Ukrainians did not immediately unite with the Ukrainians of the Dnieper, since the All-Ukrainian aspirations of Western Ukraine were so strong. The answer is to be found in the momentary situation of Eastern Ukraine. As soon as German support of Hetman Skoropadsky was withdrawn, the socialist parties led a national uprising against his regime; but at the moment when Austria collapsed the uprising was not yet complete and so union was impossible. As soon, however, as the triumphant democratic faction obtained control in Eastern Ukraine, the parliament of Western Ukraine, the Ukrainian National Rada, decreed on January 3, 1919, that the two Ukrainian Republics should be united into one independent Ukrainian state.

**From today, forever there will be One, Undivided, Independent,
Ukrainian People's Republic**

January 22, 1919 was a fine but frosty day. The historic Square of St. Sophia in Kiev was filled to overflowing with the national standards and the emblems of all the lands of the United Ukraine. The snow crunched under foot, as the people assembled in the Square, especially around the monument of Bohdan Khmelnytsky. A great holiday was being celebrated.

From the ancient cathedral, built in 1037 by Yaroslav the Wise, the Monarch of the ancient Ukrainian Kievan state, there issued a procession of clergy which was awaiting the arrival of the government of Ukraine and the guests of honor, the brethren from the Carpathian regions, who had arrived in Kiev two days before. A delegation of 65 representatives had come from Galicia, Bukovina, and Carpatho-Ukraine to bring about the reunion of the long separated sections of Ukraine into one nation.

A column of automobiles containing the members of the Government and the delegates drove up. Thanks were given to God that He had permitted the long separated kinsmen to become united into one country. Then came the historical act of union. The delegate from Western Ukraine, Minister, Dr. Longin E. Cehelsky, in strong measured tones read the decree of the Western Ukrainian National Rada concerning the union of the two Ukrainian republics. In response, Prof. T. Shvets, a member of the Directorate of the Ukrainian National Republic, read the decree of the Directorate, accepting Western Ukraine into national union with Eastern Ukraine. His proclamation ended with the words: "*From today, until the end of time, there will be One, Undivided, Independent Ukrainian People's Republic.*" Immediately at the four corners of the Square of St. Sophia, deacons began to read both acts, proclaiming to the assembled people and to the world that the Ukrainian people had settled their own future. They had created an independent United Ukrainian People's Republic as the state of the entire Ukrainian people.

The independence of Ukraine and the union of all the Ukrainian lands into one national state had been the ideal of the Ukrainian people for centuries. It had been planned by the Ukrainian Cromwell, Bohdan Khmelnytsky. The freeing of Ukraine and the beginning of the work of union had been the political plan of Hetman Ivan Mazepa. That centuries-old dream, however, was not realized until on that winter day, January 22, 1919, when the Ukrainian people regained the independence and unity of the days of Volodymyr the Great and Yaroslav the Wise of the 11th century.

That day of happiness, however, was not unmixed with sorrow. For bells of St. Sophia had scarcely ceased ringing, when from the north came the sound of Bolshevik cannon. Meanwhile in the south, in Odessa, the armies of the Russian reactionaries under Denikin were disembarking. And from the west the Poles were advancing. Could the young nation of the united Ukrainian people resist all of its enemies with its weak military forces, who were armed only with the granite-like moral right of self-determination, the creation of the American spirit?

National Faith Watered With Ukrainian Blood

The Ukrainian United Nation, founded on January 22, 1919, in the Square of St. Sophia in Kiev, could not endure. It was overthrown by the Red and the White Russians, the Poles, the Rumanians, and the Czechs, even though an independent Ukraine was the most natural solution of the key European problem, the creation of security for the small and medium sized nations of Europe from the two imperialisms of Germany and Russia. Nevertheless, the act of January 22, 1919 became the basic dogma of the political faith of the modern Ukrainian. Just as dew disappears in the sunlight, so the old conception of autonomy in a federation has disappeared among the European Ukrainians. The idea of an independent and united Ukraine remains unchallenged today.

The period from January 22, 1919 to the present proves the existence of this supreme ideal of the Ukrainian people. During this period millions of Ukrainians have sacrificed their lives on scaffolds, have been shot and exiled to the icy wastes of the Arctic. The strength and inspiration received from this act of union enabled the revolutionaries of Western and Eastern Ukraine to wage, since the last war an unceasing struggle against the foreign domination of their native country.

"Through Kiev we will reach Lwiw," was the slogan of the Western Ukrainian army, when, forced from its native soil by the Poles, it retreated into Eastern Ukraine and began the campaign to liberate Kiev from the Red Russians. With the twin visions of the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev and of the Cathedral of St. George in Lwiw before them, hundreds of thousands of the sons of Galician Ukraine died, struck down by the dreadful typhus in Eastern Ukraine.

The Ukrainian people have determined their future fate. They have manifested to the world in the blood that they have shed that their supreme desire is to be a free and united nation in Eastern Europe, regardless of the future selected for them by foreign powers, the rulers of the world. The living Ukrainians will never deny or give up the decisions and the high ideals of their fathers and forefathers.



THE DEMOCRATIC TREND OF UKRAINIAN LITERATURE

By CLARENCE A. MANNING

EVER SINCE the appearance of the *Eneida* of Kotlyarevsky in 1798, Ukrainian literature has moved steadily along the pathway of democracy, as it has been understood throughout the world during the last century and a half. Yet during this period, while the general trend has been toward the increasing of interest in the common man, there have been many changes in the particular emphasis placed upon various aspects of it by the different writers.

The late eighteenth century saw two contradictory ideas swelling into open flood. The first of these perhaps considered itself conservative in essence. It was the desire of the people of some province or country, working through their traditional institutions, to recover some of that power that had slipped from their grasp with the rise of the autocratic imperial states of the century. Later to this was added an idealization of the past, of the Middle Ages, and of the age of chivalry, which was summed up in romanticism. Yet side by side with this was the other tendency to emphasize the rights of the individual and those principles which culminated in the French Revolution. Along with this went a renewed emphasis on the potentialities of the peasant speech and a new desire to make all persons literate in the language of their parents.

These two ideals which were often in strong opposition were in conflict in every portion of Europe but their individual weight in each particular case varied with the general political and cultural situation of the people who espoused them. Thus the eighteenth century witnessed in the elimination of the Hetmanate and the disruption of the Sich the last annihilation of the old political rights of Ukraine. It was the culmination of a process which had begun when the free Kozaks of the Sich lost the right to elect their own officers and when the traditions of a class society first appeared among the free warriors of the Sich. The return to the past and Romanticism led to a glorification of the Sich and the Kozaks and a yearning for that time when the brave warriors were able to play a lone hand and to be a menace to the King of Poland, the Tsar of Moscow, and the Sultan of Turkey. Yet the development of the Russian Empire had been such that it was futile for the Ukrainians to dream of recovering their ancient liberty

and of going back to the life as it was before the Treaty of Pereyaslav, when the Kozaks came into direct and legal contact with the Tsar of Russia.

On the other hand, the steady loss of liberties by the peasants and the increasing demands for their labor by the landowners led to an appreciation of the need for a general change in conditions and inspired some of the more enlightened to look to the new reforming movements that were being given at least lip service by some of the philosophers around Catherine the Great. At the same time the new interest in language and in folksongs urged a steadily increasing number of scholars and educators to take down the songs of the average Ukrainian village and to strive to prepare written materials in the local vernacular speech.

It was under these circumstances that Kotlyarevsky prepared the *Eneida*. We have no record that he was threatened with any persecution by the authorities for his unprecedented work. Burlesque epics had long been known both in the Academy of Kiev and in the Russian writings of many of the Russianized Ukrainian noblemen. There was nothing openly seditious or even menacing in the work and yet the theme of disinherited peers under the leadership of a former prince of a once reigning house tended to a classless delineation of existence quite as it was in Virgil's original work. The Roman poet drew no sharp line between Aeneas and his followers. With the destruction of Troy and the Roman tradition that their great families were descended from these self-same exiles, there was small point in differentiating between master and man in the great debacle which he was picturing. We cannot analyze Kotlyarevsky's motives in this work. They were probably mixed and once the work was published and read with interest and amusement by Prince Repnin, himself of Ukrainian stock, and his friends, Kotlyarevsky had no need to worry over his laudation of the past ages.

The work naturally had a glorification of the Ukrainian folk customs, a sharp criticism of many of the abuses, but it was couched in such a form that it was not to be attacked. It was, however, taken up by various other writers and a new period was inaugurated. On the one hand, the very classlessness attracted attention to the classlessness of the old Sich and on the other to the abuses of modern Ukrainian life. In his later dramas and in the *Ode to Prince Kurakin*, he was able to speak more freely about the present abuses but there was already a certain literary tradition of this, even among the gentry who dominated Russian literature, and he was still on firm ground.

The succeeding authors played with the same ideas. There grew up not only in Ukrainian but also in Russian and Polish, a very definite ethno-

graphical, idyllic school of writers which emphasized every possible characteristic of Ukrainian life distinguishing it from the surrounding groups. Besides that, as the nobility had largely passed into the culture of one or the other of the dominant powers, Ukrainian literature when it dealt with the present pictured an oppressed people sympathetically, and when it dealt with the past, it glorified the free and independent Kozaks of the Sich and their fearless, democratically-elected leaders. Both ideas, therefore, detailed the study of the sad present and the glorification of the past, combined in Ukrainian to emphasize the democratic elements of life and thought and to avoid that picturing of noble culture that was such a marked feature of both the Pushkin school in Russian and the Polish romanticists.

Early in the nineteenth century there had come a remarkable outpouring of poetry among both the Russians and the Poles. In both languages a group of geniuses and highly talented writers advanced the literature to a new artistic level which has never been equalled since. Shevchenko took his place among this galaxy to express the Ukrainian spirit. He reached the same artistic level but the influences of his background and of his early life naturally separated him very sharply from their feelings, except in that noble and elevated atmosphere where genius would seek its own company to touch subjects that were of interest to all.

Taras Shevchenko was born a serf but his grandfather had taken part in the last and one of the bloodiest of the uprisings of the Ukrainians against the Poles, the Koliischina in 1768. After its failure he had suffered with the others and now he left to his grandson a flaming memory of the stories which he had told of those heroic and bloody days. On the other hand, the young boy could not fail to appreciate the sufferings of the present in the forced servitude of his people. Circumstances and his artistic talents carried him to St. Petersburg and brought him to the attention of the painter Bryulov, the darling of the Russian aristocracy and the loving painter of those classical scenes which had given Kotlyarevsky his original idea.

So from the first edition of the *Kobzar* in 1840, Shevchenko fearlessly represented the two Ukrainian democratic interests, the admiration for the independent life of the Kozaks of the Sich and their struggle against the adjacent countries and the demand for a new and better life for the oppressed serfs of the present. At first under the influence of the tales of his grandfather and the striking classical models of Bryulov, he gave predominance to the hopes of independence won upon the battlefield and to the martial exploits of the old Kozak leaders. Yet even in *Katerina*, he pictured

the injustice of the present. To him the national enemy was the traditional Poland of the Middle Ages.

Yet after his return to Ukraine in the full flush of manhood in 1843, he could not fail to notice and be impressed by the overhanging atmosphere of gloom and of oppression. Never himself possessed of real desire to take part in war, Shevchenko found more to his taste the struggle against social injustice. More and more he turned against the power of Russia. More and more he became dissatisfied with the result of Russian mastery of Ukraine and the evils that this brought with it. More and more he came to defend the injured and the unfortunate, especially young girls who had transgressed the iron traditional laws of the village and were cast out helpless to make their own way.

It was Shevchenko who made for Ukraine the fusion of the two literary types, of the past and of the present, and who transferred to the present situation that fierce spirit of national independence of the past which was needed not only on the battlefield but in the elimination of the evils of serfdom, now that Ukraine was under Russian domination. Even before his arrest and induction into the Russian army, Shevchenko had mapped out a course of action which was anti-imperial, anti-tsar, and for the people, and it was the elements borrowed from the past and the need for action that differentiated him from many of his friends in the Society of Saints Cyril and Methodius, which represented the more truly intellectual strivings of people trained in the modern ideas of liberty.

It was this that differentiated him from Panteleimon Kulish. No less ardent in his desires to help his people, Kulish could not appreciate the positive sides of the old independence. He tended to see the anarchistic nature of the Sich and it was this, undoubtedly one weakness of the old free organization, that made him finally a Kozakophobe and led to the misunderstandings between him and many of his fellow countrymen. Meanwhile life had moved on. In both Russia and Poland a new generation was arising that had no personal contacts with the eighteenth century struggles. In Russia the new intelligentsia were permeated only with the Western demands for social reform and they turned against the glorification of the past. In Poland it was already a half century since the last remnants of a Polish army had gone to battle under their own flag and for their own recognized country. There too the heroic urge was rapidly being replaced by the nineteenth century conceptions of civic and individual liberty. The Ukrainians of the next generation could not have direct personal contact with men who had dared to strike an open blow for their national rights and independent existence.

Hence it is that the following writers as Marko Vovchok turned away from the struggles of the Kozaks and the life of the Sich to express in their own tongue the cruder and inconceivable enormities of the life around them. The floggings, the forced labor, the arbitrary separation of families, the unrestrained autocracy of those landowners whom Lermontov had so aptly scourged in his poem on the Death of Pushkin, "Degenerate descendants of sires famed for their rascality," these were the themes of the younger writers. Not emphasizing for the moment the political slogan of a free Ukraine, they turned their attention to the hardships of the present and for the next half century in Eastern Ukraine, we find a steady emphasis on the same problems that marked the democratizing of Russian literature—the need for a better social order in the village, the defects in the emancipation of the serfs, when it finally was proclaimed, the newer concepts put forward by the radical and liberal thinkers. But always and in all the writers, there was an unflinching emphasis on the cultural and psychological differences between the Ukrainians and the Russians, the Moskals, and on the absorption of large parts of the newly educated classes into the general world around them.

The new generation found themselves in a hard position. The Russian government was openly and without subterfuge denying the existence of a separate Ukraine nation, separate Ukrainian culture and language. It had forbidden the publication of books of literature in Ukrainian. It was exerting every possible influence to standardize Russian culture and to throttle all manifestations of particularism, except in the archaeological and ethnographical fields and here it was endeavoring to stop everything that was not purely scientific. It was not even possible to write such glowing descriptions of Ukrainian habits as had been done by Kvitka-Osnovyanenko a half century earlier. On the other hand, the radicals themselves were as permeated with the spirit of Russian solidarity as were the conservatives and perhaps even more so, for their philosophy, based upon Western ideals which had been formulated in distinctly national states, and their indifference to poetry and the arts led them to undervalue and condemn precisely those fields which had proved most inviting in the early days of the Ukrainian revival. That same magnetic attraction of mere size which had been an overpowering menace to the Kozaks on the battlefields of the seventeenth century was now revealed in the intellectual radicalism of nineteenth century Russia. The new leaders had to find a role and a mode of working and there is small wonder that many of their writings drifted into a sterile repetition of old motifs or carried them into the all-alluring field of Great Russian disputes.

