

JOURNAL

OF UKRAINIAN GRADUATE STUDIES

M. Pytlowany: The New York Group of Poets

O. Martynowych: Early Ukrainian Canadian Socialists (II)

A. Motyl: The Problem of Bessarabia and Bukovyna

M. Romach: Ukrainian Summer Courses in Kiev

V. Makarenko: Two Watercolours

B. Korniienko: Poetry

Was Baba a Bohunk?: A Discussion (M. Kostash, R. Franko,
N. Kazymyra)

Guides to Research

Reviews and Letters

2

SPRING 1977

ЖУРНАЛ
ВИЩИХ УКРАЇНОЗНАВЧИХ СТУДІЙ

diasporiana.org.ua

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE
(University of Toronto)

PROF. O. RUDZIK
R. SENKUS

M. SHKANDRIJ
PROF. D. HUSAR STRUK

EDITORIAL BOARD :

G. BOSHYK (Oxford University)
T. GAJECKY (Harvard University)
Z. HRYCENKO (University of Manitoba)
Y. KOWALCHUK (University of Alberta)
PROF. G. S. N. LUCKYJ (University of Toronto)
PROF. P. POTICHNYJ (McMaster University)
PROF. I. L. RUDNYTSKY (University of Alberta)
PROF. R. SERBYN (Université du Québec a Montréal)

The editors assume no responsibility for statements of fact or opinion made by contributors.

The Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies is published biannually (once per semester) by The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. Subscriptions are \$4.00 a year, foreign and domestic postage included. Single numbers are \$2.00 each. All personal cheques and money orders should be made out to: The Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies. Please do not send cash.

Articles submitted, books for review and all correspondence concerning subscriptions, editorial and advertising matters should be sent to: **The Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies, c/o Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures, 21 Sussex Ave., University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont. M5S 1A1, Canada.**

Two copies of any article or note should be submitted. Footnotes should appear at the bottom of each page. Modified Library of Congress transliteration should be used. In general, articles should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages, except where especially justified, e.g., by extensive documentation, tables or charts. Manuscripts will not be returned unless specifically requested and postage is provided. The policy of the journal is not to consider materials that have been published or that are being considered for publication elsewhere.

Published by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
Printed by Harmony Printers, Toronto, Canada.

Copyright

C O N T E N T S

Melanie Pytlowany: Continuity and Innovation in the Poetry of the New York Group	3
Orest T. Martynowych: The Ukrainian Socialist Movement in Canada; 1900—1918 (II)	22
Alexander Motyl: The Problem of Bessarabia and Bukovyna: the Intersection of the Sino-Soviet and Soviet-Rumanian Disputes	32
Мирослава Ромах: Про літні курси української мови в Києві	49
Volodymyr Makarenko	56
Борис Корнієнко: „Коріння”	58
Myrna Kostash: Baba Was a Bohunk and So Am I—a Stranger, Despite Three Generations in Canada	69
Nadia Kazymyra: To Bear (Bare) Doubt: It All Started With Baba	79
Roma Franko: Of Ambition, Babas and Bohunks	84
Myrna Kostash: Response	89
<i>Guides to Research in Ukrainian Studies</i>	
A Note on Soviet Dissertations: Guide to Avtoreferaty (M. Boshyk)	91
A Guide to Foreign Ministry Archives in England Relating to Ukraine (K. Huytan)	94
<i>Рецензія: Підсумок втрат і здобутків (М.Ц.)</i>	99
<i>Letter to the Editors: Translations, Translations! (G. Luckyj)</i>	104

Melanie Pytlowany

CONTINUITY AND INNOVATION IN THE POETRY OF THE NEW YORK GROUP

In analyzing a "phenomenon" such as the New York Group of poets within the rather broad context of the development of Ukrainian literature, it is essential to be cognizant of certain factors which qualify and delineate the essence of this group. The group consists of approximately nine or ten more or less "established" members and several other "fringe participants". These people are neither all geographically from New York, nor are they all just poets. In fact, most have written or attempted to write some form of prose; in the case of Emma Andiiivska, this has proven to be a productive and successful expansion. However, the New York Group of poets does, to a great extent, follow the traditional pattern in Ukrainian literature of producing poetry which, on the whole, is on a higher level than their prose. Hence, this paper will focus on the poetic aspect of their work. It must also be mentioned that an integral feature of the group is the inclusion of members from the world of the visual arts and music. The product of their collaboration is most directly embodied in their journal *Nova poeziia*,¹ which conveys an important dimension of the group's essential nature.

Some of the significant problems or tasks which arise in attempting to ascertain the "place" or role of the New York Group within the context of Ukrainian literary development are: an exploration of the presence or absence of traditional influences, the presence or absence of innovation, the nature and range of the poetry produced, and the poet's approach to the creative process. It is not within the scope of this paper to attempt a detailed study of the work of individual members of the group; hence, several of the "most established" and well-known members of the group such as Andiiivska, Boychuk, Rubchak etc. may only be briefly mentioned in order to isolate or illustrate a certain feature of the group as a whole, or to emphasize unique characteristics of an individual. In this way, it is hoped that some light will be cast in the form of an overall view, with discovery of possible answers to the above mentioned problems.

Bohdan Boychuk, in his somewhat "stylized" article in *Terem*, "Tak i poshcho narodylasia niu iorkska hrupa", chosed 1954 as

¹ *Nova poeziia* was published from the late 50's to the early 70's in a very free-form style.

the unofficial birthday for the group. Andrievska had already published a collection of poetry, *Poeziia*, in 1951, and others had previously published in various Ukrainian journals. However, it is important to bear in mind that the genesis of the New York Group was somewhat spontaneous and anarchic, and that the style and tone of the group was directly related to the form of its conception.

If one were to look at both internal and external characteristics of the members of the New York Group, one could see how the balance between differences and similarities is revealingly maintained. Andrievska is perhaps the most well known and unique member of the group—sometimes characterized as its matriarchal forerunner. However, there does exist a cohesive element which allows the reader or critic to place Andrievska and a poet like Patrytsiia Kylyna—whose background is extremely different than that of Andrievska—side by side in a phenomenon called the New York Group of poets. Bohdan Boychuk, in the above mentioned article, isolates the “conflict” between traditionalism and modernism or avantgardism as being basic to the emergence of the group. However, modernism² or avantgardism in Ukrainian poetry—if one can speak of the birth of “isms”, arose at least 30 years before the alleged congelation of the New York Group, with such people as Tychyna, Svidzinsky, Antonych—later Barka, Lesych, etc. Wherein then does the uniqueness of the New York Group exist? Is innovation a significant factor in this uniqueness? The only way to attempt to answer these questions is to initially determine the basic avenues of creative innovation, i.e. thematic, linguistic, innovation in terms of a spiritual revolution, etc. Another important question which arises is whether or not the work produced by the group has strong experimental overtones as well as elitist tendencies, i.e. a tendency to produce poetry for poets within a very narrow framework.

Some of the questions mentioned above have already been considered by critics outside of the group as well as those within it. For example, Iurii Shevelov wrote an article in 1968 entitled “Troie proshchan i pro te, shcho take istoriia literatury” in which he cites three poems from three different literary periods including poems by Lev Borovykovsky and Iurii Tarnavsky, another “founding member” of the New York Group. He compares them thematically and stylistically, partially in an attempt to show that there is nothing “disturbingly radical” about the modernistic features

² The term “modernism” does not refer here to a technical term, i.e. to a particular periodization within Ukrainian literature. Rather, it refers to the quality of being modern, the sense of which is generally accepted in the literary world.

of recent poetry such as that emerging from the New York Group. At one point in this article, Shevelov writes:

— Я хочу сказати, що принципової різниці між поезією, яка в нас вважається наймодернішою, яка в нас зветься нью-йоркською групою поетів,... і тією поезією, що її звемо романтичною, власне кажучи, нема або дуже мало. Нова поезія відрізняється тільки підсиленням другого, нереального, метафоричного, символічного, суто образного пляну. Збільшилася роля недоговорення. Але загальний підхід подібний або спільний.³

Shevelov is speaking here of an organically linked change in perspective and mode of expression; there is no basic thematic change—all three poems cited deal with the separation of a man and a woman. The “reinforcement” of Tarnavsky’s poem by an “unreal, metaphoric, symbolic, essentially image-governed plan” of which Shevelov speaks is evoked by changing or expanding perspective which is perhaps at the root of innovation in literature. In turn, this change in perspective is possibly the result of a changing and expanding consciousness, governed and shaped by the increased complexity of life. Shevelov explains the emergence of artistic innovation in the following way: “The literary work never mirrors the fullness or totality of life. But in every art, there is a longing to imprint this totality of life. And it is exactly out of this longing that the necessity to seek new methods arises.”⁴

Hence, such themes as religion, nature, love, death, etc. are never exhausted. Genuine thematic innovation is rare and often temporal because basic human concerns remain fairly constant. The appearance of new “isms” in art or literature occurs as a result of changing or expanding perspective. For example, existentialism, which by their own admission⁵ had a significant influence on the New York Group, deals, simplistically speaking, with basic human concerns but through the prism or perspective of a sense of human isolation and alienation. Surrealism views life through the prism of subconscious manifestations. The nature of the imagery in so-called avantgarde poetry is spontaneously and intellectually conditioned by the nature of the perspective.

³ I. Shevelov, “Troie proshchan i pro te, shcho take istoriia literatury,” in *Slovo* No. 3 (New York, 1964), p. 480.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Bohdan Boychuk in his article on the genesis of the New York Group, *Terem* No. 2, 1966, cites the significant influence of existentialism on the New York Group of poets.

Shevelov's technique is worth exploring. Two poems which are open to a similar comparison are Shevchenko's "N.T." or "Velykomuchenytse kumo" (1860) and Bohdan Boychuk's "Monakhynia" from the latter's first published collection, *Chas boliu* (1957). Thematically, the two poems are similar, although Boychuk's poem appears to add the element of religion, i.e. the lady protecting her maidenly virtue is a nun. However, it is not difficult to imagine that Boychuk is writing of all women, within or beyond the confines of an official religious order, whose alleged "holiness" turns the potential for life into the reality of a sterile existence. In both cases, the sentiment is expressed that the true sin is that of consciously chosen sterility, with its negation of life forces and with its claim of a loftier cause.

— А ти ніби не добачаш:
Дівуєш, молишся, та спиш,
Та Матір Божію гнівиш
Своїм сміренієм лукавим.⁶ (Shevchenko, 1860)

...забувши / дати жебракові, / щоб
Помоливсь / за вбивство / власного життя,
Щоб помоливсь / за гріх ніколи
Ненароджених її дітей.⁷ (Boychuk)

How then do the two poems differ? Primarily, they differ in tone and structure: the same sentiment is much less tragically felt in Shevchenko's poem than in Boychuk's as a result of the nature of Shevchenko's rhyme and imagery. Shevchenko's character:

Рожевим цвітом процвіла
І раю красного не зріла

She is as if blind or sleeping—the potential for being awakened still exists. Boychuk's "Monakhynia":

У чорний шовк / старанно огорнула
І крик грудей, / і спілість свого лона /

Here the image is one of self-destruction or spiritual suicide as well as complicity in not allowing for the natural manifestation of potential life. Boychuk's imagery creates an atmosphere of unrelieved coldness and sterility, whereas Shevchenko's poem still contains images of life and procreation:

⁶ Taras Shevchenko, *Kobzar*, (Kiev, 1967), p. 525.

⁷ Bohdan Boychuk, *Chas boliu*, (New York, 1957), p. 54.

А кругом тебе / Творилося, росло, цвіло,
І процвітало, й на небо / Хвалу Творителю несло.

It is obvious that Boychuk has written his poem from a different perspective than did Shevchenko. It is important to note that members of the New York Group of poets actively sought to move away from the Shevchenko-folk and Franko-realist type of poetic expression; there was a "bursting at the seams" need for a broader and deeper form of expression, and the New York Group of poets felt this need more acutely than their predecessors. In their rebellion, they tended to dismiss the fertile period of the 20's, or to overlook the modernistic innovation which occurred at that time. This is not to say that many of the members did not have a fairly thorough acquaintance with individuals from this period. However, they could not rid themselves of the feeling that theirs was the first radical divergence from traditional Ukrainian romantic poetry.

Within the context of the above mentioned two poems, Shevchenko's poem is a rather personal response to the lifestyle of an acquaintance in a more or less friendly, if mocking tone. Boychuk's poem is suffused with a general existential pain which pervades many of his works in the appropriately named collection, *Chas bo-liu*. It is a pain which encompasses the entire realm of consciously-chosen sterility within the context of an existence already basically devoid of potential for fulfillment. It also reveals a pronounced crisis of faith; a motif which reoccurs quite often in Boychuk's subsequent collections, including his most recent, *Podorozh z uchytel'em* (1976). Finally, Boychuk's imagery is much more overtly physical and sexual, which also reveals the changing nature of perspective and accompanying change in the manner and form of expression. Boychuk can be much more succinct by saying that the woman has never experienced the pain of childbirth, whereas Shevchenko still was limited by the "birds and bees" approach:

А кругом тебе / Творилося, росло, цвіло
І процвітало...

The added perspective in Boychuk's poem, conditioned by the element of the increased complexity of life, and simply by a time-gap of 100 years, is the factor which emerges in seeking the essential difference in the two poems. This is not to suggest that existentially-conditioned conceptions were not being effectively expressed in much earlier times within the context of various cultures. The point is that this type of expression had previously been rather rare with the exception of a few poets in Ukrainian literature, i.e. that the tradition of modernistic expression had hitherto

(New York Group phase) been limited in quantity and scope due to various political and cultural conditions.

Bohdan Rubchak, himself a member of the New York Group, approaches the question of innovation in Ukrainian poetry from another angle in his article on the poetry of Iurii Tarnavsky, "Poeziia antypoezii." He states his essential thesis at the beginning of the article:

Ще в перші роки минулої декади, скажемо, між 1952-54 роками, думалося, що українську поезію треба писати тільки канонізованою українською мовою. Справа, звичайно, не в модернізмі поезії, не в новаторстві засобів. Справа тільки в мові. Чомусь думалося, що вся українська поезія мусить виростати на українських мовних традиціях, на традиціях народної чи історичної мови, що на них виросла поезія Тичини, Бажана, Маланюка, Лятуринської, Лесича — чи навіть домежно модерних Барки й Андіївської, яка тоді виступила з блискучою першою збіркою.⁸

Rubchak then relates his own experience with writing Ukrainian poetry, and how, in him, the process has developed:

Як автор віршів, я й далі залишився при етнографічних або, скажемо умовно, — шевченківських традиціях українського мовного стилю. Але ось що важливе: між моїми першими, юнацькими віршами, і тим, що я пишу тепер, — основна психологічна, а то й онтологічна різниця. Бо на самому початку п'ятдесятих років я вірив, що мушу писати „поправною” українською мовою, що в українській поезії інакшого виходу просто немає. А тепер я вибираю традиційний український підхід до поетичної мови цілком свідомо, і навіть часом дозволяю собі на пародійні нотки цих традицій... Час і обставини зробили своє, і чого не можна було й пробувати на початку двадцятих років, можна вже було пробувати на початку п'ятдесятих. Було ж бо остаточно доведено, що можна писати по-українському *інакше*, що українська мова, особливо народна мова, може бути тільки більш або менш загальною рамою для власної мови.⁹

In the above cited passage, Rubchak stresses the factor of consciousness in relation to linguistic perspective, and perhaps, herein

⁸ Bohdan Rubchak, "Poeziia antypoezii. Zahalni obrysy poezii Iuriiia Tarnavskoho," *Suchasnist*, (April, 1968), VIII, No. 4, p. 44.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 45.

lies one of the most important contributions of the New York Group.

Rubchak acknowledges two contrasting avenues leading to creative linguistic innovation of the Ukrainian language: (1) making the language denser, more complex and multi-faceted, or (2) skeletonizing, simplifying, neutralizing, and making the language more crystalline. The contrast can be concretely felt in the works of Emma Andiiivska and, in particular, early Tarnavsky. In his first collection, Tarnavsky reveals a purely utilitarian approach to the "word." Words are a means of communication—telegraph style—and hence their juxtaposition should result in the most direct, unconvoluted message, conception or impression. For Andiiivska, and several other members of the New York Group, the "word," especially in poetry, acquires an enchanted, magical quality, with a power in itself. This comprehension of the nature of the word is very basic and pervasive in many early cultures. An elementary example of this phenomenon may be seen in the traditional substitution of a word such as "vuiko" or uncle for "medvid" or bear because of the fear of the potency of the original word in conjuring up the enemy. In the beginning was the word—and the word was magic! This sense of the enchanted word manifests itself in poetic lines which resound like magical incantations or religious chants. It is closely related to what has been called the "Khlebnikov strain plus" in Andiiivska's poetry, for example, where sense and sound are organically fused in such a way as to almost create another dimension of perception. It is also related—in the case of Andiiivska and others in the New York Group, as well as outside of it (for example, poets such as Lina Kostenko and Vasyl Holoborodko), to the modernistic poetization of folkloristic, pagan and mythical motifs. This tendency is not unique with the New York Group, but rather it is a continuation and development of a phenomenon already seen in such poets as Antonych, who can be described as the essential link between "traditional" Ukrainian poetry and the poetry of the New York Group.

In analyzing the mythical base of Antonych's poetry, Rubchak stresses the vital nature of myth in poetry: "myth, to a greater or lesser degree, must exist in poetry, for myth is poetry; it is the root of poetry as well as its essence."¹⁰ Antonych "in the majority Antonych discovered his mythical well-spring in nature as did

¹⁰ B. Rubchak, "Mity metamorfoz u poezii Antonycha" *Slovo*, No. 2, (New York, 1964), p. 130.

of his works completely consciously transformed his daily surroundings into an elevated, fairy-tale-like, mythical existence."¹¹

¹¹ *Ibid.*

many of his spiritual and literary successors within and beyond the New York Group. "Antonych knew the mystery of the unexpected juxtapositions of words, which like chemical substances began to boil, ferment and explode in flame in the poetic process."¹² This "alchemistic" vision of poetic creation has also been attributed by some critics such as Emmanuil Rais to Emma Andrievska: "Many of Andrievska's poems could be designated as unadulterated enchantment."¹³ In the Ukrainian sphere, Andrievska's linguistic base transverses Svidzinsky, Tychyna, and Antonych. She has the same divine freedom and vital coloration as well as an unbridled sense of metaphoric conceptions."¹⁴

Tarnavsky, in his first collection, *Zhyttia v misti*, obviously chose a different path. Rubchak explains Tarnavsky's linguistic skeletonization as being, at least partially, a manifestation of his world view, and, more specifically, of the philosophical influence of Sartrean existentialism. As already mentioned, this was a major influence on a substantial number of the original New York Group members, who found themselves in the predicament of not feeling that they were able to express their most profound responses to existential conceptions in a language which they felt to be hitherto geared to a totally different, more or less romantic world perception. Hence, in Tarnavsky's case, a "tragic-absurd" vision of existence could only be expressed in a linguistic form which conveyed the tonal essence of such a vision. "It was impossible in such a situation to allow oneself joy, or to allow oneself the ornate poetic word; hence, the skeletal style of Tarnavsky's first collection can be seen from the perspective of the world view of his first collection as a philosophical gesture, as an individual denial, an individual asceticism."¹⁵

In Tarnavsky's subsequent collections: *Popoludni v Pokipsi*, *Idealizovana biografiia*, *Spomyyny*, and *Bez Espanii*, there is a noticeable change in poetic form and approach, but not in philosophical vision. His world view remains basically the same: the same existential vacuum is sensed despite emotions and experiences such as love: "Shche dosi u spetsi potsilunkiv ne topytsia lid zubiv."¹⁶ And from "Lubovnyi virsh":

¹² S. Hordynsky, Introduction to *Bohdan Ihor Antonych, Zibrani tvory*, (New York, 1967), p. 22.

¹³ Emmanuil Rais, "Poeziia Emmy Andrievskoi," *Suchasnist*, (February, 1963), III, No. 2, p. 43.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 45.

¹⁵ Rubchak, "Poeziia antypoezii..." p. 50.

¹⁶ Iurii Tarnavsky, *Popoludni v Pokipsi*, (New York, 1960), p. 52.

Усе пройшло.
 скажи, де ділися стогони
 в гарячих легенях готелю?
 там тепер хтось розпинає повій
 на білих голготах ліжок.¹⁷

Rubchak refers to this change in Tarnavsky's form as a "compromise with poetic language,"¹⁸; however, it is perhaps more revelatory of a mellowing process, i.e. a less radically rigid approach to poetic expression. After the first impact of existentialism and subsequent attempt to convey this impact in its keenest, most clinical form Tarnavsky seems to become aware of more linguistic and structural possibilities. Rubchak also mentions that in the process, Tarnavsky turns to "mythical (as well as mystical) powers of nature in order to find an exit from the enchanted circle of hopelessness and melancholy of contemporary man."¹⁹ This quest seems to have led him closer to the Andrievska-type of word and image perception, although the two poets remain very different. It has been said that, to a certain extent, Andrievska escaped into her mythical world of enchantment, shaped by a child-like perception from the pain and melancholy expressed in her first collection, *Poezii*.

Tarnavsky has been described as an "internationalizer" of the Ukrainian language, and a poet with the fewest recognizable literary predecessors. His early works are easily translatable, making their universal message more easily accessible to world literature. His skeletonization of the language can be considered an innovative feature in the development of Ukrainian literature, revelatory of the influence of English/American literature (E. Pound, etc.). This form of innovation is sometimes seen as a factor of linguistic competence and flexibility. Obviously, there exists a formidable range of linguistic competence among members of the New York Group itself, which is reflected in the linguistic simplicity or complexity produced. However, it must be remembered that linguistic simplicity may also be deliberately selected—as in the case of Tarnavsky, whose linguistic competence cannot be questioned. As Rubchak writes:

Та справа в тому, що Тарнавський відкрив нам альтернативу, яку, до речі, використовують наймолодші поети, як ось Олег Коверко, що їм з багатьох причин вигідніше

¹⁷ *Ibid.* p. 68.

¹⁸ Rubchak, "Poeziia antypoezii...", p. 50.

писати добру українську поезію найоголенішою, найскелетнішою українською мовою, не змагаючися з її органічною трудністю.¹⁹

Similarly, there is a range of linguistic competence among elements of the readership. Thus, charges of elitism based on linguistic complexity sometimes levelled against poets such as Andrievska might only be a reflection of the linguistic stagnation of the readership.

Although it may be said that Tarnavsky has few literary predecessors, especially as seen in his approach to the Ukrainian language, existentialist themes had previously been poetically expressed, for example, in the works of Vadym Lesych, who along with Vasyl Barka can be loosely described as "spiritual forerunners" of the New York Group of poets. A sense of isolation and alienation of the human spirit is apparent in some of his works:

Бурий дим — і округла, мов гльоб, порожнеча.
Дим від кострубятих кістяків життя,
що попеліють.
Порожнеча, яка чекає на повноту.

...Пергамен пам'яті
зашелестів
піском розбитих дзеркал
у розсипаній пустині.²⁰

Within the scope of his collections, Lesych also alternated his linguistic style. In one of his later collections, *Kamiani luny* (1964), Lesych "in Elliot-fashion tries to simplify the poetic language to its most essential state, to purify it from baroque influences, he even utilizes metaphor only as scaffolding for ideas or experiences of a deeply metaphysical nature."²¹

As has already been mentioned, Lesych is considered one of the most recent spiritual forerunners of the New York Group of poets. Hence, it is not unusual to find similar explorations and thematic considerations in his works. However, it is important to realize that the New York Group was grounded in tradition to a much greater extent than many of the members were consciously aware of and appreciated. For example, in Tarnavsky's *Zhyttia v misti*, there is a poem entitled "Samota" in which the oftentimes pervasive emptiness and loneliness of the sexual act is expressed:

¹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 46.

²⁰ Bohdan Boychuk and Bohdan Rubchak, eds., *Koordynaty*, II, (New York, 1969), p. 112.

²¹ *Ibid.* p. 107.

двоє в м'якому ліжку,
які доторкаються білими животами
і снять різні сни...²²

Antonych wrote a poem in 1935 entitled “Baliada pro blakytну smert” in which a similar sentiment or modernistic vision is expressed:

На ліжко — човен розкоші й нудьги кохання,
сідає миша місячна — цинічна й куца,
і тіло з тілом тісно сплетені востаннє
в неситих скорчах болю й насолоди в'ються.²³

The two poems are not written in the same style or form; however, Antonych's poem contradicts the idea that “modernistic” themes such as alienation existent within heterosexual relations were not being expressed in Ukrainian quite successfully prior to the emergence of the New York Group.

Hryhorii Kostiuk, in an article entitled “Z litopysu literaturnoho zhyttia v diiaspori,” refers to a fundamental artistic conflict or difference between previous Ukrainian emigre writers, for example the MUR (Mystetskyi Ukrainyskyi Rukh) group in the immediate post-war period—the group to which such people as Lesych, Barka, and Lyman belonged—and the New York Group. He suggests that the MUR group members all had the same esthetic principles, whereas with the New York Group, there arose a “new comprehension of beauty.” It is likely that this conception is related to what earlier in the paper was referred to as a change or expansion in perspective, a phenomenon which critics almost always categorize in terms of “isms”. In this connection, it is interesting to cite a definition of “cubism” found in the *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*:

While retaining concrete forms and living entities as subject matter, they (the cubists) appeared to reduce them to simplified or stylized geometric patterns. But Apollinaire, better than the critics, understood that dehumanization and the distortion of reality, which resulted from a **new concept of beauty** ²⁴ were in effect investing geometry with a fourth dimension.. The Cubist Painters explained the united effort of the poet and painter to renew nature's appearances and to convey

²² Iurii Tarnavsky, *Zhyttia v misti*, (New York, 1956), p. 6.

²³ Antonych, *Zibrani tvory*, p. 170.

