

JOURNAL

OF UKRAINIAN GRADUATE STUDIES

V. Tkacz: Tychyna's Poetic Imagery in Kulish's *Narodnii Malakhii*

E. Andijewska: *The Journey*—a translation by M. D. Olynyk

B. Nahaylo: A Reappraisal of Dziuba's Treatment of Leninist Nationalities Policy

M. Savaryn: Ivan Dziuba's Trauma

Українське життя в Румунії: інтерв'ю з Миколою Павлюком

В. Голубничий: Тези про русифікацію

J. Petryshyn: Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: Some Observations

J.-P. Himka: Ukrainian Art in the Soviet Union

E. Kasinec: Documentation for Ukrainian Studies

Guides to Research, Reviews, and Letters

3
FALL 1977

ЖУРНАЛ
ВИЩИХ УКРАЇНОЗНАВЧИХ СТУДІЙ
diasporiana.org.ua

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

University of Toronto

Professor OREST H. T. RUDZIK
MYROSLAV SHKANDRIJ

ROMAN SENKUS, *Managing Editor*
Professor DANYLO HUSAR STRUK

EDITORIAL BOARD: Yury Boshyk, *Oxford University* • Tatiana Gajecky, *Harvard University* • Zorianna Hrycenko, *University of Manitoba* • Yarrema Kowalchuk, *University of Alberta* • Professor G. S. N. Luckyj, *University of Toronto* • Professor Peter J. Potichnyj, *McMaster University* • Professor Ivan L. Rudnytsky, *University of Alberta* • Professor Roman Serbyn, *Universite du Quebec a Montreal*.

The *Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies* is published biannually, in the spring and fall, by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. Individual subscriptions are \$4.00 per year, including postage. Cheques and money orders are payable in Canadian or American funds to: Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies. Please do not send cash.

The *Journal* publishes articles written by graduate students which deal with Ukrainian-related subjects in the humanities and social sciences. The criterion for acceptance of submission is their scholarly contribution to the field of Ukrainian studies. The *Journal* also publishes original and translated poetry and prose, documents, information, book reviews, and journalistic articles of a problem-oriented, controversial nature.

All submissions must be typed on 8½ x 11 inch paper and double-spaced throughout. Footnotes must appear at the bottom of the page. Block quotations and four or more lines of verse from Ukrainian should appear in the original. Otherwise the modified Library of Congress system of Cyrillic transliteration should be used.

In general, articles should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages, except where especially justified by extensive documentation, tables, or charts. For purposes of style and footnoting, the *MLA Style Sheet* should be consulted. Authors should indicate their university affiliation at the end of their articles. Manuscripts will not be returned unless specifically requested and postage provided. The policy of the *Journal* is not to consider articles that have been published or are being considered for publication elsewhere. The editors reserve the right to edit all submissions.

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

Articles, book reviews, and all correspondence regarding subscriptions and editorial matters should be sent to: *Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, M5S 1A1.*

Copyright 1977 by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.

Printed by Harmony Printing Ltd., Toronto, Canada.

JOURNAL OF UKRAINIAN GRADUATE STUDIES

Volume 2, Number 2

Fall, 1977

C O N T E N T S

<i>Viriana Tkacz</i> : The Golden Dissonance: Pavlo Tychyna's Poetic Imagery in Mykola Kulish's <i>Narodnii Malakhii</i>	3
<i>Emma Andijewska</i> : <i>The Journey</i> (translated by Marta D. Olynyk)	18
<i>Bohdan P. Nahaylo</i> : Dziuba's <i>Internationalism or Russification?</i> Revisited: A Reappraisal of Dziuba's Treatment of Leninist Nationalities Policy	31
<i>Mykhajlo Savaryn</i> : Why Capitulate?: Ivan Dziuba's Trauma	54
Культурно-громадське та наукове життя українців в Румунії: Інтерв'ю з Миколою Павлюком	62
<i>Всеволод Голубничий</i> : Тези про русифікацію	72
<i>Jaroslav Petryshyn</i> : Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: Some Observations	81
<i>John-Paul Himka</i> : Ukrainian Art in the Soviet Union: Makarenko and Humeniuk	89
<i>Edward Kasinec</i> : Documentation for Ukrainian Studies: Reflections on the Background, Problems, and Perspectives of the Harvard Experience	91
Guides to Research in Ukrainian Studies	
Primary Sources to Immigration and Settlement at the Public Archives of Canada (Nadiia Kazymyra)	104
A Note on Missing and Unexploited Archival Sources Relating to the Early Modern Period of Ukrainian History (Stepan Velychenko)	120
Review	
Bohdan Antonych, <i>Square of Angels</i> (Oleh S. Ilnytzkyj)	125
Obituary	
Dmytro Ivanovych Chyzhevsky (Dolly M. Ferguson)	131
Letter to the Editors	134
Books Received	136

**THE GOLDEN DISSONANCE:
PAVLO TYCHYNA'S POETIC IMAGERY IN MYKOLA
KULISH'S *NARODNII MALAKHII***

The eyes of a provincial postman, which had been focused on the petty details of small town existence (he had previously spent three years suing a neighbour for killing his rooster), have acquired panoramic vision. Malakhii now sees the new humanity promised by the Revolution. Divergence of reality from this ideal has to be immediately corrected by decree. The acceptance of his words alone can bring the great reform, the transformation of man and country.

The characters in *Narodnii Malakhii*, their stories and images, created a revolution in Ukrainian drama. An unprecedented uproar of reviews, discussions, polemics, and criticism followed their appearance on *Berezil's* stage in 1928.¹ Most of the articles written about this play in the past fifty years are concerned with the political implications of the plot and the social background of the characters. This paper, therefore, will not attempt to discuss these topics, but will examine the contemporary sources for Kulish's literary images. This will illuminate an important, hitherto obscured aspect of the main character.

Certain traits of *Narodnii Malakhii* can be found in Kulish's earlier work. The play's first act, with its broad satire on the patriarchal life of provincial town dwellers, is somewhat reminiscent of *Otak zahynuv Huska*, an earlier comedy. There we also have a portrayal of characters who are so concerned with petty details that they lose sight of the reality of their situation. The character of Huska can be seen as a simplistic comic prototype for the very complex Malakhii, whose portrayal has elements of both the tragic and the comic. Kulish actually planned to combine these two modes in *Otak zahynuv Huska*. The totally comic atmosphere of the play was to be broken at the very end when the laughing audience finds out that Huska really hanged himself.² However, the printed version of the play ends with his arrest.

Malakhii is visionary as well as comic. In this he incorporates some of the qualities of Khyma, the idealist and dreamer from

¹ Natalia Kuziakina, *Piesy Mykoly Kulisha: literaturna i stsenichna istoriia* (Kiev, 1970), p. 170.

² Iurii Kobyltsky, "Revoliutsiiei narodzhnyi," foreword to *Mykola Kulish: piesy, lysty*, ed. S. S. Zinchuk (Kiev, 1969), p. 16.

Kulish's drama *Komuna v stepakh*. In the last act, Khyma describes a dream in which she sees Lenin in a snowy field, carrying something wonderful. He is smiling and waving at the commune.³ Khyma's dream and Malakhii's vision of receiving warm applause from government officials after his lecture on the reform of man⁴ share an idyllic tone, and a fervent belief that their actions will receive warm approval from officials who appear to them as ideal, almost heavenly beings. In describing a dream earlier in *Komuna v stepakh*, Khyma also uses "holubyi-holubyi,"⁵ the obsessive colouring of all of Malakhii's visions.

However, the themes, images, and characters of *Narodnii Malakhii* are much more complex and much richer than those found in Kulish's earlier plays, which tend to present situations and characters in black and white.

The early 1920s, a period of literary renaissance in Ukraine, produced great poetry but was not as rich in drama. Rulin, a theatrical critic of the time, even notes this fact.

— Довгий час не з'являлось на українському та на російському також терені творів, що могли б задовольнити високі вимоги революційного українського театру, що прагнув до вистав великого стилю. "Перші хоробрі" визначили себе в українській літературі переважно поезіями, згодом новелами. І тільки поволі підходили їх наступники до великих полотен повісті і драми.⁶

Poetry of the time provides a fertile source of imagery for Kulish. Pavlo Tychyna's poetic imagery can be seen throughout Kulish's later plays. Kobyletsky, in his introduction to the 1936 Soviet edition of Kulish's plays, points this out and adds:

Та й сам автор згадує в листі до І. Дніпровського, що в шуканнях революційних форм мистецтва він "прислухується до Тичини".⁷

In *Narodnii Malakhii*, the visions of the main character, even on their broadest thematic level, are very reminiscent of Tychyna's poetry. Revolutionary ideals are seen in religious and cosmic terms,

³ Mykola Kulish, *Mykola Kulish: piesy, lysty*, ed. S. S. Zinchuk (Kiev, 1969), p. 136.

⁴ Mykola Kulish, *Tvory*, ed. Hryhorii Kostiuk (New York, 1955), p. 68.

⁵ Kulish, *Mykola Kulish: piesy, lysty*, p. 98.

⁶ Petro Rulin, *Na shliakhakh revoliutsiinoho teatru* (Kiev, 1972) p. 77.

⁷ Kobyletsky, p. 7, n. 1.

with much stress on colour and musical metaphors. Examples of this complex intertwining appear in the work of other writers of the time, but they are most characteristic of Tychyna's work.

Kulish also incorporates into his play metaphors that are peculiar to Tychyna. In the third act, for instance, one of the inmates of the insane asylum says:

Думка була весілля справляти, коли гульк — молода і
мати весільна на баштані посохли . . . ⁸

These lines immediately bring to mind Tychyna's "Odchyniaite dveri . . ."

Одчиняйте двері —
Наречена йде!
Одчиняйте двері —
Голуба блакить!
Очі, серце і хорали
Стали,
Ждуть . . .
Одчинились двері —
Горобина ніч!
Одчинились двері —
Всі шляхи в крові!
Незриданими сльозами
Тьмами
Дош . . . ⁹

The expectation of a wedding party in the first part of the image is destroyed in a flash by the presentation of a very grim reality in the second part.

Kulish's main character shares some characteristics with figures created in Tychyna's poetry. Malakhii's sense of his own importance, his self-anointment, and his identification with a Christ-like figure at the end of the play seem to parallel the image of the father in Tychyna's "Chystyla maty kartopliu."

батько, здурівши, у штунду пошився, якби ще у штунду—
Сусом Христом об'явив себе, партію водить по селах! ¹⁰

Both characters are fanatics, although their causes differ vastly. Both are at some point considered mad. However, the auras they create around themselves are significantly different. Malakhii is

⁸ Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 70.

⁹ Pavlo Tychyna, *Zoloty homin* (Kiev-Lviv, 1922), p. 29.

¹⁰ Iurii Lavrinenko, ed., *Rozstriliane vidrodzhennia: antolohiia 1917-1933* (Paris, 1959), p. 57.

a dreamer who is totally absorbed in his utopian vision of a "ho-lubaia dal." The father in Tychyna's poem is a menacing figure. His entrance into his own home creates a "hrizno-synia—tysha."¹¹ It is important that the blues which colour their worlds are very far apart in shade.