It was Western Ukraine, included in Austria-Hungary, that seemed the only outlet for their aspirations. Already Kulish had spent years in L'viv. Already the custom had developed of publishing Ukrainian books in Western Ukraine and of smuggling them back into Russia. Yet conditions in this province were very different.

Austria-Hungary with its policy of "divide and rule" was unlike Russia. In Western Ukraine, the Hapsburgs with their officials drawn from the court of Vienna were able to keep divided both the Poles and Ukrainians, the latter whom they insisted upon calling Ruthenians. Then the overwhelming part of these people were Greek Catholic in religion instead of Orthodox. They were faced with a different system of education, with different outlets for their activity and while the fundamental problems of securing independence were the same, there was a marked difference in the external manifestations. There was less incentive for a young Ukrainian to become a Pole in Western Ukraine than to become a Russian in Great Ukraine. By the middle of the nineteenth century, if he were going to renounce his nationality and his culture, it would be far more advantageous for him to make his way to Vienna and to lose himself in the preponderantly German atmosphere of the great capital. Why move from one provincial group to another, when it was possible to enter the leading bureaucratic majority? Long before the dismemberment of Poland, the religious differentiation between Roman and Greek Catholic Poles and Ukrainians had stabilized the situation and every act of the Hapsburg rulers for a half century had tended to protect that uneasy balance.

Hence the difference that strikes the eye so forcibly when we first consider Ivan Franko, the greatest of the Ukrainian writers of Western Ukraine. His life is one of hardships but there is none of that spectacular and dramatic tragedy that had overwhelmed Shevchenko. It is the picture of a hard-working journalist, scholar, and writer doing his duty, holding up the cause of his people and choosing as his next task that which seemed to be the most immediate and necessary and which would secure at least a scanty living for himself and his family. It is the prosaic present rather than the colorful past that his life and work presents. It is true that in *Zakhar Berkut* he pictured the old village republic of the Middle Ages but even there it is an ordered community that acts as one man by ancestral tradition and not the indiscriminately gathered hand of Kozaks meeting and choosing their head from their own warlike members. His works give detailed and enlightening pictures of the struggle for democracy and equal rights under the conditions prevailing at Vienna where local diets met regularly and were manipulated, whenever possible, to suit the wishes of the ruling

feudal clique. There is a wide difference between the Polish-Ukrainian struggle under these conditions and the Russian-Ukrainian feud as seen even by the later writers in Russia. There is more of what we in the West consider a parliamentary and economic struggle, there is less of open and unconcealed cruelty. Yet the works of Franko show clearly the desperate efforts that were needed to eliminate discrimination, to spread an intelligent Ukrainian education, and to make the people able to take their own part in the tangled skein of nations that were the Hapsburg lands.

There was much to do also to explain the people of Great Ukraine and of Western Ukraine to one another, to create a truly unified national consciousness, to eliminate a border which was maintained by the armed forces of both Russia and Austria-Hungary, and to keep in the national creed the more talented youth of Western Ukraine. Franko covered the field from every angle and in every form of literature, in poetry, in novels, in short stories, and in the drama. He reached a high degree of proficiency in all but throughout all his work he preaches constantly the meaning of progress and democracy as they were received in Central Europe.

The end of the century saw Ukrainian literature both in Russia and Austria-Hungary well founded, on a broad basis with a fairly large reading population of a far higher cultural and educational level than a century earlier, when only the exceptional man and the clergy were able to read and to be conscious of the world without their village where the foreigner might be friend or foe.

The result was a still further broadening of the themes of literature. There was a wider appreciation of world literature, a stronger desire to have Ukrainian literature representative of all those impulses and methods and styles that were being introduced into the literatures of the civilized world. Neo-romanticism, symbolism, and many another school was now practised. Some of the older and more conservative leaders could not see the value of the new. To them literature which did not speak of the immediate problems of Ukraine in direct and forceful terms was but a betrayal of the people. They were not prepared to see the writers draw identical situations from world history and present them in such a way that the thoughtful reader would instinctively draw his own conclusions. They saw the value of such methods only as being a method of deceiving the censor and of telling truths that would otherwise be suppressed.

Yet the newer writers kept on. There was Lesya Ukrainka, a highly educated woman who was familiar with all of the world literatures. She read easily almost every European language and from her retirement as an invalid she was able to run over themes from all corners of the globe and

find in each a message for her own country and for the adornment of her people's literature. There was the artistic and linguistically beautiful writings of Kotsyubinsky, the individual vignettes of Stefanyk. There were many methods of treating widely divergent themes, but one and all proclaimed the intrinsic unity of the Ukrainian people and their cultural separation from their neighbors. There was far less idealization of the individual man but one and all put the question of democratic rights, of social justice and national independence. The work might be clothed in a more complicated literary form but the emphasis upon the need for proper development, education and training of the people to make them fit for the duties of citizenship never varied.

So Europe plunged to the first World War which brought with it the destruction of the two Empires and the brief political independence of Ukraine. It was a striking moment when for the first time in centuries the people could boast of their own government in Kiev. Franko was dead, Levitsky-Nechuy dying, but the Provisional Government gave him a pension as a symbol of what he had accomplished in his prime. Then the blow fell again and Ukraine was divided among Poland, the Soviet Union, and Rumania and Czechoslovakia.

The few months of liberty had produced striking changes in the literature. Stefanyk after a long silence returned to literature and now for the first time was free to use the topic of Ukrainian independence for the people of the West. A new group of poets expressing the very latest modes of composition, the very latest ideas and the latest social conceptions sprang into activity. Everything seemed to herald a brighter future. Even after the debacle and the partition of the country, it seemed possible that the Ukrainian Soviet Republic would still work for the cultural unity of the whole. Professor Hrushevsky, the former president of free Ukraine, was invited to return to Kiev as Director of the Section of Historical Research of the Academy of Sciences which was broadened to include representatives of the section under Poland. Even though there was small liberty for the non-Marxists, it seemed as if the variations within the official doctrine would allow fruitful work.

It was again a false dawn. The Ukrainians were too conscious of their past, too attached to the ideals of democracy as they had been worked out through the ages to fit into the new scheme. More and more the world heard talk of Ukrainian nationalism as an evil force. The blows fell around 1930. Prof. Hrushevsky was exiled, opprobrious epithets were hurled at the most distinguished scholars, radical and partially conservative alike, until they too vanished from the scene. Those authors who refused to bow, com-

mitted suicide or vanished. Only those who sang the praises of the Soviet Union and of Stalin remained. Only those who felt that the beginning and ending of culture were embraced within the leaders of the one Communist Party of the Soviet Union were spared to continue their work of adulation. Ukraine was back where she had been when Kotlyarevsky began his work. The language may be on surer ground. Much that has been gained has not been lost but the silence that has descended over the entire country, even before the Second World War, bodes ill for any independent cultural development. The war brought Western Ukraine into the struggle from the beginning and amid the deportation of populations, the tramp of armies and the roar of battle, Ukrainian literature is temporarily silenced in its native home.

Its history has been impressive. The enslaved population has rallied, it has reformed its language, and starting from the twin ideas of a glorification of a free past and a belief in democracy and a free future, it has kept pace with the literatures of long established countries. It has broadened its range of forms, its variety of subjects, its circles of readers, and it can now take its place on an equality with the other Slavonic literatures amid the products of humanity's widening interests. It has produced one genius, Taras Shevchenko, and many talented authors, and the people and their literature have but realized part of his broad and humanitarian spirit which deserves to be numbered with those whom the world calls great. Ukraine has suffered and is suffering, but regardless of the future the name of Shevchenko will always give Ukrainian literature a distinctive place in the world and the whole literature will stand out as an example of the expression in prose and verse of the democratic aspirations of humanity.



THE UKRAINIAN AMERICANS

By STEPHEN SHUMEYKO

THE OUTBREAK of World War I back in 1914 created a whirlpool of events on the European continent that at once sucked in those gigantic waves of emigration that had been inundating America for well-nigh one hundred years. Just before it did, however, one of those emigratory waves brought to the American shores close to one million Ukrainians.

Approximately 85% of them came from Western Ukraine (then under Austria), although the forerunners of this wave, appearing here in the 60's of the last century, came from Eastern Ukraine (then under Tsarist Russia) as the end of the famous "Gold Rush" to California. Recent researches reveal that even before this time, as early as the Colonial Period, there were already a number of Ukrainians in this country; and some of them fought in the Revolutionary War. The real Ukrainian emigration to America, however, did not begin until about 1870, and it did not assume any appreciable proportions until 1899. Beginning with that year the Ukrainians began to arrive in this country in ever increasing numbers, until the last war put a stop to this movement.

The earliest arrivals settled mostly in Pennsylvania, especially in the coal and steel districts. Those who followed settled in the industrial centers of New York and New Jersey. Others went to the gold and silver mines of Montana and Colorado. Still others made their homes in Minnesota, North Dakota and other farming states. Today most of them occupy the Middle Atlantic and the Middle West sections of this country.

Driven from their native land by economic, social and political oppression, the Ukrainian immigrants faced upon their arrival here difficult problems of adjustment. Furthermore, unlike the other nationality groups who upon coming here found many of their countrymen occupying positions of power and influence, the Ukrainians had no one to extend to them a helping hand. Nevertheless, despite the many hardships they had to endure, the inherent adaptability, perseverance, and idealism of the Ukrainian immigrant enabled him to gradually forge ahead.

As he was of a spiritual and mystically inclined character, one of his first acts upon establishing his family on this soil was the building of a place of worship, of which the first was the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in Shenandoah, Pa., founded in 1885. Today practically every Ukrainian American community has one or more churches.

Arising almost concurrently with his spiritual needs was the desire to provide some form of protection for his family in the event of his natural or accidental death. As a result there was founded in 1894 the first and largest of the several fraternal organizations now in existence, the Ukrainian National Association, with its home office in Jersey City, N. J. Other fraternal organizations are the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association (Scranton), Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics (Philadelphia, Pa.), and the Ukrainian National Aid Association (Pittsburgh, Pa.).

The Ukrainian immigrants found these fraternal societies to be the most practicable form of permanent organization. The insurance features of such societies (death and sick benefits) induce the members to stay in the organization. The printed organ each one publishes provides the means of expression, communication of news, exchange of ideas, dissemination of knowledge, and literary entertainment. Furthermore, the union of branches (lodges, assemblies) from various localities and states gives a feeling of united strength and creates the desire of activity in other than the fraternal field.

Together with the church and the fraternal society, the newspaper has played a very vital part in the life of the Ukrainian immigrant. In some respects, it has exerted a more profound influence on his life and thoughts than any other single element. On the one hand, it has helped to make him a better American citizen, by constantly impressing him with his duties and obligations as such. On the other hand it has always fanned in him the ever present desire to help his kinsmen in Ukraine to win their national freedom and independence.

The oldest of these newspapers is the daily "Svoboda," established in 1893, and published by the Ukrainian National Association. The Providence Association publishes a tri-weekly, "America". Weeklies are published by the Workingmen's Association—"Narodna Wola," and the National Aid—"Narodne Slovo." There are numerous small papers as well. The younger American-born generation has "The Ukrainian Weekly," published in English since 1933 by the U.N.A. It strives to serve the younger generation from the viewpoint of their American environment and Ukrainian background; imparting to them a keen appreciation of the best elements of both and helping them to adjust themselves properly to both.

Aside from the above mentioned churches, fraternal societies, and publications, the Ukrainian Americans have produced various other units of organized activity, including community centers, schools, choruses, youth leagues, political associations, communal and private business enterprises, and building and loan associations.

With this development of his group life and activities, came the improvement of the individual lot of the Ukrainian American. Through hard work and thrift he began to slowly rise above his mean surroundings to a more comfortable state and financial independence. Having been denied by adversity the advantages of even an elementary school education he sacrificed a great deal in order that his American-born children become well educated. As a result, Ukrainian American society, formerly composed of the laboring class, with but a faint sprinkling of intellectuals, is today assuming a more natural and balanced social structure, one including, besides the laboring, the professional, business, and cultural classes as well.

Needless to say, they have been among the best of American citizens, and the most law abiding, as police records reveal. Furthermore, despite the comparatively small number here at the time, during the last war over 30,000 men of Ukrainian descent fought overseas with the A.E.F. And although during that war they were as a group quite poor, still they were among the heaviest buyers of the Liberty Bonds among the foreign nationality groups.

Although the Ukrainian Americans have done their share in the building of America by their labors in the mines, factories, railroads, and farms, especially noticeable, however, has been their contribution to the expanding American culture, which to a great extent is still a combination of European traditions and American environment. In the early 1920's, for example, Prof. Alexander Koshetz, one of the world's foremost choral conductors, toured this country with his world-famous Ukrainian National Chorus, which many critics declared to be the finest ever heard here. Since then Ukrainian choruses, composed principally of young people have won wide recognition throughout the land. In the field of art, by way of another example, the world renowned sculptor, Alexander Archipenko, of Ukrainian nationality, has made his contribution to the American art with his modernistic sculptures and paintings, which adorn leading museums throughout the world. The motion picture industry, too, has its Ukrainian representatives, such as John Hodiak, the actor, and Edward Dmytryk, director.

"In our search for immigrant gifts," wrote Allen H. Eaton in his book on "Immigrant Gifts to American Life," (Russel Sage Foundation; 1932) "sometimes the most interesting and colorful are found among the late arrivals. To me, one of the most picturesque of our rather recent immigrant groups is from the Ukraine. Their entertainments are full of vivid beauty and action . . ." and he found himself "impressed . . . with the thought that

their power and beauty will ultimately find their way into the stream of our culture. . . ."

That has been one of the principal aims of the younger generation Americans of Ukrainian descent: to preserve and develop here some of the finer aspects of their Ukrainian heritage, and thereby (1) make a genuine contribution to American culture, and (2) aid the Ukrainian national cause, whose goal is the establishment of a free and independent nation of Ukraine.

The outbreak of the present war affected Ukrainian American institutions and organized activities of both the older and younger generations in a manner to be expected. America's war effort now became their principal objective. The older generation, grateful for the privilege of living in this free land of their adoption, and the younger generation, proud to have been born as Americans, are today doing their utmost and making every possible sacrifice to help their country win this war against the forces of evil and oppression.