²⁴ My emphasis.

the inner sense rather than the outer forms of reality, thereby stretching the limits of human imagination.²⁵

The conception of conveying the inner sense of reality was already discussed in the previously-cited article by Shevelov in which modernism in poetry was analyzed. The new concept of beauty attributed to the New York Group of poets by Kostiuk is this attempt to "stretch the limits of human imagination," whether through the prism of cubism, surrealism, or whatever "ism" one experiences and expresses. It is interesting to observe how, within the scope of Andrievska criticism, her work has been variously described as surrealistic, super-surrealistic (Derzhavyn), cubistic, grotesque, imbued with a child-like perception, Chagall-like, etc. Derzhavyn refers to Andrievska as the founder of Ukrainian surrealism,²⁶ although Iurii Dyvnych qualifies this assertion by referring to the beginnings of Ukrainian surrealism as being evident in the works of Svidzinsky, Osmachka, Antonych and Barka.²⁷ Dyvnych is correct in pointing out that these various "isms" did not find their initial expression in the poetry of the New York Group. However, many, if not all members of the New York Group, in contrast to their literary predecessors, did have the opportunity to live within—or to some degree internalize elements of other cultures, especially Spanish, German, Italian, and French. Boychuk in his *Terem* article mentions the influence of such people as Kafka, Camus, Neruda, Lorca and Sartre. The New York Group of poets were able to experience and absorb the fruits of these various cultures, observe and sense how the various "isms" were expressed in them, in a way which previous Ukrainian writers could not.

Emmanuil Rais, in his article "Kliasytsyzm i modernizm v ukrainskii poezii," writes:

Справді можна сказати, що українську людину потягнуло „на простір широкий”. В тім передчутті поетів можна передбачати близькість початку всесвітньо-історичної ролі та значення українського народу. Немало мотивів далеких країн, але бачених вже не з екзотичної далечині, а в безпосередньому контакті з їх часто неблагогородною

²⁵ Alex Preminger, ed., *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, (Princeton, 1974), p. 174.

²⁶ V. Derzhavyn, "Iz siurrealistychnykh shukan u poezii," *Vyzvolnyi shliakh* (November, 1958), V, No. 11, pp. 1303-1305.

²⁷ Iu. Dyvnych, "Novyny do desiatylittia molodoi poezii za kordonom," *Lysty do pryiateliv*, (New York, 1965), XIII, No. 5, 6, 7, pp. 49-54.

дійсністю та глибоке проникнення в психіку чужих народів, знаходимо і в Лесича, і в Юрія Тарнавського, і у Віри Вовк.²⁸

This added dimension gave members of the New York Group the opportunity to expand their perspective in a unique way, especially in creatively expressing a Ukrainian perspective, but enriched by vision through the spectrum of other cultures: an added dimension of universality.

Rais mentions Tarnavsky and Vira Vovk as expressing this expanded trans-cultural perspective. This element plus several others mentioned in this paper can also be seen in the works of Zhenia Vasylykivska who, thus far, has published only one collection of poetry, *Korotki viddali* (1959). Vasylykivska's artistic relationship with nature is reminiscent of Antonych in that in her portrayal of nature, she utilizes a device which is opposite to that of personification, wherein the human element is transformed into an aspect of nature.

Часом природа стає такою близькою, що Васильківська по-романтичному якнайщільніше зв'язує з нею і свою творчість і свою особистість... Часто це взаємнення природи з поезією доходить до того, що в віршах звучать бажання ліричної героїні фізично перетілюватися в явища природи...²⁹

Her images of nature are often wild and chaotic and often reflect the jungle of the subconscious:

І щоб жити глибше, спокійніше, повніше, все в людині мусить зануритись в цей океан зелені. Інакше кажучи, людина мусить відкрити свою підсвідомість — відзеркалення природи — і черпати з неї незглибими життєтворчі сили.³⁰

The conception of the subconscious as a reflection of primordial nature is interesting with respect to Vasylykivska because much of her nature imagery has a certain surrealist quality which is traditionally linked to the primordial world of the subconscious:

²⁸ Emmanuil Rais, "Kliasytsyzm i modernizm v ukrainskii poezii," *Терем*, (March, 1966), No. 2, p. 29.

²⁹ Bohdan Boychuk and Bohdan Rubchak, eds., *Koordynaty*, II, p. 338.

³⁰ Bohdan Rubchak, "Mity metamorfoz u poezii Antonycha," p. 131.

Снопи під сонцем розтопились —
ніхто не спинить...
Стерено, навздогін стебельцям,
тече калина. („Жнива”)³¹

Vasylkivska's poetry also has a fairy-tale, magical quality, often fused with folkloristic motifs, with its bewitching, chanting lines. In the poem “Utoplена”, certain features of Vasylkivska's style combine to produce a truly imaginative and effective poem:

Зернами падає
срібло з очей —
в чорній криниці
срібло зійде.

В горах, під каменем,
вечір застиг...
В хмарах — скривавлені
відбитки ніг.

Плахтою, вовною
небо горить
В гирлах безводних —
безрибна сіль.

Петлями, вузликом,
думка — слимак —
їжиться іклами
диких собак.

Погляд оливою
ллється в відро.
Коло криниці
привид пройшов.³²

On one level, the subject of this poem could be considered traditional: a drowning victim, most likely a suicide; this element being revealed by the crying of the victim in the first stanza. Such a theme is not uncommon in Ukrainian literature. The reason for this particular suicide is unclear. In traditional verse, the reason would be explicitly stated: a young girl deceived and abandoned, a lost love, etc. Here the reason is divulged neither explicitly nor

³¹ Bohdan Boychuk and Bohdan Rubchak, eds., *Koordynaty*, II, p. 341.

³² *Ibid.* pp. 341-342.

implicitly. As Shevelov wrote, in contemporary poetry, the role of the unspoken word has increased. This poem has the quality of conjuring or bewitching, especially in a stanza such as

Петлями, вузликом,
думка — слимак —
їжитья іклами
диких собак.

It is as if a charm were being cast, yet it simultaneously reveals the “bewitched” state of mind of the suicide. The first and final stanzas paint surrealistic images of a very vivid nature:

Зернами падає срібло з очей
Погляд оливою ллється в відро.

Vasylykivska organically combines these various elements of poetic expression, revealing a unique and very individualistic world-perception.

Another member of the New York Group who has had the opportunity to express an expanded perspective, especially an expanded transcultural perspective, is Patrytsiia Kylyna. Almost all criticism written about the work of this poet focuses upon the mythopoetic, archetypal nature of her poetry. Kylyna's uniqueness as a member of the group lies in the fact that she was born in America of American parentage and learned the Ukrainian language already as an adult. This factor alone gives her poetry a different dimension, and provides a most interesting “case study” for one who undertakes to analyze the New York Group phenomenon. In experimental, scientific terminology, she might be considered a kind of control factor through which one might be able to filter out various aspects of the group's integral characteristics. Rubchak, in describing Kylyna's work, wrote:

Для Патриції Килини образність не є тільки засобом самим у собі і для себе, ані не є виключно засобом творення естетичного чи психологічного Stimmung, як це часто трапляється, наприклад, у чистих сюрреалістів. Хоч один і другий (а особливо другий!) фактори безумовно грають в її творчості значну роль, вибаглива образність поетеси має перш за все цілком мітологічні завдання. Вона має „очуднювати” ... або „оказковувати” ... дійсність, цим віддаляючися від щоденности не цілком, а настільки, щоб могли спостерігати явища людського існування з но-

вих, навіть несподіваних, перспектив. „Перестроївши” своє світовідчуття на мітичний лад, поетеса може по-новому сприймати себе та своє оточення, по-новому зрозуміти свій стосунок до всесвіту.³³

Rubchak discovers two types of myth in Kylyna's poetry: the “open” myth or myth based upon obvious connections with the real world, as well as those myths based upon established sources, and the “hidden myths” which are autonomous creations of the poet. The first type of myth is the Jungian archetypal myth and derives from the “collective substratum.” The second type is perhaps more a product of the intellect. Kylyna has been described as a poet-philosopher, an inclination which might explain the possibility for the existence of both types of myth in her poetry.

Kylyna's portrayal of the nature-man relationship, unlike that of Antonych, reveals an existentially tragic disjunction or discontinuity instead of a natural fusion between the two. Man is separated from nature through the possession of thought-conscious processes which, because they encourage a constant changeability within man and give him a greater opportunity for freedom, also evoke an existential fear when he confronts the unchangeability of nature. It is the “melancholy of instability” which is a part of the human condition and which sends man on the quest to find some sort of anchor such as archetypal myth, in which he attempts to discover continuity.

Kylyna's imagery is often based on similes which allow for parallels between the well-known and the very strange. Some of her verbal juxtapositions seem exceptionally strange due to her unique relationship with the language. One of her most interesting poems from the first collection, *Trahediia dzhmeliv* (1960), is entitled “Case History” in which a young girl brings the skull of a cow into the house and places it on the dinner table:

і відкрила фартух, щоб сім'ї показати
череп корови з роздавленим носом.
На нього дивилася сім'я налякана й їм дочка
сказала:

„Я всюди шукала,
та нічого кращого не знайшла”.³⁴

And later, a very vivid image:

³³ Bohdan Rubchak, “Mity chuzhynky,” *Suchasnist*, (February, 1968), No. 2, p. 44.

Мати взяла череп від батька, й поклала його
на стіл, біля миски помідорів
Коли вона прикрашала розбиті роги петрушкою,
усі сміялися

This poem expresses man's confrontation with mortality and dramatizes his immediate unnatural reaction. The poem is somewhat reminiscent of a poem by Vasyl Holoborodko, entitled "Hlechyk na stoli":

Нас за столом сидить трос.
Принесла мати воду в глечичку
з блакитним боком —
хтось шматок неба приліпив! —
Поставила на столі.
Узяв один — хотів напитись —
поставив,
узяв другий — і поставив,
узяв я
заглянув у глечик —
рибкою попливло моє око
аж там не вода кринична
а кров!
Мати: чом не п'єте?
(сказав)
Ну, тоді піди да полий квіти
коло хати.³⁵

Holoborodko's poem is more obscure; however, the two poems have certain basic similarities: the blood in the jug on the table is a part of man and represents his mortality as does the skull of the cow. But the flowers of the natural world have no fear of this substance. For them, it is just another liquid. Their lack of consciousness in the human sense precludes the basic fear of mortality. They cannot operate with symbols, and thus are not subject to existential fears.

It is interesting to note each poet's choice of symbols: Kylyna, being from the American West, chooses the skull of a cow, whereas Holoborodko chooses the very Ukrainian "hlechyk" or jug containing blood.

³⁴ Patrytsiia Kylyna, *Trahediia Dzhmeliv*, (New York, 1960), p. 23.

³⁵ Vasyl Holoborodko, *Letiuche vikontse*, (Baltimore, 1970), p. 55.

Perhaps the best illustration of the potency and effectiveness of Kylyna's work can be seen in the poem, "Plach na smert Antonia Risa Pastora," a poetic eulogy for a bullfighter, where one finds such images as:

Ріг бика, немов блискавка, вдаряє твої груди
і розщеплює дерево твого серця
Ріг немов корінь розщеплює камінь твого
серця.³⁶

As seen in these lines, Kylyna often observes and expresses the same object or act in different ways from different perspectives, thus giving her works added dimension in their entirety:

Дерево є сито для мілкої муки
сонця
Воно є сіть,
через яку втікає планктон
пташок
Воно є губка, яка в міліні
долини живиться тінями.

(„Дерево”)³⁷

Kylyna has both an advantage and disadvantage as a result of her background: she has the possibility of creating fresh images within the context of Ukrainian literature without having first to break through the mesh of traditional imagery, yet her “feeling” for the language is not that of a native Ukrainian or emigré writer. Hence, her linguistic juxtapositions are often almost excessively strange to the point of being strained.

In terms of intentional linguistic experimentation within the New York Group, Marco Carynnyk can be described as a representative of this current. He, perhaps of all the New York Group poets, has a certain kind of poetic distance which allows him to experiment in a purely technical way—more perhaps than other poets in whom a greater spontaneity precludes such conscious experimentation. Carynnyk's poems relate common human occurrences and problems without benefit of ornamentation or profound image-creation:

³⁶ Bohdan Boychuk and Bohdan Rubchak, eds., *Koordynaty*, II, pp. 425-430.

³⁷ *Patrytsiia Kylyna, Trahedia Dzhmeliv*, (New York, 1960), p. 25.

Самотня лавка
 в спустошеному парку.
 Темні дерева
 під темнішим небом.
 На холодній траві
 твоє тепле тіло.
 Скритий місяць
 аж до затьмарення
 твоїм волоссям.³⁸

Thus, a fragment of life almost as if recorded without poetic aspirations but with a certain stark effectiveness is recreated. Carynyk in his later efforts is said to have attempted to transplant American concrete poetry and anti-poetry into Ukrainian linguistic soil, an effort which increases the gap between the element of spontaneity and the "product" of creativity.³⁹

I think that it is evident that since 1954, elements of innovation have indeed emerged in some of the poetry of some members of the New York Group of poets. It also appears that everyone, including the members themselves, now has a more realistic perception of their work: they can now see more elements of continuity in their own work flowing from literary predecessors within the scope of Ukrainian literature. The youthful zeal has mellowed into a more productive state which allows them to be more creative in their increased awareness. Certain illusions of being "new Columbuses" have faded.

Bohdan Rubchak, in article entitled "Pro 'inshe', te same i tym podibne," which bears some resemblance to Shevelov's earlier mentioned article, in comparing several poems, writes at one point: "...dlia mystetskoi virnosti, treba deformuvaty (ia voliiu re-formuvaty) 'tsyvilizovanu' movu, shchob vidkhylyty ii vid zvychnykh, utertykh liniy shchodennoi komunikatsii..."⁴⁰ The contribution of the New York Group of poets can be most significantly found in just this form.

University of Toronto

³⁸ Bohdan Boychuk and Bohdan Rubchak, eds. *Koordynaty*, II, p. 446.

³⁹ *Ibid.* p. 444.

⁴⁰ Bohdan Rubchak, "Pro 'inshe', te same i tym podibne," *Suchasnist*, (December, 1975), No. 12, p. 50.

Orest T. Martynowych

THE UKRAINIAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN CANADA
1900—1918

IV

Between February, 1912 and August, 1916, the leadership of the Federation and control of *Robotchyi Narod* passed from the hands of men like Stechishin and Krat into those of younger, more radical men. The small minority of radical activists who came to Canada after 1910 differed from their predecessors who had arrived at the turn of the century. In general they were from an economically more underprivileged stratum of rural society. About ten years younger (born in the early 1890s) and recent arrivals, they had some recollection of events such as the 1902 agrarian strike in which over 100,000 peasants and agrarian labourers participated, and may have participated in the struggle for electoral reforms. Unlike their predecessors they had had the opportunity to participate in organizations such as *Sich* and had been introduced to social democratic principles in student groups and in the trade union movement where Ukrainian Social Democrats were active.⁴⁶

The "new men" were much more narrowly realistic and not prone to flights of visionary romanticism. As more experienced activists, organizers and speakers they moved about the country and often went into the United States to organize Ukrainian, Russian and other Slavic workers. This provided them with a much greater opportunity to establish contacts with a variety of socialist parties and exposed them to the ideas of socialist theoreticians who were either unknown or of peripheral interest to their predecessors.

The condition of the Canadian economy facilitated their ascent. Railroad construction and mining reached their peak in the years preceding the war. Thousands of Ukrainian immigrants swelled the ranks of the Canadian proletariat and performed the most menial and unrewarding tasks. Depression and the outbreak of war deprived most of them of even this type of employment. In

⁴⁶ A number of "peasant politicians" were active in Canada. Hryhorii Tkachuk, the western organizer for the U.S.D.P. in 1915, was an eloquent orator who had played an active role in *Sich* and distinguished himself as an organizer for the Radical Party. Mykola Korzh, the U.S.D.P. representative to the Ukrainian socialist organizations in the U.S.A., had been an active peasant radical in Galicia for twelve years and had been nominated to run for a seat in the Galician Diet. Popovych and Navizivsky had been members of socialist student groups in high school. See *Robotchyi Narod*, June 9, 1915; November 25, 1915.

these circumstances the reformism of the S.D.P.C. and the romantic adventurism of men like Krat became the objects of severe criticism. A drastic and radical solution was sought.

Three power struggles occurred within the Ukrainian socialist movement during this period. As a result, many of the founding members of the F.U.S.D.C. left the socialist movement. They thereby paved the way for "new men" such as Matvii Popovych, Ivan Navizivsky, Danylo Lobai and others to take control of the movement.

The first struggle pitted Krat and Evhen Volodin against Stechishin and Holowacky. Krat and Volodin claimed that Stechishin was attempting to impose a personal dictatorship over the party: he was editor of the party organ, secretary of the executive committee, and a prominent member of the "Council of Seven."⁴⁷ Krat also insisted that funds collected by the "Council of Seven" could be appropriated for the benefit of the Federation. Ukrainian workers led by a well organized and enlightened socialist party in Canada could make significant contributions to the struggle for Ukrainian social emancipation and national liberation regardless of the fact that they were thousands of miles away from the scene of the struggle. Stechishin, who believed that the Sichinsky fund should not be used for the benefit of anyone but Sichinsky, responded by accusing Krat and Volodin of adventurism and of tampering with community funds. In September, 1912, Stechishin resigned from the F.U.S.D.C. and published a "Confession" in the *Ukrainian Voice*.⁴⁸ He claimed that after collecting and contributing \$2,200.00 to Sichinsky's escape in November, 1911, the "Council of Seven" continued to collect funds and established a "Fund for the defence of Sichinsky" (who was still a fugitive). By August, 1912, \$2,135.00 had been collected for this fund. Sichinsky received only \$400.00. Of the remaining \$1,735.00, \$325 had been invested in *Robotchyi Narod*; \$400 had been paid to fund collectors and organizers as a "commission"; Volodin had received a \$60 salary for his services as treasurer; \$150 had been loaned to the Federation and another \$100 had been loaned to individual members of the Federation. Although Volodin was disciplined by the Federation, the movement received its share of unfavourable publicity.⁴⁹ Membership tumbled.

47 *Robotchyi Narod*, September 11, 1912.

48 *Ukrainskyi Holos*, September 25, October 2, 1912. Also see article by O. Reviuk, "Zaiava", *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 24 September, 1, 8, 15 October, 1913.

49 Volodin seems to have been the guilty party. He was also involved in real estate business, and was expelled from the party for giving funds to "conservatives" [?]. See *Robotchyi Narod*, February 28, 1916.

After Stechishin's resignation, the Federation experienced two years of chaos. Ivan Navizivsky, one of the "new men", became editor of **Robotchyi Narod** from April, 1912 until September, 1913. When he announced his intention to resign, the Federation appealed to Ukrainian Social Democrats in Europe to send an editor. The Federation hoped to attract Ivan Hylka (M. Melenevsky), P. Tuchapsky, O. Skoropys-Ioltukhovsky or Volodymyr Levynsky. Although the services of these prominent men could not be secured, the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party of Galicia and Bukovina sent Evhen Hutsailo to Winnipeg. Hutsailo remained in Canada for only six months before returning to Galicia in January, 1914. He was succeeded as editor by Ivan Stefanicky who served until June, 1914. As a result of Stechishin's revelations, many rural branches in Manitoba and Saskatchewan folded, while the executive was transferred to Montreal, where it remained from November, 1912 until January, 1914. Andrii Dmytryshyn and Ivan Hnyda, two radical young men who had arrived recently, were prominent in the Montreal-based executive. In January, 1914, an eastern regional convention of the F.U.S.D.C. decided to change the organization's name to the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party (U.S.D.P.) and to transfer the executive back to Winnipeg. After a referendum these resolutions were accepted. An executive led by Ivan Hnyda and Mykola Ieremiichuk moved to Winnipeg.

There were some important developments during these two years. Increasingly **Robotchyi Narod** printed articles and reports written by leading European Ukrainian Social Democrats and reprinted translations of articles from emigré Russian Social Democratic publications. In 1912, a Russian branch of the S.D.P.C. was organized in Winnipeg. Representatives of the branch occasionally contributed articles to **Robotchyi Narod**.⁵⁰ In 1912, the Russian and Ukrainian branches invited Grigorii Bieloussov, a Russian Social Democratic member of the Second Duma sent into Siberian exile by the Tsarist government, to speak in Winnipeg. The first Ukrainian translations of Marx's Communist Manifesto to appear in Canada were also printed in **Robotchyi Narod** during this period.

In October, 1914, the second power struggle began, this time between Krat and the "new men". With the outbreak of the world war, many Ukrainians began to foresee the imminent demise of the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires, and, as a consequence, the "resurrection of Ukraine."⁵¹ On August 4, 1914, a "Union for

50 In September, 1913, Volodin and Sanin, both Russians, were on the editorial staff.

51 **Robotchyi Narod**, September 26, 1914.

the Liberation of Ukraine” was organized on the territory of the Austrian Empire as a non-class political representation of all Ukrainians in the Russian Empire. It was organized by an emigré faction of the U.S.D.W.P. which included a number of Krat’s former acquaintances from his days in Spilka. Almost simultaneously, Krat organized *Samostiina Ukraina* (Society for an Independent Ukraine) in Edmonton, and, after arriving in Winnipeg, began to call for a united front of all those Ukrainians in Canada who wanted an independent Ukrainian republic, regardless of their class and religious affiliation.⁵² To complicate matters, he also announced his intention to study theology at Manitoba College, a Presbyterian institution, and proceeded to work on the editorial staff of the Ukrainian Presbyterian paper *Ranok* (*The Morning*) while also editing *Robotchyi Narod*.⁵³ If the thought of a Social Democrat preaching from a Presbyterian pulpit aroused indignation, Krat’s apparent repudiation of the doctrine of class struggle seemed sacrilegious to the “new men”. Moreover, since some workers began to confuse the U.S.D.P. with *Samostiina Ukraina*, and preferred to devote themselves to the latter,⁵⁴ a referendum was conducted by the party late in 1914. The referendum repudiated any co-operation with non-proletarian, non-farmer organizations. Krat reconciled himself with this decision because, in the meantime, he had become thoroughly disenchanted with the opportunism of the “Union for the Liberation of Ukraine” and other groups which pinned their hopes for Ukrainian political liberation

52 *Ibid.*, September 9, 1914.

53 Krat’s decision to join the Presbyterians was not completely inconsistent with his socialist principles. The founders of Ukrainian Radicalism, especially Drahomanov and Pavlyk, had always thought that Protestantism would provide the type of secular spirit which the priest-ridden Ukrainian peasantry needed. See Drahomanov’s correspondence with Pavlyk, especially for the years 1890-93. In Canada, the movement which finally resulted in the conversion of a number of Ukrainian congregations to Presbyterianism was initially led by men who identified themselves as “Radicals,” and who attracted men of similar outlook. Moreover, Winnipeg, prior to the outbreak of war, was the home of the most prominent Methodist and Presbyterian exponents of the Social Gospel. J. S. Woodsworth, Salem Bland, C. W. Gordon and one of Krat’s professors at Manitoba College, J. W. McMillan, all lived in Winnipeg. Finally, on two major issues, Ukrainian Protestants and Socialists in Canada were in perfect accord. Both groups were concerned with social problems, with the alleviation of basic everyday human needs. Secondly, both groups repudiated the narrow, exclusive, socially apathetic conception of Ukrainian nationality, based on a regimen of “compulsory” ideas and a cult of “sacred national traits,” to which the Ukrainian Catholic clergy, and some influential laymen subscribed. Excerpts from Drahomanov’s *Chudatski dumky pro ukrainsku natsionalnu spravu* had been published by the Ukrainian Freethinkers’ Society in Winnipeg, in 1908.

54 *Robotchyi Narod*, October 15, 1914.

on German and Austrian "goodwill". Krat was convinced that only a social revolution which was the work of the oppressed Ukrainian worker and peasant masses could bring social emancipation, national liberation, enlightenment and unobstructed cultural development for the Ukrainian people.⁵⁵ Yet, the revolution, "that eternal goddess of justice... the liberator of nations,"⁵⁶ which Krat impatiently awaited, was not to be brought about in the manner envisioned by orthodox social democrats. While the "new men" were proletarian internationalists who believed the revolution could be brought about by the combined effort of the working classes and socialist parties of all nations, Krat claimed that "...before our very eyes, socialists of the ruling nations refuse to grant full recognition of national rights to socialists in oppressed nations..."⁵⁷ Thus, while calling for social revolution, Krat would not concede that the interests of the Ukrainian toiling masses could be satisfied by foreign socialists acting on their behalf.

Although he remained a party member and editor of **Robotchyi Narod**, Krat's days in the U.S.D.P. were numbered. His association with the Presbyterians incited the militants, and after party secretary Mykola Ieremiichuk, who was prepared to tolerate Krat, was interned at the Brandon detention camp, the new executive asked for and received Krat's resignation from **Robotchyi Narod** in January, 1916. In August, 1916, Krat was expelled from the party. Danylo Lobai and Matvii Popovych, two of the most active "new men", replaced him as editors. Within a few months, Ivan Navizivsky became the administrator of **Robotchyi Narod**. The paper and the party passed squarely into the hands of the "new men."

A third power struggle took place as an extension of the second one. In February, 1915, Ivan Stefanicky began to publish **Svidoma Syla (Conscious Strength)**, a newspaper which he renamed **Robitnyche Slovo (The Workers' Word)** in 1916. Although a referendum conducted among all U.S.D.P. branches condemned the appearance of a second socialist publication, the new weekly, published in Toronto, began to expand rapidly at a time when **Robotchyi Narod** could barely survive as a monthly. Popovych, unlike Krat and Ieremiichuk, was not prepared to tolerate the new weekly and did everything in his power to eliminate it.⁵⁸ The sec-

55 *Ibid.*, October 8, 1914.

56 *Ibid.*, October 15, 1915.

57 *Ibid.*, October 8, 1914.