Perhaps the most interesting parallels to Tychyna's poetry can be traced in a further discussion of Kulish's portrayal of the main character.

Malakhii, as his very name suggests, has the stance of a prophet, a messenger. (Malakai in Hebrew means "my messenger." The Book of Malachai is the name given to the work of an anonymous prophet of the fifth century B.C. which begins with these words.) He has set out to spread the word of his revelation. He believes in the strength of his very word.

— Я вам скажу таке слово, що пустять — пароль такий,
що й мур розваля . . . ¹²

This concern with the word in and of itself suggests that, on one level, the character of Malakhii can be seen as a symbol for a poet. The interpretation of Malakhii as a poet is supported by the fact that critics, Sherekh among them,¹³ have drawn parallels between the character of Malakhii and that of Ilko, the revolutionary dreamer and poet of Kulish's later play, *Patetychna sonata*.

The prophet as a symbol for a poet appears often in world literature. This equation is also present in Tychyna's work. In "I Bielyi i Blok . . ." Tychyna expresses his anguish at the state of his country. He calls for the poet to arise, implying that he can become the Moses of his people.

Воздвигне Вкраїна свогого Мойсея,
не можеж так быть!

Не можеж так быть, о, я чую, я знаю.
Під регіт і бурю, під грім од повстань
од всіх своїх нервів у степ посилаю —
поете, устань! ¹⁴

Another example of this metaphor can be found in his poem which addresses the "kazenni poety, ofitsiiantyky" and is titled "Plusk-vym prorokam."¹⁵

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

¹² Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 71.

¹³ Iurii Sherekh, *Ne dlia ditei* (New York, 1964), p. 75.

¹⁴ Tychyna, p. 48.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

Malakhii's belief that his word can create a vision of the future for all reminds one of Tychyna's "Dudaryk." In this *kazka*, the *dudaryk*, who can also be interpreted to be a symbol for a poet, actually has the power Malakhii strives for:

А ще він знав таке слово,
що як скаже —
усі люди на сто літ уперед дивляться.¹⁶

Both Malakhii and the *dudaryk* suffer rejection for their vision. Malakhii is eventually rejected by all for his obsession with his vision. The *dudaryk* at first meets a similar fate.

— Так і так, на сто літ уперед розказав, так за це й
прогнози.¹⁷

But eventually, the *dudaryk's* word and the music of his instrument are strong enough to change the social order and speak irresistibly to all.

Як заграє він, як заграє,
ціле царство підняє —
люди танцює, люди питає,
ой чого це так світає?

А він узяв та й одкрив їм усе чисто на сто літ уперед...¹⁸

Malakhii believes in the power of his word and the music of his own instrument, which in reality is also a *dudka*, although he imagines it to be a "surma zolotaia."¹⁹ However, the power of his word is evident only to him and to those who are in hopeless situations—the insane, and Olia in her moments of despair. With time even they abandon him. At the end of the play we see him totally isolated from reality, playing his instrument, still enraptured by his illusions. The play ends with the following stage directions:

Агапія засвітила свічку. Малахій грав. Йому здавалося, що він справді творить якусь прекрасну голубу симфонію, не вважаючи на те, що дудка гугнявила і лунала диким дисонансом.²⁰

¹⁶ Pavlo Tychyna, *Vybrani tvory*, ed. M. Tereshchenko (Kiev, 1946), 1:174.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 179.

¹⁹ Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 104.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

Only Ahapiia remains on the stage with him. Many of her religious visions and dreams closely parallel his, but she is never really taken by his vision. She has her own.

Malakhii aspires to the power the *dudaryk's* word and music have, but he fails. He can, therefore, be seen as a rejected prophet and as a failed poet. He is also someone who seems to have taken Tychyna's words from the poem "Siite" much too literally.

Будьте безумні — не зимні.
Нові, по нові марселєзи!
Направо, наліво мені —
ставте дієзи в ключі! ²¹

However, Malakhii proves to be incapable of creating the new "Marseillaise," the new revolutionary hymn which would rally the people to take part in his great reform.

The interpretation of Malakhii as a poet need not be limited only to the moments outlined above. Malakhii's behaviour in the first act of the play can be seen as an attempt by the poet to break away from the traditional, from concern with realistic detail. Malakhii sets his sight on universal ideals and cosmic proposals. The poet, the writer moves away from the depiction of ethnographic realism to the concerns of modern literature. Malakhii's departure for Kharkiv can be seen as a symbolic representation of the transition towards the theme of the city in the poetry of the time.

The Revolution had so frightened Malakhii at first, that he immured himself in a closet for two years. His immurement totally transformed him. The Revolution's promised ideals became his own visions. Malakhii's immurement can be seen as a symbol for the isolated moment of creative concentration a poet goes through before his vision crystallizes. This moment is reverently portrayed as a creative cloak of darkness in Tychyna's "Soniashni kliarnety."

Я був — не Я. Лиш мрія, сон.
Навколо — дзвонні згуки,
І п'ятьми творчої хитон,
І благовісні руки. ²²

Malakhii, as the poet who is destined to fail, is described as having been inspired under ridiculous circumstances. The concern of the townspeople with the petty details of the immurement make it all the more laughable.

²¹ Tychyna, *Zoloty homin*, p. 47.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

The vision which grew out of this isolation and the study of Bolshevik books is that of a world of fulfilled utopian promises. Malakhii complains of the blindness of the people to the humanism of the Revolution. New eyes are needed before people can see their new rights and forget about the quality of the new combs and thread.

— Ой, як ми не втямимо, навіть ще не бачимо, —
яких прав, яких прав надавала революція людині!
Істинно потрібні оновлені очі, щоб бачити їх.²³

Tychyna also uses blindness as a metaphor for people's incomprehension of their potential to become the new humanity.

І буде так —
Сліпі: де ж те небо — я не бачу?
Глухі: мені здається, правду я б почув!
Каліки: плачу,
Од болю кричу!

І буде так —
Фальшиве небо сміхом хтось розколе.
І стане світ новий і люди як боги.²⁴

Action must be taken by someone before the transformation of people into the gods of the new world can take place. Malakhii envisions the action which will shatter the false heavens.

Malakhii's family and friends, as Sherekh points out,²⁵ attempt to lure him back into his traditional role in the community by the use of ritualistic particulars he once loved. Of all their attempts, only the singing of his favourite religious song meets with any success. The song inspires Malakhii to relate the religious vision of his childhood. He describes seeing God as an ordinary old man carrying a censer through the meadows and fields. However, once Malakhii realizes that he has fallen into one of the traps his friend has set up for him, he destroys the piety of his vision.

Так не вдається тобі це зробити! Бо дивіться — підходить до старенького Бога хтось в червоному, лиця не видно і кида гранату.²⁶

²³ Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 27.

²⁴ Tychyna, *Zoloty homin*, p. 52.

²⁵ Sherekh, p. 65.

²⁶ Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 34.

The expected ending is suddenly shattered by violence. The supposedly meek assault the almighty. A similar moment appears in Tychyna's "My kazhemo," which tells the story of Little Red Riding Hood. The meeting with the wolf does not have the result we expect.

— А може б, я тебе з'їв? — Из'їж, —
Червона шапочка за ніж!
Вцілила вовка в лису головку,²⁷

The destruction of the traditional religious image with such violence carries Malakhii into an apocalyptic vision of the shattering of what he now considers to be a false heaven.

Кришитесь, дивіться, пада розбитес небо, он сорок мучеників сторч головою, Христос і Магомет, Адам і Апокаліпсис раком летять . . . І сузір'я Рака й Козерога в пух і прах . . . (Заспівав, що сили). Чуєш, сурми заграли . . . Сурми революції чую. Бачу даль голубого соціалізму.²⁸

The Revolution, seen here as destroying religion, adopts religious symbols. "Surmy revoliutsii" sound as they do in the traditional portrayal of the Last Judgement. However, the neighbours do not seem terribly moved by his vision. They are all more concerned with the fact that he is leaving.

Malakhii destroys all attempts to get him to conform and stands firm in his determination to leave. His stance is similar to that of the poet in Tychyna's "Vidpovid zemliakam," a poem palpably political.

серед дрібних, помстливих, тупоумних,
на купі гною жовчного, що всмоктує,
затягує на дно,
співай, поете, з нами в тон!

Стою — мов скеля, непорушний.²⁹

Malakhii rejects all the ritualistic enticements and offers of recognition. "Tebe prosyt tserkovna hromada, obraty na holovu kho-chut i tse fakt . . ."³⁰ In the city he will reject a job which is offered on the condition that he return to his own town,³¹ to his

²⁷ Tychyna, *Vybrani tvory*, p. 128.

²⁸ Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 34.

²⁹ Tychyna, *Vybrani tvory*, p. 117.

³⁰ Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 32.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

traditional role. This uncompromising stance further echoes that of Tychyna in "Vidpovid zemliakam."

Душі моєї не купить вам
ані лавровими вінками,
ні золотом, ні хлібом, ні орлом.

Стою — мов скеля, непорушний.³²

If Malakhii is viewed as a poet, one can also say that his attempt to break away from the traditional can symbolize more than just an attempt to break with the traditional content of poetry. It can also be seen as an attempt by the poet to go beyond the accepted forms of poetry into experimentation with poetic structure, a major concern for many of the poets of the time.

Malakhii's visions remain ideas; they are never fully concretized into words which could move people. Kulish's fullest presentation of Malakhii's vision of the reform of mankind takes the form of a film projection. The use of film was a very new and impressive theatrical experiment. But one also feels that there is more to it than just experimentation with a new device. The film sequence is understood to be a portrayal of the vision in Malakhii's mind. And his vision remains basically in his mind. He is really incapable of conveying it to all the people. His poetry remains an idea, and poetry, after all, must concern itself with words.

It is also significant that Malakhii's vision depends on religious symbolism for its strength. The new poetry of the time often depended on traditional symbols, even when depicting the new era. At the end of Alexander Blok's "Dvenadtsat," one of the most celebrated poems of the early Soviet era, Christ appears to lead a red partisan patrol through the snowy streets. Tychyna's "I Bielyi i Blok" is another good example of this.

Там скрізь уже: сонце! — співають: Месія! —
Тумани, долини, болотяна путь . . .
Воздвигне Вкраїна свого Мойсея, —
не може ж так бути!³³

By using a traditional description of Russia in the second line of this passage, Tychyna lets the reader equate the religious image of the Messiah with the leader of Russia at that time—Lenin. Malakhii also casts Lenin as the Messiah by urging Ahapiia to visit Lenin's mausoleum instead of Christ's tomb in Jerusalem.

³² Tychyna, *Vybrani tvory*, p. 118.

³³ Tychyna, *Zoloty homin*, p. 48.