On the fighting fronts young men of Ukrainian extraction are distinguishing themselves in a manner that gives vivid testimony to the fact that the Ukrainians are a hardy, fighting people, as witness the feats of the Kozaks of several centuries ago in defense of Europe against the unceasing invasions of the Asiatic hordes; as witness, too, the great victories the Ukrainians have won over the Nazis in driving them out of their native land. Many of the American servicemen of Ukrainian origin have already paid the supreme sacrifice for their embattled country and its cause, including John Minue of Carteret, N. J., who received his Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously. Many others, too numerous to mention here, have won high military decorations.

Here on the home front Ukrainian American life is geared to winning the war. As during the last war, the Ukrainian Americans today are again among the heaviest buyers of war bonds among the foreign extraction groups. Only last May, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America concluded a three-month war bond drive by going well over the top of its five million dollar quota. Red Cross and U.S.O. drives among Ukrainian Americans have also brought in returns that show that they are fully aware of the importance of sacrifice in this most terrible of wars. War industry, too, knows the value of steady and skilled workers of Ukrainian nationality; while Ukrainian owned war plants, have won production awards. Especially notable, however, has been the war effort of the fraternal societies and their press. The former's bond purchases and contributions to various war services and agencies, and the latter's guidance, inspiration, and news-dis-

pensing qualities, have greatly helped to make the contribution of Ukrainian Americans to our country's war effort one of which they can justly be proud.

In order that the Ukrainian American contribution to our country's war effort be the greatest possible, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, was authorized and directed by the Second Congress of Americans of Ukrainian descent, held in Philadelphia, January 22, 1944, "to coordinate and intensify Ukrainian American participation in America's war effort." This has been the primary objective of the committee since its reorganization at the Philadelphia gathering. To that end it has already conducted the above mentioned war bond drive, also Red Cross, blood donor and kindred drives.

Thus on both the fighting front and the home front the Ukrainian American people are striving to do their utmost to help their country win the war. They do this because America is their country, either through adoption or birth, and as such it is entitled to the last full measure of devotion. They do this, too, because they realize that an American victory is the victory of the American way of life, to which they owe their freedom and progress here.

In thus striving to help America win the war, the Ukrainian Americans also are inspired by the cherished hope that when victory is won and tyranny dethroned, their blood-kinsmen in war-torn and occupied Ukraine will be given an opportunity equal with that of other enslaved peoples of establishing their own free and independent Ukrainian state.

That is their inalienable right, and to the upholding of that right Americans of Ukrainian descent have been devoting themselves from the earliest days of their advent here. In every possible way they have tried to improve the sorry lot of their kinsmen back in the "old country" and win support for their centuries-old struggle for national freedom.

Among the most impressive demonstrations of Ukrainian American solidarity in support of the movement for the liberation of Ukraine were the two national congresses of Americans of Ukrainian descent, the first of which was held at Washington, May 24, 1940 and the second at Philadelphia, January 22, 1944. Both were attended by delegates from all over the country and at both gatherings the delegates unanimously stressed in form of appropriate resolutions the necessity for a free and independent Ukraine, encompassing all Ukrainian ethnographic territories.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that at the Washington congress the twenty senators and congressmen who addressed it—among them being Senators Davis, Guffey and Maloney, and Representatives Boland,

Voorhis, O'Day, Sabath—likewise declared themselves in favor of the establishment of a free and independent Ukraine. At the same time they praised the Ukrainian Americans for having assumed the obligation and privilege of being spokesmen and champions of the cause of their gagged and suffering kinsmen in Ukraine.

This interest in the centuries-old struggle for freedom of their kinsmen in Ukraine that Americans of Ukrainian descent manifest at every possible occasion, finds apt expression in form of a resolution passed at the Philadelphia congress. Its text follows:—

Ukrainian American Congress Resolution on Ukraine

"WHEREAS, at this time when the arms and cause of our country and her allies are proving victorious on the field of battle over the brutal might of Nazi Germany and her satellites, when our country is beginning to think of the shape of the post-war world to come, and when it is advisable for Americans of Old World background to give their government and fellow Americans the benefit of their special knowledge concerning the land of their origin or descent, so that the American approach to the problems of post-war Europe, particularly in reference to the countries of such Americans' origin, shall be based on a keen awareness of all the factors and latent forces that shall enter into it; and

"WHEREAS, this is especially applicable to us, Americans of Ukrainian descent, for Ukraine is today either under Nazi occupation or Soviet rule, with no government-in-exile or any other true form of national representation of its own abroad to speak for her; and

"WHEREAS, the Ukrainian people in their native land, denied any opportunity to freely express their sentiments in the matter, do now, as they did in the past, instinctively look to us, their American kinsmen, removed from them at most by one generation, to take advantage of the freedom and democracy that are ours here and to make known the truth concerning them, particularly their sentiments and aspirations; therefore be it

"RESOLVED, that on behalf of our blood kinsmen in Ukraine and their centuries-old movement for national independence, and in order that truth and justice may prevail there, we representatives of Ukrainian American communities throughout the country, convened at this Second Congress of Americans of Ukrainian descent here in Philadelphia, 'the cradle of American liberties,' do hereby make known to our government officials and other fellow Americans the following statement of indisputable facts concerning the Ukraine situation:

"The thousand-year-old history of Ukraine reveals that at the very out-

set of their appearance on the historical scene the Ukrainian people established on their territories in Eastern Europe an independent and well organized State of their own, with Kiev as its capital, and that for centuries they had to defend it and Europe as well against the constant invasions and incursions of Asiatic nomads.

"Although before the onslaughts of the wild Asiatic hordes the ancient Ukrainian Kievan State finally collapsed, the ideal of Ukrainian Statehood did not perish but lived to resurrect the Ukrainian nation when conditions allowed it. In the middle of the 17th century this ideal was realized in form of the democratic Ukrainian Kozak State. In modern times, upon the fall of Tsarist Russia and Austria-Hungary, the Ukrainian people established two republics, one in Dnieper Ukraine and the other in Western Ukraine. Of their own free volition these two republics united themselves on January 22, 1919 into one, independent and indivisible Ukrainian National Republic. Established by the free will of the people this united and democratic Ukrainian State after three years of heroic fighting was finally beaten down by the superior forces of alien powers, and became partitioned by Russia, Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia.

"During the period of alien misrule in Ukraine from the last war to the present, the Ukrainian people were exposed to an unprecedented national extermination and economic exploitation. Nevertheless the rule by terror and force did not subdue their resistance against the foreign occupants of their native land, and time and again they demonstrated that they never have and never will abandon their natural and historical right to national independence.

"As in the past so within recent years, the national enslavement of the Ukrainian people was the cause of revolutionary agitation and movements in Ukraine, which disturbed European peace and order. Hitler, the latest of the many invaders of Ukraine, attempted to exploit this discontent and unrest among the Ukrainian people, but failed completely, for they immediately perceived in him the very incarnation of those forces of evil and tyranny to which they have been subjected down through the centuries of their national martyrdom. Until Ukraine becomes free and independent, however, discontent and unrest will continue to prevail there, and future aggressors are bound to attempt to exploit the situation to their advantage. Therefore on this account alone, and in accordance with the war aims of our United Nations providing for the liberation of the enslaved nations, the Ukrainian inalienable right to an independent free state should be granted. An independent Ukrainian State will transform Ukraine from a

pawn of hostile forces into a constructive force active in the promotion of peace, stability and justice in Eastern Europe.

"In the current dispute between the Soviet Union and Poland over Western Ukraine, which Great Britain and America have offered to mediate, a generally overlooked fact is that the question to whom Western Ukraine should belong was decided some time ago by the people most vitally concerned in the dispute, namely, the Ukrainians of that territory. By the Act of November 1, 1918 they established their Western Ukrainian Republic, and by the act of January 22, 1919 they united their republic with the Ukrainian National Republic. It is our deep conviction that the unbreakable will to control their own national destinies and live their own national life would be again clearly demonstrated by the Ukrainian people at the present time if they had the opportunity to express their wishes in the matter freely and without alien coercion or interference.

"In their valiant fight to expel the Nazis from their native land, the Ukrainians have made tremendous sacrifices in human lives and material resources. Thereby they have brought nearer the day of final victory of the United Nations over the abysmal enemies of human freedom and democracy. Thus, as in the past so in the present war the Ukrainian people have served as Europe's bulwark against the onslaughts of brutal might and aggression.

"In the light of all these facts, and in order that after victory is won justice and peace may prevail in Eastern Europe, this Second Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent wishes to draw attention upon the time tried and proven historical necessity of establishing on all indisputably Ukrainian ethnographic territories a free, independent and democratic State of Ukraine."



THE UKRAINIANS AND THE POLISH-RUSSIAN BORDER DISPUTE

By N. D. CZUBATYJ

Two Historical Events in Western Ukraine

IN THE later half of March, 1915, L'viv (Lemberg) the capital of Western Ukraine—at that time occupied by the Russian Army—passed through days of high nervous tension. Russian police roamed about the city, taking into custody the most active Ukrainians, and sending them to some unknown place in the east. Word reached the capital that similar arrests were being made in all parts of the occupied country. Then things quieted down somewhat, until one day the military commander of L'viv demanded from three groups of the population, *i.e.* Ukrainians, Poles and Jews, four hostages each, who were to guarantee with their lives the safety of a certain guest, who was about to arrive in L'viv.

On the morning of the following day the streets of L'viv leading from the main railroad station to the governor's palaces were lined with police and soldiers.

About noon that same day there appeared on the balcony of the palace a pale-faced, yellow bearded man who languidly made a speech to the assembled police and soldiers and a comparatively small number of citizens. He ended his speech thus: "And so in the name of Holy Russia I take back L'viv and this Russian land of Galicia, to the bosom of the fatherland. 'Let there be no subjugated Russia,' said my great ancestor, Prince Ivan Kalyta of Moscow. Now his great testament is being fulfilled, and so, the last subjugated Russian land returns to the fold of Great Russia."

Thus did Tsar Nicholas II, in a speech from the balcony of the governor's palace to hundreds of police and soldiers, say that he "liberated" this part of Western Ukraine—exactly at the time when the finest sons and natives of the land were being banished in droves to Siberia; exactly at the time when the Ukrainian Legion in the Carpathians on Mount Makivka was waging bloody battles with his own army in order to drive out of their native land the uninvited "liberators."

Eventually the Tsar died a tragic death at the hands of his own subjects, and the Russian invaders vanished from Western Ukraine. Only Mount Makivka remained as a symbol of the struggle of the Ukrainian nation with

the Russian invaders. Until this present war every year on the third Sunday of August, tens of thousands of Western Ukrainian youths used to gather from all parts of the country by every means of transportation on Mount Makivka to honor those who on this mount fought and fell for their native land.

In the year 1935 or 1936 during this Ukrainian yearly national ceremony a regrettable incident took place on Mount Makivka. A priest had just finished his sermon and bowed his head to honor the heroism of the Ukrainian defenders against the Russians in 1915, when a communist onlooker cried "Long live Soviet Western Ukraine." In an instant the people threw themselves on this man who had dared to desecrate the most sacred sentiments of the Ukrainian people. Before the member of the Ukrainian Civilian Committee and the Polish police could intervene the communist was literally torn to pieces.

Three years later a new World War broke out and the Russians again came as the rulers of a fictitious Soviet Ukraine. Again droves of exiled Ukrainians were being driven into the boundless wastes of Asia, but this time not by the hundreds, as during the reign of Tsar Nicholas II, but by the hundreds of thousands. Moreover, the new Tsar of Russia, Joseph Stalin, did not come to Western Ukraine as his predecessor had done. Instead he commanded that representatives of Western Ukraine come to him in the Kremlin to thank him for their "liberation" and annexation of their native land to Mother Russia.

This is one side of the reality of the Polish-Russian border dispute. There is still another side.

Towards the end of the year 1918 ancient Austria by a natural death ended her century-old life. She died because of the fresh air that came from America, *i.e.* the right of self-determination of people. At 6 A.M. November 1, 1918 the yellow and blue flag of Ukrainian National Rule was proudly unfurled on the tower of the City Hall of L'viv. This was the triumph of the right of self-determination of peoples, the sacred right of the natives of this land—the Ukrainian majority of Galicia. The Polish minority, however, did not acknowledge this right of the Ukrainians and so began the Polish-Ukrainian War. The Ukrainians lost.

A few years later, March 17, 1923, thousands of Ukrainians attended Services at the beautiful St. George's Cathedral, built in the Ukrainian-Rococo style. It is situated on a picturesque hill overlooking L'viv. Thousands of people filled the cathedral and its courtyards. After the Holy Liturgy, thousands gathered on St. George's Square and waited. Before the main entrance of the Cathedral a speaker's platform had been placed, and on this was

Julian Romanchuk, the dignified 83-year old Ukrainian representative and vice-president of the last Austrian parliament, the senior representative of the Ukrainian national revival. His long and impressive grey beard gave him the appearance of an Old Testament patriarch who was about to speak to his nation of Israel.

A great hush fell upon the people as he began to speak: "People of Western Ukraine! Your sacred right to become the masters of our own land has been disregarded by the victorious powers of the Entente. By the decision of the Council of Ambassadors in Paris our country has been placed against our will under Polish domination. This is a crime against a free people. We do not and never will acknowledge this. For us the authority of the Ukrainian National Republic still exists and it alone will we acknowledge. So help us God! Lift up two fingers and take an oath that we will never acquiesce in Polish domination over the land of our fathers and forefathers."

Thousands of hands were raised in the air and each with two uplifted fingers: "So help us God" repeated the patriarch of the Western Ukrainians and like a thunder's echo thousands repeated this oath.

This is the second side of the reality of the Polish-Russian dispute over boundaries. How different are these two episodes from the present conferences in the diplomatic cabinets on the Curzon Line, on whether it is to run 30 miles to the east or west through the living body of a people, that thirst for freedom and not for alien domination.

Why Russia Wants Western Ukraine

Russia attempted to justify its occupation of Western Ukraine with phrases of liberating the Western Ukrainians. That is why it has—so it says—broadened the autonomy of the fictitious Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic. These are the same stock phrases which the Russian Tsardom employed to mask its imperialistic plans. Desiring to gain possession of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles to give the Russian Empire an outlet to the open seas, it spoke of liberating the ancient capital of Orthodoxy, Constantinople, from the hands of the infidels and of placing the cross on the dome of the Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople. It uses the same tactics in speaking of the "liberation" of Western Ukraine, even though 90% of the population does not desire such a liberation. However, there is still the question why gigantic Russia desires to possess the small Western Ukraine.