58 Early in 1917, Popovych demonstrated that a number of Stefanicky's editorials were plagiarized translations of articles appearing in the Anglo-Canadian press.

ond party convention held on 16-23 August, 1917, expelled Stefanicky and Ieremiichuk for a period of three months for undermining working class and party solidarity. Four months later, Stefanicky and Krat, who had moved to Toronto, organized a Ukrainian Immigrants Aid Committee. In one of its first declarations, the Committee criticized Bolshevik intentions to conclude peace with Germany. Rather than being an expression of ultra-radicalism, the declaration reflected Krat's anxiety at the thought of western Ukraine being left out of the social revolution which had swept across eastern Ukraine; he feared western Ukraine would not be liberated from the "tyrannous yoke" of the Austrian monarchy.⁵⁹ The conflict between the editors of both papers lasted until September 27, 1918, when both papers were padlocked.

The basic differences between the two papers centered on their evaluation of the Ukrainian Revolution. While **Robotnyche Slovo** supported the Ukrainian Central Rada, composed of Ukrainian Social Democrats, Social Revolutionaries, and other democratic and liberal parties, **Robotchyi Narod** had gradually gravitated toward the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks had toppled the Russian Provisional Government, which had waged an aggressive imperialist war, recognized Ukrainian autonomy very grudgingly, and neglected the work of social reform. Moreover, Lenin had promised to recognize the right of national self-determination. The editors of **Robotchyi Narod** accepted these promises at face value. When the Central Rada failed to adopt a clear agrarian policy and refused to allow Bolshevik troops to cross Ukrainian territory in order to confront General Kaledin's White Armies, **Robotchyi Narod** concluded that the Central Rada must be "bourgeois" and that it could not possibly be motivated by a desire to "...defend Ukrainian rights since the Bolsheviks have already recognized these [rights]..."⁶⁰

V

The Ukrainian socialist movement in Canada increasingly came under the influence of the Bolsheviks after the outbreak of war. In December, 1914, **Robotchyi Narod** printed the Bolshevik reply to Emil Vandervelde's plea asking all Russian Socialists to join the battle against Prussian Junkerdom by supporting the Tsarist war effort. A month later, an article entitled "Comrade Lenin on Ukrainian Independence" appeared. The article summarized and praised Lenin's speech at Zurich, where he condemned

⁵⁹ **Robotchyi Narod**, December 22, 1917.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

the repressive policies enforced by the Tsarist regime in Ukraine. In April, 1915, an article entitled "War and Ukraine" was reprinted from *Sotsial Demokrat*, a Bolshevik periodical published in Switzerland. The article condemned Tsarist atrocities and Russification in eastern Galicia in 1914. This was followed by the appearance of Maksimovich's (Litvinov's) "Address" at the Conference of Socialists of the Allied Powers in London. In addition to these documents, the paper also published articles and summaries of speeches by the German Social Democrats Karl Liebknecht and Klara Zetkin, reprinted articles from the German *Spartak*, published the Zimmerwald Manifesto, and reprinted articles such as Lenin's "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination."⁶¹ All these articles were printed when nativist hostility towards "enemy aliens" and "foreigners" manifested itself with great intensity in Canada; when any attempt to expose the crimes of Russian Tsarism was regarded in Canada as a treasonous offence; and, when a campaign against Ukrainian bilingual schools in the prairie provinces reached hysterical proportions.⁶² Bolshevik declarations seemed to bear a curious relevance even to the immediate experience of Ukrainians in Canada.

Nevertheless, prior to the autumn of 1917, *Robotchyi Narod* also reprinted articles by a variety of non-Bolshevik and anti-Bolshevik Russian and Ukrainian socialists. In June, 1915, Lev Iurkevych's "Appeal to the Russian Socialist International" appeared. On a number of occasions Iurkevych had questioned the motives and meaning of Lenin's proclamations concerning the right of all nations to self-determination. Articles by Levynsky, Vynnychenko and Hrushevsky were also reprinted, and money was collected to support the U.S.D.W.P.'s newspaper in Kiev.

More direct links between *Robotchyi Narod* and the Bolsheviks were forged between 1912 and 1916, while 1917 issues provide conclusive evidence that at least on an informal level, the editors were in fairly close contact with members of the Bolshevik party. From the summer of 1912 until he formally assumed the position of editor of *Robotchyi Narod* in August, 1916, Matvii Popovich had spent time in New York organizing Slavic workers for the American Socialist Party. While in New York he had come into contact with the editors of the R.S.D.W.P.'s pro-Bolshevik organ *Novyi Mir (The New World)*.⁶³ After 1914, the editorial board of *Novyi Mir* resembled a "who's who" of the October Revolution:

61 Cited by Kravchuk in his study in *Zhyttia i Slovo*.

62 See Morris Mott, "The Foreign Peril: Nativism in Winnipeg", unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1970.

63 *Robotchyi Narod*, August 7, 1912.

Volodarsky, Alexandra Kollontai, Nikolai Bukharin and, briefly in 1917, Leon Trotsky were all associated with this publication and resided in New York at the time.⁶⁴ Also present in New York between 1914 and 1917 was a young Ukrainian Bolshevik sympathizer, Ivan Kulyk (R. Rolinato), who had been on the staff of *Novyi Mir* when Bukharin was its editor.⁶⁵ In April, 1917, Kulyk and a group of Russian socialist emigrés, including Bukharin, were detained in Vancouver before being allowed to continue with their journey to Russia. Ironically, Kulyk had had no intention of returning to Russia. He had been invited and agreed to assume a position with *Robotchyi Narod* in Winnipeg. Canadian officials did not allow Kulyk to enter Canada. After his return to Ukraine, Kulyk retained his connection with *Robotchyi Narod* and contributed to it a series of articles criticizing the Ukrainian Central Rada.⁶⁶

Regardless of just how intimate *Robotchyi Narod's* relations with Kulyk and any other Bolshevik group were in 1917, it should be remembered that only five years earlier the editors of the paper were corresponding with Agappius Honcharenko and with Mykhailo Pavlyk, one of the founders of the Radical Party.⁶⁷ The transition from the utopian socialism of the Radicals and the reformism of the Social Democrats to the Machiavellianism of the Bolsheviks was precipitated by developments in Canada just as much as by those overseas. Especially after the revolution of 1917, many Ukrainians in Canada began to believe that while their countrymen in Ukraine had finally achieved social emancipation and national liberation, they were being deprived of the civil rights and

64 I. Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed*, p. 242.

65 In the early 1930s Kulyk played an odious role in the suppression of the Ukrainian literary renaissance of the previous decade. He became Postyshev's lieutenant in the Ukrainian branch of the Soviet Writers' Union, and played a prominent part in the witch-hunt for literary "counter-revolutionaries." Prior to his rise to prominence as an advocate of "revolutionary vigilance", Kulyk spent a number of years in Canada during the 1920s. In *Zapysky Konsula* (Kiev, 1958), published twenty years after he had been purged and then rehabilitated again, Kulyk recounted, among other things, conversations he allegedly had with the descendants of Louis Riel, who asked him about "...the greatest chieftain in the world, comrade Lenin, who is also called Illich — the wisest and greatest of all chieftains in the world, greater even than Riel..." [!], p. 11.

66 *Robotchyi Narod*, September 12, November 14, 1917.

67 In a letter to *Robotchyi Narod*, August 6, 1913, Pavlyk corrected Krat who had claimed that Pavlyk had once been a close acquaintance of the terrorists who belonged to *Narodnaia Volia* (1878-81). "I have always been a revolutionary only in the spiritual sense and have never advocated the use of force as a means toward the realization of my ideals, being convinced that moral courage and spiritual strength were the greatest, most vivifying of human faculties..."

liberties which they had hoped to acquire in Canada. Thousands wanted to emigrate from Canada. Under these circumstances the U.S.D.P. gained many supporters. When the party was outlawed in September, 1918, it had over 2000 full-fledged members and many more sympathizers.⁶⁸

Date	Number of Branches	Number of Members
late 1907	3	101
mid 1912	24	330
mid 1913	23	424
early 1914	18	238
late 1914	28	816
mid 1917	?	600
early 1918	?	1500
mid 1918	20	2000

VI

There is perhaps no better way of measuring the ideological gulf which separated the "early socialists" from the "new men" than by comparing the subsequent activity of prominent representatives of both groups.

The tradition of libertarian anti-clericalism, so typical of Ukrainian Radicalism, was particularly prominent in the activity of leading "early socialists". Even before his involvement with the Ukrainian Brotherhood in California, Iurko Syrotyuk had been a Baptist colporteur for the Bible Society. Kyrylo Genik, Ivan Bodrug, and Ivan Danylchuk in Winnipeg, and Petro Zvarich and Hryhorii Kraykivsky in Edmonton, were all involved in the formation of the "Independent Greek-Ruthenian Church" in 1904, and some of them remained associated with the Church after its dwindling membership converted to Presbyterianism. After completing his studies in theology, Pavlo Krat became a Presbyterian minister. In 1923 he was one of the founders of the Ukrainian Evangelical Alliance and served as its first missionary in western Ukraine from 1925 until 1938. It was even rumored in 1914 that Vasyl Holowacky had become a Russellite (Jehovah's Witness) preacher. Ferley, Arsenych, Zvarich and somewhat later Stechishin became leading laymen involved in the movement which led to the formation of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada. While the advocates of Protestantism had opposed the jurisdiction of the French Roman Catholic clergy in Ukrainian immigrant communities and the absence of ethical and social concern among many Catholic clergymen, the founders of the Orthodox Church protested against attempts by the Ukrainian Greek Catholic hierarchy to

68 Membership in the F.U.S.D.C. and U.S.D.P. varied during the period under consideration in the following manner:

control every aspect of the national, social, educational and cultural life of the Ukrainian community in Canada. Men like Ferley, who became the first Ukrainian M.L.A. in Manitoba in 1915, Arsenych, who became the first Ukrainian-Canadian judge, and Stechishin, who edited *Ukrainskyi Holos* from 1921 until 1946, wanted to free themselves from the paternalistic, unenlightened influence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in order to independently exercise their own initiative and leadership within the Ukrainian community.

Many of the “new men” became prominent Ukrainian-Canadian communist leaders. In addition to being founding members of the Ukrainian Labour-Farmer Temple Association (U.L.F.T.A.), Popovych and Navizivsky also became founding members of the Communist Party of Canada and members of its Central Committee. Popovych was an unsuccessful Communist Party candidate in Manitoba provincial elections (1922) and Winnipeg civic elections (1924, 1925). In 1925, Vasyl Kolisnyk became the first elected Communist officeholder in North America when he was elected alderman from Winnipeg’s North End in the civic elections. As members of the Communist Party the “new men” remained unflagging adherents of the party-line. Navizivsky, Maurice Spector and John MacDonald represented the Communist Party of Canada at the Sixth World Congress of the Comintern in Moscow in 1928. While Spector and Macdonald responded to Trotsky’s *Critique of the Third International*, of the doctrine of “socialism in one country,” and of its implications, Navizivsky remained “loyal”. After Spector and MacDonald had been expelled from the party, Popovych became one of Tim Buck’s closest associates. Of the prominent “new men”, only Danylo Lobai, a former editor of *Robotchyi Narod*, broke with the Communist Party and the U.L.F.T.A. in 1935 when, with other former party members, he founded the Ukrainian Workers’ League, an independent working class organization which exposed, publicized and condemned Stalinist atrocities in Ukraine.

University of Manitoba

Alexander Motyl

THE PROBLEM OF BESSARABIA AND BUKOVYNA:

The Intersection of the Sino-Soviet and Soviet-Rumanian Disputes

Territorial disputes have a long tradition in Eastern Europe and the Balkans. Historically shifting state boundaries and a large number of intermixed nationalities have conspired to make territorial and irredentist claims a constant feature of the inter-state relations of this area. One of the most important of such disputes concerns Rumania's quarrel with the Soviet Union over Bessarabia and Bukovyna, two territories that were formerly part of Rumania but that now belong to the USSR.

Rumania and the Soviet Union, however, are not the only two actors, just as Bessarabia and Bukovyna are not the only two issues that are involved. The Ukrainian and Moldavian SSRs and China have also expressed a keen interest in the Soviet-Rumanian polemic. That the number of participants is not limited to the two principals strongly suggests that more than just land is at issue here. In fact, what is ultimately at stake is the legitimacy of Soviet nationalities policy. This, more than anything else, explains the inordinate amount of attention given Rumania's territorial pretensions by such superpowers as the USSR and China.

Bessarabia is essentially coterminous with the present Moldavian Republic. Northern Bukovyna is currently known as Chernivtsi Oblast of the Ukrainian SSR, while the southern half belongs to Rumania. Both territories were incorporated into Rumania in 1918 and stayed in Rumania's possession until 1940 when the Soviet Union demanded their cession. Again under Rumanian control during the war years, Bessarabia and Bukovyna were re-taken by the Soviets in 1944.

Rumania's claim to these territories is based on historical and ethnic considerations. Both lands were at one time a part of a greater Rumania. Their currently questionable status stems from their later dismemberment by and incorporation into Austria-Hungary and Russia and from the fact that a large part of their present populations is not Rumanian.

Communist Rumania acquiesced in and occasionally even praised the loss of Bessarabia and northern Bukovyna until 1964, when the first evidence of an official reassessment appeared in the form of a book of Karl Marx's writings on the area, which indicated that he apparently believed the two territories to have been Rumanian. The timing of this reappraisal was no doubt influenced by Rumania's attempt in the early 1960s to achieve some measure

of independence from the Soviet Union. Such a step required ideological reinforcement and an increased sense of national solidarity. As a result, heavy emphasis began to be placed on Rumania's sovereignty, and her historical and national uniqueness. Irredentism was a convenient means of rallying popular support as well as of aggressively asserting Rumania's national existence. Not surprisingly, scholarly works of a historical character usually presented the Rumanian case.

Although Rumanian criticism of the loss of their territories continued throughout the sixties and seventies, with First Secretary Nicolae Ceausescu himself making a number of comments on the matter, it is only in 1975 that the dispute became less insinuating and more direct. Although the Rumanians still refrained from actually claiming Bessarabia and Bukovyna, their polemics assumed a more accusatory and aggressive tone. The same has been true of the Soviets.

To a certain extent, the Rumanians were provoked by the publication in the USSR in early 1975 of a lengthy monograph severely critical of their positions on the issue.¹ Other, more significant considerations probably also played a part. Rumanian propaganda may have been intensified in preparation for the Helsinki Conference on European Security and the Berlin Conference of communist parties. A display of militant national solidarity may have been seen as a timely manifestation before the world and, of course, the Soviet Union, that Rumania, although engaging in multi-lateral discussions, was nonetheless determined to remain a gadfly and continue to pursue her own independent path.

However, it is the Soviet Union that is the chief target of Rumania's polemics. Although Rumanian pretensions to Moldavia also have the effect of countering Hungarian and Bulgarian pretensions to, respectively, Transylvania and Northern Dobruja, their primary purpose is to unsettle the USSR. Likewise, the role of Hungary and Bulgaria is less that of a disputant and more that of a spokesman for Soviet interests. "Rumanian claims to Bessarabia are a useful reminder to Moscow that territorial transfers are a two-way street; and at the same time the Soviet Union has utilized the Hungarian claims to Transylvania as a means of pressuring the Rumanians."² The upshot of all of this is that the conflict is first and foremost between Rumania and the USSR.

¹ A.M. Lazarev, *Moldavskaia sovetskaia gosudarstvennost i bessarabskii vopros* (Kishinev: Kartia Moldoveniaske, 1974).

² Robert R. King, "The Escalation of Rumanian-Soviet Historical Polemics Over Bessarabia," RAD Background Report/38 (Rumania), *Radio Free Europe Research*, February 12, 1976, p. 12.

The new Rumanian tactic has been explicitly to assert that Bessarabia and Bukovyna were at one time, and properly so, Rumanian. Still using history as their field of contention, Rumanian scholars have seized on the 1918 incorporation of the two territories into Rumania in order to argue the correctness of this move.

The historians Ion Ardeleanu and Mircea Musat have written the following:

“On 27 March, 1918, in response to the movement for national unity, to the struggle and desire of the broad popular masses, Bessarabia, which had been annexed by tsarist Russia in 1812, returned to our fatherland; this move was also sanctioned by the Sfatul Tari, a democratic body elected from among representatives of all social classes as far back as 1917. The uniting of Bessarabia with Rumania was a major event in the process of completing the Rumanian state.”³

“The union of Bucovina with Rumania was hailed by Rumanians all over the country. Their enthusiasm was shown in demonstrations, telegrams, letters, press releases, and declarations. After being separated from Moldavia for 143 years, Bucovina had been restored to the fatherland as one of its provinces.”⁴

Of greater importance than the Rumanian claims, however, were the underlying historical theorizings used to justify them.

What the foregoing two statements indicate above all is that the 1918 annexation of Bessarabia and Bukovyna was an event that was widely supported by the popular masses. In short, this was not the action of some elite alienated from and not supported by the people. Second, Ardeleanu and Musat present the Sfatul Tari as the proper spokesman for the people—its existence is considered legitimate because its essence is considered legitimate. Yet it is clear that the Sfatul Tari is, according to the Soviets, a “bourgeois democratic” body hardly reflective of the interests of the “toiling” masses—something on the order of the “bourgeois nationalist” Central Rada that governed Ukraine in 1917-1918.

The analogy of Rumanian interpretations of their history with “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism” becomes even more apparent in the ideas that are occasionally given expression in the official Ukrainian-language newspaper for Rumania’s Ukrainian

³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁴ Robert R. King, “Debate Between Rumanian and Soviet Historians Over Bessarabia Continues,” RAD Background Report/137 (Rumania), Radio Free Europe Research, June 15, 1976, p. 17.

population, entitled *Novyi vik* (The New Age). One article, published on the occasion of the 98th anniversary of Rumanian state independence and of the 30th anniversary of the defeat of Nazi Germany, stated:

“The struggle against any kind of foreign rule was a permanent feature of the Rumanian people’s desire to preserve their national existence and independence and to achieve state unity and sovereign consolidation in international life...”

“The consciousness of Rumanianism had its basis in the reality of life and developed on a common ethnic basis of all the territories inhabited by Rumanians. That is why the struggle for the preservation of the national character, and for the unity and independence of the country was a major coordinate of the middle ages and of the contemporary history of Rumanians.”⁵

That such sentiments should have appeared in a newspaper read by Ukrainians living just south of the Rumanian border with the Ukrainian SSR is not only remarkable but patently dangerous to the Ukrainian regime, which is sufficiently burdened with its own “bourgeois nationalist relics of the past.” Aside from the somewhat remote possibility that there is nothing more at stake here than to inform Rumanian Ukrainians of current events, it would appear that the point of articles such as the foregoing is to remind the Soviet Ukrainian regime and, by extension, the Soviet regime, that Rumanian nationalist aspirations have a friend in the nationalisms of such peoples of the Soviet Union as the Ukrainians.

Why so tightly controlled a state as Rumania, however, should want to tell its Ukrainian minority that a state, in this case Rumania, has the right to all the territories inhabited by its nationals is a highly problematic and perhaps unanswerable question. One must assume that the Rumanians saw no reason to fear the possibility of arousing the nationalist sentiments of their passive and very underdeveloped Ukrainian population and that, even should this happen, such a development would be outweighed by the benefits of effective anti-Soviet propaganda.

Nicolae Ceausescu’s own statements, however, go farthest in undermining Soviet perceptions of Russian and Soviet history. In a speech made in March, 1975, the Rumanian President, having Moldavia primarily in mind, implicitly attacked Soviet justifications of tsarist and Soviet expansionism:

⁵ “Borotba za nezalezhnist i derzhavnu iednist — permanentnist istorii rumunskoho narodu,” *Novyi Vik*, April 16, 1975, p. 2.

"...currently all sorts of distorted and misrepresented interpretations of certain historical realities and processes are being formulated in the world, in order to justify past and present inequities. There are, for example, frequent attempts to present the history of imperialist and colonialist domination, and the policy of oppression and looting of other people that was promoted for centuries, as progressive phenomena that assisted the development of the oppressed peoples."⁶

Ceausescu's reference to policies of oppression being interpreted as "progressive phenomena" has direct bearing on practically all the nationalities of the USSR and is indeed very relevant to the Ukrainian case.

The cornerstone of current Soviet interpretations of Ukrainian history is the 1654 Treaty of Pereiaslav which placed the Ukrainian Cossack Host under the protection of the Russian Tsar. Neither Soviet Ukrainian historians of the 1920s nor those of a "bourgeois nationalist" orientation interpret this event in a positive light. Both view the treaty as leading to the impoverishment and tsarist oppression of the Ukrainian people. The current Soviet line, however, presents the event as the reunification (*vossoedinenie*) of two fraternal peoples which led ultimately to the greatest good of all—the October Revolution.

This interpretation continues to have its detractors, particularly in the dissident movement. The Soviet Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Braichevsky, for example, presented one of the most cogent critiques in a 1966 samizdat essay entitled "Annexation or Reunification?" where he hearkened back to the positions of the twenties.⁷ The official view, however, must be maintained in order to give historical and ideological backing to the manner in which the Soviet notions of the "drawing together of peoples" and of the "new Soviet man" are being implemented. For the "Russification" of non-Russian cultures to carry weight, it must be shown to have legitimate roots in the distant past.

Ceausescu's statement, however, stands in direct opposition to the Soviet viewpoint. Aside from encouraging nationalist sentiments in the Soviet republic, it challenges the very essence of the Soviet Union—its legitimacy and historicity. Moldavia alone is

⁶ King, RAD Report/38, p. 6.

⁷ M. Iu. Braichevsky, "Prisoedinenie ili vossoedinenie," in *Natsionalnyi vopros v SSSR*, ed. Roman Kupchinsky (New York: Suchasnist, 1975), pp. 62-125. Also in Ukrainian as "Pryiednannia chy vozz'iednannia" in *Shyroke more Ukraïny* (Paris-Baltimore: Smoloskyp, 1972) pp. 241-310 and in English: G. P. Kulchycky (ed.), *Annexation or Reunification* (Munich: Ukrainisches Institut fuer Bildungspolitik, 1976).

not really at issue here, it is the whole notion of the Soviet Union that is being questioned.

It is no wonder that all available forces—Soviet, Soviet Ukrainian, and Soviet Moldavian—have been mobilized for the USSR's propaganda response.

A collectively written historical work on Northern Bukovyna published in the Ukrainian SSR in 1969, for example, deals with the Rumanian annexation of Bukovyna in 1918 as an outright aggression of the Rumanian bourgeoisie against the Ukrainian working masses. Doctor of historical sciences F. P. Shevchenko wrote in the preface, no doubt with the Rumanians in mind:

“We must also not forget the fact that various invaders, so as to justify their rule over Bukovyna, have falsified (and continue to falsify!) the history of this part of Ukrainian land. To expose the falsification of enemies is an important task of Soviet historians.”⁸

The authors' treatment of the Sfatul Tari and its counterpart in Bukovyna, the National Council, is almost identical to Soviet Ukrainian attitudes towards the Central Rada. This, of course, is hardly surprising considering that all three bodies were opposed to the Bolsheviks.

With regard to the Sfatul Tari, the authors write:

“At this time the counter-revolution grouped its forces for the struggle against the revolution. In particular, the Sfatul Tari... does all it can not to allow the ultimate triumph of Bolshevism in Bessarabia. Seized by fear before the Great October socialist revolution and its powerful influence on the toiling masses, the Sfatul Tari sees its salvation in the separation of Bessarabia from Soviet Russia and its annexation to boyar Rumania.”⁹

The Ukrainians' condemnation of the Rumanian annexation extends beyond 1918. They write of the inter-war period in the darkest of colors:

“In the interests of monopolies, the Rumanian-boyar occupiers hardly did anything for the reconstruction of industry and agriculture. Bukovyna, like the other territories seized by Rumania, was for them only a source of cheap labor and raw materials.”¹⁰

⁸ V. Kurylo, M. Lishchenko, O. Romanets, N. Syrota, and B. Tymoshchuk, *Pivnichna Bukovyna, ii mynule i suchasne* (Uzhorod: Karpaty, 1969), p. 6.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

“Having grabbed Bukovyna, the Rumanian occupiers instituted a savage regime of terror, economic and political oppression.”¹¹

The point is obvious: Bukovyna, along with Bessarabia (the reference to “other territories”), were illegally seized by a rapacious exploiting class in complete opposition to the wishes of the masses. The picture presented is almost violently different from that given by Ardeleanu and Musat.

The First Secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party, Ivan Bodiul, meanwhile, explained Moldavia’s position within the USSR in this manner:

“In recent years Western propaganda has intensified its provocative campaign to distort the national existence of the Moldavian people, their historical fate, and Soviet patriotism, and also Russia’s liberating mission in the Balkans, falsifying the revolutionary events in this region and belittling the role of the Soviet Army in liberating the peoples of Europe from fascism.”¹²

According to Bodiul, the Moldavian CP was combatting these pernicious influences by “instilling a feeling of intense class hatred toward those who slander the Soviet national pride of the Moldavian people, encroach upon their socialist statehood, and calumniate the great and indestructible friendship of the Soviet people.”¹³

Bodiul’s comments highlight three features of Moldavia’s relationship with the Soviet Union: first, that Moldavians are indeed a separate people with, by implication, the right to a separate state existence; second, that the tsarist annexation of Bessarabia was not “oppressive” as the Rumanians might claim, but rather “liberating”; and third, that the Moldavians are happy within the USSR because of the fraternal relations among its nationalities.

The end result of Bodiul’s statements is the vindication of Soviet nationalities policy—a subject of great concern for Soviet scholars of all nationalities. His need to claim Moldavian separateness, however, is potentially problematic, insofar as it may appear to assume the form of too strong an assertion of national uniqueness.

Soviet policy towards the nationalities is alleged to assist the development, the “all-round flowering” of national cultures while, at the same time, leading towards a “drawing together”, a “rap-

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

¹² King, RAD Report/137, p. 6.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

prochement" of all the peoples of the Soviet Union. Cultures are to be "national in form", "socialist in content", and "internationalist in spirit". All the peoples, drawing on the "great wealth" of the Russian language as an "international means of communication" and living within a Soviet socialist society, are to have fraternal relations amongst each other—leading finally to the evolution of a "Soviet people."