... не до гробу тепер єрусалимського нам треба йти, а до Ленінового мавзолею, до нового Єрусалиму плюс до нової Мекки, — до Москви ...³⁴

Malakhii's vision of the reform of mankind promised by the Revolution finds its metaphors in religious symbolism. His mind synthesizes religious hymns, with the "Internationale" as background for his vision. The ceremony of the reformation of man takes on the rituals and the symbols of the Transfiguration feast day. Even the date and place are the same.

Збирайтеся до нової Фавор-гори дванадцятого серпня, по-старому шостого ...³⁵

In his monochromatic vision, Malakhii sees himself lecturing "v holubii RNK."³⁶ Previously he had identified the RNK with Mount Thabor which, according to tradition, was the place of Christ's Transfiguration.

— Мільйони дивляться з молінням на цю свою найвищу установу, на гору цю — преображення України, на нову Фавор, ...³⁷

Malakhii then proceeds to transform individuals. As in Christ's Transfiguration, their faces become radiant and acquire angelic features. Malakhii sees himself leading the new god-like masses past Mount Thabor, where Olia brings fruit for blessing, a customary ritual which is performed in the Eastern Churches on Transfiguration feast day.

... Оля несе яблука святити, люди співають їй "осанна", тільки якось по-новому. По тому в голубому мариві маячить якийсь новий Єрусалим, ...³⁸

Again, there are many instances in Tychyna's poetry where the celebration of the Revolution is compared to that of a religious holiday. His poem "Velykden" describes a workers' celebration.³⁹ In his "Pershe travnia na velykden," the people take on the role that is traditionally seen to be God's.

³⁴ Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 42.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

³⁹ Tychyna, *Vybrani tvory*, p. 161.

не Христос воскрес —
робітничий клас.⁴⁰

The same kind of substitution of man for God happens in Malakhii's vision of the Transfiguration.

In his "Ispyt/Antystrofa" Tychyna writes:

Без конкурсів, без нагород напишіть ви сучасне "Христос воскрес",⁴¹

Malakhii hears a new hosanna in his mind, but he is incapable of communicating it. Although his vision is powerful, his word itself does not stand up to Tychyna's challenge.

In his first contacts with the city, Malakhii is hypersensitive to the corruption of everyday reality. He sees huge discrepancies between the promised new world and the actual one. He wants a humane society, but sees all around him greed, bureaucracy, crime, and the degradation of individuals. People in the city are just as concerned with the petty, the materialistic, and the self-serving as his townsmen had been.

— Не про голубі реформи, а про форми жіночих ніг думають і мріють, зовсім не звертаючи уваги на те, що в наслідок таким мріям любов обмежується ногам, в очах не цвіте, в серці не співає, — ото ж і згвалтовано двох старих бабів . . .⁴²

Tychyna also touches on this topic in "Pliuslym prorokam," where he asks:

Що те братерство, коли вам еротика? —⁴³

In "Teror/Antystrofa," Tychyna rejects technology as a substitute for humanity in a society.

Аеропляни й усе довершенство техніки — до чого це, коли люде одне другому в-вічі не дивляться?⁴⁴

The same sentiment is expressed by Malakhii.

. . . — отакеє з людьми робиться, дарма, що навколо у радіо грають, пасуться трамваї, басує авто!⁴⁵

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

⁴¹ Tychyna, *Zoloty homin*, p. 87.

⁴² Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 86.

⁴³ Tychyna, *Zoloty homin*, p. 74.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁴⁵ Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 51.

Some of Malakhii's strongest lines were those calling for a rebirth in national culture. His first proposal for reforms called for the reformation of mankind and singled out the Ukrainians as most in need of it.

... бо в стані дядьків та перекладачів на тім світі зайців
будем пасти, . . .⁴⁶

Many of the lines which dealt with this topic did not appear in the version of the play published in *Literaturnyi iarmarok* in 1929 because they were subjected to harsh political criticism. One can find some of these lines in the footnotes to the play in the 1955 UVAN edition. Others appear in Kuziakina's study of Kulish's plays published in 1970 in the Soviet Union. Kuziakina quotes the following lines, which she ascribes to Malakhii:

Включивши нацменшості, питаюсь українців: назвавши
малоросійський борщ українським та переклавши укр-
мовою конституцію, ви думаєте, що справді оновилися?
Перекладачі ви! Де ж ваше власне творіння, згідне з
оригіналом матері нашої революції? Невже й тепер ска-
жете, що дала вона карі очі, та не дала долі?⁴⁷

Malakhii's bitter words addressed to his contemporaries criticize their provincial closed minds, their superficial sense of culture, and their satisfaction with imitations. The cultural process has to be constantly recreated to be of any value. Now was not the time to bemoan the provinciality of the past, but to correct it.

Tychyna, in his "Odyn v liubov," criticized the poets of his time for their inability to create a vibrant new literature. He also accused them of being mere "translators."

І от перебивають копію
з солодких руських поетес.
Ідуть з утопії в утопію —
і називають це "Sagesse".⁴⁸

The UVAN edition includes the following lines in the footnotes to *Narodnii Malakhii*:

... Оновити їх треба, і Україну. І Україну, кажу. Старчи-
хою бо стояла при шляхах битих, задрипана, струпом
укрита, з торбиною... Що з того, що в торбині Тарас і
Грінченка словник — вся культура... Така даль сього-

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁴⁷ Kuziakina, p. 206.

⁴⁸ Tychyna, *Zoloty homin*, p. 73.

дні, а вона . . . соняшник луска. Ненавидю рабу . . . Оно-
вити або вбити . . . ⁴⁹

The image of an abused woman by the roadside appears further in Tychyna's "Odyn v liubov," but there it symbolizes specifically the Ukrainian Muse.

А справжня муза неомузена
там десь на фронті в ніч суху
лежить запльована, залузана
на українському шляху.⁵⁰

Malakhii's words imply that one cannot rely only on past cultural achievements, but must continually recreate the living cultural process. This is not a matter of totally disregarding all the achievements of the past—there is an underlying concern for preserving the best of the traditional. But literary achievements of the past "in a bag" do no one any good. The people must be acquainted with them; the new literature must be built on them. One also has to be able to discriminate between the superficial and that which is of value in the traditional. Kulish, as the *Iarmarkom*, raised this question of value:

— Чим відрізняється "Шевченко в рушниках" від "самовару з канаркою"? ⁵¹

But "Shevchenko v rushnykakh" is as worthless as "Shevchenko v torbyni," if that is his only function. Blind adulation is not very different from total ignorance.

As the play proceeds, Malakhii's critical view of reality is clouded by his utopian visions and his inability to make them real for anyone else. He is mocked and rejected by the workers in the fourth act. His romantic vision creates a barrier which isolates him from them. He has to accept the fact that they are absorbed in the creation of their own forms on which *they* hope to build the future.

— У них свої, червоні мрії. Яка трагедія! (Закрив очі й пішов. Услід йому гриміла симфонія труда.) ⁵²

These lines and stage directions bring to mind the closing lines of Tychyna's "Psalom zalizu."

⁴⁹ Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 447.

⁵⁰ Tychyna, *Zoloty homin*, p. 73.

⁵¹ [Mykola Kulish], "Do knyhy sto trydtsiat pershoi," foreword to *Literaturnyi iarmarok* (December, 1928), 1:244.

⁵² Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 91.

Червоно в небо устає
новий псалом залізу.⁵³

The last act emphasizes Malakhii's isolation and loss of contact with the people around him. He is deaf to the mocking tones of the cheers he receives at the bordello. When Olia sings the then popular "Kolechko", in an earlier version of the play Malakhii interjects: "Tykho, Ukraina spivaie,"⁵⁴ echoing the sentiments of Tychyna's "Osin/Antystrofa."

Дорослі й семилітні: "Ой, яблучко, да куда котишся".

Так. Народ у толоку, а поети в борозну.

Годіж кривитися на фабричну: передтеча завше менш талановитий за Месії.⁵⁵

The poet and the people have parted ways and the poet has headed for empty, barren fields. The people create their own music.

Malakhii's isolation is now complete. He sees himself as the rejected prophet, an almost Christ-like figure.

— І плювали, і били його по ланитах.⁵⁶

He attempts to create a universal symphony, something which would parallel Tychyna's "V kosmichnomu orkestri," but in reality his music does not match his illusions.

Йому здавалося, що він справді творить якусь прекрасну голубу симфонію, не вважаючи на те, що дудка гугнявіла диким дисонансом.⁵⁷

The music of the failed poet dissolves in dissonance.

In "Liu" Tychyna had written:

... — Очевидячки люде лише по духу негармонійні.
Бо всі трагедії й драми — врешті є консонанси.⁵⁸

Although the ending of *Narodnii Malakhii* certainly seems tragic, Malakhii is not a true tragic figure, as Sherekh points out:

⁵³ Tychyna, *Zoloty homin*, p. 68.

⁵⁴ Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 449.

⁵⁵ Tychyna, *Zoloty homin*, p. 78.

⁵⁶ Kulish, *Tvory*, p. 104.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ Tychyna, *Zoloty homin*, p. 80.

Але ця трагедія не вислід його активної діяльності, вона відома наперед. Малахій іде їй назустріч тільки тому, що він фантаст і обмежена людина. Тому його тема — не трагедія, а тільки “трагедійне”, тому він жалюгідний і смішний навіть на вершках свого піднесення, . . . Тому музика цього Кулішевого твору раз-у-раз зривається в дисонанс.⁵⁹

As has been shown, Malakhii can be seen as a poet who strives to make the transition in both theme and structure from a traditional to a modern literature. *Narodnii Malakhii* is a pivotal work for Kulish, since it is the play in which he, as a writer, makes this very transition. Kulish's earlier plays, 97 and *Komuna v stepakh*, were realistic and had a village setting; his later plays, *Pate-tychna sonata* and *Maklena Grasa*, were to be modernist and set in the city. Kulish entered the urban environment as Malakhii entered Kharkiv.

Narodnii Malakhii, as a whole, can be read as a meditation on the position of the poet in the 1920s. Malakhii's criticism of literature, national culture, and ethics expresses the views held by Kulish and many of his contemporaries. His metaphors and symbolism are those of the new literature, as shown by their close resemblance to Tychyna's imagery. However, Malakhii is neither a Tychyna nor a Kulish. He is a man with a vision who faces the many problems of the new literature, but who never finds the word which could made his vision poetry. *Narodnii Malakhii* does not present us with a portrait of any particular poet, but portrays the problems a whole generation of writers were faced with.

Harvard University
Ukrainian Summer School

⁵⁹ Sherekh, p. 71.

THE JOURNEY

"Language was given to man so that he might
make surrealist use of it."

André Breton

The Journey is the first English translation to appear of a small portion of Emma Andijewska's prose works. Published in 1955, the following four stories are in the same order as they appeared in Podorozh, a collection of stories united by a single character named D. Through the use of the "automatic (unconscious) method" perfected by the French Surrealists in the 1920s, Andijewska has suggested the daily life of an ordinary, universal man by means of daring fantasy in disquieting syntactic juxtapositions. D. travels through a number of adventures combining the supranormal with humdrum events. Objective and subjective events flash by like animations, reality mingles humourously with dreams. Humour has frequently functioned as a liberating force in the hands of surrealists and such literary and visual artists of the unconscious as Nikolai Gogol, Iurii Olesha, Franz Kafka, Marc Chagall, and Lewis Carroll.