From the time of Peter the Great, the builder of the modern Russian Empire, to the present Russian policy has been consistently the same, re-

regardless of whether Russia is ruled by a Peter, as an absolute monarch, or a Stalin, as a dictator. The basis and aim of this policy is to create one Russian nation and turn tens of different peoples into a stable monolithic Empire. The greatest obstruction in the realization of this plan have been the 45 million Ukrainian people, who are quite distinct from the Russians not only in language but still more in tradition, ideas, culture and psychology. The freedom loving Ukrainian people belong in spirit to Europe; Russia belongs to Asia. That is one reason why the Ukrainian people have always striven to free themselves from Russia and to become an independent nation. Russia succeeded in different ways in stifling the Ukrainian National Movement, but she did not have the power to crush the Ukrainian efforts for independence, which, based on Western European civilization, made enormous progress outside of Russia, first in Austria and afterwards in Poland despite all the hindrances created by that country.

Western Ukraine received the name of the Ukrainian Piedmont, because from there the Ukrainian ideals of independence spread over all the Ukrainian lands, held by Russia, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. The Russian internal policy was always to gain control of Western Ukraine and to suppress the Ukrainian National life just as she was doing with her own Ukrainians. Tsar Nicholas II entered the World War I against Austria to attain not only other imperialistic aims, such as the acquisition of the Dardanelles, but also to conquer Galicia, the Ukrainian Piedmont which was so dangerous for Russia. For the very same reason Stalin made an agreement with Hitler so as to get possession of this nationalistic Western Ukraine, which is a threat to Russia in its possession of Soviet Ukraine, and by this very fact a threat to its access to the Black Sea. The loss of Ukraine would be a painful blow to Russia and its imperialistic character. That is why she tried to stifle everywhere any Ukrainian movement for independence. The rise of the Independent Ukrainian National United Republic during the Russian Revolution and the fierce struggle with the Ukrainian Nationalist movement until the present war are proofs that such a threat is serious. Here we have the real reason why Stalin wants the "liberation" of Western Ukraine from the domination of Poland, just as Tsar Nicholas II wanted it from the domination of Austria.

Why Poland Wants Western Ukraine

The Polish nation today is in fact a medium sized nation, with a population half as numerous as the Ukrainians and a land that is not very rich. The Poles are a patriotic people, dynamically convinced of their Messianic role in East Europe. Taking advantage of the weakened condition of the

Ukrainian people, who, living near the Gateway of Nations had exhausted themselves in their struggle with the Asiatic hordes, Poland from the middle of the 14th century began to encroach upon the Ukrainian and White Ruthenian lands.*

In the 16th century Poland created a strong state in Eastern Europe. In this great historical Poland the Polish population was a minority. Therefore such a country could hope to survive only if it became ethnically and culturally unified. In order to attain this, Poland began to propagate the Roman Catholic faith and Polish culture in Ukraine and White Ruthenia, which already had their own highly developed cultures of an eastern character based on the rich source of Byzantine culture. As a result, the Ukrainian lands under Poland became a fierce battleground between two cultures—the Latin-Polish and the Byzantine-Ukrainian. This struggle brought about the weakening of Poland. Russia took advantage of this and occupied not only the Ukrainian lands, with the exception of Galicia and the White Ruthenian lands, but also a goodly part of Poland proper. Modern Poland, reborn after World War I, did not give up hope of realizing its dreams of power despite the fact that its strength did not equal its old historical ambitions and the modern conception of the right of every nation to be master of its own soil.

In view of the tremendous weakening of Russia during the revolution it was to the interest of Poland to aid in the creation of an Independent Ukraine, White Ruthenia and Lithuania and together with these nations to guarantee its own security against both Germany and Russia. It did not do so. In Poland short-sighted chauvinistic elements got the upper hand. Fascinated by the ideal of an ancient historical Poland they strove to annex to Poland as much non-Polish land as possible from Ukraine, White Ruthenia and Lithuania. By fighting with these nations Poland helped Soviet Russia bring about the downfall of the independent non-Russian countries that arose from the ruins of Russian Tsardom.

During 20 years of their independent existence the Poles followed a policy of national extermination of the Ukrainians and White Ruthenians. They had little success in doing this because of the little economic strength of Poland and the high national consciousness of the annexed population, especially of the Ukrainians. The main sponsors of this plan to denationalize the Ukrainians and thus to acquire a Polish majority in Western Ukraine

* White Ruthenian is used here in preference to "White Russian" because: first, this name has an historical foundation from the 16th century, and secondly, this is the way in which White Ruthenians call themselves in foreign languages (English, French, German) to show that they are a different nation from the Russians.

were professors of Lviw University: Prof. S. Grabski, the present President of the Polish National Council in London, Prof. E. Romer and Prof. J. Czekanowski. Prof. Grabski was most confident of the success of his political venture, because he calculated that in 25 years Ukrainians would become a minority in Western Ukraine. Prof. Czekanowski was more modest, as he was satisfied with 50 years. The chief means of Polonizing this country was the colonization of Polish farmers (on soil already overcrowded with Ukrainians in the east) on land given them by distributing the lands of the big estate. "Pacification" by armed police and military forces also was employed to stem the dynamic cultural and economic progress of the Western Ukrainians.

All these calculations were found to be purely illusory, for World War II showed that the Polish population of Western Ukraine had increased by only about two or three percent. On the other hand the national consciousness of the Ukrainians had grown so greatly that it threatened to rend Poland asunder. The miscalculation of Polish policy in relation to its eastern neighbors showed itself fully in the Autumn of 1939. The agreement of a revived Germany and Russia necessarily brought about the downfall of Poland.

Such is the historical rule of Poland in the past, present and the future. Independent Poland situated between Russia and Germany cannot exist by itself; it can exist only in coalition with an Independent Ukraine and her other eastern neighbors.

Historical Past of Western Ukraine

We can clearly see from what has been said, that neither Russia nor Poland can have any legitimate claims to Western Ukraine, even though both of them at times use "historical" arguments and then turn to practical politics.

Western Ukraine was never either Russian or Polish land. It was an organic part of the whole Ukraine. Historically it has never lost its Ukrainian ethnic character, even though it has been occupied for centuries by Poland and Austria.

From pre-historic times to the middle of the 14th century Western Ukraine belonged to the ancient Ukrainian kingdom, the capital of which was Kiev. Historically this country was known by the ancient name of the Ukrainian people, Rus. From the middle of the 12th century the Western Ukrainian land became more and more independent. At the same time the northern colonies broke away from their center of Kiev and began to form themselves into a separate nation, Russia, known to the beginning of the

18th century, *i.e.*, up to Peter the Great, as *Moscovia*, from its capital *Moscow*.

When the invasion of the barbarian Tartars laid Kiev in ruins, the center of Ukrainian national life shifted to Western Ukraine. Its capital was first *Halych*, later *Lviv*.

After the extinction of the Dynasty of *Romanovych* in the 14th century, Western Ukraine became the spoils of Poland and Lithuania.

The close union of Poland and Lithuania, brought about in *Lublin* (1569) caused all of Ukraine together with its western provinces to be subject to Polish domination until the partitions of Poland (1772-1795). Then the southern part of Western Ukraine (called the provinces of *Galicia* and *Bukovina*) found itself within the boundaries of the *Hapsburg* Monarchy, under whose domination *Carpatho-Ukraine* had already been for several centuries prior to them. The rest of the Ukrainian lands were taken by the *Russian Tsars*.

During the liquidation of World War I (1918) the Ukrainians restored their own government on the Western Ukrainian lands, but this from the first days of its existence had to defend itself against Poland and its other neighbors.

Western Ukraine in the Light of Statistical Figures

What is to be understood under the name of Western Ukraine? A Ukrainian geographer and historian considers as Western Ukraine the Western Ukrainian ethnic territories, *i.e.* that country inhabited by a majority of Ukrainians and situated west of the Polish-Russian boundaries as they were at the beginning of this war.

It is the understanding of Ukrainian scholars that Western Ukraine includes not only the Ukrainian land held by Poland, but also *Carpatho-Ukraine* and Northern Ukrainian *Bukovina*. For twenty years *Carpatho-Ukraine* was held under the domination of *Czechoslovakia*, while Ukrainian *Bukovina* experienced a similar fate for twenty-three years under *Rumania*. Thus the area of Western Ukraine (which up to the present war was never under the rule of the *Soviets*) is 153,022 sq. km.* greater than pre-war *Czechoslovakia* (140,400 sq. km.) and nearly twice as large as the independent countries of *Austria*, *Hungary*, *Portugal* or *Bulgaria*. It is 4-5 times larger than *Belgium*, *Holland* or *Denmark*.

In 1931 the population of Western Ukraine was 10,420,000, considerably greater than that of *Hungary*, *Bulgaria*, *Portugal*, *Austria*, *Belgium*, *Hol-*

* A sq. km. equals 0.386 sq. mi.

land or Denmark. In Western Ukraine the Ukrainian population forms an absolute and distinct majority, with more than two-thirds of the entire population (66.7%). It has a separate cultural unity. The national minorities of Western Ukraine are the results of the historical colonial domination of Western Ukraine by other nations. The greatest minority are the Poles (17.7%), and the Jews (12.3%). Then follow very small minorities such as: Germans (1.2%), Hungarians (0.8%), Rumanians (0.4%) and about 0.3% each Slovaks, Czechs and Russians. The Polish minority is noticeable in Galicia (23.1%), the Rumanian in Ukrainian Bukovina, the Hungarian in Carpatho-Ukraine. None of these other national minorities exceed 20%. On the other hand we find that the Ukrainians have about a two-thirds majority.

The national minorities are dispersed here and there throughout this Ukrainian sea like little islands, and they have a majority only in some separate towns. Such an island in the midst of a large Ukrainian majority is L'viv, the administrative center of Western Ukraine. It has a population of 312,000 with 50% Poles, 30% Jews and 20% Ukrainians. The towns of Mukachevo in Carpatho-Ukraine, and Stanislaviv in Galicia, have a Jewish majority.

From the economic point of view, Western Ukraine is a country of medium wealth, almost self-sufficient, and entirely so in its production of food and oil. It is known for its valuable Carpathian forest, medicinal springs which are among the richest of Europe, for an excellent black soil.

All this shows that Western Ukraine would be well able to exist independently as a state like Czechoslovakia, Austria or Hungary even if the ideal of the Ukrainian people of living as one Independent and United Ukrainian Nation could not now be achieved. Today Western Ukraine, against the express will of the majority of its population and in contradiction to the second point of the Atlantic Charter, is being considered as an object and not as a subject of international policy. The powers are preparing again to divide it among Russia, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

The dispute about Polish-Russian boundaries is actually a dispute between Russia and Poland for only a part of Western Ukraine, and not even all of that part, had been previously under the rule of Poland. The line drawn by Ribbentrop and Molotov towards the end of 1939 left on the side of Germany—*i.e.* in the so-called Government General of Poland, an area of Ukrainian ethnical territory of 17,462 sq. mi. with a population of 1,239,000. The new Curzon Line proposed by Moscow is still further to the east and adds to Poland about 2,000 sq. km. more with a quarter million population.

Western Ukraine in Figures*

	Territory in sq. km.	Population		Ukrainians		Poles		Jews		Russians		Germans		Others	
				No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
														No.	%
West Ukraine with Carpatho-Ukraine and Bukovina	155,022	10,420,000	6,948,000	66.7	1,845,000	17.7	1,286,000	12.3	20,000	0.2	126,000	1.2	195,000	1.9	
West Ukraine Under Polish Domination 1939	132,172	9,196,000	6,103,000	66.4	1,818,000	19.8	1,116,000	12.1	17,000	0.2	93,000	1.0	51,000	0.5	
Soviet West Ukraine of Ribbentrop- Molotov Pact	115,250	7,959,000	5,431,000	68.3	1,404,000	17.6	983,000	12.3	15,500	0.2	78,000	1.0	47,500	0.6	

* The above Statistical Table is based on data found in the Ukrainian General Encyclopedic V. III, page 419-422, published in Lviv 1934. The appropriate chapters were written by the best geographical specialists and are based on the official figures issued about 1931 by Soviet Russia and Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, as well as upon private sources. The official data, which deliberately confuses the national rethods, were critically analyzed and verified on the basis of studies of linguistic, ethnic and church calculations—at any rate they are very conservative in their enumeration of the Ukrainian population.

Official voices from Moscow allude to a possible further bargaining over Western Ukraine; and they hint of giving to a Red Poland an additional area up to and beyond Lviw and the oil center of Drohobych together with pure Ukrainian countries as Javoriv and Turka (75-80% Ukrainian). If this bargaining succeeds Poland would retain 27,000 sq. km. of Ukrainian ethnical territory with a population of about two and a half million, of which 60% would be Ukrainian. Besides this gift of Western Ukraine to Poland, Czechoslovakia would receive Carpatho-Ukraine—14,870 sq. km., with a population of 734,000.

The high national consciousness of the Ukrainian population, the clearly ethnic character of Western Ukraine as a whole and in its separate parts cannot allow the least doubt that the fate of this country must be decided by the Ukrainian population of this land itself, if the fundamental principles of international justice and a future enduring peace are to be conserved.

Cultural Character of Western Ukraine

The ethnic Polish-Ukrainian boundary coincides with an important line that divides entire Europe from north to south into two zones—that of Eastern-Christian civilization and that of Western-Christian civilization. The Ukrainians belong to the first zone, because, having received Christianity from Constantinople, Kiev not only was included in the world of Eastern Christianity, but, in addition, became its propagator in Eastern Europe.

The Poles received Christianity of the Latin Rite through the Czechs, who had previously received it from Germany, and this brought about the fact that the Poles belong to the nations of Latin-Christian civilization. These two facts have a decisive influence also upon the cultural character of Western Ukraine.

For 900 years Western Ukraine was a territory of Eastern-Christian civilization; strongly influenced by Western-European culture. The Christian civilization of the Greek world became the fundamental basis of the civilization of the natives of Western Ukraine. Of all the provinces of Ukraine, however, Western Ukraine has been the most influenced by the Western European Civilization since the 12th century. When the whole of Ukraine through its vital connections became a cultural part of Europe, Western Ukraine formed the bridge over which these western influences entered. A notable part of the Western Ukrainians (*i.e.* in Galicia and Carpatho-Ukraine) are of the Catholic faith, even though they still are of the Eastern Byzantine Ukrainian Rite.

Perhaps some may mistakenly think that because of this the Western Ukrainians are apt to compromise with the Latin-Christians, and consequently also with the Polish world. Several centuries of history prove the opposite. The Western Ukrainians are tenaciously attached to their ancient church and civilization and they always were and are today their zealous defenders.

After the annexation of Western Ukraine to Poland in the 14th century Polonization was attempted by the propagation of Latin Catholicism. The Poles began to establish in this land of eastern-Christian Civilization Roman Catholic dioceses, parishes and monasteries. All these tried to spread Polish culture in Ukraine. That is why religious culture here is more identified with national culture than in any other place in Europe. In Western Ukraine practically every Christian of the Eastern Rite is a Ukrainian, and almost every person of the Latin Rite is a Pole.