Whatever the ideological merits of the foregoing, the practical effect of Soviet nationalities policy is to "Russify" non-Russian nationalities, thereby eliminating peripheral opposition to the center as well as homogenizing and (it is hoped) stabilizing the various groups within the society. Concessions are made to the Russian nation, as the largest and most powerful Soviet nationality, so as to elicit its support for the state and counter the centrifugal pressures exerted by the national minorities. To oversimplify, what is involved here is a trade-off: the ruling elite attains a certain degree of legitimacy by seeking the support of so large a segment of society, while the Russians have the satisfaction of living in a state that is relatively responsive to their national interests.

As was implied previously, the notion of "rapprochement" stresses the naturalness and historicity of fraternal relations between fraternal peoples. The present is projected into the past, with the result that present relations among the nationalities are seen as a *zakonomirnist*. Fraternity must therefore have been an aspect of these relations even in the distant past. A corollary of such thinking is that tsarist aggrandizement of foreign territories was clearly progressive.

An important element of the current Soviet understanding of Russian-Ukrainian-Bielorussian relations is precisely this notion of past and present fraternity. In this case, however, the alleged fraternity is further buttressed by the claim that all three peoples stem from a single, ancient Rus *narod* that was neither Russian, Ukrainian, nor Bielorussian in character. This concept, not surprisingly, is used to justify the "drawing together" of the three nationalities, be it now or in the past. Braichevsky pointed this out in the very title of his essay ("Annexation or Reunification?"). The officially-preferred term *vossoedinenie* implies that the peoples being reunited were originally united but somehow came to be disunited. In the case of the Ukrainians, they are said to have been separated from the Russians after the downfall of the Kievan Rus state, reunited with their brothers at the time of the Pereiaslav Treaty, and continually being drawn together since then. In short, common origins justify later unity.

Rumanian pretensions to Moldavia, however, have placed this outlook in a precarious position, revealing in the process the great

difficulty the Soviets have in trying to give their "Russificatory" policies a coherent theoretical justification. It is no wonder, as will later be seen, that the Chinese have not hesitated to exploit the weaknesses in Soviet attitudes towards the nationalities.

In order to respond to Rumanian claims that the people who inhabit Moldavia are essentially of Rumanian origin if not actually Rumanian, Soviet scholars and party officials have had to assert the separateness and historical uniqueness of a "Moldavian people", possessing the right to national self-determination and to freedom from foreign, meaning Rumanian, domination.

This separateness is problematic, however, since both sides agree on the common origins of the Rumanians and Moldavians. But whereas the Rumanians argue that this original people was actually Rumanian in character and that its descendants are therefore also Rumanian, the Soviets assert just the opposite. The historian Lazarev, author of the previously mentioned study of the Bessarabian question, claims that the East Romanic nationalities (of which there are two—Rumanians and "Moldavians") evolve from an earlier people who were neither Rumanian nor Moldavian but from whom both are descended.¹⁴

In this case, common descent from a "faceless" ancestor is the rationale for the separation and, finally, independence of the Moldavians from the Rumanians. This very same reasoning, however, leads to different conclusions concerning the relationship of Ukrainians and Bielorrussians with Russians. Here the existence of an "ancient Rus narod", supranational in character, forms the basis for the fraternity and "drawing together" of the descendant nationalities.

This inconsistency reveals the uncertain nature of relations among the various Soviet nationalities as well as the dangers to which the regime is exposed on this issue. The problems are unsolvable under the present set-up—hence the great attention that is devoted to the nationalities question and the great concern shown anything that may upset the precarious balance. As should be clear, the ideological background to Rumania's pretensions towards Bessarabia and Bukovyna belongs to this category of potentially dangerous phenomena.

The Chinese realize that the nationalities question provides them with a convenient means of attacking the USSR. As a result, they have presented themselves as the champions of the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The case of Bessarabia and Bukovyna provides an interesting example of the "dialectics"

¹⁴ King, RAD Report/38, p. 4.

involved in their strategies towards the various participants in the dispute over the area.

This is not to say that China is making political or other kinds of inroads into Eastern Europe or the USSR (discounting Rumania and Albania), or that its chances of doing so in the future are particularly good. It must be understood that what is involved here is a propaganda war, a war of words, theories, charges, and counter-charges. Influence of a practical kind is not really at issue here and is, besides, probably much too difficult for the Chinese to attain. The point of this discussion, after all, is to examine the various kinds of ideological posturings being assumed by the countries involved in the Moldavian dispute and what these posturings mean in relation to each other and in relation to the reality.

The following two passages illustrate China's line on the nationalities question in the Soviet Union:

"The Brezhnev revisionist clique in recent years has redoubled its efforts in pushing greater Russian chauvinism in the guise of 'national rapprochement'. At the same time it has done all it can to gloss over the national contradictions which have become more and more acute in the Soviet Union, claiming that the 'national question, as it came down to us from the past, has been settled completely, finally and for good.' But hosts of facts show that with the only difference, except for its cloak of Leninism, the so-called 'national rapprochement' is actually the sinister trash peddled by the Russian tsars in the past to impose Russification on the non-Russian nationalities."¹⁵

"Why are the new tsars so eager to justify the aggression and expansion by the old tsars? The answer is, as Engels pointed out, 'Any Russian who is a chauvinist will sooner or later fall on his knees before the tsar.' [emphasis in the original] Two dynasties—the Romanov dynasty and the Khrushchov-Brezhnev dynasty—are linked by a black line, that is, the aggressive and expansionist nature of great Russian chauvinism and imperialism. The only difference is that the latter dons a cloak of 'socialism', and is 'social-imperialism' in the true sense of the word".¹⁶

The theme that appears in these as well as in most articles on the Soviet Union is that the current Soviet rulers are the "new

¹⁵ "Analysis of Soviet Revisionists' Policy of 'National Rapprochement'," *Peking Review*, No. 29, July 19, 1974, p. 18.

¹⁶ "A Black Line Running Through Two Dynasties," *Peking Review*, Nos. 35-36, September 7, 1976, p. 42.

tsars” and that their policies are therefore extensions of those of the “old tsars”. The connecting link is “great Russian chauvinism and imperialism.” Significantly, the approach is historical, thereby reflecting the importance of history to the issues involved and allowing the Chinese to assign to the Soviets the damning transgressions of feudal monarchs.

The Chinese analysis, however, is not confined only to the peoples of the Soviet Union but extends also to the Eastern Europeans. China’s good relations with Rumania and Albania, its condemnation of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, and such publications as *Czerwony Sztandar*, a Polish-language newsletter printed in Albania, attest to China’s ongoing interest in and concern for Eastern Europe. As with the peoples of the USSR, Eastern Europeans are the focus of so much Chinese interest on the fairly obvious rationale that any loosening of the Soviet bloc means a weakening of the Soviet Union.

Chinese interest in the Bessarabian question—an interest that does not, of course, occupy the center of Chinese propaganda on the nationalities question—is due largely to two interconnected reasons. China’s close ties with Rumania as well as its own territorial disputes with the Soviet Union impel it to regard the issue of Bessarabia and Bukovyna as being vital to its conflict with the USSR. An ally naturally deserves Chinese support; at the same time, these territories offer a target for China’s own territorial grievances against its northern neighbor.

Of particular interest here, however, is the manner in which the Chinese express themselves on this issue with regard to each of the nationalities involved and to the nationalities question as a whole. It will be seen that their efforts to curry favor with the non-Russian peoples can lead to a number of ideological and practical difficulties.

Of course, the notion of blaming only the “Khrushchev-Brezhnev revisionist clique” for all of the nationality problems of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe seems somewhat ludicrous in light of China’s persistent admiration for Stalin. Such statements as “the working people, once masters of the country, have been turned into hired slaves and, not unnaturally, have lost the enthusiasm for work they had in the period of socialism,”¹⁷ reveal that although much of the Chinese analysis is reasonable, its underlying premise—that “Khrushchev-Brezhnev revisionism” alone is at fault—is rather shaky. Such inconsistencies, however, do not obviate the effectiveness and value of Chinese propaganda on

¹⁷ “Who Is to Blame for Ukraine’s Economic Trouble?” *Peking Review*, No. 39, September 27, 1974, p. 35.

questions of nationality and territory. They only serve to point out the complexity of the issues involved and of the tactics utilized.

Essentially, the Chinese position on Moldavia echoes that of their Rumanian friends. In 1964, for example, Mao Tse-tung himself mentioned in an interview with a group of Japanese socialists that the Soviets "have appropriated a part of Rumania."¹⁸

"It is a well-known fact that the territory now under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Moldavia was grabbed by tsarist Russia by force... Referring to this, Engels explicitly pointed out: 'Here we are dealing with the naked conquest by force of foreign territories, with robbery pure and simple [emphasis in the original].'"¹⁹

And although the Chinese have noted that "in 1853 Marx and Engels pointed out that 'the Wallachians or Daco-Romans' were 'the chief inhabitants of the district between the Lower Danube and the Dniester,'"²⁰ this is still a long way from saying the all the people within this area are Rumanian and says nothing at all about the nationality of Bessarabians in particular. It is highly significant that China's support of Rumania's ambitions toward Moldavia is based not on ethnicity—a factor which, as is clear from the foregoing pages, occupies an important position on both sides of the Soviet-Rumanian polemic over Bessarabia and Bukovyna—but on territoriality. That the ethnic element is thus far absent is probably due to the fact that were ethnicity to be the criterion for the resetting of the Sino-Soviet frontier, China would stand to lose several border regions, particularly in Sinkiang province, that are inhabited by such Soviet nationalities as the Kazakhs and Kirghiz.

This emphasis on the primacy of historical territorial boundaries is ultimately incompatible with the principle of national self-determination and causes serious theoretical difficulties for the Chinese. However, as the glorification of Stalin shows, inconsistencies hardly seem to worry the Chinese.

Although the Chinese appear to have made no comments specifically about Bukovyna, it follows logically that their support of Rumanian territorial aspirations also extends to the argument that Bukovyna is rightfully, because it is historically, Rumanian. As will later be argued, this is inconsistent with Chinese support

¹⁸ King, RAD Report/38, p. 14.

¹⁹ "Soviet Social-Imperialism Pursues a Policy of National Oppression," *Peking Review*, No. 22, May 28, 1976, p. 20.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

of Ukrainians as a nationality that is being oppressed by the “Brezhnev clique.”

While asserting that Moldavia was forcibly taken from Rumania, the Chinese highlight the fact that a “Moldavian people” and the Moldavian Republic are the objects of intense exploitation.

References to the Moldavian people are numerous in Chinese anti-Soviet propaganda. A **Peking Review** article from May, 1976, however, presents the most developed and coherent view of how “the Soviet revisionists... frenziedly frumpeted big-Russian chauvinism and brutally exploited and oppressed the non-Russian nationalities.”²¹ The Moldavians, of course, are considered one such nationality.

“The Soviet revisionists have resorted to despicable and malevolent tactics to Russify Moldavia,” begins the article. It then goes on to assert the historicity and separateness of the Moldavians:

“Having taken over the old tsars’ mantle, the new tsars are especially afraid of the exposure of the old tsars by the people. They fear most the narration by Moldavians of historical facts about the old tsars’ occupation and oppression of their country. The Soviet revisionist authorities have openly declared against any permission ‘to make use of the Moldavians’ respect for the past and their sense of national independence.’ While the new tsars have time and again criticized noted Moldavian scholars for their appraisal of ‘past events and phenomena’, they themselves have distorted history by every possible means in defending the old tsars.”²²

This concern for the survival of Moldavian culture, the remark about “their sense of national independence”, the emphasis on Moldavian history, and the persistent use of the term “Moldavian people” suggest very strongly that the Chinese consider the Moldavians to be a people separate from the Rumanians. Unless one is to assume uncritically that the Chinese believe the Moldavians desire the loss of their statehood and incorporation into Rumania, then it appears that the Chinese are trying to reconcile two unreconcilable positions: Rumanian territorial pretensions and Moldavian national self-determination.

Of course, for the Chinese to desire to incite Moldavian nationalism makes perfect sense in the context of their anti-Soviet

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 20.

agitation. It makes little sense with regard to their support of Rumania.

It is true that insofar as Moldavia is not really an issue over which the USSR and Rumania are about to come to blows, divergent Chinese posturings can be perhaps attributed to the vagaries of propaganda. To the extent, however, that propaganda is supposed to present some kind of logical and structured worldview, this, along with previously mentioned inconsistencies, reflects poorly on the level of Chinese ideological thinking and is potentially dangerous to the future implementation of Chinese policies.

The one Soviet republic to which the Chinese have consistently devoted much attention is Ukraine. This is to have been expected considering the difficulties that the Ukrainian SSR persistently poses to the Soviet leaders. The stubborn nationalism of its people—a nationalism which somehow manages to infect the higher echelons of the local party cadres—makes it the problem area of Soviet nationalities policy. Added to this are a large dissident movement, frequent economic troubles, and the occasional outbursts of its working class—all potent factors that contribute to the potential instability of the republic and China's consequent interest in it.

The Chinese, of course, are well aware of all these problems and continually play upon them. Their themes are Great Russian chauvinism, cultural stultification, economic exploitation, and national resistance. It is quite clear from Chinese remarks about the Ukrainian situation that they support the Ukrainians' "national-liberation struggle."

The following statements by a Hsinhua correspondent are fairly typical of the Chinese stand:

"The Soviet revisionist renegade clique, taking over the mantle of the old Tsars, has carried out the great-Russian chauvinistic policy of national discrimination and oppression against the Ukrainian people. This has aroused their ever more growing discontent and tenacious resistance..."

"Proceeding from great-Russian chauvinism, the Brezhnev clique does not permit the establishment of a comprehensive economic system in the Ukraine but attempts at 'regional division of labour' and 'specialization' which actually means the practice of lopsided colonialist economy..."

"Where there is oppression, there is resistance. The great-Russian chauvinistic policy of national oppression followed by the Brezhnev clique in the Ukraine has aroused strong

discontent and mounting resistance among the Ukrainian people.”²³

Continuing the theme of the colonial exploitation of Ukraine, the Chinese write:

“The Soviet revisionist leading clique has all along pursued a Russian big-nation chauvinist policy of oppression towards the nationalities in the country. To achieve the ‘closest combination’ with the non-Russian nations, the Brezhnev clique has opposed all-round development of the economy in non-Russian regions. It advocates ‘division of labour’ and economic ‘specialization’, which are in essence a curious out-growth of colonialism. Among the cadres of the non-Russian republics, anyone standing for all-round economic development is branded as a ‘nationalist’ and accused of having a ‘closed-door’ mentality.”²⁴

It is clear from the foregoing series of quotations that the Chinese view the Ukrainian SSR within the context of their understanding of the East European problem: Ukraine, like the countries of the Warsaw Pact, is the victim of the USSR’s economic exploitation. This notion, not coincidentally, fits in rather neatly with the decade-long assertions of the Rumanians to the right to full economic development and industrialization. As these facts illustrate, the scope of Chinese anti-Sovietism is indeed very broad, so much so, however, that it risks being accused of an indifferen-tiated approach that can result in serious contradictions.

The Chinese have made their sympathy for the Soviet Ukraine very clear: they denounce its exploitation, they support its nationalism, albeit indirectly. As with Moldavia, this tactic is eminently reasonable where the enemy is the “Brezhnev clique.” It is contradictory, however, in terms of China’s actual or potential relationships with Rumania and Ukraine. Support for the Ukrainian people’s national aspirations logically leads to the belief that they have a right to include within their state those territories that are ethnographically Ukrainian. At the same time, the Chinese imply that Rumania has a right to Bessarabia and Bukovyna on the grounds that these territories are historically Rumanian.

Given the prominence of the Ukrainian issue in Chinese anti-Soviet propaganda, one is not surprised to find the large number of anti-China references and articles in the Soviet Ukrainian press.

²³ “Soviet Revisionist Policy of National Oppression Stubbornly Resisted in Ukraine,” *Hsinhua Weekly*, No. 42, October 21, 1974, pp. 38, 39.

²⁴ “Who Is to Blame for Ukraine’s Economic Trouble?” pp. 35-37.

It is, after all, fitting and a sign of the worries caused the Soviet leadership by Chinese meddling in Ukrainian affairs that the object of China's attentions should play so large a role in countering the propaganda.

It is revealing, above all, of the Soviet Union's own sensitivities on the subject that Soviet Ukrainian attacks on China should frequently concern themselves with Chinese mistreatment of their own national minorities.

For example, T. Rakhimov, a Soviet Ukrainian propagandist, has written of China's nationalities question in a manner and style that could just as easily have belonged to the Chinese:

"The great power chauvinism of Mao and his group is revealed most notably in the legal status of non-Chinese peoples. From the very beginning the law has denied them the right of self-determination and national statehood which had been won in the course of a long and bloody struggle against Kuomintang reaction."²⁵

The rhetoric and terminology are familiar. It is essentially the same employed in the Soviet-Rumanian dispute, because the issues, after all, are essentially the same.

Conclusions

There are many elements in the accusations the Chinese and Soviets level against each other. One such element, certainly one of the most important, is the question of nationalities. Since both countries include a large number of minority nationalities with which they have had trouble in the past, it is natural that this question should be seen as a "weak spot" in the enemy's armor.

The Chinese position, however, does not confine itself to the Soviet Union but quite understandably extends to the Warsaw Pact countries as well, which have revealed and continue to reveal varying degrees of official and non-official resistance to Soviet hegemony.

In this conflict of the non-Russian nationalities with "Great Russian chauvinism" and "social imperialism", the Chinese have obviously taken the side of the nationalities. More than this, however, China takes the stand of supporting all the minority groups in their aspirations towards national independence. One may perhaps go so far as to say that the Chinese will support any nationally-inspired grievance directed against the Soviet center.

²⁵ T. Rakhimov, "Natsionalna trahediia narodiv Kytaiu," *Radianska Ukraina*, April 12, 1970, p. 3.

Such a blanket patronization of what the nationalities of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union desire vis à vis Moscow leaves the Chinese vulnerable to the charge that they are ignoring the many inter-nationality complexities involved.

The issue of Bessarabia and Bukovyna highlights this danger vividly. While supporting Rumania's polemical war with the Soviet Union, China has also reacted with favor to the national aspirations of Moldavia and Ukraine—the countries who stand most to lose in the dispute over the two territories.

But that China's approach to this area should be confused is to have been expected in light of Rumania's own uncertainties. It tells its Bukovynian Ukrainians that Bukovyna is Rumanian; it argues about the historically Rumanian character of Bessarabia while signing the Helsinki accord.

That such difficulties exist attests to the fact that the nationalities question still remains an unresolved and vital issue within the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. It is precisely this fact that makes any problem in any way related to nationalities a matter of great concern for the USSR, whose vulnerability on this score is well-known to its enemies. Moldavia is important to the Soviets not for its resources, but for its being a national republic which, should it become unstable, could prove destabilizing to the Union structure as a whole.

But the propaganda, however confused, is of course the point. Rumanians can assert their national independence and sovereignty, the Soviets proclaim the wonders of their nationalities policy, and the Chinese that they are the true friends of all oppressed nationalities. Where all sides more or less know that the status quo is unlikely to be changed and that practical measures are largely irrelevant, words and the effect they have on the world become of primary importance. In this manner propaganda takes the place of concrete action and becomes the means by which influence may be extended and national righteousness affirmed. Propaganda is, of course, by no means unimportant because it does reflect the "real" world. Such contradictions as are apparent in the ideological positions assumed by Rumania, the Soviet Union, and China with regard to the Bukovynian-Bessarabian question in particular, and to the nationalities question in general, reveal that all three states stand on shaky ground in their attitudes towards the problems involved. After all, as is particularly true of the Soviet Union, it is to be expected that a nationalities policy will be contradictory as long as the nationalities question remains unresolved.

Columbia University

Мирослава Ромах

ПРО ЛІТНІ КУРСИ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВИ В КИЄВІ *

На прохання керівництва Онтарійської Асоціації Вчителів Модерних Мов, я згодилася розповісти про літні курси української мови, які відбуваються вже чотири роки підряд у Києві при Київському державному університеті ім. Тараса Шевченка. Мавши нагоду прослухати ці курси, я постараюся коротко і в той же час, сподіваюсь, об'єктивно представити перед вами мої спостереження і зауваження.

Найкраще, думаю, було б почати від того, що спричинилося до створення таких курсів. Справа навчання української мови дітей, народжених у Канаді, а особливо англомовних дітей, тепер дуже актуальна. Вона набрала ще більшої важливості після другої світової війни, коли збільшилась українська еміграція. Виникла потреба методики навчання української мови, потреба кваліфікованих учителів української мови й потреба вміти прищепити мову в серця канадських дітей українського походження. У зв'язку з цим, учителі були змушені шукати такої методи, завдяки якій можна б швидше навчити дітей другої мови. А таких метод багато в світі. У 50-х роках, серед давнішої української еміграції з'явилося особливе зацікавлення до вивчення української мови. В цей час група українських учителів із західної Канади почала організувати навчання української мови в державних школах. Люди в уряді почали цікавитися цією проблемою й цю справу узаконено провінційним урядом. У пошуках за ефективною методикою навчання мови й підготовки вчителів, при кінці 50-х років група українських учителів поїхала в Україну, де для неї були організовані спеціальні курси. Але, на жаль, виявилось, що організатори курсів у Києві зрозуміли, що метою їх мало б бути пропагування ідеології марксизму-ленінізму, і вчителі вернулися до Канади розчаровані невдачею своїх старань. Незважаючи на те, ідея користуватися можливостями вивчення методів викладання й навчання мови практикованих в Україні продовжувалась.

В 60-х роках, коли питання багатокультурності в Канаді стало популярним, то й проблема вивчення української мови в державних школах стала актуальною в провінції Онтаріо. Цією справою зацікавився й став піонером у її реалізації учитель Юрій Джуравець.

* Доповідь була виголошена на засіданні Асоціації восени 1976 р.

У 1969 році пан Джуравець, як представник Онтарійської Асоціації Вчителів Модерних Мов, зробив старання зорганізувати й започаткувати знову курси в Києві для канадських учителів української мови. І так відновилися ці курси. В Україні відповідальність за влаштування цих курсів взяло на себе товариство „Україна” в співпраці з викладачами й професорами Київського державного університету. Однак, на жаль, від 1974 р. організування цих курсів у Канаді перебрало бюро подорожей “Globe Tours”.

Чимало кандидатів зголосилося на курси української мови в Києві; більшість з них тільки тому, що таким способом вони могли вигідно перебувати в Києві цілих три тижні. Отже, багато з тих, що їздять на ці курси, це випадкові, й „різношерстні”, словом, не зацікавлені і не ознайомлені з справою методики навчання чи вивчення мови. Очевидно, є й такі, що справді цікавляться цим, тобто вчителі, професори та студенти української мови.

Учасники курсів різнилися головним чином рівнем особистого знання української мови. Це й було принципом поділу курсантів на три групи. Перша, завансована група мала складатися з людей, що свobodно розмовляли по-українському. В дійсності, це так не було, бо, на жаль, деякі вчителі мали мовні труднощі, але, природно, мусіли бути й вважали, що повинні бути в цій групі з огляду на їхнє знання методики навчання мови. Інші студенти в цій групі, навпаки, добре володіли мовою, але не знали методики. Крім цього, коли відбувалася дискусія теоретичних проблем, то й для студентів і для вчителів виникали труднощі щодо знання і оперування українською мовознавчою термінологією. До другої, середньої групи входили курсанти, які розуміли українську мову, але слабо нею володіли. В третій, початковій групі були ті, які зовсім не говорили по-українському й не розуміли цієї мови. Через цей різноманітний склад слухачів, з різним рівнем знання мови, і, мабуть, через те, що радянські викладачі ще не мають достатньо опрацьованої методи навчання чужої мови, тобто методики навчання людей української мови як їхньої другої мови, курси відбуваються без визначеної мети. Не зовсім ясно було, що ми вивчали: чи саму мову, чи теорію. Вони не були добре пов'язані і тому наслідки цих курсів були мало корисні для учасників. Теоретичні виклади проходили мимо нашої уваги, бо учасники не були ознайомлені з проблематикою граматики й мовознавства. Тим більше, теоретичні виклади недостатньо були пов'язані з мовною практикою. Викладачі не уживали жодних посібників у навчанні. Вони або їх не мали, або попросту не хотіли користу-

ватися ні мовними лабораторіями ні зорово-слуховими посібниками й т. п. Проте, як виняток можна уважати уживання грамофонів, на яких ми слухали пластинки мистецького читання літературних творів.

В таких обставинах трудно зосередитися над темою, коли її викладає фахівець академічного рівня, вживаючи наукову термінологію й оперуючи науковими поняттями, які для курсантів невідомі, і до сприйняття яких немає жодних пояснень. Це, разом з тим, що існують різні рівні знання методики й володіння мовою серед курсантів, доводить до замішання й роз'єднаності на викладах. Тяжко до такого різноманітного складу людей виробити відповідну програму.

Щодо навчального персоналу — це всі кваліфіковані мовознавці, університетського рівня вчителі, які поважно ставляться до свого завдання. Хоч склад їхній міняється кожного року, з минулого року я запам'ятала деякі прізвища. Поперше — моя улюблена викладачка Ніна Тоцька, яка дуже багато зі свого часу присвятила нам і широко старалася допомогти нам удосконалити наше знання української мови й відповісти, наскільки було це можливо, на всі наші питання. Вона є співавтором підручника *Ukrainian — A Textbook for Beginners*, для якого вона приготувала пластинки з записами текстів з цього підручника. Викладали теж Михайло Жовтобрюх — голова відділу теорії української мови при Інституті Лінгвістики АН УРСР, Ілля Кучеренко, Віктор Коптілов, Лариса Кадомцева, Людмила Олексієнко, Ольга Пазяк, Антоніна Мартиненко, Єла Примак і Олесь Білодід. Були також спеціально запрошені доповідачі — представники Академії Наук, важливі люди з державних міністерств і відомі культурні діячі — письменники, композитори й художники. Наприклад, Степан Крижанівський читав лекцію про головні риси сучасної української літератури. Відбувалися також організовані зустрічі з письменниками: з Павлом Загребельним, Миколою Тарновським, Віталієм Коротичем, Олесем Гончарем, Борисом Олійником, Іваном Драчем, Леонідом Новиченком та іншими. Стрічали ми й композиторів: Филипенка і Грабовського. Присутність вище згаданих людей вказує на те, що ці курси ними вважаються важливими. На таких зустрічах часто повторювалися незручні ситуації. З радянського боку прийшли висококваліфіковані знавці, а з боку курсантів було багато таких, які мало цікавилися цими зустрічами, чи взагалі курсами, і тому мало з цих зустрічей скористали. Тому що з кожним роком приїжджає така мало поінформована й мало зацікавлена кількість людей на ці курси, зустрічі стають чимраз менш цікавими й приєм-

ними, і культурні діячі — відвідувачі чимраз більше насміхаються з курсантів і чимраз менш поважно ставляться до таких зустрічей.