Emma Andijewska was born in Donetsk, Ukraine in 1931 and emigrated to the West in 1943. She has lived in Paris and New York and presently resides in Munich. To date she has published seven collections of poetry and five prose works (stories and novels).

Bying a Demon

Seizing the door handle, D. felt like buying a demon. He ran off, afraid that the stores would soon close; indeed, some were already shut, but he was in time.

The shop clerk was just drawing down the window blinds when D., gasping for breath and excusing himself for the late hour, asked to buy a demon.

The clerk took a ladder, leaned it against the shelves, climbed up, removed the demon from the top shelf, shook the dust from it, wrapped it in shiny paper, tied it up with string, clanged the keys of the cash register, and, switching off the light, turned into a ladder

D. left the store in great delight, the demon under his arm. At last he had his very own demon—he had wanted one for a long time. It was even strange that he had not bought one sooner, but then, surely, the time for this had not yet come.

In the streets they were selling newspapers and lighting the streetlamps. Beneath the lamps stood policemen eating cookies.

D. clutched the package tighter with his arm so that he could feel his purchase. "Pass the cathedral, a few more steps—and I'm home!" And he smiled as he imagined the expressions of his wife and children who were waiting for him.

"You've bought yourself a young demon!"

D. looked in the direction of the voice. In a niche of the cathedral stood a saint with a missing arm, beckoning to D. to come closer.

D. felt very awkward.

"Yes, I've got my own demon..."

"You know," continued the saint, as though he hadn't noticed D.'s discomfiture, "I suffer from rheumatism. My niche leaks a bit, and ever since my arm was blown off during one of the air raids, I've felt pain right in that missing piece of arm. It happened a long time ago, but I still can't get used to it. Odd, isn't it?"

"It was I who persuaded him to call you," yawned a rooster above the niche, turning towards D.

"I'm sick of his stories about rheumatism in his missing arm. I very much suspect that he doesn't have any rheumatism—he just made it up out of boredom, and it's not completely clear about the severed arm. I know his story by heart—even backwards and forwards. Rheumatism is his only topic of discussion and he has all sorts of ways of telling this story. In the winter it's not that bad; but in the summer! Don't worry," the rooster reassured D., noticing that he was glancing stealthily at the saint.

"He won't be offended, he's a saint. My profession is making soap bubbles. I like to blow them all night, and now, in the spring-time, is the best time for this. But you have to concentrate and he bothers me. How I love soap bubbles! Nobody can blow them like I can. Don't think I'm conceited. I'm saying this sincerely—I'm not conceited. After all, you just have to look at the rooster standing on the other side of the cathedral who's known for blowing bubbles in order to grasp my art. He's nothing compared to me, an ignoramus. Because really, I do it better than anybody."

And to demonstrate his skill, he blew a garland of crocodile-like, shell-like, round, elongated, orange, yellow, red, black, and silvery bubbles.

"You have your own demon," the rooster remarked. "Good-bye."

And he turned his tail towards D.

"D.," said the saint, shaking the soap bubbles from his clothes, "you have a demon, so now you..."

Suddenly he forgot what he wanted to say, waved his hand, and fell silent.

At the corner a tram passed by. D. stood for a while longer and went off. He no longer felt like going home.

For the first time in his life D. felt different. Pausing before a shop front, he felt the packaged demon carefully. The demon felt soft and nice. "No," thought D., "I don't want him to speak yet," and walked decisively towards the building in which he lived. His eye fell on a circle of metal flowers nailed to the middle of the door, which he had not noticed before.

D. rang the bell, the door opened, and he began climbing the stairs, when the superintendent's door opened a crack and her son stuck his head out, saying with a melancholy sigh:

"Oh, you have a demon!"

D. pretended not to hear and quickened his step. But now, as if on command, all the neighbours were poking their heads out of their doorways, shouting:

"You have a demon!"

"And what did your demon cost?"

"Is it domesticated or not?"

D. felt he'd been climbing the stairs for years. "These boors, what business was it of theirs!" The boors did not stop.

"Se-se-se!" D. hissed, screwing up his face, and he stuck his tongue out at them.

"Aha!" the neighbours burst out with relief. Pacified and content, they closed the doors.

D.'s wife was waiting for him on the doorstep. She helped him take off his coat, and he almost regretted that he wasn't wearing galoshes; he would so have liked to take them off.

In the room the children were playing with a cat which was waving its tail and meowing.

D. placed the package on the table and said:

"Now we have our very own demon."

In their fascination the children tore the cat in two and flung both pieces under the bed.

"Now I have a demon," D. thought in bed while listening to the sleepy breathing of his wife and children.

He could not fall asleep. The germ of the mood which was born on the way home had grown into a great, pristine joy. Joy was expanding his muscles. D. felt his body fairly crackling with it, like electricity. His head began to spin.

D. arose, threw on a robe, went out onto the balcony, and inhaled the air with his entire body. Unaware of it, he clapped his hands. It was as if he was thrust into a heavy, black agitation. He

stood as if he were in a trance and did not even feel the blood gushing from his finger tips. He was looking in front of him to where the roofs were beginning to shine with a light he had once seen long ago, although he could not recall where. By his feet the splashes of blood were turning into a stream.

On the table lay the demon, neatly wrapped in shiny paper and tied with string.

The Suitcases

"Just a moment, sir!" "Oh, sir!" An obese person was making straight for D. "Sir, I give you these suitcases as a present!"

Before D. could understand what was happening, the fatty had already disappeared down one of the nearest streets. Smiling innocently, porters placed about a dozen huge suitcases at D.'s feet.

D. glanced at the bags, at the porters, shrugged, and prepared to go on. Perhaps under different circumstances his attitude towards this kind of gift would have been different, but D. was in a hurry for a rendezvous. He had decided that it was time to declare his love to a girl and that he would do it today. He did not need these suitcases one bit. The porters seized the suitcases and ran after D. He stopped.

"I don't need any suitcases!"

The porters looked at each other, shook their heads, and, at the first step of their new master, followed him. D. had neither time nor desire to argue with them: "They'll leave me alone if I don't pay any attention to them," he thought, and, without looking back, walked ahead.

It was Sunday, D. recalled, seeing that half the city was in the park. On every tree hung a sun; wild ducks and all the small birds were crying out. Dogs were being taken for a walk. Happy parents, accompanied by friends and relatives, were pushing baby prams, while people who could not afford to pay for a boat to row on the lake were sitting by the lake and noisily delighting in nature. Even D. himself felt like remarking: "Trees—what a miracle of nature!" or "The world is beautiful!"

On one of the benches a girl was sitting between two bearded grannies. Seeing D. with the suitcases, she jumped up, and the flowers on her dress faded.

"You're leaving? So that's what you're like!" and she ran off crying.

"Wait, I'll explain everything!" shouted D., running after her.

Journal

The porters, bouncing along with the suitcases, bounded off in pursuit. A pedestrian was thumped so hard with a suitcase that his head was twisted around backwards. Horrified at suddenly seeing his own spine, the man was howling, not daring to budge. In passing, the porters upset a baby carriage. From the jolt the infant flew into a tree and hung there with its shirt caught on a bough above the crowd.

In the general confusion D. lost sight of the girl, but it was too late to halt after what the porters had done, and D. ran without seeing where he was going, as long as it was away—away from the cries and people and suitcases which had so senselessly ruined his life.

D. stopped and caught his breath in the first alley where it was no longer possible to hear the cries. The porters stopped near him and put the suitcases down smoothly and gaily, as though the recent run had been amusing, not worthy of attention.

"Open the suitcases; I'd at least like to know what's in them!"

"Sir," said one of the porters, "these suitcases are impossible to open."

"So break them open!"

"You can't destroy them."

"In that case, go to hell!"

"Sir, we belong to you."

If D. had had a weak heart, it would have exploded with anger, but D.'s heart worked at several horse power. In a flash it had distributed his blood into the proper places, and D. felt only hungry.

"To hell with you," he said, feeling for a few small coins—all his capital—in his pocket. "One of you go buy me a few rolls."

"Sir, we don't know how to buy."

"If you belong to me, then you must go. I'm hungry—quickly!"

"Sir, you can kill us, but we don't know how to buy. We only know how to carry suitcases."

After this D. said no more.

The alley was so narrow that it was even strange that it still existed in such a large city. Buildings stood deserted, although, above, wet laundry hung from one building to another. Except for the drops which, from time to time, fell onto the pavement, there was nothing here to remind one of human existence. D. sat down on one of the stone doorsteps and fell asleep, leaning against someone's door that looked as if it had never been opened.

Something shook D., threw him to one side, hit him on the eardrums, and he woke up. All around him, as far as the eye could

see, drivers of taxi cabs were bawling from old, new, small, and big cars; some drivers had even taken off their steering wheels and were fighting with them. D. himself was sitting in a car chauffeured by a streamlined driver. Behind him the porters smiled enthusiastically.

"What's happening here?"

"These drivers are miserable because they were not lucky enough to get your fare."

"I don't have any money!" shouted D. "You are mistaken if you think my suitcases are worth something!"

"You don't like the speed," moaned the driver, and stepped on the gas.

The car howled and, passing the hulking shapes of other cars, turned the corner on one wheel.

"Stop! I want to get out. Stop!" D. shouted, embracing the seat so as not to fly out.

The bowels of the city flashed by him.

The car stopped in front of one of the best hotels and the owner of the hotel ran out personally to open the door for D.

D. decided instantly: "It's now or never." He hit the owner in the stomach with his head, leaped over the car, and ran away. But he wasn't able to escape; he was seized and carried back to the hotel.

"You blockheads, I don't have any money; I don't want to go to the hotel," D. croaked in time with the motion.

This was taken to mean that he wanted privacy, so the owner, holding his hurt stomach, gave instructions to toss out all the guests and give over the entire hotel to D.

Guests in pyjamas, with robes and without, were standing waving their toothbrushes and threatening the hotel owner, until they all grew into the ground. When their heads had grown even with the grass, that spot was rolled over and planted with flowers.

D.'s life became unbearable. Wherever he went, everyone was happy to welcome him although he would never pay. It seemed that all they needed was the sight of the suitcases themselves. Had D. commanded a mountain of gold to be poured in front of him, everyone would have fallen over themselves to carry out his wishes. This did not please him one bit. The porters followed him even into his dressing room, and D. thought longingly of the times when nobody was running after him.

He loved swimming. Once he even took part in a competition and great hopes had been placed upon him; but now the porters had made even this pleasure hateful. Whenever D. showed up at any pond, stadium, river, or lake, or, hoping there would be fewer people, would drive to the sea, the porters would accompany him.

Journal

When he dove into the water, the porters would leap in after him and swim with the suitcases, keeping perfect pace. This caused a sensation. Throngs of reporters flocked after D., photographed him, and the newspaper headlines shone: "Mystery of Nature, or the Man with the Suitcases."