The Poles were concerned with the acquisition of members into their new Latin parishes, which were usually well off materially. They could find these faithful either among the newly arrived element from the west or among the neophyte-Ukrainians of the Eastern Rite. To snatch souls for the Roman Rite became the alpha and omega of Polish policy in Western Ukraine up until 1939. This served only to put the Ukrainians more on the alert.

The Ukrainians and Poles created on this land their cultural wealth: churches, libraries, museums, schools, intellectual institutions. Perhaps nowhere else in the world can there be found beside a Roman-Gothic Church a Byzantine cupola. Both accepted the Renaissance and Baroque, but the finest monuments of the Renaissance in L'viv were erected by the contributions of the Ukrainian city dwellers.

During the half century preceding World War I when in Russia anything Ukrainian was verboten, Western Ukraine under Austrian domination became the refuge of all Ukrainian study and art and, with the arrival of political emigrants from Russian Ukraine, Western Ukraine truly became the Piedmont of contemporary Ukraine. In L'viv were published all the more serious literary and scientific journals bearing on all-Ukrainian character. Here was founded the greatest scientific Ukrainian institution, the Scientific Society of Shevchenko, which was materially helped and supported by Ukrainians from Russia. It was a true Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

Rebirth of the Ukrainian Nation and of Western Ukraine

The relative freedom in Austria and the centralization of the cultural

life of Ukrainians in Galicia made Western Ukraine the most dynamic part of the Ukrainian people.

After the first World War when the political situation in the Ukrainian lands became fluid, the Western Ukrainians played the principal role in the rebirth of the entire Ukrainian nation.

The first Ukrainian army, the Volunteer Legion, was formed of Western Ukrainians to free Ukraine from Russia. In L'viv was founded the all-Ukrainian political organization, the League for the Liberation of Ukraine with the same purpose in mind. When the Revolution broke out in Russia the Sitchovi Striltsy military unit was formed in Kiev from prisoners of war from the Austrian Army. They gave the most faithful support to every government of the Ukrainian State without any regard to the changing political principles of the members of the government. When Austria fell, Western Ukrainians of all the Austro-Hungarian lands, *i.e.* of Galicia, Bukovina, and Carpatho-Ukraine, formed the Western Ukrainian National Republic, which three months later united with the Ukrainian National Republic of Eastern Ukraine and formed one Independent United Ukrainian National Republic of the entire Ukrainian Nation (Jan. 22, 1919).

The Ukrainian Republic had to defend itself against Soviet Russia and Poland, both of which invaded the Ukrainian lands. Poland occupied Western Ukraine in June 1919. The Peace Conference of Versailles, however, could not acknowledge this land to be part of Poland, because this would have been contradictory to the 13th point of the Declaration of the Fourteen Points. The Highest Council of the Peace Conference of Versailles, by its decision of June 25, 1919) permitted Poland only to institute an administration in Galicia, and prepared at the same time a temporary statute for Galicia for the next 25 years, after which the fate of Galicia was to be decided by the League of Nations. Proclaimed on November 20, 1919, this statute made permanent in Western Ukraine the Polish-Ukrainian border, known later as the southern part of the Curzon Line, which gave Poland a goodly part of Ukrainian territory.

This project of a Statute was not accepted by Poland and so Galicia remained under Polish occupation until 1923. To hasten a favorable decision for itself of the Galician situation, the Polish Sejm decided (1922) to give Galicia a restricted autonomy. This did in fact influence the Council of Ambassadors to render a decision on March 15, 1923 giving Galicia to Poland under the understanding that it would give Galicia its autonomy. But Poland never fulfilled its promise.

The Ukrainian people acknowledged neither the international decisions in regard to Western Ukraine, nor the unilateral decisions of the Polish

government. Therefore the Ukrainians of Galicia did not take part in the elections for the Polish Sejm of 1922, and they boycotted the draft into the Polish Army and the Polish census of the population. The 20 years preceding the present war were filled with the struggle of Ukrainian political legal parties and the Ukrainian underground against Poland.

About the year 1922 the so-called Period of War Communism ended in Russia. It was replaced by the New Economic Policy (NEP) of Lenin, which allowed a freer Ukrainian national life in Soviet Ukraine. A period of Ukrainization set in (1923-1929), which gave some hope for the development of Ukrainian national life in an autonomous Ukraine as a member of the Soviet Union. This change was favorably welcomed by Western Ukrainians, and the first steps of cooperation between Soviet and Western Ukraine were taken in the field of science and economy.

All possibilities of the Western Ukrainians risking the future of Ukrainian national life on cooperation with Soviet Russia ended in a complete fiasco when a complete change of nationalities policy in Russia came early in 1930. Having ended his struggle with Trotsky's opposition Stalin based his rule on Russian Communistic chauvinists, who were extremely unfriendly toward any non-Russian national movement in Soviet Russia, and especially toward the development of a very powerful national life in Soviet Ukraine during the era of the so-called Ukrainization. The Russifying trend returned to Soviet Ukraine just as it had existed during the days of the Tsaristic regime, but now in a different form and under new fictions, such as the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic. This had a decisive influence upon the political orientation of Western Ukrainians.

The Western Ukrainians, still continuing their anti-Polish course, strongly opposed the Russification of Ukraine and the persecution of the Ukrainian intellectuals and nationalistically minded Ukrainian masses by the chauvinistic center of Moscow. In Western Ukraine all traces of pro-Soviet feeling vanished completely. The Ukrainians quit almost entirely the illegal so-called Communist Party of Western Ukraine; this was proved by the Communist trials in which practically no Ukrainians were found to be involved. Sympathy with the Soviets and communism on the eve of the outbreak of the present war were considered in Western Ukraine as anti-Ukrainian manifestations and as such were banned from all organized Ukrainian life. In a word, Western Ukraine adopted a united anti-Russian front.

What the Western Ukrainians Want Now

It is the opinion of the author* of this article, who is a Western Ukrainian and who lived in Western Ukraine until the last days preceding the outbreak of the present war, that the political sympathies of his native land at that time (1939) were: Ukrainians, who form two-thirds of the entire population of Western Ukraine, are 95% against Soviet Russia and against Poland. The negligible role of pro-Soviet Ukrainians at all elections in Ukrainian cultural and economic cooperative institutions—always conducted in a strict democratic fashion—does not warrant any doubt. Not even one important Ukrainian cultural or economic institution of Western Ukraine was controlled by Soviet sympathizers. The orientation of the Polish minority of Western Ukraine (about 20% of the population) was about the same (95%) for a national anti-Soviet Poland. The Jewish minority was controlled 80% by national Jewish political parties. It is a certainty that not more than 20% of the Jews then were pro-Soviet. Finding themselves between the dominant Poles and the Ukrainian majority the Jews were practically neutral. When they were compelled to decide between Poland and Ukraine usually half were for Ukraine, half for Poland. During the Polish-Ukrainian War (1918-1919) the Jews served as volunteers in both armies.

A democratically conducted plebiscite in Western Ukraine would in the opinion of the author of this article, bring approximately this result: For Soviet Russia about 10%, for Poland about 25%, for an Independent Ukraine about 65% of the entire population, Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian.

What is a practical solution of the Western Ukrainian problem? The answer is that Ukraine should not be divided among Soviet Russia, Poland and Czechoslovakia, because this again would only create a vast field for international intrigues and irridentism and would offer an excellent opportunity for anyone who would wish to destroy the peace in Europe. In this part of Europe stabilization and consolidation are vitally needed. To obtain this, Western Ukraine should not be annexed either to Soviet Russia, or to Poland, or to Czechoslovakia. All Western Ukrainian lands should be united into one national organism with its own government and parliament. Only such a government will have the power to satisfy the needs of the mixed

* The author of this article left Lviv, August 10, 1939 and arrived in America, August 21, 1939 as the leader of a delegation of Western Ukrainian Catholic intellectuals to the International Congress "Pax Romana," which was held in Washington and in New York, August 28 - September 7, 1939. The outbreak of the war rendered impossible his return to Lviv.

population of this country. For the internal organization of Western Ukraine the cantonal system of Switzerland could serve as a model.

Western Ukraine should be placed under the protection of the new international body, that will be formed after this war. An eventual confederation of this country with one of the neighbors immediately or after some time would have to be left up to the Constitutional Assembly of Western Ukraine. This is the one reasonable, practical and just solution of the tangled situation of Western Ukraine.

The question in this part of Europe really is not about the Polish-Russian border, because the Poles and Russians have no actual boundary. The real question is as to the life of 10 million inhabitants of Western Ukraine in a better after-war world, and whether this world is to be better for them and not worse. Such a solution of the Western Ukrainian question is in harmony with the Atlantic Charter, the second point of which is: *Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that are not in accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.*"

In no part of the world can this principle, and the principles of the Declaration of Four Freedoms of President Roosevelt have a better chance for application than in Western Ukraine. Therefore it is clearly the wish of the Western Ukrainians, whose voices are silenced by dictators, to conclude the dispute over the Polish-American border and to replace it with a discussion as to how to safeguard the human life of 10 million Western Ukrainians.



THE PROBLEM OF UKRAINE IN RECENT AMERICAN PEACE-PLANNING LITERATURE

By ROMAN OLESNICKI

BACON'S FAMOUS PHRASE: "Some books are to be tested, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested" has been quoted and applied to various occasions, but it remains nonetheless applicable to the torrent of peace-planning literature, now so profusely pouring on the heads of the American public. Hardly had the United States entered this war, when works on "winning the peace as well as the war" began to appear. It is well over two years since the appearance of "Problems of Lasting Peace" by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson and over a year since "United States Foreign Policy" by Walter Lippmann, but the real avalanche of peace-planning literature came only recently, as an apparent result of the Moscow and Teheran conferences. Each work on the future peace endeavors naturally to sell to the American public a plan for a better and more permanent peace. The approaches to the problem are manifold: some are motivated by a desire rather to achieve a social revolution than a lasting peace, some display a partiality for certain nations or forms of government, but all fail in one respect, and that is in overlooking or underestimating Ukraine, as a major factor in the problem of peace in Eastern Europe.

The most recent trend in American peace-planning seems to be away from utopias, super-governments and the revolution, so much so that it has provoked Professor Frederick L. Schuman (Williams College) to say: "Come weal, come woe, my status is quo." As I shall endeavor to point out later, that "status quo ante" now wished for, not only is "ante 1939" and "ante 1914," but assumes the Holy Alliance of the Congress of Vienna of 1815 as an ideal.

Out of the half dozen or so books which I have read for the purpose of this article, not one acknowledges the existence of a separate and distinct problem of Ukraine. In this respect the title given above may sound misleading, but further analysis shows that in many instances the problems of Soviet-Polish boundaries, of Poland, of Czechoslovakia and of other countries, although discussed by the respective authors under other titles, are in reality—although sometimes even unappreciated by the authors themselves—discussions of the Ukrainian problem. The denial of the existence of a Ukrainian problem, or at least its concealment have been common practice

for such a long time that it is not the least surprising to find as little direct discussion of and reference to the Ukrainians and their country as possible, even in works which purport to picture all problems of Europe with impartiality. Russia has been pursuing her "freedom to subjugate Ukraine" too long, to permit any slips at this time, when all the odds are in her favor. Russia's everyday dispatches on the valor of her Ukrainian Armies, on the liberation of all Ukrainians to join one big happy family, appear too plausible for Americans to detect anything suspicious behind them. It remains for us, who either came from Ukraine, or have strong ties with Ukraine, to point out to the various authors of peace plans when and where they have erred, so as to forestall in time, if at all possible, the creation of a new boiling cauldron in Eastern Europe, which would be incompatible with a durable peace.

One of the few authors who does not deny the existence of a Ukrainian problem, albeit only as a more or less internal problem of the Soviet Union, is Dr. James T. Shotwell in "The Great Decision." Making a most lucid analysis of all stages of Soviet development, internally and externally, Dr. Shotwell comes to the conclusion that in spite of the existence of so-called independent Soviet republics, and in spite of all constitutional guarantees, it is Russia and solely Russia which rules the whole Union through the Communist Party, and that, furthermore, in spite of his recent grant of more "freedom" to the Republics of the Soviet Union, Stalin is not hoping for the same kind of political evolution and status for Ukraine, which has been achieved by members of the British Commonwealth of Nations. It is significant that in discussing general problems of the rights and welfare of peoples, Dr. Shotwell clearly states that independence is the political embodiment of liberty. Further, that exploitation of non-self-governing peoples is in disrepute in enlightened circles of Great Britain and the United States (this with reference to Asiatics), and then without any qualms concedes to Russia all rights to annex, exploit and deprive of political liberty civilized *European* people like Ukrainians and White Ruthenians, not to mention the Baltic nations. It is perhaps because it is politically expedient for America to scrap the Wilsonian principles and the Atlantic Charter in favor of Russia? Hardly so, because, as another author, Harold Callender, informs us in his "Preface to Peace," it is America and only America, and not Great Britain, who is so closely tied to Europe that it can inject broad issues of principle into relations with Russia, which Mr. Callender would have us believe would mean the requirement of adherence to Wilsonian doctrines, as reaffirmed in the Atlantic Charter. Does this attitude of Dr. Shotwell result from insufficient acquaintance with the problems of Eastern

Europe? Certainly not. Dr. Shotwell knows Europe, and he appears to know Eastern Europe right through and even down to the working processes of Stalin's mind. His attitude seems to have been influenced by the acceptance of Russia as one monolithic, indivisible unity. This has come about through centuries of Russian propaganda, which has been poured out by Russia into the western world since Peter the Great. Immediately after the beginning of the liquidation of the Hetmans of Ukraine, Russia gave Ukraine the name of "Malorosseyia" or Little Russia, and the Russians began to assume the role of the elder brethren of the Ukrainians. Through the centuries the Anglo-Saxon world came to believe that this is as it should be, and started to regard the Ukrainians in Russia as they did the Bavarians in Germany. This attitude is clearly revealed when Dr. Shotwell simplifies the whole problem of Ukraine by making his readers believe that Ukraine is a *province* of the vastly preponderating unity of Great Russia. This is precisely what the Russians having been trying to achieve through centuries of brutal extermination of Ukrainians, culminating in the greatest ruthlessness during the recent times of Stalin's Empire, when Ukraine was deliberately starved to death (with the applause of Mr. Walter Duranty) and untold millions were deported to Siberia, until now there are probably as many Ukrainians in Siberia as there are in Ukraine proper. The Russians are themselves not quite yet sure that they have made Ukraine their "province," but here a representative of the most enlightened opinion of America concedes them this point without much ado. Thus we see that American scholars, who would not tolerate the withholding of at least some kind of self-government and freedom from exploitation from Asiatic peoples, simultaneously approve the application of a colonial system by Russia toward Ukraine.