Порядок дня для курсантів був такий: Від 9.30 ранку до 1.00 години дня (крім неділі) — навчання. Після обіду — зустрічі, бесіди з громадськими представниками, відвідини музеїв, екскурсії в місті й поза містом, тощо. Після вечері — культурна програма або відпочинок.

Навчальна програма була поділена на дві частини: на теоретичні виклади й практичні заняття. Теоретичні виклади охоплювали проблеми граматики, правопису, синтакси, лексики, морфології і т. д., але без будь-якої системи й зв'язку між ними. Викладачі добре знали свій предмет, але їм трудно було зійти до рівня курсантів, давати пояснення, і так задовольнити потреби курсантів.

З теорії були такі точки програми:

- 1) Фонетична будова української мови.
- 2) Фонетичні закони української мови.
- 3) Основа української ортоєпії.
- 4) Лексика сучасної української літературної мови.
- 5) Тарас Шевченко — великий народний поет.
- 6) Фразеологія української мови.
- 7) Особистості словотвору сучасної української мови.
- 8) Морфологія сучасної української мови.
- 9) Стилїстика української мови.
- 10) Основні риси українських діалектів.

Минулого року дуже поверхово була заторкнена тема сучасної української літератури.

Найбільш корисними були практичні зайняття, де була нагода робити граматичні й розмовні вправи. Тут увага зверталася на досить елементарні граматичні вправи: на будову слова — префікс, корінь, суфікс; на пунктуацію; на звуковий склад української мови; на вислови; на частини мови; й на відмінки іменників. Нам, між іншим, твердили, що кличний відмінок не вважається відмінком, і, що оскільки в українській мові було так мало слів зі звуком „г” (вони нам їх перелічили), ця буква не потрібна.

Одначе, треба признати, що було багато позитивного в цих вправах. Н. Тоцька давала нам безліч прикладів, з яких можна було багато дечого навчитися. Вона звертала особливу увагу на нашу вимову, навчила нас у розмовних вправах правильних зворотів увічливості, вітання, прощання, як також

прислів'я та ідіоми. Вона завдавала готувати після лекцій „уроки”: писати змісти й коротенькі есеї. Можна сказати, що правдоподібно минулого року ці курси були найінтенсивніші до цього часу, і тому для мене найбільш корисні. Все таки, на жаль, бракує цим курсам якоїнебудь загальної системи навчання через вищезгадану щорічну мішанину курсантів і їхніх рівнів, для яких замало часу присвячено для навчання (тільки 3½ годин денно). Я вважаю, що інтенсивний курс на довший час ніж три тижні був би кращий. Він мусів би бути або виключно практичного, або теоретичного роду, якщо не вдасться зорганізувати балянсованої програми, охоплюючи обидві частини. Також, вважаю, що учасники, які прийняті, мусять мати певні кваліфікації, щоб курс був більш успішним і корисним.

Задум курсів у своїй основі добрий. Такі чи подібні мовні курси влаштовують інші національності. Наприклад, поляки систематично їздять щороку в Польщу на курси польської мови. Вони шукають якогось порозуміння, нав'язують контакти з тамошніми людьми. З погляду загально-українського інтересу, такий курс в справі знання мови повинен існувати. Грозить небезпека, що українська мова на еміграції без контактів з Україною стане діалектом. Такі контакти потрібні хоч би тому, щоб принаймні знати, які в Україні існують напрями й успіхи в ділянці навчання української мови, який її стан взагалі, і які процеси відбуваються в житті українського народу. При нагоді зустрічей з культурними діячами, хоч в обмежених формах і звичайно, неширих розмовах, можна все таки до якоїсь міри обміняти думками й поглядами.

Влаштування таких курсів спонукує організаторів думати про препарування відповідних навчальних матеріалів і підручників. Кожний нарід, який хоче, щоб його мова була живою, дбає про підручники й методичну літературу для навчання своєї мови. Якщо з радянського боку є добрі наміри, то можна спонукати їх до такого якщо далі приїжджатимуть люди на такі курси і покажуть потребу для таких матеріалів. Тому, з цього огляду, курси варта б було продовжувати. Коли ці курси були влаштовувані перший раз, то на запит професора Е. Бурштинського з Торонта про підручники — йому показали уривки лекцій з газети „Вісті з України”. Радянські організатори тоді не були приготовлені, не мали підручників. Тепер, хоч цих підручників ще мало — двоє чи троє — це все таки вказує на те, що організатори відчули потребу їх виготовити.

Організаторам важко приготувитися до таких курсів не тільки з точки зору підручників. Вони мусять розвинути ме-

тодику навчання, знайти відповідних викладачів, і також опікуватися учасниками з-поза кордону.

З туристичної точки зору, коли звичайно існує таке обмеження часу на перебування в одному місці, дуже добре є використовувати ці курси, щоб перебувати в Києві — столиці України, і уживати це середовище, щоб поглиблювати й розвивати знання української мови. Крім того, Київ дає змогу пов'язати курсантів з життям в Україні, заохочує їх до дальшого самостійного вивчення мови, і дає їм нагоду дещо познайомитися з культурою, економією, наукою й побутом українського народу. Нав'язання знайомств з радянськими культурними діячами дає змогу цим представникам радянського наукового й мистецького світу пізнати людей і, до деякої міри, життя української еміграції.

Це все можливе тільки за таких умов, якщо організувати курси будуть люди, які мають безпосереднє відношення до самого шкільництва, люди, які знають проблему підготовки вчителів. Люди постільки вивчені, що вони зуміють бачити суть проблеми, абстрагуючи її від складностей обставин, в яких курси відбуваються. На жаль, кожний боїться цієї справи торкатися. З нашого боку ці курси повинні організувати вчителі, тобто якась офіційна організація, як, напр., Онтарійська Асоціація Вчителів Модерних Мов, або цю справу можна полагоджувати через провінційний або федеральний уряд, щоб ці курси відбувалися в формі офіційного обміну між країнами або окремими університетами. Важливе є те, щоб такі курси не були приватною ініціативою, щоб не мішати політику з наукою. Такий обмін був би на користь обом сторонам — їхнім і нашим учителям, викладачам і студентам. Вони могли б почути, що відбувається в діяспорі, що такі проблеми мови актуальні серед українців поза Україною. А наші люди могли б розказувати, як в Канаді виглядає навчання української мови, які посібники використовуються. Це для них було б повчаюче. Такий обмін дає й підтримку справді зацікавленим людям там. Але до такого корисного обміну треба й нам тут підготуватися.

Методика навчання української мови є дуже складна. Тому мусить між нами бути співпраця в цій ділянці. Нам потрібний діалог. Треба бути в курсі розвитку життя, щоб його вхопити й зрозуміти. Стан, який існував дотепер, спричинив багато негативного. Він довів організаторів до знеохочення й недбалости в їхній підготовці курсів минулого літа. Коли б були відповідні учасники, тоді можна б було прийти до справжнього обміну методики і поглядів на різні теми, як, напр., „мовне взаємозбагачення в радянському періоді”, до

дійсного удосконалення української мови. При нагоді таких курсів можна порушити різні мовні проблеми й питання. Суть справи лежить в тому, щоби була обопільна користь, щоби виробити удосконалену форму й методику вивчання й навчання української мови.

Коли мова йде про аргументацію проти існування таких курсів, треба розуміти, що, не зважаючи на незадовільний результат курсів, які відбулися в останніх чотирьох роках, Київському університетові й товариству „Україна” все таки залежить на дальшому існуванні таких курсів. Це йде по лінії інтересів цих двох установ. Не думаю, що вони мають на увазі добро українських учителів у Канаді. Сподіваюся, що вони обумовлені, з одної сторони, звичайною економічною потребою — мати якнайбільше туристів, а з другої сторони, щоби мати вплив на людей з інших країн з метою пропагування й поширення радянської ідеології між рядками, якщо не відверто. У великій мірі це також для них престижева справа. Товариству „Україна” треба мати діяльність, а Київський університет матиме в своїх реєстрах атракційну ділянку в праці навчання мови закордонних учителів.

Накінець можна зробити певні висновки. Курси, як і кожний контакт з Україною, є корисні й потрібні їм і нам. Але їх мусить організувати установа державного чи провінційного масштабу. Учасники повинні їхати щоби удосконалити своє знання мови й навчитися методики навчання мови, а не починати щойно вивчати мову. В той сам час, треба організувати подібні курси тут на Заході, особливо в Канаді. Треба вимагати, щоби відповідальні люди ставили ці курси на рівень фаховости. Велику роль відіграватимуть грошові фонди — якщо організувати курси на основі офіційного обміну між університетами, тоді можливі будуть знижки для оплачування курсів і навіть стипендії. Але, щоби далі продовжувати курси в формі, у якій вони дотепер існують, немає сенсу. Це нас тільки компромітує.

Торонтський Університет

VOLODYMYR MAKARENKO

It is always refreshing and encouraging to witness developments in Soviet art and literature which have somehow managed to transcend the restrictions imposed upon them by the canons of socialist realism. Such was the case with the emergence of the phenomenon of the *shestydesiatnyky* in Ukraine. The decade of the 1960's revitalized Soviet cultural life and proved that true culture had not been obliterated by the many years of Stalinist hardship. Ukrainian artists and writers were given and took advantage of the possibility to draw upon the achievements, traditions and innovations of their counterparts in the West, and combined this with a discovery of their own traditions, history, culture and mythology.

Unfortunately these processes were stopped from reaching their full potential by the ever-growing repressions which began in the mid-sixties and continue to this day. However, it appears that creativity is still able to continue, especially in the most "western" areas of the Soviet Union: the Baltic republics, and "the window to Europe"—Leningrad.

It is here that an avantgarde group of artists, calling themselves "Peterburg" found it possible to develop an approach to visual art which they called "metaphysical synthetism." Their artistic vision was fashioned primarily by two influences which they incorporated into their painting: 1. the mystical religiosity, symbols, forms and techniques of traditional Russian and Ukrainian iconography and 2. the ideas and forms of West European modern art from the impressionists onwards.

The Ukrainian member of this group is Volodymyr Makarenko. Born in Dnipropetrovsk in 1943, Makarenko studied at the art school there (1958-1963) and the Mukhin school of higher education in the arts and industry in Leningrad. It was during his stay in Leningrad that he came into contact with the ideas and the individuals of the group "Peterburg," especially with their spiritual leader, Mikhail Shemiakin.¹ Since 1973, Makarenko has lived in Tallin in the Estonian SSR where he has had several exhibits. He has also participated in the 11th Biennale in Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, in 1975.

In 1976, Makarenko's works were exhibited in Galerie Hardy in Paris, and were subsequently published as a catalogue by the

¹ Other members of this group are V. Ivanov, A. Vasilev, E. Esaulenko, and O. Liagachev.



MY UKRAINE
МОЯ УКРАЇНА



MY CHILDHOOD DREAM
МІЙ СОН З ДИТИНСТВА

gallery.² In the catalogue one can see that the young artist has not neglected his cultural roots. Indeed, Makarenko displays a familiarity with Ukrainian iconography, folk art, mythology and literature. Shevchenko, Skovoroda, Ukrainka, Kotliarevsky and Kotsiubynsky figure as saints in several of his "icons." In general, Makarenko adheres to the ideas of "metaphysical synthetism",³ which, as the name suggests, attempts to synthesize the achievements in the history of art and through the individual, but yet as a collective consciousness, to raise it to a higher metaphysical plane.

One can see that Makarenko has assimilated well what he has learned about traditional and avantgarde art. Often he combines this with his knowledge of his native culture and with his apparent identification with Shevchenko, the painter-poet in exile. He quotes Shevchenko or employs Shevchenkoesque sentiments in the watercolours in which he expresses a romantic longing for his homeland and childhood or a fatalistic attitude to life. For example, in his "My Dream as a Child" (1973) he writes:

„Мої сльози, мої [рожі?], горе мені в самотності. Горе мені на чужині, де мене вітають та кохають, а я їй не можу покохати. Не можу. Бо не маю що діяти, куди подітись. Перелічую дні і літа. Кого я, де, коли любив? Нікого в світі. Нічому в світі. Неначе по лісу ходив. Не допоможе, Милій Боже, як то кажуть люди. Буде каюння на світі, а вороття не буде”.

„Минають літа молодії. Минула доля, а Надія в неволі знову за свос. Благаю Бога, щоб смеркало... Щоб знав, як волю марнувати. Що дурня всюди б'ють. Ой слухай же, мій голубе, мій орле-козаче. Як конаю я в неволі. Як я нуджу світом. Мина літо... а козак в немозі”.

The use of the written word in his painting adds an extra dimension to Makarenko's works.

All in all, Makarenko gives one the hope that Soviet Ukrainian art and literature will still be able to develop and mature, not unlike Western art, and yet be able to retain the best cultural, artistic and mythological aspects of its own history. The two watercolours by Makarenko which follow are reproduced by permission of Galerie Hardy, Paris.

R. S.

² Vladimir Makarenko, *Aquarelles—Exposition 29 Avril-22 Mai, 1976*. (Paris: Galerie Hardy, 1976)

³ A discussion of the aims and ideas of "Peterburg" can be found in the Russian and French introduction by M. Shemiakin entitled "Cossack Volodymyr Makarenko, the group 'Peterburg' and 'Metaphysical Synthetism,'" to the catalogue of Makarenko's watercolours.

Борис Корнієнко

КОРИННЯ

Передруковуємо вибір поезій з рідкісної збірки українського молодого поета з передмовою Леоніда Первомайського. Борис Корнієнко народився 1954 р. в селі Моринцях на Черкащині. Збірка була опублікована видавництвом „Молодь”, Київ, 1971; тираж — 4000.

**
*

ЗАПАМ'ЯТАЙМО ЦЕ ІМ'Я

Це був щасливий день.

Сімдесятилітній художник показував нам свої малюнки останніх кількох місяців.

Рама з старовинного золотого багета, в яку художник вставляв їх один по одному, стояла на мольберті посеред тісної майстерні. Раптом стіни її наче розсунулись, а потім зовсім зникли, і нічим не обмежений простір оточив нас з усіх боків.

Літо й осінь, зима й весна, цвітіння дерев, глибокі замети снігів, розкошлані хмари, тиша на морі, квітучі луки, нічні кораблі, гірські схили, жінки і квіти, — orbis pictus — світ в образах розкривався перед нами, покликаний до життя, перетворений творчою уявою художника.

Це був начебто й знайомий, але разом з тим — новий світ, бо ми дивилися на нього очима сивого майстра з молодою невтомною душею, назавжди враженою щастям творчого існування і можливістю дарувати це щастя іншим.

Перед його малюнками я не вперше переконувався, що в творчості ніякого значення не має вік.

Справжня обдарованість виявляється дуже рано, — найбільше ж щастя, коли вона не вичерпується до кінця життя.

Потім я читав рукопис цієї книжки.

Ім'я автора нічого не сказало мені — я чув його вперше.

Короткі вірші — в п'ять, два, а то й один рядок, з невловним ритмом, позбавлені рим, наповнені хвилюючим змістом, в одежі точного і місткого слова, одразу ж узяли мене в полон.

Вони вражали первозданною самобутністю, несподіваністю і свіжістю. Коли б мене не попередили, що автору ще немає сімнадцяти років, я подумав би, що створив їх досвідчений глибокий майстер, для якого слово не іграшка, а те, чим воно насправді є — знаряддя творчої думки, яка прагне пізнати світ

і визначити в ньому місце людини і в прагненні своєму не спляється ні перед якими загадками, хоч наперед знає, що кожна відповідь є новим запитанням і що вся могутність людини полягає саме в тій сміливості, з якою вона ставить свої запитання перед життям.

Спитала квітка: “Як живеш?”

Спитав я в квітки: “Як цвітеш?”

Цей дворядковий вірш міг би написати Григорій Сковорода або молодий Павло Тичина.

У ньому чується здивування тривожної душі перед чудом світу і перед самою собою і та мудрість юності, котра, коли й не знає, то почуває, що кожне окреме існування дорівнює в своїй цінності усій світобудові в цілому — від малої квітки, яка хилиться від легкого подуву вітру на обніжку до мерехтіння мільярдів зірок у нічному небі над нашою головою.

Та не тільки здивування, закоханість і віра в життя присутні в цих рядках, так невимушено висловлених і так просто написаних.

Вони повні невловної, ледь чутної іронії і мудрого смутку.

Чому? Звідки вони у сімнадцятирічного юнака?

Що він знає такого, що б не знали чи вже забули ми?

Він же ще майже дитина, деякі вірші викликають в нашій пам'яті повну безмежної ніжності первісну поезію материнських примовок до немовляти: сорока-ворона на припічку сиділа, діткам кашку варила...

І в той же час щось підказує нам, що ми маємо справу не з дитиною, що дитинство продовжує існувати в свідомості юнака вже перетворене спогадами про нього — це образи, за допомогою яких поет осмислює своє існування в світі.

— Сороки-сороки,

Куди летите?

— Летимо ми, сороки,

На верби високі...

— Сороки-сороки,

А що несете?

— Несемо ми, сороки,

Чотири мороки.

І триста цукерок

Із Нового року.

Вслухайтесь, яка туга бринить в протиставленні “чотирьох морок” щасливому сну про триста цукерок з новорічної ялин-

Journal

ки. Ніжність материнської примовки уже тільки відгукується в душі автора.

Почуття перелому, прощання, далекої дороги сповнює вірші цієї дуже молодой і надійної книги.

Поет ще зовсім дитина, коли вихоплюються у нього ці повні радісного захвату рядки, коріння яких десь у дитячих щедрівочках:

Як одягну я кожуха,
Та як піду селом,
Та як защебечуть собаки, —
Ото різдвяна буде ніч.

І він уже зовсім не дитина у недитячій печалі й утомі ось цього вірша:

Давай поскидаємо черевички.
Поставимо поруч — спочинемо.
А вони хай походять.
(Прощаюся з дитинством).

Душі потрібний перепочинок перед далекою дорогою, вона передчуває своє призначення в світі, ще не обірвалися зв'язки з казками і снами дитинства, але вона дивиться вже не в минуле, хоч і недалеко, а в повне загадок майбутнє, в якому треба знайти себе.

В дійсності, як і в казці, перед нами завжди роздоріжжя і той повний глибокої мудрості камінь, на якому усі можливі перестороги...

Яке щастя, що вони не спиняють сміливих!

Ось чому немає вже й сліду дитячої наївності і безжурності в думках юнака про себе, про своє місце в житті... Не камінь, а орне поле перед ним, овіяне весняним вітром, свіжим, бадьорим, тривожним.

Поле стає для поета образом світу, і цей образ підказує йому вирішення чи не найістотнішої проблеми творчого існування людини, вирішення сміливе і героїчне:

Цей прохолодний плуг
І березнева борозна
...посій себе...

Образ: світ — поле, людина — зерно вражає простотою і величністю, йому не треба прикрас, звідси лаконізм і остаточність вислову в цих трьох рядках.

Ні, він зовсім не дитина, цей хлопчик, він уміє думати, він знає, дочого прагне, і почуває зв'язок не тільки з теплом материнських рук.

Я не виріс поетом,
Я виріс полином гірким.
Із-під джерел землі пухкої
Коріння прадідів моїх
Торкається мене.

Можна дивуватися ранній зрілості цих рядків, але не вірити їм не можна — в них не самовпевненість, а обгрунтована певність, не безкрила мрія, а сила.

Існує закономірність: поет хоче зрозуміти себе через світ, який його оточує, але ж і цей довколишній світ має зрозуміти себе через поета.

Даруйте сю книгу всім,
Хто не знає себе, —
Хай узнає про мене.

В цьому прагненні до двостороннього пізнання ніщо не нове і ніщо не старе. Старий тільки світ, людина у ньому завжди нова і має все осмислити заново, хоб оновити його с о б о ю. Це оновлення світу с о б о ю і ч е р е з с е б е відбувається на наших очах, коли у віршах нового поета він втілюється в нову образність, для якої не було і немає прикладу в нашій поезії. Ось образ життя:

Я не хлопчик, а — бджілка,
Ти не дівчинка, а — квітка.
Як будемо взимку жити?

Образ кохання:

Листя, по якому ми йшли,
Шурхотіло-стогнало.
А в чорнім дуплі пташка співала.
Горіх упав на долоню твою —
То його білка впустила,
Побачивши сльози в твоїх синіх очах.

Образ смерті:

Колись і я стану братиком
Степової материнки,
А поруч цвістиме перестріч...

Безліч питань виникає, коли читаєш ці вірші, не виникає тільки сумніву щодо обдарованості їх автора.

Чи знає поет наперед свою долю? В усякому разі він замислюється над нею і вірить у своє призначення. Складні і неоднозначні образи, в які він втілює свої надії, свідчать про широчінь і багатоплановість мислення цього юнака, який стільки кардинальних питань творчості ставить перед нами уже однією своєю появою.

Росте дівча, наче куш калини,
Гудуть машини на шляху.
Ластівки в моїх віршах ночують
До початку нового дня.
Місяць запряжу я в сани,
Назустріч зимі виїду.
Окрилені ластівчиними крилами
Літатимуть мої вірші.

Вражені незвичайністю цих рядків, їх простотою і оголеністю почуттів і думок, що пульсують в них, ви можете запитати:

— Вірші? Невже це вірші?

Я відповім:

— Ні, це більше, це — поезія.

Ви будете згадувати колядки і щедрівки, захочете встановити зв'язки цієї творчості з японськими "танка", намагатиметесь зрозуміти її через Федеріко Гарсія Лорку або Поля Елюара — надаремно; усе це буде помилкою; юнак народився в Шевченкових Моринцях, і хоч жодною рисочкою не схожий на свого уславленого земляка, джерела його творчості саме тут, на цій землі, в її природі, в звичаях її людей, в силі традиції і в найсучаснішій сучасності.

У жодному кутку земної кулі, з усією різноманітністю народів, побуту і мов, ніхто не зможе так сказати:

А за тим яром
Поле яринове.
А на тому полі
Яринова мати
Ярину в'яже.

І нарешті остання цитата, якою я хотів би закінчити ці короткі замітки:

Хтось передав привіт
(22 лютого ввечері)
Мені попутницею матері,
Для того, може, щоб тужив?
Чи, може, хто пожалів?
Чи, може, полюбив?
Я нікого не забуду в житті
І нікого не зраджу.

Яку велику силу треба почувати в собі, щоб дати таку просту і таку велику обіцянку!

Поет — я не вперше вживаю тут це слово. Можу ще додати до нього — молодий. Але це нічого не міняє. Молодий поет, це той, про кого, незважаючи на його молодість, ми можемо сказати — поет.

Книжка має назву, яка найбільше відповідає її змісту, — “Коріння”. Звуть поета — Борис Корнієнко.
Запам’ятаймо це ім’я.

Леонід Первомайський

**
*

*

Сьогодні я вільний, як зірка
у небі.

*

Корова роги наставила —
Перевернувся світ:
Пастух спати ліг.

*

Ну, гей-бо, коники, чому відстаєте? —
Іще гучніше хльоснув по мокрій спині.
А дід біля криниці бджолу з відерця витяг
І став сушити на долоні.

*

В сю мить, як дід помер,
Почув,
Як голосно іде годинник.

*

“...Не бійся ближче підійти...” —
Сказала ти у телефонну трубку.

*

Я не хлопчик, а — бджілка,
Ти не дівчинка, ти — квітка.
Як же будемо взимку жити?

*

Дідусь везе санчата
Померлої онучки.

*

Пливла хмарка
Понад маком.
Я спитав:
— А ти чия?
— Я Тичинина...

*

Нарешті, зловив
В'юна чорно-синього:
Так тепло лоскоче долоню!
Та розкрилась рука моя, ніби квітка...
Ти переходила річку.

*

Постою під вікном твоїм,
Так гарно мені
(тепло твоє чую крізь скло).

*

За плуга ми взялись
І приорали сонце,
А вже як сіли відпочить,
Раптовий дощ пройшов,
Зелений місяць з-під землі
Двома пелюстками зійшов.

*

В небі падали зорі
І цілу ніч писали небо.
Писали і не дописали,

Малювали і не домалювали,
Бо місяць в небі не світив,
Бо серце рано встало,
Бо заспане відро вже пробудило воду,
Бо дід корові січку виніс.

*

Виходили діти на став,
Виходили діти на гору.
Сміялись, а лід плакав.
Ламались лижі,
А снігу ставало ще більше.
Танув сніг...
(Ми додому приходимо
І стаємо дорослі).

*

Я не виріс поетом,
Я виріс полином гірким.
І з-під джерел землі пухкої
Коріння прадідів моїх
Торкається мене.

*

Чорний вітер гойдає
Теплі вії твої.
Коник спати на камені ліг.

*

Сонце білозубе
Хмарці облизує губи.

*

Натомлений роботою,
Заснув я в полі у соломі.
Цвіркун заліз у вухо і збудив.

*

Вишня дозріла — мене поманила,
Шпак прилетів — вишню вкрав.

*

Голкою з ялинки
Платтячко тобі зашию.

*

Загубив дві підківки брів твоїх
Для чийогось щастя.

*

Найбільше в дитинстві любив
Розчісувать білу гриву коня.
А він щасливо іржав...

*

Пам'ятаеш, коли запитав,
Чи можна тебе поцілувати?
(Відцвітали червоні маки).

*

А метелики не вірять,
Що літо зів'яло,
І самотньо ще літають,
Шукаючи квіток.

*

Якщо ви не чули, як олені плачуть, —
Ви нікого іще не кохали.