D. felt very much alone. In the city were friends he would have gladly visited. He wanted to go to the theatre, the cinema, but with the suitcases he didn't dare.

Somehow, after a rainfall, he remembered a school friend whom he had not visited for a long time (as far as D. could remember, this was the only man who could give him some sound advice), and pushing aside the clouds of ozone sprinkled with sun like candy, he went to seek his advice.

The friend was very pleased with this visit, but seeing the porters with the suitcases behind D.'s back, he immediately became embarrassed and started to speak to D. formally.

"Have you gone out of your mind? At least you must understand!" D. pleaded as he told of his adventure with the suitcases. But his friend scarcely listened, restricting himself to a "yes" or "no," and it seemed to D. he was suffering from his presence.

D. was alone in the entire world. More and more often he refused to venture outside for weeks. He would shut himself up in the house and sit in front of his suitcases. He detested the porters who slept on their feet, leaning against the suitcases, as long as he remained still. The suitcases seemed to have grown even larger. D. would not have even been surprised if one day the suitcases suddenly opened and swallowed him up. So, one day he decided to end his life. D. loved life with all its good and bad, but was the situation in which he found himself life? D.'s strength was becoming exhausted.

Knotting a tie for the first time in a long while, he resolved to throw himself under a train, but since he was wearing a tie, he thought it might be better to throw himself under a car.

It was late spring. People were carrying out troughs of water to warm in the sun. Dogs were being washed and getting haircuts. The languishing sidewalks kept getting tangled under the feet and impeded walking. Old spinsters walked their cats out to the meadows; clotheslines on which laundry was drying were tied to the cats' tails, uplifted like trumpets. The air on the turns was like soda water and made breathing difficult. It hung between the buildings in buns smelling of vanilla, smoked cemetery pollen, and sweet rush.

D. breathed in the street and, so as not to rethink his intention, almost ran to the intersection where he had resolved his earthly existence was to end. D. was not thinking of anything; he

desired nothing. He was barely aware that he was walking. He only quickened his step and, turning the corner, collided with all his force into a beggar, and both fell onto the sidewalk.

The beggar, distorted with fury, got up, shaking off the fall like drops of water, but he calmed down a bit when he saw the suitcases and angrily poked his hat in D.'s chest.

D. was looking at the beggar as though he were an apparition and didn't budge.

"Alms!" The beggar advanced with growing anger and yanked D. by the sleeve.

"I give you these suitcases!" shouted D. into the beggar's eyes.

And before the beggar could swallow his astonishment, D. had disappeared down the closest street.

Paradise

When D. got bored with sleeping without a pillow, he went to a sale and bought quite an inexpensive solid feather pillow in a grey cover. The salesman swore that it was impossible to find a cheaper and better pillow. This acquisition made D. happy. For many years he had slept without a pillow and now he wondered, as he was carrying it, why he had never thought of buying a pillow earlier.

Still cheerful, as though he had just met someone very dear, D. shut the door behind him, put the pillow on the bed, and stepped back to admire it. And unable to resist his satisfaction, he lay down to try how it felt to sleep on it.

He lay down and heard the pillow humming. D. jumped up and, digging his little finger in his ears, puffed up the pillow with his fists, turned it over, and put his ear to the pillow. The pillow was humming.

D. knew that running to the salesman to demand his money back because the pillow was humming would lead nowhere. The salesman would probably pretend he was seeing him for the first time, so try and convince him that the pillow was humming! D. sat on the bed and wrung his hands. To sleep so long without a pillow, finally to buy one and suffer such a blow! There was only one thing to do—throw out the pillow—but this would mean that money would be wasted. To recognize once and for all that he had been stupidly swindled was something D. could not bear. After a short internal battle and two glasses of bromo and water, he decided to get used to the pillow.

In the mornings he would get up feeling ill. His head ached from the humming, and dark circles appeared under his eyes.

Friends, noticing the change in him, advised him to see a doctor, to be outdoors in the fresh air more often, to eat salads, and to take care of himself. At work they gave D. a leave of absence so that he could go away for a rest. D. did not go on a holiday but thought about what his friends would do if they knew about his pillow.

The first time D. touched the pillow, he had heard continuous humming; but gradually, listening more attentively each time, he began to note how the pillow hummed in several different tones. Listening very acutely, it was possible to distinguish clearly the high tones that dispersed like ants over all the humming.

One day, as he was looking through the window at women below beating carpets in the sun, D. wanted to attach an antenna to the pillow.

Digging through all his drawers and chests, D. found a piece of wire, stuck it into the pillow, and placed his ear to it.

At first only humming was heard as usual; then it disappeared, and a cross voice asked from the pillow:

"What do you want?"

"I don't know what I want . . ."

D. felt as if he had a pneumatic balloon on his shoulders instead of a head. A freshness emanated from the pillow, like a draft.

"He doesn't know what he wants." A stern voice was transmitted deep from within.

From the depths a laugh was heard and someone with a very pleasant voice began speaking. D. could not grasp the sense at all, although all the words were familiar.

"Do you want to be a prophet?" Suddenly the gruff voice came so close that D.'s ears began to buzz.

"I don't know . . ."

"Think about it. This is paradise. Do you want to be Napoleon, a banker?"

D. yanked out the antenna and put it on the floor. The pillow was paradise and he, D., was the keeper of paradise! Seizing the pillow, he capered around the room and stomped his feet. A pillow that you can toss around, sit on, sleep on—was paradise. D. was so happy he felt as if, should he cut his veins, rock would flow instead of blood. Then the room filled with red bison, and D. no longer remembered anything.

Opening his eyes, D. saw in wonder that he was sitting all covered with chestnut blossoms on a bench on an embankment beneath chestnut trees and clutching the pillow. Perhaps he had been sitting here for weeks, even months. On the other side of the canal the sun was busily spreading its particles on the buildings.

It had to be around noon. D. knew this section of the city well. Further along the embankment a school could be seen; it was there that he had studied. This particular thought troubled him. Why had he come here? He didn't like this part of town.

D. tried to unclasp his hands, which were clutching the pillow. They had become numb from long immobility and did not move. Finally his hands unclenched with a creak, and D. shook the shadows and chestnut blossoms from himself. But he did not feel like getting up. He sat and listened to the sentimental clanging of a fragment of chain on the wall of the embankment. This still bothered him, just as it used to, but he continued to listen.

Schoolchildren began leaving the school. No one was walking in the direction of D.'s seat, for the street was a dead end. D. thought how nice it would be to get married and have children. The schoolchildren parted company, and only the last little yellow girl was heading towards D. along the embankment.

"I own paradise!" said D. when the little girl came abreast of him. Suddenly he felt he must share his thoughts with someone.

"I am the keeper of paradise."

The little girl halted, frightened.

"I am the keeper of paradise."

D. stood up and held out the pillow to her.

"Do you have any candy?"

"I have paradise."

"Can I touch it? If you stand on the pillow, will all the saints inside suffocate?"

"This is paradise, it can't suffocate."

"And are there trees, rivers, goats? . . ."

"Yes."

The girl walked on thinking.

"And when you want something, will paradise do it for you?"

"It will."

"Even if you want a ton of candy?"

"Yes."

"Give me the pillow!"

"I can't, this is paradise!"

Suddenly the little girl snatched the pillow from him and threw it into the canal.

"Mummy doesn't like me to walk with strange old men."

She stuck out her tongue and ran off.

The pillow floated with the current, rocking gently.

Paradise! And D. threw himself in after paradise.

Diving into the water, he remembered that he couldn't swim. He wanted to cry out, but instead of water, he breathed in suns which began humming and revolving furiously inside of him,

Journal

growing bigger and bigger, all the while making it impossible to breathe. With his last surge of strength, D. stretched out his arms once more to where the sky ought to have been, and, at the point of surrender, he grabbed the pillow. In that instant the suns in him burst like soap bubbles, and he stepped forward.

The Shoes

On his birthday D. was given shoes as a gift. They were nice and shiny, but D. could not take a single step in them. The shoes were neither too small nor too large. On the contrary, D. always wore that size. But with this pair, as soon as he tried to put them on, he would be seized with such cramps that D. would fall down and lie in bed sick. So he firmly resolved to get rid of them, which was not an easy matter, as it turned out.

D. went to the first large shoe store, but there they refused to take them, saying that the shoes were of an unknown brand, that they hadn't been bought there, and that they could not accept such shoes. Finding himself outside the door, D. wished them to hell and, whistling crossly, headed towards a second and a third store. Then with growing fear he turned to shoemakers and friends: everywhere he went he got the same result. Even though everyone liked the shoes, which fitted feet both large or small, well-formed or misshapen, not even the bravest could wear them.

The fact that there existed shoes which could neither be worn nor sold so irritated D. that he was determined to sell them at any price, even though it might cost him his life. He felt he had to act this way to keep his self-respect.

Soon there was not a single person in the city whom D. had not approached. On his days off work, he took his shoes and travelled around the neighbourhood.

D. himself did not realize how the process of selling the shoes had become the substance of his life. If he had suddenly been able to sell the shoes, he would have become terribly unhappy.

With time the circle of his travels widened so far that D. had to quit his job. He left it with an easy heart—the job had long ago lost its significance for him. He sold the rest of his property, bought a knapsack, put his shoes in it, and went out into the world, leaving behind him countries, seasons of the year, and obligations.

One spring, indistinguishable from the previous ones, D. realized that he had travelled to every country and that it was time to live in train stations.

He liked living in train stations. There were enough customers, and he didn't have far to go. By this time D. had developed a particular type of sales pitch. His gestures were so convincing, so well-executed, that passersby involuntarily stopped in front of him like rabbits in front of a boa constrictor. D.'s frame, which had become tall and thin, could almost be seen in every corner of the station simultaneously. He looked as if he never felt tired; only his beard had already begun to grow bushy.

D. was known in every station. They even knew the story of his shoes. But with time the contents of this story were forgotten. It was depicted in various ways; all sorts of rumours began to circulate about it. Some people even asserted that D. was a prophet, and began to date the new era from the time of D.'s arrival at the station.

D. spent the nights in train cars, or in kiosks where all sorts of knick-knacks were sold. When suddenly, for reasons unknown even to himself, he stopped liking a spot, he would crawl into his knapsack that already had a few holes in it, and fall asleep. He ate very little, only whatever strangers gave him—his friends believed he never ate at all. But he really had quite enough.

His presence led to the rise of a new custom. It came to be considered a sign of good taste to try to buy his unwearable shoes at least once. In the city there was a man who had tried to buy them ninety-nine times, for which he was received in all the aristocratic homes, and the mayor of the city awarded him with a medal.

D.'s fame increased, and one day a loudspeaker that announced the departures and arrivals of the trains began to advertise his shoes. One could hear this announcement above the rumble and whistle of trains day and night; when the station was empty, the echo crawled out of the baggage cars. The initiator of the advertisement was one of D.'s pupils, as a certain number of odd people called themselves. They loafed in groups in front of the station and sometimes even tried to enter it. But all that was required was a single glance from D., and they would disappear without a trace.