The system of peace produced by the Congress of Vienna in 1815 resulting in the Holy Alliance finds in Dr. Shotwell an apologist. The future peace, according to Dr. Shotwell, should face the fact that the era of small nations is a thing of the past, and should be built around alliances between Great Powers, similar to the Holy Alliance. In this connection it might be pertinent to recollect that the Congress of Vienna did not produce a durable peace. It produced new wars, uprisings and revolts, especially against the enlightened leader of that Congress, the Tsar of Russia.

On one more point it seems imperative to take issue with Dr. Shotwell's arguments. The point must be cleared up entirely, because on one side of his argument Dr. Shotwell places the question well known to Americans, and that is States' Rights. The comparison between the struggle of the Republics comprising the Soviet Union for severance and independence and the conflict of power (not for power) between States and the Federal Gov-

ernment of the United States, is completely without foundation, either in fact or history. All would be well if this comparison were used to show a struggle within the Russian Soviet Republic on one side, and its higher authority the Soviet Union on the other. But there is no analogy between conquered and subjected nations such as Ukraine, White Ruthenia and others and the States comprising the United States of America. To illustrate: secession is incompatible with the Constitution of the United States, hence the Civil War was constitutional on the part of the North. Secession is permissible and guaranteed (on paper) by the Soviet Constitution. There is no State in the United States of America which uses a different language, which has a different history and cultural heritage and which has been forcibly annexed into the Union, whereas all the Republics of the Soviet Union except Russia are diverse, have different languages, a different historical development and have been made to join the union by force of arms.

Another author, who purports to analyze every country and problem which would have a bearing on the future peace, but who omits to mention by name a specific Ukrainian problem is Andre Visson in "The Coming Struggle for Peace." Mr. Visson takes a more reportorial attitude towards the problems which he discusses, and discusses them broadly without analyzing them deeply, and as a result in some instances uses facts which have no support in history. To Mr. Visson the Ukrainian problem exists officially only as the Polish, or Polish-Russian Problem, and he calls it "an open wound on the body of the United Nations." It suffices to read his chapter on Poland, however, to recognize that this is the problem of Ukraine. He does not hide the fact that this is just a squabble between Poland and Russia for the whole or part of Ukraine. To quote: "The Russian-Polish boundary question is an old, old quarrel, older than the modern Polish state which emerged only after the Allied victory of 1918; older than Soviet Russia which dates back only to the First World War; older even than the Empire of the Tsars. It is the struggle between two neighboring Slavic peoples of Russia and Poland for the domination of White Russia and the Ukraine." This is absolutely correct. But if so, then the conclusion to be drawn from such fact is not to permit it to recur, by making adjustments of so-called Polish-Russian boundaries or swaying them this way, and that, according to the temporary preponderance of one neighbor over the other. On the contrary, the only sound and logical conclusion for the sake of peace is to solve the problem of Ukraine. By permitting Ukraine to become free and independent of either Poland or Russia "the open wound" will be healed automatically, with never again a problem of Polish-Russian boundaries arising. It must be pointed out to Mr. Visson, that there does not

exist even one mile of a Polish-Russian boundary, since Poland borders in the South and center on Ukraine, and in the North on White Ruthenia and Lithuania. Therefore any admission of the existence of a question of Polish-Russian boundaries is not only an injustice (to Ukraine) but also a misnomer.

To point out a few historical errors committed by Mr. Visson. Mr. Visson would have Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Hetman of Ukraine "swear allegiance to the Moscovite Tsar in 1654," whereas in fact Khmelnytsky concluded a treaty of alliance with Muscovy. The treaty of Pereyaslav created an express alliance between Ukraine and Muscovy, with Ukraine retaining full independence in all internal and external affairs. It was only after Khmelnytsky's death, when leadership in Ukraine could not rise to Khmelnytsky's talents and energy, that Russia began to encroach upon the liberties of Ukraine step by step, to the point of later interpreting the treaty of Pereyaslav as one of allegiance rather than alliance. Again Mr. Visson calls the Truce of Andrusiv of 1667 "one of the most enduring peace agreements in history." This statement finds no substantiation in history. The truce of Andrusiv was virtually a partitioning of Ukraine between Poland and Russia. It produced no peace, and immediately after 1667 a fourteen year war started among Muscovy, Poland and Turkey, which lasted until 1681 and was known in the history of that part of Europe as "The Great Ruin." The result of this three-way war was a complete devastation of the object for which the parties were fighting, that is the full ruin of Ukraine. Moreover, by the Treaty of Bakhchissaray of 1681 terminating the war between Muscovy and Turkey, it was stipulated between them that it is a duty of the contracting parties to keep forever Ukraine an empty land.

Furthermore the creation of a common border between Poland and Russia facilitated Russia's gradual penetration of Poland in the 18th century, which finally led to the infamous three partitionings of Poland beginning in 1772 and ending with a fourth one between Ribbentrop and Molotov in 1939. Thus Andrusiv became not an enduring peace agreement, but a curse, the results of which it may still take centuries for Poland to live down. Finally in referring to quite contemporary events Mr. Visson misinterprets historical facts. As for example he charges that: "the Poles allowed themselves, under French influence, to become involved in a joint invasion of Russia. Assisted by Ukrainian nationalists, most of them from former Austrian Galicia, they attacked the Soviet Ukraine in April 1920," and further "Just as the presence of Polish soldiers in the Kremlin in 1610 resulted in a Russian national revolt, the appearance of Polish soldiers in Kiev in 1920 provoked a surge of Russian patriotism." This period of

Ukrainian history has been thoroughly analyzed by many Ukrainian scholars, but as these might sound partial to Americans, I use as my source of information a book entitled "The March on Kiev—1920" published in Warsaw in 1937, the author of which is General W. Kutrzeba, chief military historian of the Warsaw Historical Society. In this book, General Kutrzeba, who took part in the 1920 campaign, truthfully states that the war against the Bolsheviks was preceded by an agreement between Poland, represented by Marshal Pilsudski, and independent Ukraine, represented by the Chief of its Armed Forces, Simon Petlura. There were hardly any Galician Ukrainians in Petlura's army. On the contrary, the Galician Ukrainians were so taken aback by this alliance between Pilsudski and Petlura, with its tacit "désintéressement" on the part of Petlura in the fate of Galicia (just a few months previously conquered by the Allied-equipped Polish forces of General Haller), that it took the Galicians a number of years to recognize Petlura's true statesmanship, which would have left the settlement of Ukrainian-Polish boundaries and relations until after the victory over the Bolsheviks. General Kutrzeba points out, in agreement with Ukrainian historians, that it was not "a surge of Russian patriotism" which defeated the Ukrainian and Polish armies, but a grave mistake on the part of Poland. The mistake was its immediate seizure of lands formerly belonging to Polish landlords, which the Government of Ukraine under an agrarian reform had parcelled out to the peasants. This made the local populace indifferent and at times even hostile towards the liberating forces, and permitting the Bolshevik slogan "all land to the peasants" to catch their fancy. These Ukrainian peasants have subsequently learned how wrong they were, when they were liquidated as "kulaks" by the Soviet regime and sent to islands in the White Sea and Northern Siberia. Some credit is due Mr. Visson for at least citing more or less correct figures of the Ukrainian population, as up to 7,000,000 in former Poland, and about 30,000,000 in Soviet Ukraine. Mr. Visson forgot to point out, however, that the Ukrainians have one of the highest birth-rates of all Europeans, and that the Ukrainians on Soviet territory in spite of this high birth-rate showed, according to Soviet statistics, no increase or practically none in the population of Ukraine. This would prove that millions of Ukrainians have been starved and deported by Russia, as consistently claimed by the Ukrainians. This state of affairs is not only an open wound on the body of the United Nations; it is a decay in the body of humanity.

From the review of the above literature, and some not specifically quoted, it is apparent that few people in the United States realize the importance of the solution of the Ukrainian problem as a prerequisite to the

durability of the future peace. It would be of course grossly presumptuous on the part of the Ukrainians to expect the United States to set up for them and guarantee an independent Ukraine. But as the trend of the times is towards democracy and self-expression of the people themselves, it is not presumptuous to expect that the people of Ukraine will be entitled to exercise a free and uncontrolled vote on questions of their allegiance and form of government, without interference from any dictatorship.

Otherwise it is easy to foresee and predict that a future peace, based like the peace of Vienna of 1815 on force and conquest, will not last. It is therefore a duty for all those of us, who through birth or descent have roots in Ukraine, to warn that no durable peace can come out of another injustice committed on Ukraine. A truce might be bought for the price of iniquity, but peace can only then be lasting, if the people involved are satisfied, and not merely their alien rulers. The Ukrainians themselves did not in the slightest degree contribute to the starting of this war; it was their subjugation under four foreign yokes which made Hitler scheme to bring them under his fifth yoke. The Ukrainians wish to live their own free life, and will not start wars, as they have never in their history waged any, except the struggle for liberation. But as long as they remain enslaved, someone will covet them and their natural riches, and for that purpose will wage war.

Nature abhors a vacuum in politics as in all else. A subjected Ukraine is a political vacuum, which will always invite some ambitious nation to fill it. Such adventurers can only be restrained if the political vacuum is removed. Its only sure removal is to permit Ukraine to develop along the lines its people wish: towards freedom and independence.

Literature

The Problems of Lasting Peace, by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson.

U. S. Foreign Policy-Shield of the Republic, by Walter Lippmann.

The Geography of the Peace, by Nicholas J. Spykman.

Searchlight on Peace Plans, by Edith Wynner and Georgia Lloyd.

Durable Peace, by Ross J. S. Hoffman.

A Preface to Peace, by Harold Callender.

The Great Decision, by James T. Shotwell.

The Coming Struggle for Peace, by Andre Visson.

UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN LIFE

UKRAINIAN AMERICAN HEROES OF WORLD WAR II

Out of the welter of news reports coming from the battlefronts all over the world, those relating to the courageous action of some hero or heroes often draw the attention of the home front public most. Americans of Ukrainian descent can feel justifiably proud that among the ranks of the great will be found fighters whose origins are in the soil of Ukraine. Among them will be found the following:

LT. COL. S. M. MELLNICK:

The story of Lt. Col. Mellnick's experiences as a Japanese prisoner of war after the fall of Corregidor on May 6, 1942 in the battle of the Philippines, and his subsequent escape to freedom with ten other Americans deserves first mention in any review of the exploits of Ukrainian American heroes in this war.

Born of Ukrainian parents in Volhynia, Western Ukraine, Lt. Col. Mellnick came to this country while yet a boy, settled near Scranton, Pennsylvania, and in time entered and graduated from West Point. He was one of the seven thousand Americans and five thousand Filipinos who surrendered to the Japs after the hopelessness of resisting the well-armed and numerically superior enemy became apparent to the commanding officer in charge, General Wainwright. Mellnick's description of the sufferings of both the American and Filipino captives due to lack of water and food, and their torture at the hands of the savage Japs received wide circulation in the press of the United States. The horror of how 5,200 Americans died in Jap prison camps was transmitted in no uncertain terms to the American public through the pen of this noble American of Ukrainian descent.

In relating the story of his escape with his little party of ten others, Lt. Col. Mellnick could not divulge all of the details for security reasons, but those he did mention conveyed the desperateness of the American prisoners' situation in the Philippines. In their efforts to elude the pursuing Jap searching party after their break from the concentration camp, the Americans endured innumerable ordeals, chief among which was that of hacking their way step by step through the almost impenetrable tall jungle grass. When finally Lt. Col. Mellnick and his group completed their dangerous route through the Island of Mindanao, after having narrowly missed re-

capture by a relentless searching party, they were royally welcomed by their Army and Navy colleagues in Australia.

PVT. NICHOLAS MINUE:

A veteran of both the 1st and 2nd World Wars, Pvt. Nicholas Minue, who lost his life in action on April 28, 1943 near Medez-el-Bab, Tunisia, after performing a heroic deed of bravery and valor, was awarded posthumously the highest decoration of the United States—the Congressional Medal of Honor. According to the citation, which was read by Major General Alvin C. Gillem, Jr., at the presentation of the medal to Mrs. Mary Minue of Carteret, N. J. in behalf of her hero son, Pvt. Minue volunteered to attack an enemy machine gun position alone when his company's advance was held up by its cross-fire. He not only destroyed the nest of ten machine gunners and riflemen singlehandedly, but he continued forward, routing enemy riflemen from dugout positions until he was fatally wounded. This display of courage and fearlessness was a factor in spurring his company to offensive action which drove the enemy from the entire sector.

Pvt. Minue was born in the village of Zaluzhe in Western Ukraine, and came to the United States at the age of seven. He enlisted in the army in the last war in 1918 and served for a year before being mustered out. Entering civilian life again, Minue went into business, but this apparently did not appeal to him, for he re-enlisted in the army and for many years was an army cook. At the time of his death, Pvt. Minue was 44 years old.

LT. THOMAS KINASZCZUK:

During his three years as a flier in the United States Navy, Lt. Thomas Kinaszczuk of Elizabeth, New Jersey, has had two most exciting experiences. The first, the sinking of a German U-Boat with depth bombs from the Naval patrol plane which he piloted, occurred in April of 1943. Attacked by the Lieutenant's plane, the submarine commander decided to return the fire with his deck guns rather than submerge. In the encounter that followed, one wing of the plane was riddled by shells, but Kinaszczuk pressed home his flight and saw the sub settle beneath the waves, destroyed by his bombs. For this gallant act, he was awarded the Navy Cross.

His second experience, a most trying one from which he was lucky to escape alive, happened when a Ventura plane he was piloting developed engine trouble 300 miles from shore and crashed into the sea. Although the plane burst into flames upon landing in the water, Lt. Kinaszczuk was successful in pulling out the life raft which was responsible for saving not only his life, but those of his crew. After drifting on the ocean for five days,

much of the time in rough water which made it difficult for him to alleviate the suffering of three of his badly burned crewmen, the Lieutenant and the others were finally spotted by a Navy plane which sent a boat to the rescue.

MAJOR STEPHEN MALEVICH:

By his daring and also skill as an engineer which he displayed during the Battle of the Philippines, Major Malevich won himself a prominent place among war heroes. Being in charge of a crew of U. S. Army Engineers, Malevich, then a captain, directed the repairing of the Carmen Bridge, which had been damaged by Japanese bombs, to make it possible for General MacArthur's men to withdraw successfully across it. After the last detachment of troops had crossed the repaired structure, other Army engineers set off blasts which destroyed it and thus delayed the oncoming Jap troops until the American forces were able to dig into new positions.