*

Я тебе поцілую —
І зів'яне весна.

*

Прийшла весна,
Полема проїхала.
Я взяв батіг
І пішов у далеку синь,
Де гори небо підпирають;
Я пішов до сонця,
До його зимового схову
І хльоснув батомама,
Підганяючи сонце
І білі хмама.
(Прийшла весна).

*

Якщо моя земля стане холоднома,
Я нагрію її.

*

Стоїть журавель над криницею
І, ніби долю свою,
Відерцем у воду вмочає.

*

Стоїть кіт
Край воріт
Та й знай собі
Книжку читає —
Про півня старого,
Про голуба білого
І про мишку-втіканку.
І так йому гарно,
Що аж: “Мур-мур-мур”.

*

Ти зірвала гілку тернову
І кинула в зелену траву.
А восени оленичка бігла
І поранила ногу.

*

Нитка павутинки на уста тобі сіла.
А хто зніме її — вітрець чи я?
Бабине літо кохання найпершого.

*

Давай поскидаємо черевички,
Поставимо поруч — спочинемо.
А вони хай походять.
(Прощаюся з дитинством).

*

Розлились береги, повні повені,
І до себе качок заманили.

*

Ти була чорна
Як оцей олівець,
Як ніч...
(Ніби я в чорній сорочці
На чужому весіллі).

*

Моя сонячна зоре,
Дерева намокли,
А потім замерзли
І стали скляні,
Світлі і мовчазні,
Як ти, моя нене,
Як ти, моя зоре.

*

Я тобі подарую ластівку,
Як пісню з чорними крилами.
Ти мені подаруєш троянду.
І навіть як нас не стане,
На наших могилах
Цвістимуть троянди,
Ластівки воду носитимуть,
Щоб вони не зів'яли.

*

Зима закінчилась сьогодні
(Сьогодні ти прийшла).

*

В цій криниці вода чиста-чиста, —
Боюсь і словом її скаламутити...

Myrna Kostash

BABA WAS A BOHUNK *

And so am I—a stranger, despite three generations in Canada

There are ways in which my grandmother and I are more like each other than either of us is like the generation between us—my parents, her children. Baba is incontestably Ukrainian or “Galician,” as she called herself in 1914 when she came to Canada—it took the combined efforts of Old World intelligentsia and Ukrainian-Orthodox priests and her own Canadian-born children to persuade her to discard the provincial designation “Galician” and adopt the nationalist “Ukrainian.” And I am a Canadian. Unhyphenated. She has acquired enough English to make her way with shopkeepers, busdrivers, and me. I have sponged up enough Ukrainian to be courteous with priests, great-aunts, and her. We share a mutual but mystified curiosity about the conditions in which the other was bred and a respectful astonishment that the hardship and bedevilment of the one life underlie the jubilation and ease of the other, mine. We are tourists in each other’s history, and conduct ourselves accordingly. In each other’s country, we do not try to pass as natives.

With the generation between us it’s a different story. Baba’s children went to school with heavy accents (the short English “e” was consistently pronounced as the broad Ukrainian “a” so Edmonton became Admonton), and came back home memorizing lines from the Alexandra Readers about Empire, British manliness, and the duties of a good citizen in a democracy. Parent and child had to co-exist, but what was the one to make of the other? Baba grew up illiterate under a regime of Polish landlords, believing in the efficacy of prayer and garlic against mundane evils and in the hopelessness of protesting an arranged marriage with a fellow villager who had already left for Canada and built himself a house to contain her. Now she was raising children who learned not only algebra and grammar but also notions of racial inferiority and cultural shame. If her children ecstatically waved the Union Jack at the parade of George VI and Elizabeth, and identified passionately with the Duke of Wellington, it was not so much out of positive acceptance of Anglo-Saxon virtues as out of negative repudiation of their parents’ Slavic character, deemed unworthy.

* Reprinted from *Saturday Night*, October, 1976, by permission of the author.

It would have been impossible for the immigrants to protest: they had learned servile behaviour in the oppressively feudal Old Country. And there was a sense of insecurity in the New, where an alien could—by a flip of the Immigration Act—be deported for subversive or immoral behaviour, or even for being too poor. No, Baba bit her tongue and kept her own counsel even when Canadians ran behind her in the street bleating at her back (she still wore a sheepskin coat), even when her children sat around the dinner table teaching her table manners and talking to each other in English, making her a stranger in her own kitchen. But, she reminded herself, she had come here to grubstake an economic existence. Its indignities, she felt, would ultimately be cancelled out by the financial gains of her children as they made the transition from peasant to lower middle class. And if lack of respect for her Galician habits and reflexes was the penalty she had to pay, she would pay it.

However, it wasn't a simple "lack of respect" that was confounding the children. All but the most opportunistic and craven of them endured a muddle of loyalties and an agony of appraisal symbolized by the hyphen-shaft of dual identity. On the one hand, their sense of decency and their sentiments showed them that Baba was the salt of the earth. She worked hard for little. She always fed and clothed them ("We may be poor but we're clean"). She encouraged their intellectual appetites even while she continued to console herself with superstitions and proverbs delivered in an ungrammatical version of the Ukrainian language. She formed part of the horde of European peasants without whom there would have been no economy on the prairies except for the Hudson's Bay Company, native hunters, and the CPR. For all these things, Baba was to be respected and admired. And so she was, sooner or later.

On the other hand, on the other hand. The children also knew that in exchange for the good fortune of being Canadian-born they were expected to do the decent thing and Anglicize themselves. If the native born Canadians tolerated the sudden influx of European peasants and all their strangeness, it was only because within a few years the whole tribe was sure to assimilate and be indistinguishable from the law-abiding, orderly, and Protestant Anglo-Saxon Canadians who represented the acme of Western culture. Even the redoubtable J. S. Woodsworth, future founder of a socialist party, was moved in 1909 to confess in his book **Strangers Within Our Gates** that "the idea of a homogeneous people seems in accord with our democratic institutions and conducive to the general welfare."

Assimilation was a loaded proposition, however. For one became “English” only through a process of defining “un-English” as bad, disgusting, and unstable. The trick for Baba’s children was somehow to appear to be “English” in spite of the accent, the funny clothes, the so-called unpronounceable name, the childhood memories of Ukrainian food and music and festivals. So they polished up their English, changed their names, joined the United Church, moved out of Eastern European ghettos and into suburbs, and ate turkey on December 25, just like everybody else. For this chameleon’s talent they were appropriately rewarded: they could enter the bottom of the middle class.

This was it, then, Baba’s *raison d’être*: to raise sons and daughters who would become teachers in onerous schools outside the cities, grain buyers in Ukrainian-speaking villages, and butchers in ethnic districts of the city. The hyphenated Canadians who became lawyers, doctors, and professors were the exceptions that proved the rule: the fuss made about them within the ethnic community was fantastic.

And then an interesting thing happened. It became obvious to these models of a success appropriate to their hyphenated status that in spite of all their attempts to “pass” as average citizens, the real power and influence in the country still resided with the Anglo-Saxon elite. It became obvious that nobody in this elite had ever been fooled into thinking Baba’s children were anything but the second-class progeny of Bohunks. At that point, the children became hostile. In their chagrin and disappointment, they defiantly resurrected the left-hand side of the hyphen. The Ukrainian-Canadian was born. And the sub-culture of ethnicity took off.

It was fuelled by a number of noisy intellectuals who had refused, throughout the pioneering era, to take their lumps as second-class citizens. As lawyers, members of legislatures and Parliament, schoolteachers, and newspaper men and women (in the ethnic press), they had consistently urged their compatriots to insist on their rights as Ukrainian-Canadians and not as some soulless, assimilated facsimile of an Anglo-Saxon. They had pressured the Establishment to open its ranks to the non-WASPs instead of keeping them huddled among the farmers and proletariat. These spokesmen were invariably polite and suggestive rather than nasty and aggressive in their demands, but they were sticking out their necks while all about them were meekly blending into the Anglicized woodwork. They are now vindicated, in their terms at least, by the next generation, which is middle class and acceptable while also observing the Ukrainian holidays and keeping their last names intact.

You have a right, those intellectuals argued, to both upward mobility and ethnic identity. But in the process of upward mobility the Ukrainian as Ukrainian vanished, to be replaced by someone like me: someone socialized by Anglo-American institutions, with English as a mother tongue, with culture and values vastly more dependent on what my generation is doing from Vancouver to London than on the past accomplishments of desperate muzhiks and Cossacks along the Dnipro some time ago. I have to ask that first generation of hyphenates: now that I'm successfully Canadian—a condition you demanded for me—how on earth can I also be Ukrainian? Is eating *pyrohy* and claiming William Kurelek as one of "ours" all it takes? If you mean something deeper, why are you so intent on being so innocuously colorful?

In this "ethnic revival," this cavalcade of pseudo-folkloric forms and sentimentalized rituals, the ethnics have received considerable support from the very elite they are reacting against, particularly from the Liberal government. So one has always to ask who and what are really being served by the revival. One has, in other words, to remain skeptical of the ethnics' claim that in their picturesqueness they are resisting the Anglo-Saxon hegemony even while the Anglo-Saxon is signing the cheques that make the multicultural extravaganza possible.

Ukrainian Day at the Vegreville Ukrainian Festival, sixty miles east of Edmonton in the middle of a densely Ukrainian district. I have been ten years away from this sort of intramural celebration, and I notice some changes. When I was a girl, I had been sometimes embarrassed by my ethnic origins. "Greek," I would say to my friends, "I'm Greek," unwittingly reproducing a hierarchy of ethnic undesirables in which, to my mind at least, Greeks were less undesirable than Ukrainians. I would have said I was German, if I could have gotten away with it. In those days, what we did as an ethnic collective to remind each other where we came from was purely an introspective and almost covert act. A series of ritualized encounters—dance, song, poetry, speeches—in the church basement with none but ourselves as witnesses and consumers. The fact that the rituals were incomprehensible to an outsider was the very essence of the act, and the exclusive use of the Ukrainian language was evidence of that introversion. It occurred to me, years later, that since I didn't understand the language very well either, I too was systematically excluded, along with non-Ukrainians, from socialization into these Ukrainian mysteries. This more than anything marked the gap between first- and second-generation Canadians.

So, in Vegreville, in 1975, I, second-generation Ukrainian-Canadian, socialized Anglo-American, English-French bilingualist,

confronted a festival organized from the consciousness of the first generation. I was amazed. It was obvious that the first generation had grown more self-confident, not to say boastful, and was now assuming that the Ukrainian-Canadian "fact" was of interest to all Albertans. No more church basements for them; the festival was held at the exhibition grounds. It was this generation which had erected last summer a monstrous, aluminum **pysanka** (decorated Easter egg) near the Yellowhead Highway in Vegreville, and dedicated it to the RCMP. (How short their memories are: it was the police who had broken up their hunger marches in the 1930s, closed down their Ukrainian-language concerts, spied on them in their Labour-Farmer Temples.) It was these same people who had scattered throughout Vegreville signs in shop windows saying "Vitayemo," meaning "Welcome," and innumerable plastic and china knick-knacks decorated with Ukrainian motifs. They operated concession booths at the festival selling **kubassa-on-a-stick** and T-shirts emblazoned with "Drink Molson's Ukrainian" and "Kiss me, I'm Ukrainian." The message seemed to be that anybody could be a Ukrainian; it was implicit that somebody would want to.

As it turned out, however, the message was only teasing. For the core of the programme was the content familiar to me from twenty years ago when Ukrainians were a racial tribe. The mysteries were the same, with few concessions to the fact that now there were fewer than ever pioneers in the crowd and many more third and fourth generation Canadians (the 1971 census lists 580,660 Canadians of Ukrainian origin). Use of the Ukrainian language among the young is limited to "Hello, how are you?" for Baba's benefit; their use of the culture amounts to changing out of blue jeans and into ethnic costume because the dancing is fun and easy to learn. The "National Hymn" was announced and I was taken by surprise that it wasn't **O Canada** they sang but the European (and pre-Bolshevik) anthem, **The Ukraine Is Still Not Dead**. In fact, I was impatient with this, and my impatience escalated to irritation when references in speeches from the M.C. and the Alberta minister of education to the "mother tongue" were to Ukrainian, not English.

I watched this sea of Ukrainian-Canadians singing mightily, meaningfully, the patriotic anthem of a country they have never seen, and which, since their parents' departure, has become a Soviet Republic. Their nostalgia is for a Ukraine where peasants in gorgeously embroidered, hand-woven linen shirts and bright red boots eat **pyrohy** under thatched roofs. Where they tremulously take their braided bread to the priest for blessing, respect their

elders, detest the Jew and the Catholic Pole (tavern-keeper and landlord, respectively), and die, uncomplaining, in a slaughter or famine. Or so they would have me believe through their anthems and icons, their eulogies and dedications. And if it wasn't like that, why don't they tell me the truth?

The fact is, none of them really knows. They are Canadian by birth and experience, and their nostalgic zeal is not meant to function as history but as mythology. They were raised and socialized within a racist society whose message was that Slavic farmers and their families were "yokels." A columnist in the *Vegreville Observer* wrote: "In view of their education, ideas, moral standards, and mode of life, we justly regard them as inferiors. We are not prepared to be bossed by them . . . and it is unlikely that white men in this Province will stand for it," thereby raising the proposition: the Ukrainian as nigger. As objects of slander, they did the psychologically normal thing. They revised their past so they'd look better to the ruling class. This had its happy side-effects: it instilled a racial pride where there had been apology, a sense of worth and a community where there had been self-disgust and alienation. It offered a position from which to dispute the calumny of Anglo-Saxon bigots.

But it performed a disservice as well. For one thing, it gave the lie to the experience of the pioneers who left Europe precisely because their lives there were intolerable, squeezed mercilessly between landlord and priest, between service in the imperialist's army and service for a pittance on his land. They left because they were hungry and crowded and had no pasture for cows or acres to inherit; they had to scrounge for firewood and, according to some accounts, gave precious food to the priest who, overladen with such gifts, tossed it to his pigs.

It gave the lie, as well, to their Canadian experience, for the mythologizing process extended forward to the history of what happened to them in the New World. They were in a double-bind. On the one hand, they prettified their European past in order to maintain dignity in the face of racism. On the other hand, they had also to dress up their Canadian experiences in order not to be further oppressed for making trouble about the very conditions they were protesting.

It was a touchy situation for them, in the 1930s for example, when the Depression hit only a few years after they had achieved a modicum of economic security as farmers. Their first five years as homesteaders had been gruelling, with the man usually away half the year working on the railroad or in coal mines to earn some cash for the oxen and plow and seed, the woman and children left

on the land to feed themselves, somehow, and to ward off illness and staggering loneliness. By the time the husband returned to work the land, his family had already cleared an acre or two by hand, and the first crop could be sown. Inch by inch the bush was beaten back, the oxen traded for horses, the sod hut abandoned for a two-room log house. In the meantime, women died in childbirth, children died of diphtheria, men were killed in accidents—the nearest doctor was still too far away—crops were lost to early frost and creditors, Ukrainian-speaking teachers were dismissed by the department of education, male relatives (holding Austrian passports) were interned in camps during the First World War, and daughters were sent off to town to work as housekeepers in well-to-do homes. During the Depression, the Communist Party was disproportionately successful in organizing among non-Anglo-Saxon farmers and labourers through groups like the Ukrainian Labour and Farmer Temple Association, and Ukrainian communities in Alberta like Myrnam and Hairy Hill and Two Hills mounted several farmers' strikes and hunger marches. During the Second World War, Ukrainian Communists like John Boychuk and Matthew Popovich were arrested and imprisoned for "seditious activity," and ULFTA halls were shut down.

I make a point of listing these catastrophes because, parallel with them, was a consistent attempt on the part of some of the Ukrainian-Canadian intelligentsia to muffle the complaints and disguise the rebelliousness of their compatriots. English-speaking citizens were assured that the Ukrainians were rapidly and enthusiastically becoming assimilated, as in the speech of the lawyer, George Szkwarok, to a Rotary Club in 1930: the Ukrainian-Canadians "will like your ways and customs, and they will assimilate them if they find them good. They will abandon their own if they are bad. They will learn of your ideals and will follow them," etc. In 1928 a federal member of Parliament, Michael Luchkovich, blamed the economic problems of his constituents not on their vulnerability to the excesses of capitalism but on their lack of character: "I have seen many run up a debt and then leave their farms because they would not live within their means. True patriotism, I insist again, also includes persistence and frugality even under trying circumstances." And my own great-uncle, a community leader and pedagogue, wrote in the *Vegreville Observer*: "We hear quite often that Ukrainians do not respect the law of this country . . . If they do fight, assault or murder anyone it would be their own countryman, as they have great respect for the English or any other people." (But not, presumably, for their own.)

The self-hatred implied in these statements is painful. So is the transparent self-abnegation in assurances that Ukrainians “did not care for their own comfort,” that centuries-long exploitation made them, not seditious, but “enduring, self-reliant, hard-working, and thrifty” and that, in the words of an amateur poet, Michael Gowda:

A new horizon opens to our eyes
Majestic vistas spread from shore to shore
Our new-found home in a new promised land
With freedom bordered and fair justice bound.

One struggles to imagine the pressures brought to bear on these people to deny in such sycophantic prose what was as plain as the nose on their face: that immigrants and the children of immigrants had to sweat and heave against exploitation for every penny of their prosperity and that, denied it, not a few would fight for it. One begins to understand such “patriotism” as a survival tactic, a manoeuvre to deflect the repressive reflexes of the ruling classes against the grumbling mass.

So, watching them last summer in Vegreville sing and dance and speechify—“Such days as today are very valuable for the patriotism of this country. You should first of all be the best possible Canadians and express thanks and gratitude to this country”—I wondered if this process was still in effect. Are declarations of Canadian patriotism still a political necessity for ethnics? Further: where are the art forms and contents, after all these years in Canada, that reflect the Canadian experience? Why are teenagers in 1975 still dancing the Arkan and reciting poems about the Motherland (“Ridna Maty Moya”) and singing ditties about linden trees they’ve never seen?

The explanation is that the Establishment came under pressure during the 1960s from various dispossessed groups, including “ethnics,” to spread its power around. In response, the federal government concocted multiculturalism for the verbal and articulate ethnic middle class as a make-believe participation in power-broking and a sweetener to help bilingualism go down. So we put on our costumes and invite John Munro to deliver his homilies about our “cultural and spiritual values” and make demands for Ukrainian-English bilingualism on the grounds of a fallacious comparison with Quebec, believing miraculously that such actions somehow decrease the distance between us and the board of directors of Capitalist Enterprises, Inc. Now that we are securely assimilated into our appropriate slot in the vertical mosaic—now that, in our habits and speech and values, we are indistinguishable from the mass of Canadians—it’s no skin off the Establishment’s

collective butt to toss us a few dollars for a festival. We're so cute in our get-ups!

We see ourselves that way, too. Ask most Ukrainian-Canadians why they are proud of their heritage and they'll respond with a list of folk arts—Easter eggs, cross-stitch embroidery, cabbage rolls, the *kolomeyka* dance—which are characteristically described as “colourful” by a society inured to the tedium of assembly-line artifacts and metropolitan-based mass-culture. The ethnic as aesthetic relief.

There is an irony here, and it is that the skills displayed by these folk arts are themselves largely a product of North American, middle-class lifestyle; no peasant woman, either in the Ukraine or frontier Alberta, had the time or energy to spend on infinitesimally patterned eggs or microscopically embroidered clothes or laboriously braided breads. No work-exhausted farmers had the leisure to create choreographed dances or five-part harmonies. One must assume that what we take to be the popular arts of the Ukrainians of all classes and generations are in fact either the crafts of the Old World burgher class or the contrived and intellectualized products of a self-conscious Canadian middle class with the benefit of education and leisure time.

Ethnicity, then, is homage to a variety of icons, emblems of who we imagine ourselves to have been and are no longer. Ethnic culture as a hobby. Aluminum Easter eggs, cross-stitched tea cosies, *holubsi* dished up in a drive-in restaurant: surely these aren't signs of an indigenous culture crafted from our experience within the stewing pot of native, nomadic European-peasant, and Anglo-Saxon-urban ways-of-life. They seem rather to be transplants grafted artificially onto a stem of nostalgia, cut off from its sources and able to survive only as a carnival souvenir.

It has all happened so fast. On the prairie, lifestyles barely evolved disintegrate at shocking speed. Within the space of ninety years our history has included the incarceration of the Indians, the surveying of land into quarter-sections, the cultivation of virgin sod, the erection of log buildings, churches, and grain elevators, the laying down of track and spur-lines, the closing down of spur-lines, the abandonment of log buildings, churches, and grain elevators, the overlaying of cultivated soil with cement, and the subdivision of quarter-sections into suburban developments. The people who dug holes in the ground as their first shelter here and walked fifty miles to Edmonton to get flour are still alive, living in high-rise old-age homes and shopping at supermarkets.

I grew up in Edmonton, my father on a homestead. The speed with which the transition was made from pre- to post-industrial

culture shows up in the pile of rubble that marks the place where he was born. The farm is a ruin, a northern parkland version of a post-bellum Louisiana plantation.

The road into the barnyard is a horror of weeds, a treacherous path of nettle and thistle. The barn is still there but, oh, such a modest, insecure structure compared to the cavernous building I remember! The loft into which my father and uncles pitched bales of hay is filtered through with sunlight. Barnswallows pass in and out through holes, and mice are at home. The roadway from the barn to the fields, down which they drove the team of Clydesdales, has reverted now to the prairie it was hacked from. The pathway from the barn to the house is so overgrown with bush that we make our way through it now like Stanley to Livingstone. The house burned down several years ago, after having been looted of junk that passes now for antiques. The site is grassed over. Somewhere to the right, under the bushes, is where the garden and flowers used to grow. Some of the perennials still bloom. To the left are the pig sheds, collapsed in their middles, a mess of weather-beaten wood, silent, hidden, and unregarded.

In one generation the materials of daily existence have become obsolete and unrecognizable. At the Shandro Ukrainian Pioneer Museum I had to ask the elderly warden over and over again, "What is this? What was it used for?" as he handled the churns, flails, spindles, and sheaf cleaners. They would have been familiar to my ancestors 200 years ago. Fifty years after their manufacture, they are mysterious to me.

The graves I've seen: Marx, Dumont, El Cid, and now also the resting place of antecedents who came and went with nothing to mark their adventure except tombstones with their photographs sealed into the cross—stone-faced old ladies and jaunty, middle-aged men standing cross-legged in hats and old men posed defensively in front of their log houses. "This is me, this is where I was alive, and this was my condition"—while a mile down the road the homestead decomposes. Well, it's what they came here for. The disappearance of their generation and all its works into merely nostalgic memorializing is a measure of the success they've had in side-tracking their descendants from the land, as much from the CPR quarter as from the *kolkhoz*. One should then perhaps be more indulgent about the sentimentality surrounding their sacrifice: heaven forbid that the ethnic should be an ingrate.

Nadia Kazymyra

TO BEAR (BARE) DOUBT: IT ALL STARTED WITH BABA

The image of Canada's respectable literary outlet for social comment and cultural polemics, *Saturday Night*, is one of commitment, not so much to the solidification of Canadian cohesiveness but more so to the revealing of that peculiar Canadian distinctiveness in all spheres of activity. *Saturday Night* is preoccupied with the Canadian *raison d'être*. No doubt, the appearance of Myrna Kostash's, "Baba was a Bohunk" (October, 1976), surprised many attesting to be part of the new breed of introspective, egocentric, nationalist Canadians who generally find the tone of *Saturday Night* righteous, positive, correct and therefore agreeable. Much to the chagrin of some, Ms. Kostash's article fails to meet the criteria on all accounts. Disarming are Kostash's thoughts as she pokes and prods at the fibres permeating the Ukrainian experience in Canada. Words rise from the page and accuse. Ms. Kostash writes bluntly, without hesitancy. The tone is bitter and occasionally remorseful. Questions are raised; ideas are churned; bewilderment and confusion prevail. The result of Ukrainian immigration to Canada and subsequent acclimatization, viewed in retrospect, is not enticing. In order to achieve a semblance of economic stability and social acceptance, the Ukrainian, on many an occasion, has sold his 'soul'. Ms. Kostash is the product of that process, left alienated, anxious, and angry. The reader is left in a daze. *Saturday Night* should be complimented.

Ms. Kostash uses the "tools of effect" skillfully—sounds of gnawing, subliminal pain, cushioned by belligerent, defiant tones of the protagonist echo, reverberating from word to word. The reader is compelled to listen. But in spite of the intensity of the emotional expression emanating from "Baba", what is there of actual substance? The purpose of writing about the fate of Baba's offspring is not clear entirely. Is the commentary devoted solely to that of soul searching and self-analysis, which invites re-examination and possible re-direction? Or is the writer concerned with unravelling the 'tangled' past, perhaps in hope of making sense of contradiction, shedding light on the obscure, finding continuity in fragmentation?

If Ms. Kostash's purpose is to explore the realm of "id", groping for the "I", she is only partially successful. The reader is not satisfied totally nor are cures found for the ills of the victim. There is one achievement, and an unfortunate one, I feel. Kostash suc-

ceeds in raising the defenseless victim of insensitive 'Canadianization' into prominence and in vocalizing the plight of the veritable scapegoat. Quite unintentionally I believe, Ms. Kostash has elevated the tattered, well-worn sheepskin coat to the rank of martyrdom. And so what, the reader may well wonder, "Kostash has the right to belly-ache but what am I to do?" Does the writer wish to force the reader out of indifference and complacency? Perhaps. But what can be expected when the theme is not developed well, when the story consists of generalizations and a loose array of events? Confusion. As a result, the reader may excuse the writer's impassioned outburst, relegate her to the position of rabblrouser and generously lavish sympathy with dosages of pity, to soothe and pacify. Apologies will be doled out. I suspect that Kostash will hurl them.