D. could not bear them. It bothered him that someone was interfering in his personal affairs. It often seemed to him that to advertise the shoes was a profanation of that to which he had dedicated his life. To tell the truth, this did not happen very often, for he was only the keeper of the shoes, and anything existing beyond him basically did not interest him.

Time passed. In the city his followers continued to increase. They kept themselves at a distance, but from afar they watched his every movement and facial expression, trying to adopt them all in order that others in turn could imitate them. They

walked around with huge blackboards on which they would note down everything they thought D. might have said; they were drawing on the original sources.

D. was aging. His tall, skinny frame still caused everyone to be excited. But one day, while calling buyers, D. suddenly stopped in mid-word; he was no longer interested in selling the shoes. This happened as unexpectedly as if he had been run over by a street-car. D. listened to himself and tried to decide what was the matter, but did not understand anything. He still did not give up selling, but those gestures, which recently had been so striking, lost their persuasiveness, and passersby walked by without noticing him. According to habit, D. still called out for buyers, but instead of cries, little clumps of feeble whispers escaped from his throat, and it became clear to D. that the selling of the shoes, which had been his whole life, was to end forever. He walked around the train station as though he were seeing it for the first time. All his feelings were revolving around the shoes. Then he took out the shoes from his knapsack, fondled them with his sleeve, and sat down in front of them. They were shiny and beautiful, just as on that first day when he had received them as a gift. Since the time when D. had set forth into the world, he had not tried to put them on.

D. smiled at the shoes and slipped his feet into them. The shoes fit! It felt so airy and cosy in them, as if they had been ready and awaiting their master for a long time. D. had to feel them several times to convince himself they were actually on his feet.

D. jumped around in his satisfaction, then suddenly sensed his body was losing weight. He felt himself with his palms, looked at the shoes, and realized that the time had come for him to die. D. bounced up for the last time, performing a somersault in the air. His body was so light that he did not feel it at all. He put on his empty knapsack and left the station, where he had spent so many years.

They were washing the city streets. Streams of water splashed across the sidewalk like a membrane. The sun was setting across the entire horizon. Bakery boys were delivering baskets of sleepy rolls on bicycles. D. crossed the street, passed some buildings and, not hurrying, walked into the sun. From a distance his disciples followed him with their eyes but did not dare go after him. His black figure became gradually smaller and smaller. Now almost a speck, it entered the sun.

Then the sun pushed off from the earth and went across the sky.

Translated by Marta D. Olynyk
University of Toronto

Bohdan P. Nahaylo

**DZIUBA'S INTERNATIONALISM OR RUSSIFICATION?
REVISITED: A REAPPRAISAL OF DZIUBA'S TREATMENT
OF LENINIST NATIONALITIES POLICY**

More than ten eventful years have passed since Ivan Dziuba, the Ukrainian literary critic, wrote his penetrating study of the Soviet nationalities problem *Internationalism or Russification?*. Originally intended as a memorandum for the Party and government leaders of the Ukrainian SSR, it soon began to circulate widely in Ukrainian *samvydav* and Russian *samizdat*, and in 1968 it was published abroad in English.¹ Its appearance heralded the emergence of a Ukrainian human and national rights movement which was subsequently brutally suppressed by the Soviet authorities in 1972. Dziuba's study provides an eloquent and detailed statement of the Ukrainian national problem in the USSR and is generally regarded to be, in the words of Valentyn Moroz, "the most important document of the present-day Ukrainian rebirth."² It exposes and condemns what Dziuba calls Russian Great Power chauvinism and Russification in the Soviet nationalities policy, which, he argues, are causing the Ukrainian nation to experience a grave crisis threatening its very existence.

The fundamental reason for this critical state of affairs, according to Dziuba, is the violation and abandonment of the Leninist nationalities policy. Consequently, he devotes a very considerable part of his study to an examination of this policy and to outlining the means whereby it should be restored. It is precisely in this area, though, that Dziuba's main premises and methodology are open to serious criticism. This is particularly significant considering that before the repressions in Ukraine of 1972-73, the arguments of Ukrainian patriots were generally presented in Leninist rhetoric and in a tone similar to Dziuba's. This article will therefore attempt to present a critique of Dziuba's treatment of Lenin's nationalities policy and the Ukrainization policies of the 1920s in Soviet Ukraine.

At the outset, it should be stated that a closer examination of Lenin's thought on the nationalities question reveals many ambi-

¹ Ivan Dziuba, *Internationalism or Russification?: a Study in the Soviet Nationalities Problem* (London, 1968).

² Valentyn Moroz, "In the Midst of the Snows," in J. Kolasky, ed., *Report From the Beria Reserve: the Protest Writings of Valentyn Moroz* (Toronto, 1974), p. 102.

guities and inconsistencies. The basic reason for this is that Lenin's thought is an amalgam of theoretical and pragmatic elements. Lenin's writings prior to 1917 are those of a theoretician and revolutionary tactician, while his later ones reflect a statesman's and administrator's preoccupation with the task of solving urgent, daily, practical problems on a state scale. Lenin's statements, if misquoted or taken out of their context, can be used to support contradictory arguments. Lenin's successors based their claims to legitimacy on the notion of themselves as his heirs, who were continuing to develop the inheritance in accordance with his directives. Hence, Lenin's works came to be used as a "convenient grab bag of quotations,"³ by which to justify or to discredit a particular course of action. Not surprisingly, therefore, *Internationalism or Russification?* provides a case where the author uses Lenin to argue that Stalin and Khrushchev perverted Lenin's nationalities policy, whilst both Stalin and Khrushchev quoted Lenin in their speeches to emphasize that they were acting in accordance with Leninist principles.

To avoid confusion and distortion, it is necessary to place quotations from Lenin in the context of his evolving thought on the nationalities question, and to examine the circumstances in which he made the statements. This Dziuba often neglects to do, with the result that in his study Lenin is presented in a biased, idealized manner, as a sort of unblemished, omniscient hero. Moreover, several of Dziuba's statements about Lenin are based on very flimsy supporting evidence or are factually misleading.

Dziuba moulds his image of Lenin around the assertion that Lenin possessed an "incomparable sensitivity and susceptibility also in matters of nationality,"⁴ and accredits him with "profound and extensive understanding of questions of nationality" and "incredible intuition" in these matters.⁵ Though Lenin did show a greater concern about the nationalities question in the last stages of his life, studies of his thought on this subject indicate, in fact, that its importance to him was a function of its utility as a tactical weapon in his revolutionary arsenal. A. Low, for example, states that:

There was a streak of coolness, of indifference, toward the national movement in Lenin's thought. Neither [did] Lenin waste time defining, characterizing, and explaining the phenomena of nationality and nationalism. One will look in vain

³ A. G. Meyer, *Leninism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957), pp. 291-92.

⁴ Dziuba, p. 30.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

in his pertinent writings for a definition of nationality, for an exposition of its essence and character.⁶

Contrary to Dziuba's assessment, Lenin's attitude towards national sentiment was basically a negative one. Lenin viewed nationalism as a product of capitalism that would be surmounted by internationalism after the proletariat had seized power. He believed that the tendency of the whole historical process was "to break down national barriers, obliterate national distinctions, and to assimilate nations." This process was manifesting itself "more and more powerfully with every passing decade" and it constituted "one of the greatest driving forces transforming capitalism into socialism."⁷ He claimed that Marxism could not be reconciled with nationalism "be it even of the 'most just,' 'purest,' most refined and civilized branch."⁸ In the capitalist conditions of the bourgeois period, though, the duty of every Marxist was to "recognize and champion the equality of nations and languages" and to "fight against all national oppression or inequality."⁹ This he qualified with the instruction: "Combat all national oppression? Yes, of course! Fight for any kind of national development, for 'national culture' in general?—Of course not."¹⁰ He concluded that "the proletariat . . . far from undertaking to uphold the na-

⁶ A. D. Low, *Lenin on the Question of Nationality* (New York, 1958), p. 29. Another author comments that "Lenin's all-engrossing preoccupation with revolution at the cerebral as opposed to the emotional level, his life abroad in small isolated cosmopolitan communities: his seeming lack of response to literature and uninterest in history, save for the systematized elements in it he thought relevant to revolution—these things made him oddly unaware of the strength and variety of nationalist emotions." M. Holdsworth, "Lenin and the Nationalities Question," in L. Schapiro and P. Reddaway, eds., *Lenin the Man, the Theorist, the Leader: a Reappraisal* (London, 1967), pp. 289-90.

⁷ V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question," (1913) in *V. I. Lenin, Collected Works*, 4th ed. (Moscow, 1960). (This publication will be hereafter referred to as *CW*.) E. H. Carr points out that "Lenin never departed from the Marxist conception of 'national differences and antagonisms' as 'vanishing ever more and more' before the approach of socialism. He therefore never allowed them any long-term or absolute validity." *The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923*, Pelican ed. (London, 1969), 1:430.

⁸ Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question," *CW*, 20:34.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

tional development of every nation, on the contrary, warns the masses against such illusions . . . and welcomes every kind of assimilation of nations, except that which is founded on force or privilege.”¹¹ Lenin specified that by assimilation he meant “the shedding of national features, and the absorption by another nation.”¹²

Right up until his death, Lenin believed in the superiority and attraction of internationalism. He reasoned that “by transforming capitalism into socialism the proletariat creates the possibility of abolishing national oppression.” This in turn would “serve as the basis for developing the practical elimination of even the slightest national friction and the least national mistrust, for an accelerated drawing together and fusion of nations that will be completed when the state withers away.”¹³

The linchpin in Lenin’s statements on the nationalities question was the right of nations to national self-determination. By this he meant the right to secession and the formation of independent states.¹⁴ The use of this slogan was, however, purely tactical. By causing distrust between oppressed and oppressor nations to vanish, it was designed to bring nations together rather than to draw them apart. Lenin stressed that “the right of self-determination is an exception from our general premise of centralisation,” being “absolutely essential in view of reactionary Great Russian nationalism.”¹⁵ He explained that the Bolsheviks recognized this right “not because we have dreamt of splitting up the country economically, or of the ideal of small states, but, on the contrary, because we want large states and the closer unity and even fusion of nations, only on a truly democratic, truly internationalist basis, which is inconceivable without the freedom to secede.”¹⁶ When in power, in March 1919, at the Eight Congress of the RCP(b), Lenin

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 27.

¹³ Lenin, “The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up” (1916), *CW*, 22:325.

¹⁴ Lenin, “The Right of Nations to Self-Determination,” (1914), *CW*, 20:397.

¹⁵ Lenin, “A Letter to S. Shaumyan,” (1913), *CW*, 19:509.