After a six-month period of uncertainty as to his whereabouts, the wife, Dorothy, and the parents of Major Malevich, Mr. and Mrs. Vladimir Malevich of Pittsburgh, Pa., received word from him that he was a prisoner of the Japs.

Prior to the time he entered the service as a volunteer in the U. S. Army Engineers, Malevich, a graduate of Carnegie Tech, worked as an engineer together with his father at the Jones and Laughlin Steel Works. Later he went to Baltimore to aid in the development of Government war projects. Shortly after the outbreak of the war with Japan, he held the rank of army captain, from which he was promoted to major, a position he had earned by his outstanding action in Luzon. Major Malevich continues to be a prisoner of war.

STEPHEN KURLAK.

UKRAINIANS OF U.S.A. AND CANADA IN COOPERATION

The joint communique in the adjoining column of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Ukrainian Canadian Committee is truly a historic document. For it marks the first time in the history of Americans and Canadians of Ukrainian descent that a definite step has been taken toward collaboration between them along lines of common interests.

The collaboration shall be conducted through the medium of the above mentioned committees. Both these committees, it should be borne in mind, were elected at national congresses and empowered by them to represent and act on behalf of Ukrainian Americans and Ukrainian Canadians, respectively. Likewise both committees have wide backing among the people and

their organizations. Thus, for example, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, though organizationally founded strictly on the basis of community representation (unlike the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, which represents an alliance of various Ukrainian political—excluding Communists) has the support of such leading national organizations, and their press organs, as the Ukrainian National Association, with its daily "Svoboda" and "The Ukrainian Weekly," the Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics with its "America" tri-weekly, and the Ukrainian National Aid Association with its "Narodne Slovo" weekly. Aside from its national organizational support, the Ukrainian Canadian Committee likewise has the backing of the Ukrainian-Canadian press. Obviously such a widely representative character on the part of each committee gives its collaboration with the other a truly national scope and the utmost importance.

Aside from their representative character, both committees have the mutuality of purposes which is indispensable to any real collaboration. These purposes are based on support of the Allied war effort and support of the Ukrainian struggle in Europe for national freedom. In view of this fact it was not at all difficult at the conference during the past weekend for representatives of the two committees to explore and find means of collaboration between Ukrainian Americans and Ukrainian Canadians. And although the generally worded communique of that conference does not set them out, definite and detailed decisions were reached at the conference in respect to such collaboration. May these decisions bear early fruit.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE

OF THE

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

AND THE UKRAINIAN CANADIAN COMMITTEE

On September 23 and 24, 1944 there was held in Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City a conference of representatives of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, arranged by the executive boards of the two committees for the purpose of exploring the possibilities of collaboration between Americans and Canadians of Ukrainian descent, particularly between the two undersigned committees which represent them.

The conference was opened and its program presented by Stephen Shumeyko, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, while its pro-

ceedings were conducted by Rev. Dr. Vasile Kushnir, president of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee.

Following a review of the purposes, activities and plans of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, a general discussion ensued, in the course of which certain fields of endeavor were indicated on which collaboration between the two committees is not only possible and necessary, but also free of any possible hindrances arising from the fact that such collaboration would be between the nationals of two different countries. Following their deliberations the representatives of the two committees came to the following conclusions:

1. Americans as well as Canadians of Ukrainian descent have steadily and vigorously supported the war effort of their respective countries. They have always been of the conviction that until the war ends in total victory for the United Nations, the war effort must continue to be their supreme task. This applies not only to those who are serving in the armed forces or who do war work, but also to those who are engaged in other occupations, embracing as well activities of a general civic-communal-national nature, such as those being conducted by the nationally representative Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Ukrainian Canadian Committee.

2. Aside from the war effort which engages their primary attention, certain activities supplementary to that war effort merit attention, too. Chief among them is the humanitarian action, designed to relieve the needy in both the United States and Canada and come to the aid of the victims of war throughout the world, especially to the hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian war victims in Ukraine itself as well as in other parts of Europe, Asia and Africa. There is full scope for the conduct of such humanitarian action in America and Canada, provided of course it has the required governmental sanction.

3. In their efforts to introduce into American and Canadian culture the finest elements of their Ukrainian cultural heritage, Ukrainian Americans and Ukrainian Canadians should exchange views and plans concerning such matters as the publication in English of various works on the history, literature, art, and traditions of Ukraine, also handbooks and textbooks on how to learn Ukrainian, Ukrainian English dictionaries, and other such printed works.

4. Americans and Canadians of Ukrainian descent, organized on the ideological platform of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, respectively, realize that together they are a constituent part of two mighty democratic powers, the two most free nations in the world. Likewise they realize that they and their American and

Canadian countrymen are engaged in this war in order to defend their democratic liberties and their way of life, to defeat the aggressors and thus put an end forever to aggression and totalitarianism, and finally to establish a new order throughout the world, founded on the Four Freedoms and respect of the right of people to free and independent national existence. Bearing this in mind they consider themselves conscience-bound to proceed in a manner which would assure victory for them not only in time of war but also in time of peace. Therefore they are resolved to constantly and thoroughly illuminate those problems which in the past constituted a threat to peace and which are bound to remain as such in the future, unless a just solution is found for them at the close of this war. That is exactly why Americans and Canadians of Ukrainian extraction must continue their endeavor to draw the world's attention to the vital necessity of a just settlement of the Ukrainian problem in Europe, and stress at the same time that this settlement can be just and advantageous to world peace only when there shall come into being respect for and realization of the centuries-old struggle of the Ukrainian people to attain their national freedom and independence.

REV. DR. W. KUSHNIR,
*President, Ukrainian Canadian
Committee.*

STEPHEN SHUMEYKO,
*President, Ukrainian Congress
Committee of America.*



BOOK REVIEWS

"ISTORIYA UKRAINY" (History of Ukraine) by a brigade of historians of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. under the direction of S. M. Byelousov. Published by the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Kiev, 1941. 411 pages, plus maps.

Research on Ukrainian history became dormant after the dissolution of the Historical Department of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and all its historical institutions in 1930. Prof. M. Hrushevsky, the head of the department and the creator of the modern Ukrainian historical school, was exiled. At the same time, many renowned historians, such as Slabchenko, Vasilenko, Hermaize, Okynshevych, and others, were liquidated. Some were forced to make retractions, that they had been led onto "false nationalistic paths" by Michael Hrushevsky in their studies of Ukrainian history. Two years later one more issue of M. Hrushevsky's historical journal "Ukraina" was released. The introductory article, written by Comrade Joseph Vysarionovych Stalin gave instructions on "How to write the history of the Soviet people." In order that the study of Ukrainian history could be carried on in such a manner, a new staff of academic historians was chosen, suitable to this task, which could write such a history of Ukraine as demanded by Moscow. After a few years just such a history of Ukraine did appear, written according to Comrade Stalin's recipe. It is a handbook on the History of Ukraine written by a brigade of historians at the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., and examined and approved by the Institute of Marx, Engels and Lenin in Kiev and is, therefore, the brainchild of the Communist Party.

This new History of Ukraine has two characteristics. The first is its slant on national affairs to the political line of the communist government of the Soviets. The second is the adjustment of this history to Marxist dialectics; therefore it is interwoven with quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Comrade Stalin. Where there are no such Russian-imperialistic and communistic influences, this handbook is worthwhile, for it profits from the new historical literature of the past 20 years. This can be said of the first part of the book which deals with history until 1914. The second part of the book is ordinary, agitable communistic literature, without any scientific value.

The first part of the History of Ukraine takes advantage of new scientific findings covering pre-history, economy, and culture in Ukraine; on

the other hand it sharply diverges from the fundamental ideology of all Ukrainian historians outside of the Soviet Union. Ukrainian relations with Russia are presented either one-sidedly or completely ignored, if they are inimical and impossible to explain. Bohdan Khmelnytsky's yielding of Ukraine to Tsarist protection is viewed by this handbook as the outcome of natural evolution and not because of dire necessity. This history regards Hetman Ivan Mazepa, the nationalist who declared war against Russia, as a traitor, and an enemy of the Ukrainian people.

The second part, exactly one half of the book, is dedicated to events resulting from the communistic Russian domination of Ukraine. This is not so much the history of Ukraine as it is the history of the Communist Party in Ukraine, interesting perhaps to orthodox Communists who must memorize this Koran. Furthermore, the presentation of these events is biased and without any historical objective. This new academic History of Ukraine is an excellent handbook showing the paths along which Ukraine is being brought closer to Russia, in other words, the further enslavement of Ukraine.

NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ.

THE ROAD TO FOREIGN POLICY, by Hugh Gibson, 252 pp. New York. Doubleday, Doran & Co., \$2.50.

So many quacks have been endeavoring to cure the ills of war, peace and foreign politics, that they produced a feeling of the incurability of these maladies. In the above-titled book, however, the confidence of the patient is at last restored, for a real expert has taken over the job, and he does not prescribe any cure-alls; but simply and plainly shows that there does not exist an incurable condition in world or American foreign politics. Mr. Gibson points out rather than prescribes remedies for the various ills and ailments from which the world and America are suffering and finds them none too numerous or hopeless. One real ailment from which Mr. Gibson strongly advises to rid ourselves is "uninformed and artificially stimulated enthusiasms," and for this a cure is required.

One of the many fields where enthusiasms obscure elementary diplomacy is the relationship with one of the Allies: the Soviet Union. Giving due credit to the accomplishments of Soviet arms, Mr. Gibson analyzes minutely all the diplomatic moves of the Kremlin which inevitably lead to plain territorial expansion of the Soviet Union at the expense of independent European states and the reaction to these moves of American public opinion and American officialdom, and comes to the conclusion that the phrase "Friends in fact, in spirit and in purpose" coined at Teheran is rather questionable in its meaning.

Not all hope is lost yet for the oppressed peoples of Europe and the possibility of the revival of the principles of the Atlantic Charter if voices like Mr. Gibson's will be heeded. It may indeed be a sign of the times and of the end of mushy sentiments towards everything Russian when Mr. Gibson classifies the "technique of Berlin and Moscow" under one category.

As regards United States' foreign policy, Mr. Gibson sees three possible roads: power politics, isolation or collaboration. A lone hand at power politics is ruled out. Isolation in today's world is impossible and no more desired by anyone. So there remains but one course, that of collaboration. This collaboration according to Mr. Gibson should, however, not assume blind approval of every and anything undertaken by our Allies. It should have a goal, a goal to which the American people can subscribe by reason of their traditional development as well as their self-interest. That goal is: world peace through development and preservation of democratic government and institutions first at home and then abroad. The road to this goal leads by patient and constant plodding through: assertion of America's interests, international arbitration, limitation of armaments and other methods of peaceful intercourse heretofore only half-heartedly attempted.

R. OLESNICKI.

UKRAINIAN LITERATURE. Studies of the Leading Authors by Clarence A. Manning. Foreword by Prof. Watson Kirkconnel. Published by the Ukrainian National Association, Jersey City, N. J., 1944, 126 pages.

"UKRAINIAN LITERATURE offers perhaps the best medium for studying the aspirations of the Ukrainian people and their mode of existence." With such characteristic words Prof. Clarence A. Manning begins his book on the leading authors of Ukrainian literature.

The author discovers in Ukrainian literature "two outstanding qualities, a keen sense of realism and, above all, a confidence and belief in democracy in every form and this is its chief characteristic. There is hardly a literature which is more devoted to the cause of the common man and presents him more sympathetically in his struggles, his difficulties and his achievements and if there may be said to be anywhere a literature of the common man, it is the Ukrainian literature." After thus characterizing Ukrainian literature the author places before us several of the leading Ukrainian authors. Prof. Manning, as it were, builds the pillars of a bridge while he invites the reader to construct the spans between the pillars himself, with his own intelligence.

Prof. Clarence A. Manning includes among these leading authors also the first Ukrainian philosopher, Hryhory S. Skovoroda, the predecessor of

Ukrainian national rebirth, who spiritually influenced Kotlyarevsky to protest against Ukrainian enslavement by Moscow in a most disharming manner. After describing Kvitka-Osnovyanyenko, he masterfully depicts with a few strokes the great genius of Taras Shevchenko. Here Prof. Manning describes the broad background of that cultural Russian environment in which the genius of Shevchenko matured. Some of the details are actually new and are interesting even to an educated Ukrainian reader.

Pantaleymon Kulish, Marko Vovchok and Ivan N. Levytsky represent the period following Shevchenko. The growth of Ukrainian national rebirth among the masses resulted in a violent battle by the Russian government against Ukrainian literature as being the expression of Ukrainian nationalism.

Then follow the realistically drawn figures of Ivan Franko, Lesya Ukrainka, and Michael Kotsiubinsky, who led Ukrainian literature onto the wide highway of international literature and found for it a link with Western European literature.

Stefanyk and Oles represent the contemporary times of the unsuccessful national fight for freedom. The author ends with a chapter on the unenviable fate of Ukrainian literature among the new conditions under the Soviets, which the author characterizes as a new Valuyev period. "The language was allowed to exist." So Prof. Manning characterizes the stagnation of Ukrainian literature under the Soviets. "No one ventured to repeat the words of Valuyev in the sixties that there never was, is not and never will be a Ukrainian language. It was clear, however, that there never was, is not, and never will be a Ukrainian culture distinct from the general Soviet culture within the Soviet Union. The measures taken in the twentieth century go further than any in the nineteenth."

Prof. Manning has created an excellent and easily readable work for the information of the Anglo-Saxon world about Ukrainian literature. Himself being a basic specialist on Russian-Polish literature as well as Anglo-Saxon literature, the author was able to find a suitable niche for the individual Ukrainian authors in international literature and connected their creativeness with the main trends of world literature. The author's knowledge of the material itself absolutely amazes the Ukrainian intellectual, especially since he is an Anglo-Saxon. Yet he has been able to fundamentally master and appreciate the literature of distant Ukraine and to comprehend the background of that literature, the elements of which constitute the most confused problem of international life—the Ukrainian Problem.

NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ.

UKRAINICA IN AMERICAN PERIODICALS

JOURNAL OF CENTRAL EUROPEAN AFFAIRS. 1944/2 *An Error in Curzon's Note* by W. Sworakowski.

The author endeavors to prove that in the present Polish-Soviet boundary dispute, the Soviets have no right to base their claim on the so-called Curzon Line. This line, demarcated in a note of the British Government to the Soviets of August 11th, 1920, does not, according to Mr. Sworakowski, apply to the southern sector of the Polish-Soviet boundary, *i.e.* to the division of Galicia.

From the formal viewpoint the author is right, but not when all facts are considered. Delineation between Poland and Western Ukraine was performed on this southern sector very accurately about nine months earlier in a proposed Autonomous Statute for Galicia of November 1919. The proposed boundary between Poland and Ukrainian Galicia contained in this Statute was later referred to as the Curzon Line.