By struggling with her own identity, I see little difference between Baba, her children and her children's children. Neither has found his/her niche inspite of occasional attestation to the opposite. But neither has the average Canadian. Neither has Canadian history. At any given point in time during the last one hundred years, discussion surrounding the Canadian destiny has grappled with the maintenance of British tradition, the north-south continentalist view, the myth of the mighty St. Lawrence, and, when these theories proved limited in scope, the concept of 'unity in diversity' became popular.¹ Certainly the dilemma of the second generation is not a new one. It is a subject which has evoked considerable interest among sociologists (Nathan Glazer, Frank G. Vallee, Nathan Keyfitz) as well as writers of fiction—a good example is John Marlyn's *Under the Ribs of Death* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, reprint, 1971).

What makes Myrna Kostash's case special and different? Some could answer, nothing. Yet she has taken the time to think, to question rather than to accept. She is in search of answers. It is quite clear that the peculiarities of the Ukrainian background linger on, molesting her mind. She may not like the form of fragmentary cultural survival as she has come to view it in Western Canada, but it is there. Together with this "two bit vaudeville act", Kostash is perturbed by the effects of rapid industrialization

¹ Canadian intellectual history has not been a subject of great interest. Only recently, in the last decade, has some progress been made to understand late nineteenth and early twentieth century ideas dominant in Canada. See Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power. Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970) and S.E.D. Shortt, *The Search for an Ideal. Six Canadian Intellectuals and their Convictions in an Age of Transition* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976).

on prairie society and the transition of the one time peasant Ukrainian to the more affluent, comfortable position within an increasingly secure middle class. Ethnicity, for some reason (it leaves Kostash baffled) has become a popular fad since the late 1960's. Its form of expression irritates the writer—"aluminum Easter eggs, cross-stitched tea cosies, **holubsi** [sic] dished up in drive-in restaurants." Kostash maintains that ethnicity is the promulgation of a lie—"homage to a variety of icons, emblems of who we imagine ourselves to have been and are no longer"—but far worse is the fact that this pop art version of Ukrainian culture is "either the crafts of the Old World burgher class or the contrived and intellectualized products of a self-conscious Canadian middle class with the benefit of education and leisure time." Profiting from this showcase display is not the Ukrainian but the power structure, the "Establishment", "the board of directors of Capitalist Enterprises, Inc." The Ukrainian is serving the needs of the ruling elite, as well as its own.

At times Kostash is like an empty wind bag, with an inclination for throwing easy rhetoric. Far too often questions pertaining to social alienation, class stratification, mass conformity and economic exploitation have found their answers in 'catch-all' cliches. Rather than studying in totality the cultural background, social relations, economic and political behavior of the ordinary human being, which would increase the writer's appreciation of the first and second generation's dilemma, Kostash relies on the 'patch-work technique', stringing together a hodge-podge of disparate ideas. (Unfortunately, Canadian working-class history has nothing comparable to Edward Thompson's **Making of the English Working Class** or Eugene Genovese's **Roll Jordan Roll: The World the Slaves Made.**)

Granted, Ms. Kostash's article was not intended to be a massive work on the history of Ukrainians in Canada, but it does give, in capsule form, something of what happened to the Ukrainians in the past. In fact I would suggest what the writer had tried to do is to present an introduction to her "700 page manuscript", "a veritable balloon of an enterprise" concerned with Ukrainians in Canada.

What I'm trying to do is several things at once: tell the story of a generation barely examined beyond the recitation of success stories; highlight events generally ignored, trivialized or mystified in the ethnic histories (internments during the Wars, farmers' strikes, activities of the Communist Party); emphasize neglected topics (work, women, Anglicization,

anti-clericalism, fascist nationalism); dispute the points of view of those ethnics who would rather be agreeable than right; develop a critique of multiculturalism [sic]; and figure out what, if anything, delineates "ethnic" consciousness from that of class, sex, race and religion.²

It appears to me that the writer attempted to cover too much ground without proper basis.

I feel that it is essential, in order to gain an understanding of the present state of Ukrainian society in Western Canada, that Ms. Kostash should have attempted to detach herself from her own experience (I cannot tell which is more important or more central in the article, Kostash's identity crisis or the fate of Ukrainians on the Prairies), put aside the accusations, and with a degree of sensitivity and tolerance delved into the past to examine what happened—not only the fact, but also the nuance. Knowledge of nineteenth century Ukrainian history with respect to cultural development, political expression and nationalist/socialist perceptions is imperative; immigration did not curtail Old World ties nor were behaviour patterns completely altered. The contention of the writer that all that existed in Halychyna or Bukovyna can be summarized in one word, "misery", points to a lack of study and submission to simplicity.

I find Ms. Kostash's individual examples from Canadian history acceptable, but the manner of presentation, the sequence of events, appear to be grounded in sensationalism. Almost in one sweeping motion, Kostash presents her version of the Ukrainian experience, pointing to the initial hardships of homesteading, internment camps during World War I, the mushrooming of the ULFTA, the mediocrity of Ukrainian politicians and the "singing of ditties about linden trees" in 1975. Kostash overlooks the effects of the second and third wave of Ukrainian immigration; it is as though all Ukrainians in the 1970's act alike, particularly in response to the government policy of multiculturalism. It appears, almost, as if the writer is incapable of recognizing subtleties—all is either black or white. For example, in order to understand the past, it is imperative to study the composition of the Ukrainians and the development of their attitudes and ideas as part of social stratification, so dependent on the impact of the economy, events in Europe, 'Canadianization', and above all, the effects of immigration. Ukrainians are not homogeneous in thought and action, hence the difficulty in comprehending them.

² Myrna Kostash, "Questions About Ethnics: An Open Letter from Edmonton", *This Magazine*, January-February, 1977.

My criticisms aside. In spite of the shortcomings of "Baba was a Bohunk", Myrna Kostash's ideas cannot be dismissed lightly. She has succeeded in compelling her readers to react. Few can remain indifferent. You either applaud or throw stones. That is no mean feat for Kostash.

OF AMBITION, BABAS AND BOHUNKS

The title of Myrna Kostash's article, standing as it does on an entire half page, hits the reader squarely in the face: "Baba was a Bohunk. And so am I—a stranger, despite three generations in Canada." If this is a writer's gimmick intended to catch the reader's attention, it certainly succeeds in my case. I quickly count off the generations in my family: my grandparents arrived in Canada from Ukraine in 1900; my father was born a couple of years later in what is now the province of Saskatchewan; I am a native Saskatchewanian; and, if I count my two sons, that gives us four generations in this country.

The catchy, alliterative phrase of the main title and the thought-provoking subtitle continue to intrigue me. Obviously I am of the same generation as Myrna Kostash. Am I a stranger in my own land despite three generations in Canada? Was my baba a bohunk? Am I a bohunk? What is a bohunk?

More recent editions of the College Edition of Webster's *New World Dictionary* do not include the word. The misguided compilers must have assumed that the term had fallen out of usage. A 1957 edition yields the following information: "**bohunk** (bō'hunk), n. [prob. Bohemian and Hungarian] [Slang], 1. a person from east central Europe. 2. any unskilled laborer; especially one from east central Europe. Vulgar term of prejudice and contempt."

Stifling my immediate reaction of anger and incredulity, I reread the definition. Yes, my grandparents, like those of Miss Kostash, and of my husband, and of many other Canadians, did come from Ukraine which is indeed in east central Europe. The first definition, then, although rooted in slang, would seem to fit. Turning now to the second statement I ask myself if my grandparents could be considered unskilled labourers. Hardly. They were farmers and good ones at that, if one takes into account the acres upon acres of brushland that they brought under cultivation with the simplest of implements. So, unless one concludes that all farmers of yesterday and today are unskilled labourers, the second definition falls by the board. I ponder now the use of the word bohunk as a vulgar term of disrespect. I know that the first immigrants from eastern Europe were treated with prejudice and contempt. Their strange dress, their different way of life, and their inability to communicate in English inevitably made them objects

of ridicule and scorn. If I had some difficulty in understanding this before, I have a clearer picture of it now as I see the same process being repeated with other immigrant groups in Canada in 1977.

But, good heavens! Much as I sympathize (retroactively, though it may be) with my grandparents, am I to assume that I and my children are to consider ourselves as heirs not only to their invaluable contribution to Canada but also to the degrading term that some misguided souls saw fit to fling at them? Why would someone of my generation want to bring back into currency this pejorative and tired old label? I begin to read the article in the hope that it will provide me with an explanation.

After reading the article for the first time, I am left with the most distasteful impression that, in her desire to gain Instant Recognition, Myrna Kostash has resorted to cheap and opportunistic journalism. In short, it seems to me that she has churned out a controversial piece of writing by trading in on her ethnic background. After a second reading, I see more clearly the writer's confused state of mind and, while I can sympathize with her, I wonder why some fuzzy-minded editor permitted her to inflict her neuroses on the Canadian reading public. A third reading, coupled with a sincere desire to understand this troubled woman, leads me to the conclusion that the article is the cathartic outpouring of a reflective individual who is trying desperately to come to grips with the problem of who she is.

In her obvious longing to be included among the upwardly mobile in our Canadian society, Myrna Kostash feels it incumbent upon herself to state emphatically in the first paragraph of her article: "And I am a Canadian. Unhyphenated." Having categorically rejected the hyphenated condition, she feels justified in laying claim, further on, to being "successfully Canadian." A few paragraphs later, however, she does an about-face: "So in Vegreville, in 1975, I second-generation Ukrainian-Canadian..." Standing in direct contradiction to all of her statements is, of course, the title of her article in which she refers to herself as a bohunk and a stranger in her own country.

If Myrna Kostash seems to be confused as to whether or not she is successfully Canadian, an unhyphenated Canadian, a hyphenated Canadian, a bohunk, or a stranger in her own land, and if, in some instances she includes herself within the community of Canadians of Ukrainian origin by using the pronoun "we", while at other times she excludes herself by saying "they", she is no less confused about many of the other topics that she raises in her article.

Within the space allotted to me it is impossible to deal with all of the issues raised by Myrna Kostash. Before dealing with some of them, I would like to make a few general comments. First of all, in reading her article, one must keep in mind that Myrna Kostash is oversimplifying matters by concentrating solely on the first wave of Ukrainian immigrants who settled in Western Canada as pioneer-farmers at the turn of the century and whose descendants by now extend into the third, fourth and even fifth generations. She neglects to take note of the infusion of Ukrainians from the semi-professional and professional classes who arrived in Canada during the interwar years and in the period immediately following World War II. In an article such as hers, the influence of these two groups should have been taken into account.

Secondly, throughout the article there is a tendency to strive for a calculated effect rather than for accuracy. While Miss Kostash is simply following the fad of our day by attempting to evoke emotional rather than rational responses within her readers, it is annoying, for example, not to have the dates provided for poems or for quotations from newspapers so that some sense of historical perspective can be achieved by the reader. This disregard for facts is accompanied by a certain carelessness in her choice of words; thus, some very real tragedies in terms of human lives are contained within the same list as the shutting down of UFTLA halls during the Second World War and, thereafter, all of these events are referred to on an equal basis as catastrophes. The "creative" style of journalism indulged in by Myrna Kostash is perfect, of course, for delivering sarcastic slams at any individual, group or institution that comes within a writer's purview and the above-mentioned lady proves in this article that she is, without a doubt, a past master at this form of writing.

Thirdly, Miss Kostash should have researched her topics more thoroughly prior to embarking upon the writing of her article. Asking an elderly warden at a Pioneer Museum about farm implements and artifacts was a good idea. It should have been complemented by visits to Ukrainian Folk Arts Museums where knowledgeable curators (many of whom are recent university graduates) could have provided Miss Kostash with accurate and detailed information about the historical development of the various brilliant art forms found in different regions of Ukraine. In her article Miss Kostash claims that the popular art forms of the Ukrainians are "the contrived and intellectual product of a self-conscious Canadian middle class with the benefit of education and leisure time." I am curious if she would include within this same category the artistic creations of other cultural groups, such as,

for example, the Scottish tartans, Indian headdresses and Eskimo carvings.

In her article Miss Kostash decries the absence of art forms and contents that "after all these years in Canada reflect the Canadian experience." At the same time she disparages the perpetuation of traditional art forms. Is there not a contradiction here? Is it possible for new forms of artistic expression to grow in a vacuum? Does one not have to be steeped in one's past in order to have a wellspring upon which one's creative talents can draw? Obviously it will not be the Myrna Kostashes, those who have repudiated their heritage and who have tried (try?) to pass as Greek or German, who will be the moving spirits of the cultural renaissance that all of us would wish for Canada. The transformation of the old forms into a new and unique expression of the Canadian experience will be wrought by those who are able to combine the freshness and originality of their vision with a thorough understanding of their past. Indeed, some of these art forms have already begun to emerge at both the folk and classical levels and the results are most refreshing and encouraging.

On the one hand, Miss Kostash takes umbrage at the very thought of those times when the Ukrainian language was used exclusively at Ukrainian functions in Canada. To her way of thinking this state of affairs was grossly unfair as it served to exclude from these activities all those who did not speak Ukrainian. Is it possible that she would have preferred to have excluded those who knew little or no English from participation in their own meetings, concerts and "intramural celebrations"? On the other hand, the increasingly popular Ukrainian festivals to which all Canadians have ready and easy access seem to be equally unappealing to her. Perhaps if Miss Kostash were to share with her readers her idea as to how things should be done we would all stand to benefit from it. (And should her idea not suit us, how easy and satisfying it would be to criticize it from a distant vantage point!)

Perhaps I am being too hard on Miss Kostash. In a way I feel sorry for her. She seems to be someone who is searching for her roots but who is unable to reach them across the barrier of language. It is at moments such as this that I say to myself: "There, but for the grace of God and the wisdom of my parents, go I." For, although my parents never thought of themselves as "noisy intellectuals," they did, nevertheless, provide me with the key to my cultural heritage. And, irritating as it may be to Miss Kostash, my husband and I have seen to it that the "mother tongue" of our sons is Ukrainian so that they too may have access to what is rightfully theirs.

While the whole concept of multiculturalism seems to meet with Myrna Kostash's disfavour, she fails to realize that she herself is living proof of the salutary effect that this program is having on the entire country. I am not referring now to the "few dollars" that are tossed by the Establishment to cultural groups for their colourful festivals. After all, our particular group has survived in Canada for 75 years without any handouts and it still relies mainly upon its own resources. In this instance I am referring to the awakening interest in their heritage on the part of those who grew up in homes or communities that were on the periphery of culturally-oriented activities. All of a sudden it's "in" to be an ethnic, and the amount of talent and energy that is being released as a result of this acceptance is already changing the very fabric of our nation. Multiculturalism may have been designed as "a sweetener to help bilingualism go down," but it may well end up as the entire cake with bilingualism serving as a filler between the many different layers.

In her article Miss Kostash has been critical of many aspects of the Ukrainian community in Canada, but, since she has gone through the process of examining it, I have a feeling that she is closer to it now than she ever was before. I would like, therefore, to end my response to her article by saying to her: "Welcome home, Myrna. At the moment you may well be a "second-generation Ukrainian-Canadian, socialized Anglo-American, English-French bilingualist," but with any luck at all, you will soon be trilingual and the hyphenated Anglo-American part of you will be replaced by a new sense of what it means to be Canadian.

University of Toronto

RESPONSE

If nothing else, I seem to have hit some raw nerve endings. When, purporting to be detachedly critical in contrast to my own "emotionalism", Kazymyra and Franko offer up largely personal attacks and snide innuendoes, then it seems to me that the whole issue of re-examining the official version of our Ukrainian-Canadian history goes beyond the serenity of scholarship and close to where we live: our private passions. How else to explain that my alleged "neuroses" and "subliminal pain" got into the discussion? And I detect rather unscholarly tones of resentment and sarcasm in the suggestion that I was basely motivated in writing the article: in defense of myself, allow me to point out that, as an established journalist, I am not in need of "Instant Recognition" and that, as regards a "longing" to be upwardly mobile, let her who is without sin, etc.

Not I but the editor of *Saturday Night* was responsible for the title of the piece and the cut-lines. As for the use of the word "bohunk", I agree that it is possibly incendiary but I use it the same way blacks use "nigger" and feminists, "bitch". That is, to reappropriate it from the mouths of our detractors and render it innocuous.

I am not and have never advertised myself as a "scholar". As a popular journalist, I write speculatively, opinionatedly, and personally as well as authoritatively. A political lesson of the Seventies has been to learn that the "personal is political" and therefore the evocation of emotional as well as rational responses in readers is absolutely valid. Further, it is inconsistent to accuse me of failing to study "in totality the cultural background..." etc. (this would be the work of a whole committee of scholars) at the same time as accusing me of having attempted too much! Kazymyra asks: which is more important, "Kostash's identity crisis or the fate of Ukrainians on the Prairies?" I ask: how, in the name of what my article was about, can the two be separated? As for detaching myself from my own experience, it was precisely the attempt to do that when I was much younger that led me to believe, quite falsely, that the fate of Ukrainians on the prairies had nothing to do with me.

I am chastized for things I never said. I never said that "all that existed" in Ukraine was "misery". My point was to counter the idealized pictures of Ukrainian life that are passed on to us. I never said that Ukrainians are "homogeneous in thought and action". My point was precisely the opposite: to suggest that there are points of view other than those of the Ukrainian-Canadian

elite. I do not “disparage” traditional art forms, merely the notion that what we celebrate in Canada as “traditional” does not, according to the statements of interviewees in the Two Hills area, bear much resemblance to the art forms practised by their immigrant parents. I do not “take umbrage at the very thought” of the exclusive use of the Ukrainian language among Ukrainian-Canadians. I was simply pointing out that, without the language, one is pretty much exiled from the ethnic “mysteries”. Of course one has to be “steeped in one’s past in order to have a well-spring” of creativity! My point is that for a second-generation **Canadian** that well-spring is likelier to be filled from North American rather than European sources. The “whole concept” of multiculturalism does **not** meet with my “disfavour”, merely the version of it publicized by the Liberal Party and its sympathizers among the Ukrainian-Canadians. Finally, the notion that those misfortunes which befell left-wing Ukrainian-Canadians are somehow not the human equivalent of misfortunes experienced by the rest of the community I find repugnant and vicious.

As for my “bitterness” and “alienation” and Franko’s pity, let me say that, in the course of writing my book, the attempt I made to go beyond the conventional wisdoms of ethnic history and to fill in the empty spaces left by idealized and self-serving versions of our history in this country has been the most exhilarating and joyful work of my life. If I have felt despair, it was **before** I took up this work: the despair of someone who could find no common ground with the Ukrainian-Canadian establishment’s tendency to revise the past, pass on an attenuated and bowdlerized culture and demand for the community only a piece of an unsatisfactory pie. If that was the only way to be “ethnic”, then I refused it. My articles and book are by way of finding another way.

Myrna Kostash

GUIDES TO RESEARCH IN UKRAINIAN STUDIES

The following two articles by M. Boshyk and K. Huytan are the first in a projected series to appear in this journal which would provide information and suggestions to scholars and students of Ukrainian studies about archival and other source materials available in this field throughout the world. Articles providing information about private and public collections in Eastern (U.S.S.R., Poland, Czechoslovakia) and Western Europe (Great Britain, France, Germany, Finland) from students and scholars who have utilized these repositories would be greatly appreciated. Similarly, descriptions of the holdings of private, personal and institutional archives and libraries in North America are equally welcome. We invite contributions from our readers to this invaluable and necessary section.

**A NOTE ON SOVIET DISSERTATIONS:
GUIDE TO AVTOREFERATY**

Trying to obtain unpublished Soviet dissertations can be a frustrating affair for those scholars who do not have access to Soviet libraries as well as for those who do, but find they are allowed to read a maximum of approximately twelve. The problem of gaining access to them is further complicated by the fact that Soviet dissertations cannot be obtained by libraries in the West. These circumstances force the western scholar to look for a substitute, and although the procedure involved is a lengthy one, it can be worthwhile. The key to finding the results of a Soviet author's research lies in the use of dissertation abstracts called "avtoreferaty."

Soviet dissertations are divided into two categories: the **kandydat nauk** degree and the **doktorat nauk** degree. The former requires at least three years study after the five year undergraduate period and falls somewhere between the American M.A. and Ph.D., coming closer to the Ph.D., while the latter, considered to be on a higher level, is awarded only to a very small percentage of scholars who are well established in their field.¹ Candidates for these degrees have certain requirements to fulfill in order to be successful, and these are of direct relevance and benefit to the Western researcher.

¹ Eleanor Buist, "Soviet Dissertation Lists since 1934", *The Library Quarterly*, v. 33, no. 2. 1963, p. 193 and Thomas F. Magner, *Soviet Dissertations for Advanced Degrees in Russian Literature 1934-1962*, (Pennsylvania State University, 1966), p. 2.

One requirement is that a copy of the thesis must be deposited in the Lenin State Library in Moscow or in the Central Medical Library. Another, established towards the end of 1948, is that the author must write and publish separately an abstract of the thesis (which varies in length from approximately 15 to 60 pages). A further requirement, brought into practice in 1957, obliges the candidate to publish the substance of the thesis in the form of monographs or articles before submitting it for defence.² This means that avtoreferaty published in the last two decades should contain references to these published materials.

An avtoreferat contains an outline of the author's methodology and materials used, and provides a summary of his arguments and conclusions. More important, and this is the main benefit of an abstract, is the list of publications at the end indicating articles which embody the substance of the thesis. It is these articles one must turn to as a substitute for the total work. Avtoreferaty are generally available through Inter-Library Loan, but, according to informed library sources, can take anywhere from about six weeks to ten months to obtain.

How to trace avtoreferaty ³

The most useful reference work is the **Knizhnaia letopis**, a weekly national bibliography. Abstracts are listed at the end of each weekly issue from 1955 through 1960. In 1961, however, they begin to appear in a separate monthly supplement to the **Knizhnaia letopis**, the **Dopolnitelnyi vypusk**. Throughout the 1960's and 1970's avtoreferaty are conveniently listed in a separate section of the supplement, under the appropriate subtitle e.g. history, philology, mathematics, et cetera. The exception is 1962, when avtoreferaty were entirely omitted in all the issues. Abstract entries include the following information: author, title, publication details of the abstract, number of pages, university or institute at which the thesis was defended,⁴ and on occasion the page listing published titles.

In the **Dopolnitelnyi vypusk** avtoreferaty are not listed by Republic. Instead, avtoreferaty of dissertations produced, for example, at Ukrainian universities on Ukrainian topics are included

² M. A. J. Gollop, "Avtoreferaty", *Sbornik*, No. 2, (Leeds, 1976), p. 57.

³ For those researching in Soviet libraries, a short description of the location of dissertation catalogs is provided by Patricia Grimstead in *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR*. (Princeton, 1972), pp. 377-78. Professor Grimstead also has a similar volume on Soviet Ukrainian repositories ready for publication.

⁴ Gollop, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

with all the other entries, that is, according to the field of study. There is, however, a separate publication for abstracts of dissertations produced only in the Ukrainian SSR. This is the **Litopys knyh**, a monthly bibliographical periodical, in which abstracts are listed in each issue, also under area of study. Here they appear several months prior to being included in **Knizhnaia letopis**. A further useful source for Ukrainian dissertations in the humanities and social sciences is M.M. Onopriienko (ed.), **Vydannia Akademii Nauk URSR (1919-1967)**, **Suspilni Nauky**, (Kiev, 1969). In this bibliography, as in **Litopys knyh**, all entries of abstracts are in Russian.

Occasionally references to Soviet dissertations are made in various periodicals and bio-bibliographies. In such cases it may be safely assumed that an avtoreferat is available if the date of the thesis is 1949 or later.

Marika Boshyk

St. Antony's College
Oxford University

A GUIDE TO FOREIGN MINISTRY ARCHIVES IN ENGLAND RELATING TO UKRAINE

Students of modern Ukrainian history should be aware of important archival depositories which, although they may at first appear unrelated to Ukrainian matters, contain considerable and important contemporary source materials on Ukraine. The foreign ministry archives of the former major western European powers contain numerous reports from embassy and consular staff stationed in Ukraine. Reports from European consuls posted at Odessa, Kiev, Nikolaev, Sevastopol, as well as from embassy staff in St. Petersburg (Petrograd) and later Moscow, along with cabinet minutes shed interesting light on events in Ukraine and on how the major powers regarded Ukraine. It is the purpose of this account to provide the prospective researcher with some idea of where and what kind of archival materials relating to Ukraine can be found in London, England.¹

The archives of the British Foreign Office are located in the Public Record Office (PRO), presently situated in central London. The PRO is composed of two annexes: the Portugal Street annex contains Foreign Office and Cabinet documents from and including 1906, while a few hundred yards away in Chancery Lane are Foreign Office documents up to 1906, as well as documents from other government departments such as the Admiralty, War Office, Munitions and the like. However, this convenient central location will soon be no more, as it is expected that by the end of 1977 the archives will have been transferred to the new PRO building on Ruskin Avenue at Kew, far out in west London. Nevertheless, Kew is easily and quickly accessible by underground or rail.

Beginning research in any archival depository often confronts the student with the intimidating and frustrating prospect of leafing through mounds of papers. A useful, basic introduction is the *Guide to the Contents of the Public Record Office*, volume II, (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963). This book should be on the reference shelves of any university library.

In the PRO itself, the main catalogue is the multi-volume and straight-forward *Lists and Indexes, Supplementary Series, List of Foreign Office Records, General Correspondence*, (New

¹ To be sure, the PRO is not virgin territory to Ukrainian historians. See, for example, Teodor Matskiv, "Ukraina v zvitakh anhliskoho posla z Moskvy, 1705-1710," *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, 1-2 (33-34), rik 9 (1972), pp. 43-56; 3-4 (35-36), rik 9 (1972), pp. 78-84 and Jeremy Rakowsky, "Franco-British Policy Toward the Ukrainian Revolution, March 1917—February 1918," (Ph.D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1974).

York: Kraus reprint, 1966). Now, the Foreign Office (FO) correspondence, that is, the communications between the FO in London and its representatives abroad, is divided into several series, each series being the result of changes in cataloguing.

In brief, the FO65 series for Russia and the FO7 series for Austria² contain general correspondence (of political, commercial, consular and treaty nature) for the years 1781 up to 1906. The above-mentioned **Lists and Indexes** for the pre-1906 period give a fairly accurate breakdown of the nature of the correspondence in each volume.