¹⁶ Lenin, “The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination,” (1915) *CW*, 21:413-14. Stalin later commented that: “Lenin sometimes depicted the thesis on national self-determination in the guise of the simple formula: ‘disunion for union.’ Think of it—disunion for union. It even sounds like a paradox. And yet, this ‘contradictory’ formula reflects that living truth of Marx’s dialectics which en-

indicated the actual significance which the Bolsheviks attached to it, by declaring that the right to self-determination, the main plank in their nationalities policy, was "of less than secondary importance" to them as far as their Party programme was concerned.¹⁷

Despite the consistency of Lenin's attitude towards the assimilation and fusion of nations, Dziuba claims that to quote Lenin as supporting these processes is "a brutal distortion of the Leninist spirit." He qualifies this by saying that Lenin did not defend assimilation as such, but what Dziuba calls a spontaneous "political union of proletarians of all countries." Furthermore, he asserts that after 1917 "Lenin substantially shifted his emphasis and did not say *one more word* about the benefit of assimilation, but directed the whole force of the struggle against Russification, Great Russian chauvinism and Great-Power ideology, that is to say, in fact, *against assimilationism*."¹⁸

Here Dziuba seems to have either completely missed the point, or to be guilty of a misleading oversimplification. Lenin did not suddenly change his mind in 1917 and become opposed to "assimilationism." What he did in fact change was his tactical approach to the matter. He had, for example, hitherto opposed federation on principle as being a centrifugal force, but confronted with a difficult situation, he demonstrated his tactical skill and tactical flexibility by using federation as a centripetal force. In view of the disintegration of the Russian Empire and the strength of the national movements among the non-Russian nationalities, Lenin and the Bolsheviks adopted the federal idea as a means of welding together a fragmented empire. At this stage, any talk of the fusion of nations would have had no appeal to the nations that had broken away from Russia. It was now presented in a more acceptable form, disguised as the federal idea.¹⁹ Thus, in

ables the Bolsheviks to capture the most impregnable fortress in the sphere of the national question." "Political Report of the Central Committee to the Sixteenth Congress of C.P.S.U.(B), 27 June 1930, in J. V. Stalin, *Works* (Moscow, 1952-55), 12:381.

¹⁷ Lenin, "Speech Closing the Debate on the Party Programme, 19 March 1919," *CW*, 29:194.

¹⁸ Dziuba, p. 43.

¹⁹ Stalin later gave the following reasons for the acceptance of the federal idea: "First, the fact that at the time of the October Revolution a number of the nationalities were actually in a state of complete secession and complete isolation from one another, and, in view of this, federation represented a step forward from the division of the working masses of those nationalities to their closer union, their amalgamation. Secondly, the fact that the very forms of federation, which suggested themselves in

March 1919, at the Eighth Congress of the RCP(b), the Bolsheviks adopted a national programme which stated that: "in order to overcome the suspicion of the toiling masses of the oppressed countries towards the proletariat of the states which had oppressed these countries . . . as one of the transitional forms towards complete unity, the Party proposes a federal amalgamation of states organized on the Soviet pattern."²⁰ In 1920 the Second Congress of the Comintern endorsed this line, defining federalism as a "transitional form to complete union of the toilers of different nations."²¹

Dziuba's equation of Lenin's struggle against Great Russian chauvinism and Russification with a struggle against assimilationism is hardly tenable. Lenin was opposed to a specific type of assimilationism and not assimilationism in general. He was against the enforced assimilation of small nations by large nations, which he regarded as defeating its purpose. He stated this view unequivocally in December 1913 when he wrote to Shaumian, a fellow Bolshevik who wanted to promote Russian as the single state language:

Why will you not understand the psychology that is so important in the national question and which, if the slightest coercion is applied, besmirches, soils, nullifies the undoubtedly progressive importance of centralisation, large states, and a uniform language?²²

Lenin believed that, in order to effect the transition to socialism and to achieve internationalism, it was essential for the proletariat of the large oppressor nation to ensure for itself the maximum confidence of the non-Russians.²³ Great Russian chauvinism

the course of Soviet development, proved themselves by no means so contradictory to the aim of closer economic unity between the working masses of the nationalities of Russia as might have appeared formerly and even did not contradict this aim at all, as was subsequently demonstrated in practice. Thirdly, the fact that the national movement had proved to be far more weighty a factor than might have appeared formerly, in the period prior to the war, or in the period prior to the October Revolution." Stalin, *Works*, 3:32-33.

²⁰ TsK RKP(b), *Rossiiskaia Kommunisticheskaia Partia (bolshevikov) v rezoliutsiakh ee sezdov i konferentsii (1898-1922)* (Moscow-Petrograd, 1923), pp. 235-36.

²¹ A. Chugaev, *Obrazovanie Soiuza Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik* (Moscow, 1951), p. 24.

²² Lenin, "A Letter to S. Shaumyan," *CW*, 19:499.

²³ See, for example, Lenin's last notes on the nationalities question: "The Question of Nationalities or 'Autonomisation'," *CW*, 11:605.

and Russification would only perpetuate mistrust. Far from equating Great Russian chauvinism with assimilationism, Lenin in fact feared and opposed the former as a potential wrecker of the latter. Thus, for instance, the Tenth Congress of the RCP(b) in March 1921, at which Lenin condemned Great Russian chauvinism, passed a resolution which stressed that it was impossible to lay the foundations for internationalism in the borderlands without overcoming "colonialist and nationalist survivals" in the Party ranks. Consequently, the Congress considered that "the elimination of nationalist, primarily of colonialist vacillations in the border regions, is one of the Party's most important tasks in the border regions."²⁴ Two years later, at the Twelfth Congress of the RCP(b), Stalin went further and described Great Russian chauvinism as "the principal force impeding the union of the republics into a single union."²⁵

The weaknesses inherent in Dziuba's tendentiousness are most apparent in his analysis of Lenin's attitude towards Ukraine. Lenin is presented as a sympathetic patron of the Ukrainian nation who was persistent and tireless in stating the Ukrainian case despite opposition from the Bolshevik ranks.²⁶ According to Dziuba, the slogan of Ukrainian independence was tolerated in Lenin's day, and Lenin himself had an open mind on this question. "Far from considering all 'separatists' as agents of imperialism," Lenin "even recognized Bolsheviks among them," and adopted a "positive attitude" towards the Ukrainian Borotbist Communists.²⁷ Lenin insisted that the actual realization of the formal equality of nations that had been won in the October Revolution required an extended period of purposeful national construction. He therefore left clear instructions on how this was to be implemented. They were elaborated upon by the Tenth and Twelfth Congresses of the RCP(b) and form the basis of what Dziuba considers to be the Leninist nationalities policy. It was in direct agreement with their spirit that Ukrainization was carried out in Soviet Ukraine during the 1920s until the reversal of this policy by Stalin in the early 1930s.²⁸

This is not only a misleading portrayal of Lenin's attitude towards Ukraine, but also a simplistic explanation of how Ukrainization came about. Dziuba seems to take for granted that the

²⁴ *KPSS v rezoliutsiiakh i resheniiakh*, Part 1 (Moscow, 1954), pp. 562-63. English translation in Stalin, *Works*, 5:16-30.

²⁵ Stalin, *Works*, 5:249.

²⁶ For example, see Dziuba, p. 30.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

²⁸ For examples, see *ibid.*, pp. 127-30, 150-51.

nationalities policy embarked upon by the Bolsheviks in the 1920s was the logical outcome of Lenin's whole approach to the nationalities question. He fails to examine the extent to which the Leninist nationalities policy, the subject of so much praise in *Internationalism or Russification?*, was the product of situational considerations necessitating compromises, concessions, and deceit. Consequently, Dziuba does not probe at all deeply into the actual reasons for this policy. Neither does he attempt to deal with several possible questions which his approach raises. Why, for instance, did Stalin, the villain of Dziuba's book, support "national construction" and the "flowering of national cultures" throughout the 1920s, only to reverse Lenin's policy in the early 1930s? Why was Khvylovism branded as a "deviation" in the midst of the implementation of the Leninist nationalities policy when, according to Dziuba, Khvylovy was only opposing "Great-Power pressure in the Ukraine . . . that petty-bourgeois 'Great-Russian riff-raff' which Lenin attacked so violently."²⁹

Before 1917 Lenin's attitude towards Ukraine reflected his general approach to the nationalities question. He opposed the Great Russian discrimination against the Ukrainians, but also condemned those Ukrainian socialists who wanted to counteract the process of Russification in Ukraine by striving to instill national consciousness into the Ukrainian workers. At the end of 1913 he denounced the Ukrainian Social Democrat, Lev Iurkevych, who had called for Ukrainization work amongst the Russified proletariat, as being:

a short-sighted, narrow-minded, obtuse bourgeois at that, i.e., like a philistine, when he dismisses the benefits to be gained from the intercourse, amalgamation and assimilation of the proletariat of the two nations, for the sake of the momentary success of the Ukrainian national cause.³⁰

Recognizing the fact that the economic development of Ukraine was attracting "hundreds of thousands of peasants and workers from Great Russia," Lenin believed the resulting assimilation of Ukrainian with Russian workers to be an "undoubtedly progressive" fact. He asserted that Ukrainian and Russian workers "must work together, and, as long as they live in a single state, act in the closest organisational unity and concert, towards a com-

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

³⁰ Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question," (1913), *CW*, 20:32.

mon or international culture of the proletarian movement . . .”³¹ The only concessions that Lenin was prepared to advocate were “absolute tolerance in the question of the language in which the propaganda is conducted, and in the purely local or purely national details of that propaganda.”³²

Because of his defence of the right of nations to self-determination and condemnation of Great Russian oppression, Lenin no doubt succeeded in conveying the impression that he was concerned about the plight of the non-Russian peoples. In actual fact though, the nationalities question was for him, first and foremost, an instrument with which to weaken the tsarist autocracy and later the Provisional Government.³³ In the summer of 1917, for instance, Lenin supported the Ukrainian Central Rada’s demands for autonomy and castigated the Provisional Government for its procrastination in meeting this demand. At the same time, he also stated that no democrat could deny Ukraine’s right to free separation from Russia. Lenin’s rationale for this last statement was that “only unqualified recognition of this right makes it possible to advocate a free union of the Ukrainians and the Great Russians, a voluntary association of the two peoples in one state.”³⁴

A few months later Lenin and the Bolsheviks were themselves in power. Now, however, the right of nations to self-determination and the previous support for Ukrainian national demands were explained away, and in January 1918 Bolshevik forces invaded Ukraine. For a while it remained unclear whether or not the Bolsheviks even intended to respect the territorial integrity of the Ukrainian People’s Republic (UNR) that had been proclaimed by the Ukrainian Central Rada in November 1917. For a brief period in February 1918, the Bolsheviks appear to have been in favour of the creation of a Donetsk-Kryvyi Rih Soviet Republic from the rich industrial eastern part of Ukraine.³⁵ In March 1918, though, at the Second All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets, this idea was aban-

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 33.

³³ See S. F. Page, “Lenin and Self-Determination,” *The Slavonic and East European Review*, No. 71 (April, 1950), pp. 342-58, and J. S. Reshetar, “Lenin and the Ukraine,” *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the USA*, 9(1961):6-9.

³⁴ Lenin, “The Ukraine,” (1917), *CW*, 25:91.