Mr. Sworakowski's arguments give an impression of dialectics. He evades carefully the core of the question: who in truth has a just claim to the lands east of the Curzon Line? For this reason and for the additional reason that the contents of the British note of August 11, 1920 had never been put to a practical test, his fundamental analysis of the form of this document seems to be futile. It was understood at the conference in Spaa in July 1920, when the idea of the Curzon Line was conceived, that neither Poland nor Russia have any rights to Ukrainian Galicia, but only the Ukrainian people. At a future peace conference to deal with these territories, which was being planned at Spaa, Ukrainian Galicia was to have been represented by a special delegation of its people. It should be borne in mind that Poland was not ruler of Galicia in 1920, she became ruler on March 15 1923. Purely dialectic is Mr. Sworakowski's statement that the Soviet decree of August 29, 1918, which voided the acts of partition of Poland, restored Poland's boundaries of 1772, which would mean eastward to the line of the Dnieper river. As is well known, by signing the Second Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with the Central Powers in February 1918 Soviet Russia renounced all claims to Ukraine. (The boundaries of Ukraine were drawn by the First Treaty of Brest and in the West ran along the Vepre and Bug rivers). Where are the grounds for concluding that six months later a Soviet decree ceded half of this very same Ukraine to Poland?

Ukrainian territories are obdurately referred to by Mr. Sworakowski as "Russian soil." Evidently he forgets that the Treaty of Riga (1921) was concluded between three sovereign states: Poland on the one hand, and Soviet Russia and Soviet Ukraine on the other hand. Likewise the official text of the Treaty of Riga is in three languages: Polish, Russian and Ukrainian.

If Mr. Sworakowski would admit the existence of a third and vitally interested party in the Polish-Soviet dispute—the Ukrainian people, then he would be less likely to call Prime Minister Lloyd George's attitude towards Poland in 1920 as "hostile," and then perhaps his arguing of a case against Soviet Russia would have been more convincing.

• • •

In the same journal 1942/3 and 1943/3 we find an interesting discussion between Professor Dr. W. J. Rose, Director of the School of Slavonic Studies in London and Professor Oscar Halecki, Director of the Polish Institute in New York, on the subject of impartiality in rendering Polish history. Professor Rose, known to be friendly to Poland, shares the views of the Polish historian, Professor O. Gorka "that much of the history of Poland has not been truly and honestly written."

The misrepresentations of Polish history admitted by Dr. Gorka and summarized by Dr. Rose are:

1. That the penetration of Polish influence and rule over Eastern territories was significant with the carrying by Poland into non-Christian lands of Christianity and civilization. (The so-called Eastern Mission of Poland).
2. That Poland was tolerant and free from religious persecutions.
3. That the Union of Lublin (1569) or the Union of Brest (1596) were acts of goodwill accepted with enthusiasm.
4. That the institutions of old Poland were truly democratic.
5. That Poland was a dangerous obstacle to Prussian militarism and Russian despotism, and was for those reasons partitioned.

It is significant that the above misstatements accepted as truisms by a majority of Poles, have been branded as falsehoods by a prominent scholar like Dr. Gorka.

The critique of the "accepted" history of Poland refers in the main to Polish rule of Ukrainian territories, and therefore it is of value to students of Ukrainian history.

Dr. Rose also shares Dr. Gorka's criticism of the official history of Poland. Dr. Gorka, a professor of history in Vilna proposed in 1934 that all text-

books of Polish history be radically revised, by laying its foundations on proven facts instead of fantasies if the teaching of Polish history was to be an asset in the education of the Polish citizen. Dr. Gorka criticized Polish historians for their lack of appreciation of the cultural values of other nations, especially those of Ukraine. Polish history oftentimes glorifies sinister personalities, which were supposed to have been carriers of Polish culture to the East. Dr. Gorka strongly condemned the person of Prince Jeremy Wyshnyvetsky for his known hostility to the Kozaks, and charges him not only with cowardice, but even with treason to Poland.

The bold stand of Dr. Gorka in this connection produced a veritable tempest among Polish historians. The main counter-attack was launched by Professor W. Konopczynski at the Congress of Polish Historians in Vilna in 1935.

The war and subsequent events connected with it have proved Dr. Gorka's realistic attitude to have been right, and that is why he reiterated his views in 1942 in a Polish publication in London. Dr. Gorka's views caught the attention of Dr. Rose, who *transplanted* the discussion to American soil. Professor Halecki, a representative of the old official school of Polish history, took issue with Dr. Rose. But he could not refute the statements of Gorka-Rose completely and had to make compromises. He was unable to disprove any of the five points of Gorka-Rose. Instead Dr. Halecki tried to take off the edge of three of them, and shows that in certain respects Poland was higher developed than certain countries of Western Europe at the time.

From the Ukrainian viewpoint Professors Gorka and Rose are absolutely right. And to their opinion may be added ours, that official Polish history has been detrimental to the education of whole generations of Poles, who thereby could not come to understand their neighbors and their problems, notably the Ukrainians, White-Ruthenians and Lithuanians.

The ideology of the Polish historians was transposed by the famous novelist Henryk Sienkiewicz into the domain of literature. His historical novels wielded a destructive influence upon Polish youth. This ideology of an unrealistic approach to history is responsible for the fact that Poland could never solve her Eastern problems, and is even today unable to organize a moral bloc of Poles, Ukrainians, White-Ruthenians, Lithuanians and others, which would stem the tide of Russian imperialism.



In the *RUSSIAN REVIEW* (Vol. 3/1, Autumn 1943), W. H. Chamberlin writes on *The Russian American Cooperation*. He considers cooperation

between the United States and the Soviet Union indispensable, and for this reason enumerates favorable and unfavorable aspects of this cooperation. According to him most of the obstacles appear on the Russian side, the chief of which is the Russian imperialistic drive to the West. Mr. Chamberlin acknowledges Russia's claim to Bessarabia, but denies it to other western territories, including Western Ukraine. On this latter subject he writes:

"The question of Poland's Eastern boundary is also complicated because a large part of the population in the disputed area is ethnically Ukrainian and White Russian. The Ukrainians in Galicia, having lived first under Austria, then under Polish rule, have developed under quite different conditions from the Ukrainians in Soviet Ukraine, with their experiences first of Russia, then of Soviet rule. Here again an agreed settlement, which should correspond so far as possible with the will of the local population, would certainly be preferable to an arbitrary annexation."

The last conclusion of Mr. Chamberlin corresponds to the desires of the Western Ukrainians, but for other reasons than those quoted by him. In spite of a separate life and development of Western Ukrainians and their Eastern co-nationals, the Western Ukrainians are preponderantly for a union of all Ukrainians; not, however, under Russian domination, only in an independent Ukraine. As long as this cannot be achieved, Mr. Chamberlin's proposition is the only acceptable alternative.

In another article of *RUSSIAN REVIEW* (1944/7), *Russia After the War*, Mr. Chamberlin speculates on whether the Soviet system can be expected to change toward liberalism after the war. This is a question of paramount importance to Ukrainians. Mr. Chamberlin points out the abyss between the written Soviet Constitution and real life. It would be absurd to compare the Soviet Union with the British Commonwealth, because as Mr. Chamberlin states: "It will be a long time before the Prime Minister of the Ukraine will criticize openly the speech of a Soviet Ambassador in another country as the Canadian Prime Minister . . . recently took issue."

The Soviet Union is today a strictly centralized country, and the centralization was accomplished through the dictatorial powers of the Communist Party. In order to effect a change, the dictatorship of the Communist Party would have to be abrogated. There may be a hope that the heroes of the Red Army will grow in stature and outrank the party. On the other hand, the party may claim and absorb them, and then everything will remain as before. Mr. Chamberlin does not subject the first eventuality to a broader analysis. In our opinion this eventuality must not of necessity bring about a liberalization of the Soviet system, because the place of the party can be taken by a Russian nationalist militarism. Such

Russian militarism may become even more dangerous to Ukrainian nationalism than any internationalist system.

Professor O. J. Frederiksen writes in the same issue on *Alexander I and His League to End Wars*. This is a critical analysis of the Alliance of the Big Three of 1815, created after the defeat of Napoleon with the object of forever ending all war in the world, and known to the world as the Holy Alliance of Russia, Britain and Austria.

The Alliance adhered to the principles of legitimism and promised to rule Europe according to moral precepts of the Holy Gospel. The Alliance disintegrated after thirty-odd years, because each party sought its self-interest. This interesting article by Mr. Frederiksen is very timely, for lately a number of publicists have been polishing up the Holy Alliance and setting it up as an example to be emulated when the time comes to put the world in order by the present three great powers, United States, Britain and Russia. The author does not, however, give a complete picture of the Holy Alliance, as he omits to mention that this Alliance, pledging to rule according to the Holy Gospel, introduced in fact the most reactionary police system of Chancellor Metternich, along with political prisons of the most cruel sort, as in Spielberg and Kuffstein. Europe simultaneously developed a close net of underground revolutionary organizations which dealt the Holy Alliance the final crushing blows in the Pan-European revolution of 1848. It is therefore, apparent that the Holy Alliance and its system did not contribute to a lasting peace.

• • •

THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC MAGAZINE (May, 1944) brings forth an article by Eddy Gilmore, *Liberated Ukraine*. Geography is today considered by many to be a synthesis of all sciences, because it concerns itself with inanimate territory, figures as well as with live humans. For the one part geography is an exact science, for another, when dealing with living people it extrudes into the field of humanities. We approached the article "Liberated Ukraine" in that frame of mind.

For a geographer the first condition is an accurate map. Eddy Gilmore's article is illustrated with a map of a southwestern section of the U.S.S.R., but Ukraine is not specifically marked off, and it is up to the reader to guess how far it stretches. Contrary to principles accepted by American geographers, which provide that names of towns, rivers etc. should be

rendered the same way as named by the local people, this map as well as other similar maps in current usage uses either Russian or Polish names for Ukrainian places. For instance: Krivoi Rog, Chernigov, Belaya Tserkov, Vasilkov, Mogilev, Razdelnaya, Tarnopol, instead of Kryvy Rih, Cherny-hiv, Bila Tserkva, Vasytkiv, Mohyliv, Rozdilna, Ternopil.

The author gathered most of his material on Ukraine from Russian officials occupying the country and for that reason it is confusing and biased. He quotes Leonid Lebedev, Chairman of the Kiev City Soviet, on Ukraine: "What was once a land of proud beauty has become one of the most desolate places in all of vast Russia." It would, therefore, appear that Ukraine is a province of Russia. After Lebedev Eddy Gilmore himself started counting Ukrainians as among the Russians. Says he: "Ukrainians, above all of the Russians, love song and dance." In every country in the world the days and nights are those of that country. After sunset a French night settles over France, an Italian night over Italy; only over Ukraine, for an unknown reason, amongst the songs of Ukrainians there reigns a Russian night: "Songs of Ukrainians will float once more out into the soft Russian night." It is not surprising that out of this confusion of the author's information there emerge as Ukrainian folk musical instruments the guitar and the balalaika which never were known in Ukraine as national instruments. Moreover an elderly Ukrainian peasant is described in the article as "a Tolstoy muzhik," which is contrary to all findings of Eastern European ethnography, especially to the description of the Ukrainian peasant by H. Tiltman in his work: "Peasant Europe," London, 1934.

Nevertheless whenever the author met Ukrainians he could immediately discern a vast difference between them and those who rule over them. A Ukrainian poet told Eddy Gilmore with emphasis, "We are Ukrainians." This short sentence conveys a lot, when present day Soviet realities are considered. Likewise Eddy Gilmore is able to see the Ukrainian peasant as a fanatical lover of his soil who starts rebuilding his home wrecked by the Nazis with his bare hands as his only tools.

Interesting, too, is the statement that changes in the social economic structure brought about by the war are quite astonishing. The government of Ukraine, being unable to set again in motion great factories, is now encouraging individuals to conduct small privately owned enterprises. Private restaurants are mushrooming too. Disabled veterans are planning to run a cooperative tobacco factory.

Following the National Geographic's usual policy, this article is amply illustrated with good pictures, not all of which seem to be in place. What connection is there, for example between Ukraine and the picture of

Oreshkov Village Soviet, Rouzsk region, Moscow territory? The picture of a group of monks in front of the Pechersha Lavra Shrine must be of pre 1914 vintage, as it is a well known fact that Pechersha Lavra in Kiev was changed by the Soviet authorities into a museum of cults, practically a museum of godlessness.

• • •

THOUGHT, Fordham University Quarterly, Vol. XVII/65, contains a review of Hrushevsky's "A History of Ukraine" (Yale University Press, New Haven 1941) by Leonid I. Strakhovsky of Maryland University.

The review contains very little on the subject of Hrushevsky's History, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Hrushevsky was the greatest Ukrainian historian, and one of the greatest historians of Eastern Europe. The author of the review does not fail, however, in proffering his prejudiced Russian views, so outmoded as to be rare now in and out of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Strakhovsky appears to be an unequivocal supporter of the Tsarist Secretary of the Interior and Chief of Police, Count Valuyev, who in 1863 issued an official declaration in regard to Ukrainian national life, known as "Valuyev's Ukase." At a time when after the death of Taras Shevchenko, the greatest Ukrainian poet and a prophet of the national revival, national trends began by way of literary works to penetrate into the masses, Valuyev issued a prohibition of publishing anything in the Ukrainian language. By way of explaining his motives for this decree, Valuyev said thus: "There never was, there nowhere is, and there never can be a separate Ukrainian or Little Russian language." After 80 years of stormy events in Eastern Europe during which an independent Ukrainian State was set up (and then fell) in Mr. Strakhovsky's mind there is no Ukrainian language, no Ukrainian people, no Ukraine. The Ukrainian language, says Mr. Strakhovsky is artificial, because it is based on folk speech. Ukrainian history is non-existent, because Ukraine is a region of Russia. There never was any Ukrainian national movement, except the one created in the mind of Prof. Hrushevsky. The ancient period of Ukrainian history, the so-called Kievan period, does not belong to Ukrainian history (in the estimation of Mr. Strakhovsky) perhaps because the Kievan State's beginnings and its center were in the heart of Ukraine. The author seems to be ignorant of Ukrainian political and cultural relations with foreign countries (cf. i. Rumania) although such facts can be found in many textbooks of history. The author of the review considers it as a most compromising circumstance of the appearance of Hrushevsky's History at Yale, the fact that its pub-

lication was materially aided by the Ukrainian National Association, a leading fraternal and cultural organization of fifty years standing in this country.

It is to be considered a pitiful waste of the precious space of as serious a publication as the official organ of Fordham, **THOUGHT**, that so many non-scientific and trivial statements were crammed into the space of one page.