However, after 1906 matters begin to cloud. Three new series appear: FO371, FO368, and FO369 which contain political, commercial and consular correspondence respectively for all countries. As for any breakdown of the nature of the correspondence, there is none save the designation of the country, date, volume and file numbers. Thus, one must again look under Russia, Austria, even Rumania and later Poland, find the relevant volumes for the desired time period, and then leaf through the volume looking for reports on Ukraine. For the years 1906 to 1920 there is a so-called comprehensive subject card catalogue which allegedly gives one a document's file and volume number. Sadly, such is not always the case, as this writer discovered after many hours of diligent catalogue exploration. For example, file number 24400 on Nikolaev's naval works appears to be in volume 2093 in FO371 for the year 1914, subject Russia. The document, however, stands a good chance of either being in another volume altogether or missing.

Almost unbelievably, there appears to be no rhyme or reason to the cataloguing of the Foreign Office archives which might explain why the documentation is so haphazard as to defy comprehension. The Staff at the PRO itself can provide no satisfactory answer. The problem is that, unlike the French or German Foreign Ministries, the British Foreign Office left documents pertaining to most matters, Ukraine being no exception, scattered throughout the thousands of volumes of correspondence. Consequently, document hunting can be a time-consuming and wearisome process, but not altogether an unrewarding and uninteresting one. There are two possible explanations for missing or misplaced documents: a) they may have been transmitted to another competent department once the Foreign Office had done with them; b) then there is the process of "weeding". Although government documents

² There is no section for Ukraine as such, and not until after 1920 are there entries under "Ukraine" in the Foreign Office Index. Hence one must look at embassy & consular reports from diplomats stationed in the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires.

become available for study after thirty years, before being released, however, documents considered either too sensitive or embarrassing at the time are “weeded” on the highest authority, going as high as prime ministerial level. Once “weeded” a document is as good as lost—it has either been destroyed, or else kept by an interested party.

After 1920 the hunting becomes slightly more complicated, but better results are achieved. The Foreign Office devised its own cataloguing system. See Great Britain, Foreign Office, *Index to Correspondence of the Foreign Office*, (Nendeln-London: Kraus-Thomson-HMSO, 1969). Here there are detailed and comprehensive entries under “Ukraine.” However, the problem lies in translating the Foreign Office Library numbering system into the PRO’s numbering system which still works under the FO371 etc. designations. Hence a Foreign Office entry under Ukraine of N1551/333/38 is translated as FO371/333/1551. In this case N represents “northern” usually meaning FO371, 1551 is the file or document number, 333 is the volume number and 38 is the country code—here it is still Russia, and not Ukraine.

Generally, the FO65 and FO371 series contain most of the relevant information on Ukraine. The FO65 files on the 1905 Revolution and the FO371 on the years 1917-1921 are particularly rich in material. Consular archives in themselves (as opposed to consular reports found in FO65 and FO371) are of little value, as they contain mostly routine consular business. For economic historians, the FO368 commercial correspondence and the relevant FO65 sections contain information on foreign economic development in Ukraine.

Other series of relevance are as follows: FO374, FO373 and FO608 for the Paris Peace Conference where Ukrainian national representatives were trying to get a hearing with the great powers. Events in Ukraine during the First World War and the Civil War are in sections of the Admiralty (ADM) 137 series, subtitled War Histories or Historical Section. Here one should look under South Russia and the Black Sea; in addition, the War Office Class List catalogue categorizes the War Office (WO) 106 series, parts of which relate to South Russia. The FO800 series contains the private papers of ministers and officials in the Foreign Office; among them are, for example, Lord Curzon’s (Marquess of Kedleston) papers. Curzon was His Majesty’s Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in 1919-24—the time when the Polish Galician question was being settled. The FO418 series contains several volumes of so-called “confidential prints” which are in fact specially reprinted documents of significant reports taken from FO65 and FO371. The relevant volumes for Ukraine here are FO418/21-26 for 1905,

FO418/30-35 for 1906, FO418/38-40 for 1907 and FO418/53,54,58 for 1919-1922. This last series may save time in plowing through the FO65 volumes for 1905 and the FO371 volumes for 1906-07 and 1917-1922. However, what one would miss in this case are the cabinet minutes which reflected policy formulation in London vis-à-vis the Ukrainian problem.

One would normally think that the PRO holdings would be complete. However, there are still state and private papers of Foreign Office personnel connected with Ukraine lying around undiscovered, either tucked away in different manuscript holdings in various libraries or even in private hands. The papers of C. S. Smith, British consul-general for the Odessa consular district which included most of central and southern Ukraine, are in private hands in the Midlands. A brief introduction to research in England is G. Kitson Clarck and G. R. Elton, *Guide to Research Facilities in History in the Universities of Great Britain and Ireland*, 2nd edition, (Cambridge University Press, 1965).

II German Foreign Ministry Papers in London

In contrast to the British Foreign Office archives, those of the German Foreign Ministry appear more like a model of good house-keeping. But, then, the German government had a better familiarity with and more immediate imperialistic designs on Ukraine. In London, the Foreign Office Library in Stamford Street, Waterloo, has a microfilmed set of the German Foreign Ministry Archives. The National Archives in Washington D.C. have a similar holding, while St. Antony's College, Oxford, the University of Michigan and the University of California at Berkeley have partial holdings. The complete set is in the Bundesarchiv in Bonn. These microfilmed series are virtually complete, with only routine correspondence being omitted and what was lost in the last war. Two items on Ukraine, however, were not filmed and repose in Bonn. These are two volumes of "Ukraine 2" and "Ukraine 3" series which deal with the Church and Finances respectively for the years 1918-1920.

The German holdings are particularly voluminous, with the years 1886-1920 having some 103 volumes on Ukraine alone. To be sure, much of the material deals with the First War and the Revolution. Some of this material has already been published in the four volume collection edited by Theophil Hornykiewicz, *Er-eignisse in der Ukraine, 1914-22*, (Philadelphia: Lypynsky Institute, 1966-69). Of particular value from the German materials are the following series:

Journal

- Russland 101: Die Bestrebungen der Ukrainophilen und die kleinrussische (ruthenische) Frage, 4 vols., January 1886—January 1920.
- Russland 106: Beziehungen Russlands zum ukrainischen Staat, 4 vols., May 1918—December 1919.
- Russland 108: Die Don Kosaken, 4 vols., April 1918—December 1919.
- Ukraine 1: Allgemeine Angelegenheiten, 36 vols., January 1918—March 1920.
- Oesterreich 94: Die Angelegenheiten Galiziens, 28 vols., January 1885—March 1922. (Until well into the First War the Germans relied much upon Austro-Hungarian sources).
- Weltkrieg #11a: 22 vols., August 1914—December 1918.

There are two indispensable guides to the German materials: American Historical Association, Committee for the Study of War Documents, *A Catalogue of the German Foreign Ministry Archives, 1867-1920*, (Oxford: 1959), and George O. Kent, ed. & comp., *A Catalogue of the Files and Microfilms of the German Foreign Ministry Archives, 1920-45*, 4 vols., (Stanford: Hoover Institution, 1962-69).

The value of using these unpublished archives cannot be sufficiently emphasized. Although one might be tempted normally to look at published documents, these published series provide relatively little information on Ukraine, as the ostensible purpose of their publication was to relieve the respective governments of any responsibility for the two world wars. It is hoped that this brief survey of archival sources in England will serve both as a clarification of the existing materials relating to Ukraine and as an encouragement for students and scholars to use them.

Konstantin Huytan

The London School of Economics and
Political Science, University of London.

Рецензія

ПІДСУМОК ВТРАТ І ЗДОБУТКІВ

Панорама найновішої літератури в УРСР: Поезія, проза, критика. Видання друге, перероблене і доповнене. Упорядкування, вступні статті і біографічні довідки Івана Кошелівця. Мюнхен: В-во „Сучасність”, 1974. 701 стор.

Іван Кошелівець має за собою чимало досягнень. Він — довголітній редактор спершу *Української літературної газети*, а потім *Сучасности*, яка появляється без перерви ось уже сімнадцять років (що само собою є неабияким досягненням в умовах українського дисконтинуїтету). Кошелівець також критик, літературознавець — він іще 1954 року видав книжку про теорію віршування¹ — перекладач з французької, німецької, російської і білоруської мов, упорядник поезій Василя Симоненка² і редактор польськомовної антології документів українського руху опору.³ В усьому проявляється його витончений смак і майже бездоганне відчуття мови. Почуваючи себе як удома в кількох літературах, Кошелівець ґрунтовно знає і українське письменство і кололітературні кон'юнктури, які так часто і з такими згубними наслідками визначають його становлення.

Якщо монографічне дослідження окремих періодів і письменників не аж так уже кульгавить у порівнянні з іншими слов'янськими літературами, то студенти гостро відчувають брак підручників, курсів і хрестоматій, особливо якщо вони вивчали й російську літературу, яка доступна в десятках антологій і російською мовою і в перекладі. Цю прогалину — коли йдеться про літературу останніх десятиріч — до великої міри заповнила Кошелівцева *Панорама найновішої літератури в УРСР*. Перше видання появилось 1963 року, і другим томом до нього була монографія Кошелівця *Сучасна література в УРСР*.⁴ Це либонь єдина західна праця, яка обговорює весь радянський період української літератури.

¹ Нариси з теорії літератури. Випуск перший: Вірш. (Мюнхен: Накладом автора, 1954). Наступні випуски, на жаль, не появились.

² Василь Симоненко, *Берег чекань*. Видання друге, доповнене. Вибір і коментарі Івана Кошелівця. (Мюнхен: В-во “Сучасність”, 1973).

³ Iwan Koszeliwec, *Ukraina 1956 - 1968*. (Париж: “Інститут Літерації”, 1969).

⁴ Нью-Йорк: В-во “Пролог”, 1964.

Оскільки між двома виданнями *Панорами* простягається проміжок понад десяти років, порівняння їх дає нагоду підсумувати втрати й здобутки української літератури в шістдесятих і на початку сімдесятих років. У передмові до другого видання Кошелівець констатує, що злиття націй — тобто русифікація — завдало болючих ударів українській літературі. Рух шестидесятників задушено двома навалами сталінської чорносотенщини. Дехто з цих поетів слухняно перебудувався; дехто пішов на Схід, а більшість імен просто зникла безвісти. Перестали друкуватися, наприклад, Борис Мамай-сур, Григорій Кириченко, Микола Холодний і Василь Голобородько. Талановитіші критики й есеїсти змовкли (Маргарита Малиновська) або опинилися в ув'язненні (Євген Сверстюк, Іван Світличний, Валентин Мороз). Померли в ранньому віці Григорій Тютюнник, Василь Симоненко і Іван Бойчак.

Але були за це десятиріччя і здобутки. Нескресленим літературним фактом стала творчість Симоненка, Мороза, Калинця, Стуса й Холодного. Раніше відомі поети появили новий доробок, і Кошелівець у всіх цих випадках відповідно переглянув вибір їхніх творів. Важливим здобутком були чотири книжки спогадів Юрія Смолича, які скзали частину правди про літературне життя двадцятих і тридцятих років на Україні.⁵ Центральне місце знайшла собі проза Григора Тютюнника, Юрія Щербака і Володимира Дрозда і проза та поезія Леоніда Первомайського. Розсудливістю і добродушністю позначені статті Бориса Антоненка-Давидовича, і шкода, що Кошелівець не мав місця передрукувати більше їх, зокрема із книжки *Як ми говоримо*.⁶

Істотним (але досі мало обговореним) явищем у цьому десятиріччі було зменшення питомої ваги поезії і надзвичайний розвиток прози, особливо ж критики й есею. Знаменний тут Василь Симоненко. З усією пошаною до щирости його патріотизму і розумінням його незрівнянної популярности серед українців, я наважусь заявити, що він був не поет, а журналіст, який римував свої статті. Але після появи Чорно-

⁵ Юрій Смолич, *Розповідь про неспокій: Дещо з книги про двадцять і тридцять роки в українському літературному побуті* (Київ: В-во "Радянський письменник", 1968); *Розповідь про неспокій триває: Дещо з двадцятих, тридцятих років і дотепер в українському літературному побуті* (Київ: В-во "Радянський письменник", 1969); *Я вибираю літературу: Книга про себе. З циклу розповідей про неспокій* (Київ: В-во "Радянський письменник", 1970); *Розповіді про неспокій немає кінця: Ще дещо з двадцятих і тридцятих років в українському літературному побуті* (Київ: В-во "Радянський письменник", 1972).

⁶ Київ: В-во "Радянський письменник", 1970. Є на цю книжку непогана рецензія Ліси Крон: *Recenzija*, Vol. III, № 1 (Fall 1972), pp. 24-33.

вола, Дзюби й Мороза стало неможливо писати так, як Симоненко. Зріст самвидаву звільнив поезію від публіцистичних обов'язків. Зберігаючи своє суспільне значення і аж ніяк не відходячи в сферу „чистого мистецтва”, українська поезія сьогодення віднаходить — або може навіть уперше знаходити — свій справжній голос. Громадські мотиви далі проступають, скажемо, у ліриці Ігоря Калинця і Василя Стуса, але це вже зовсім не те, що Симоненко. В одному із своїх „розрізнених записів” (їх передруковує Кошелівець) Первомайський зауважив: „щоб зрозуміти нікчемність літературного твору, досить перекласти його будь-якою іншою мовою”. Симоненко, а то навіть більшість шестидесятників, у перекладі не виграє.⁷ Це творчість для домашнього вжитку. Натомість без Сверстюка, Осадчого й Світличного весь світ був би бідніший.

Оздоровлення прози відбулося не тільки в критиці і мемуаристиці, але й в белетристиці. Мені здається, що Кошелівцеві належить велика подяка за те, що він передрукував ледве помічену на Заході новелю Ярослава Ступака „Гординя”. Цим одним приголомшливим оповіданням Ступак виявив не менше хисту, я ризикну сказати, ніж Стефанік або Фолкнер. Написана густим, соковитим діалектом, новеля розповідає про верховинця Дорка, який гине, коли „чужинці” з „степів” обстрілюють його халупу у боротьбі з „партизанами”. (Леонид Плющ розповідає, що у рукописі Ступак послідовно писав „німці”, а як здавав до друку, то замінив двозначним словом „чужинці”.) Після появи новелі у *Вітчизні*, Ступакові зачинилися всюди двері і він зник без сліду, але про „Гординю” заговорили навіть зеки в Мордовії. У невіданому варіанті *Вільма* Осадчого є уривок, в якому в'язні розмовляють про Ступака:

Хто такий Ярослав Ступак? Не знаю. Пам'ятаю, що студіював журналістику, де я викладав, носив окуляри і виглядав на сімнадцятирічного. А по „Гордині” цього б не сказав. Сміх у раю. Я б хотів її перекласти на російську, але десь затерся журнал межі зеками. Я не можу його знайти. Тим зекам не давай хліба, каже Кнут. Я теж хочу перекласти того відчайдушного хлопця. Хай би латвійці тішилися. Ти знаєш, каже Юлій [Данієль],

⁷ Це зокрема видно з перекладу Vasyl Symonenko, *Granite Obelisks*. Selected, translated, and annotated by Andriy M. Fr.-Chirovsky (Jersey City: Svoboda, n.d.). Мені, що правда, можуть відповісти, що цей приклад нічого не доводить, бо переклад цей графоманський, але промовистий тут, бодай з соціологічного погляду, факт, що “Свобода” видає таку халтуру.

мене не цікавить: про що там. Мені інший бік: як? Ти відчуваєш, як він усе зруйнував. Те, що закам'яніло в камені, раптом зірвалося. Ти відчуваєш натомість пустку. Кнут: цей чоловік поламав стару модель світу. Він важко ступає по піску: я думаю, що знаю українську мову, але цей хлопець збив мене з пантелику. Його мовою можна огорнути мусора [вартового] і ліпити з нього вошчані коники. Треба нарешті знайти той клятий журнал. Коли зек оживає, він забуває про хліб.

Друге видання *Панорами* відмінне від першого не тільки тим, що воно доповнене, але й тим, що до нього не ввійшло чимало такого, що було в першому. Добрих дві третини другого видання зовсім нові. Кошелівець, наприклад, безпощадно, але мабуть зовсім слушно, оскільки сам час розв'язав питання, усунув розділ „За і проти творчості шестидесятників”. Як ретельний дослідник, Кошелівець піддав ревізії і власні коментарі. Передруковуючи передмову, він пропустив пасаж про Тичину, в якому писав, що „для нього усе ще існує сталінізм і все ще живе Сталін, і тематично головним у його поезії залишилося одописання”. Чи не спричинила цей пропуск ґрунтовна стаття Гриця Грабовича, яка закинула Кошелівцеві „одверто ідеологічне упередження” до Тичини, додала, що „літературна мінливість його [Тичини] долі дотримується внутрішнього моделю, такого ж неунікненого, як і дозрівання і старіння” і захоплювалася „органічністю його поетичного розвитку”?⁸

Ревізіонізмом позначене і Кошелівцеве обговорення Довженка. У першому виданні — але не в другому — він писав, що „композиція великого цілого ніколи не була сильним місцем у творчості Довженка. Він захоплювався несподіваною знахідкою, окремим кадром, що, висловлюючись мовою кіномистецтва, напливав „крупним пляном” і закривав цілість”. Я б аргументував, що завдання критики — реконструювати це велике ціле, і у статті „Плянетне видиво” намагався довести, що вся Довженкова творчість — і кінематографічна і літературна — пройнята обрисами одного великого твору.⁹

І на кінець, ревізіонізму зазнали погляди Кошелівця на творчість Первомайського. Згадуючи його роман *Дикий мед*, Кошелівець уже не заявляє, що його твори „споріднені з пру-

⁸ George G. Grabowicz, “The Poetry of Reconstitution: Pavlo Tycyna’s *V serci u mojim.*” *Recenzija*, Vol. II, № 2 (Spring 1972), pp. 3-29.

⁹ “Плянетне видиво: мітотворче світовідчування Олександра Довженка”. *Сучасність*, 1973, ч. 10, стор. 49-67; ч. 11, стор. 28-43; ч. 12, стор. 27-42.

стіянським „шуканням втраченого часу’”, а обмежується твердженням, що „паралелі для Первомайського треба шукати в інтелектуальному західньому романі”. Тепер Кошелівець також пише:

Даючи з нього в першому виданні лише прозу, я мав необережність твердити, що проза, а не поезія, є його покликанням. І грубо помилився, бо останніми своїми поетичними збірками Первомайський демонстрував вершинну досконалість української поезії, zarazом давши їй гарні зразки нової прози, чим і вмотивоване його виняткове становище в обох цих розділах книжки.

Друге видання *Панорами* можливо виграло б від дещо вичерпніших біографічних і бібліографічних даних про помічених у ньому авторів, але немає сумніву, що й в теперішній формі ця антологія необхідна кожному, хто займається новітнім українським письменством. Здобутки української літератури за цих десять років стали й здобутком її сумлінного дослідника. *Панорама найновішої літератури в УРСР* займе не останнє місце в довгому списку досягнень Івана Кошелівця. Тепер може він порадує нас доповненим і поглибленим виданням *Сучасної літератури в УРСР*.

М. Ц.

LETTER TO THE EDITORS

Translations, translations!

Translations are like servants who were sent to deliver a message and say the opposite of what they were told to say.

(translation from Voltaire)

There is nothing more pleasing than to be criticised by one's former students. All the more so, if their criticism is to the point. In his review of Kulish's *Sonata Pathetique* M[arco] C[arynnyk], writing in the last issue of the *Journal*, delivered a heavy salvo against me and my wife as translators of the volume. A great deal of this criticism, as he himself admits, is quibbling and sometimes he cannot make up his mind about the translation as a whole (on p. 88 he calls it "perfectly honourable," but on p. 85 "insipid"). However, his main thrust is against "academism" of the translation and here his criticism is well taken. I am the first one to admit that as a non-native writer of English (even in collaboration with my wife who is English but who knows no Ukrainian) I am simply not well qualified to render a good literary translation of a poetic drama. The question may indeed arise: why did we attempt it at all? And the answer is: because no one from the younger generation was doing what needed to be done very badly—beginning to translate modern Ukrainian literature into English. Therefore, the beginning, imperfect as it is, had to be made—with the result that several Ukrainian classics are now available and used in classrooms. Once M. C.'s generation gets off their "backsides" (M. C. would have preferred "asses") then this most important task can be carried out. So much *pro domo sua*.

What disturbs me about the review is not so much the criticism of our translation which is legitimate, but the "federal case" M. C. is trying to make out of it. For while attacking our "academic" translation he launches a crusade for a truly modern literary translation and here he reveals himself to be very "trendy" indeed, despite or perhaps because of his reliance on Irving Howe, Robert Lowell, George Steiner, and Nelli Kornienko to boot. All these literati argue convincingly that translation must be sensitive to the hidden aspects of the original work and must, in fact, be a recreation of it. This is all very well and nobody would seriously disagree with them (except the eccentric and rather conservative Nabokov). But the crux of the case is M. C.'s very clear advice on how *Sonata Pathetique* could be improved. Here he seizes on sex and belabours it so much that eventually he asks his readers'

forgiveness “lest I be accused of an obsession with sex and obscenity” (p. 86). There is clearly a sexual undercurrent in many of Kulish’s plays, but it would be wrong to translate these innuendoes with four-letter words. M. C.’s “obsession with sex and obscenity” which he so well demonstrated in his otherwise masterful translation of Osadchy’s *Bilmo* (also reviewed in the last issue of the *Journal*) is part of the current literary vogue. It is used indiscriminately by many translators (cf. the recent production of Molière at Toronto’s Hart House Theatre) and is a symptom of the contemporary malaise which elevates copulation to the pinnacle of human experience. To apply this trendy method to a literary work written in 1930 in Soviet Ukraine is, in my view, absurd. The undercurrents are there for the reader to guess and to feel and should not be brought into the open and underscored in the modern idiom. If they are underscored, as M. C. wants them to be, they distort the original just as much as bowdlerizing does. Better an “accurate trot” than a Hollywood scenario.

Sex, so scarce in Ukrainian literature, is the least important factor in Kulish’s play. What is overriding in the *Sonata* is its intense lyricism. Here, curiously, M. C. approves of my alleged “pruning” of what he calls the “folkloric vines” (p. 84). Yet the task of a literary translation should be, precisely, to render this poetic quality in English. Here more is required than an expertise in scatology.

But perhaps a compromise solution for a truly good translation is still possible. The academic concern with the text must not be thrown to the winds—it must be combined with literary skill (which I sadly lack). However, the literary skill must avoid exaggeration and vogueishness (in Carynyk’s translation of *Bilmo* the swearing of the KGB major Halsky “Padlo! zareviv ne svoim holosom maior Halsky — Podlaia tvoia dushonka!... Suka!... Mraz v...” becomes “You piece of shit!” Major Haliski roars in a frenzied voice. “Shitty, motherfucking sonofabitch!”—while in the text Halsky’s words are “You carrion!—roared Major Halsky in a voice that was no longer his own, “you mean scum!... bitch!... filthy...”)). To sprinkle obscenities wherever there are three dots may, I suppose, be permissible, but why omit the words that Osadchy actually used? I am not suggesting that a literal translation is best; far from it. But there is a degree of veracity which must be preserved. Otherwise one may just as well translate Shevchenko’s “Skhame-nitsia budte liudy/ Bo lykho vam bude” as “Smarten up, you bastards/ Or else you’ll croak.”

Despite these disagreements I look forward to further cooperation with M. C. on many translations which are planned for

Journal

the Institute. His assistance is indeed invaluable. He has been commissioned to translate the next volume for the "Ukrainian Classics in Translation"—Kotsiubynsky's **Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors**. I am sure there will be no shadows of necrophilia in it. For the challenge, as M. C. says, is to translate our classics so that they "read as literature." This means controlling the urge to make them all read as if they were contemporary American literature.

George Luckyj

**PUBLICATIONS OF THE CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF
UKRAINIAN STUDIES**

**Mykola Zerov, Lectures on the History of Ukrainian Literature
(1798—1870)**

Appr. 300 pp.; \$9.95 hardcover, \$3.95 paper.

First publication of the renowned scholar's lectures delivered at Kiev University in 1928. Subsequently, his works were banned and Zerov himself perished in a Soviet concentration camp. His lectures deal with the crucial period of modern Ukrainian literary history and are a model of scholarly objectivity. They appear in the Ukrainian original and are intended not only as a textbook for universities but also as a highly educative book for the general reader. Available May, 1977.

George Luckyj (ed.), The VAPLITE Collection (in Ukrainian)

Appr. 300 pp. Illustrated. \$10.95 hardcover,
\$4.95 paper.

This volume is an expanded edition of previously published materials from the archives of the literary group VAPLITE (1925-1928). It offers a unique insight into the life and work of a group of Ukrainian writers and artists in the 1920's who spear-headed a national and cultural revival. Their attempt to develop a high Ukrainian culture, based on Western European models, was cut short by the onset of Stalinism. The collection contains letters, diaries, excerpts from both prose and poetry, and many illustrations, some in colour. Available October, 1977.

Published by MOSAIC PRESS.

For information write to: Mosaic Press,
P.O. Box 1032,
Oakville, Ont.

THE JOURNAL OF UKRAINIAN GRADUATE STUDIES

A TABLE OF TRANSLITERATION
(Modified Library of Congress)

а	a	н	n
б	b	о	o
в	v	п	p
г	h	р	r
г	g	с	s
д	d	т	t
е	e	у	u
є	ie	ф	f
ж	zh	х	kh
з	z	ц	ts
и	y	ч	ch
і	i	ш	sh
ї	i	щ	shch
й	i	ю	iu
к	k	я	ia
л	l	ь	-
м	m	-ий	y in endings of personal names only

THE JOURNAL INVITES GRADUATE STUDENTS IN ALL FIELDS RELATING TO UKRAINIAN STUDIES TO CONTRIBUTE TO OUR PUBLICATION. PLEASE SEND IN YOUR ESSAYS, ARTICLES, REVIEWS, NOTES AND COMMENTS. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, PLEASE SEE THE FRONT INSIDE COVER.

\$3.95