³⁵ See J. Lawrynenko, *Ukrainian Communism and Soviet Russian Policy Toward the Ukraine: an Annotated Bibliography, 1917-1953* (New York, 1953), pp. 76-80 and the introduction by M. Luther to S. Mazlakh and V. Shakhrai, *On the Current Situation in the Ukraine* (Ann Arbor, 1970).

done, and an independent Ukrainian Soviet Republic was declared.³⁶ A month later, a Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) of Ukraine was formed at Tahanrih. It was to be organizationally separate from the RCP(b) and would join the Third International as an independent Communist party. But, as a student of this period points out:

Such independence in party matters Lenin would not tolerate. Homogeneity of the Communist movement and strict unity of its command had been cardinal tenets of his long before he had come to power, and perhaps the only principles to which he remained loyal throughout his life.³⁷

Within two months the Ukrainian party organization was brought into line. At the First Congress of the CP(b)U held in Moscow in July 1918, the CP(b)U was declared to be an integral and subordinate section of the RCP(b), thus having the same programme as the latter, and being ineligible to join the Third International.³⁸ What this meant in effect was that Ukraine would now be ruled by the Central Committee of the RCP(b).

In the next year and a half Lenin can hardly be said to have shown much sympathy for the Ukrainian national cause. As the collapse of the Central Powers took place, Lenin's attention was riveted to the prospect of the proletarian revolution spreading throughout Europe. For this reason the consolidation of Soviet rule in Ukraine assumed a secondary importance. Bolshevik troops, driven out of Ukraine by the Germans in the spring of 1918, were, however, back again in early 1919, bringing with them a Ukrainian Soviet government as a rival to the Ukrainian nationalist government known as the Directory. Disregarding Lenin's calls

³⁶ This seems to have been a purely tactical move. "Since . . . the RSFSR had signed a peace treaty with the Germans, prolonging the war with the Germans would have put Lenin in a difficult position. The Congress, therefore, declared Ukraine to be an independent state and its government to be in a state of war with the German occupying armies." V. Holubnychy, "Outline History of the Communist Party of the Ukraine," *Ukrainian Review*, Institute for the Study of the USSR, No. 6 (1958), p. 72. See also R. Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union*, Revised Edition (New York, 1974), p. 132.

³⁷ R. Pipes, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

³⁸ On these developments see R. Sullivant, *Soviet Politics and the Ukraine 1917-1957* (New York, 1962), Chapter 11, and J. Borys, *The Russian Communist Party and the Sovietization of Ukraine: a Study in the Communist Doctrine of the Self-Determination of Nations* (Stockholm, 1960), pp. 140-41.

for tact in dealing with the Ukrainian peasantry, the second Soviet Ukrainian government proved to be a failure like the first. Russification and hostility towards the Ukrainian language were characteristic of both regimes.³⁹ The second attempt to establish Soviet rule in Ukraine came to an abrupt end in August 1919 when Denikin's troops occupied a substantial part of Ukraine, including Kiev.

For most of 1919 Lenin does not seem to have understood the extent to which the revolution in Ukraine was both a social and a national one. Consequently he underestimated the national feelings of the Ukrainians. For instance, in March 1919 at the Eighth Congress of the RCP(b), Lenin stated that Ukraine had been separated from Russia by "exceptional circumstances." The national movement had not taken deep root there, and what there was of it had been "killed" by the Germans. Furthermore, Lenin revealed his ignorance about conditions in Ukraine when he added that "even as regards the language, it is not clear whether the Ukrainian language today is the language of the common people or not."⁴⁰ The culmination of this negative attitude towards Ukraine was reached in October 1919, when the Bolshevik leaders reversed their policy of encouraging a separate Ukrainian Soviet government. The Central Committee of the CP(b)U was dissolved, and direct control over the Ukrainian party organization was assumed by the Central Committee of the RCP(b).⁴¹

It is worthwhile to note that at this time two Ukrainian-born Bolsheviks expressed their profound disillusionment with the Party's policy towards Ukraine in a book entitled *On the Current Situation in the Ukraine*.⁴² What is particularly significant from the point of view of this article is the fact that the authors saw Lenin as talking about national self-determination while actually aiming to preserve the unity of the former Russian Empire. Unfortunately this book is still banned in the Soviet Union, and so Dziuba was unable to use a very valuable critique of Lenin's nationalities policy by Lenin's contemporaries.

The Bolshevik fiasco in Ukraine in 1919, pressure from Ukrainian Bolsheviks, and the need to consolidate Soviet control as Bolshevik troops once again occupied the country at the end of

³⁹ R. Pipes, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

⁴⁰ Lenin, "Speech Closing the Debate on the Party Programme, March 1919," *CW*, 29-194.

⁴¹ V. Holubnychy, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-77.

⁴² English translation: S. Mazlakh and V. Shakhrai, *On the Current Situation in the Ukraine* (Ann Arbor, 1970).

that year caused Lenin to reconsider Bolshevik policy towards Ukraine. Ukraine was hardly the ideal setting for a proletarian revolution. According to the 1926 census, Ukrainians comprised eighty percent of its population, Russians only nine percent, Jews five percent, and various ethnic groups the remainder. The fact of paramount importance was the existence of what Dziuba describes as "the conflict . . . between the Ukrainian-speaking peasantry and the predominantly Russian-speaking proletariat, between the Ukrainian village and the Russified city."⁴³ The Ukrainians were primarily a rural people, ninety percent of them living in the countryside. The urban centres of Ukraine, however, were dominated by Russians and Jews who comprised forty-eight percent of the inhabitants while the Ukrainians—only forty-seven percent.⁴⁴ Moreover, Russification was also taking its toll of the Ukrainian proletariat. Consequently the urban culture in Ukraine was predominantly Russian. What this meant was that the national division in Ukraine coincided with the cleavage between town and country. This situation raised a serious problem for the Bolsheviks. How were they to consolidate their control over a country of which the overwhelming majority of the population was both Ukrainian and rural in background, when, with their social base located in the Russified cities, they were essentially an alien and urban movement? Bolshevik experiences in Ukraine in 1918 and 1919 had shown them quite clearly that they had no real roots in Ukraine and that the CP(b)U was totally dependent on Russian backing. Furthermore, the Bolsheviks had underestimated the strength of Ukrainian nationalism which was now clearly a force to be reckoned with. At the end of 1919, for instance, the Ukrainian Borotbist Communists, who derived most of their support from the rural areas, had emerged as a serious rival to the CP(b)U.⁴⁵

In November 1919 Lenin drafted a resolution entitled "On Soviet Rule in Ukraine" in which he outlined his reappraised pol-

⁴³ Dziuba, p. 193.

⁴⁴ Tsentralnoe Statisticheskoe Upravlenie SSSR, Otdel Perepisi, *Vse-soiuznaia perepis naseleniia 1926 goda* (Moscow, 1927), 11:8-30.

⁴⁵ For an idea of the strength of Ukrainian nationalism in these crucial years, see O. Radkey's analysis of the election to the All-Russian Constituent Assembly in the autumn and winter of 1917: *The Election to the Russian Constituent Assembly of 1917* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950) and the conclusions made by A. E. Adams in his study: *Bolsheviks in the Ukraine* (New Haven, 1963). For details on the strength and activities of the Borotbists see I. Majstrenko, *Borotbism: a Chapter in the History of Ukrainian Communism* (New York, 1954), especially pp. 147-66.

icy. In early December it was endorsed by the Eighth Conference of the RCP(b).⁴⁶ The resolution began by repeating the Bolsheviks' recognition of the right of nations to self-determination and stated that "the RCP(b) holds consistently to the view that the independence of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic be recognized." Lenin had, nevertheless, personally insisted on the inclusion of "Clause Two" in the resolution. This stated that "the closest alliance of all Soviet republics in their struggle against the menacing forces of world imperialism is essential." The "form of that alliance must be finally decided by the Ukrainian workers and labouring peasants themselves." Until that time, relations between the Ukrainian SSR and the Russian SFSR would be of a federal nature. There now followed an implicit admission that the Bolsheviks had underestimated the importance of Ukrainian nationalism. To prevent the repetition of previous mistakes, the resolution obligated "all Party members to use every means to help remove all barriers in the way of the free development of the Ukrainian language and culture." The "greatest caution" was called for in dealing with the nationalist movement. Care was to be taken to ensure that Soviet institutions employed a sufficient number of Ukrainian-speaking personnel and that Party officials obtained at least a basic understanding of the Ukrainian language. Party members were instructed that "they must in every way counteract attempts at Russification that push the Ukrainian language into the background and must convert that language into an instrument for the communist education of the working people."⁴⁷ The final parts of the resolution dealt with the need to conciliate the peasantry. Efforts were to be made to win the confidence of the peasants and to form a close bond between them and the Soviet institutions.

A few weeks after this resolution was passed, Lenin indicated the importance of the Ukrainian question by sending a personal appeal to the workers and peasants of Ukraine.⁴⁸ To what had already been stated in the previous Party resolution, Lenin added an emphatic argument for the need for the closest possible union of the toilers of different nations against the forces of world im-

⁴⁶ Lenin, "Draft Resolution of the CC RCP(B) on Soviet Rule in the Ukraine," *CW*, 30:163-66.

⁴⁷ It is worthwhile to note that the word *Russification* is given only up to the fourth edition of Lenin's *Collected Works*, which appeared in 1950. In the 1963 fifth edition it is absent, and its place taken by the expression: "all *obstacles* in the way of the free development of the Ukrainian language and culture . . ." *CW*, 5th edition, 39:139.

⁴⁸ Lenin, "Letter to the Workers and Peasants of the Ukraine A Propos of the Victories Over Denikin," *CW*, 30:291-97.

perialism. He made it quite clear what the Bolsheviks stood for as far as the nationalities question was concerned:

We are opposed to national enmity and discord, to national exclusiveness. We are internationalists. We stand for the close union and the complete amalgamation of the workers and peasants of all nations in a single world Soviet republic.

This union of nations was to be voluntary, without national oppression, and based on complete trust. Lenin added, though, that it was impossible to achieve such a union straight away. It could only be accomplished "with the greatest patience and circumspection, so as not to spoil matters and not to arouse distrust . . ." For this reason he warned Russian Party members to be very tactful in their approach to Ukrainian-Russian relations so as not to be accused of being Great Russian chauvinists.

What did Lenin's reappraisal of the Bolshevik policy amount to? Firstly, he recognized that the strength of Ukrainian nationalism necessitated certain concessions. He also realized the psychological importance of allowing a hitherto oppressed people to freely use its own language. Consequently "the right of the working people to study in the Ukrainian language and to speak their native language" was to be given actual recognition two years after the Revolution had taken place. It is important to remember, though, that this concession was not designed to foster national differences and peculiarities. Lenin saw it as a means of removing the mistrust between the Ukrainians and Russians which stood in the way of a fusion of the two peoples. Furthermore, he did not intend that the national element in Ukrainian culture be developed by this measure.⁴⁹ Rather, the Ukrainian language was to be used as the most efficient instrument of Soviet propaganda, providing the essential bridge between Soviet power and the Ukrainian masses.

Secondly, Lenin recognized the fact that for Soviet rule to be consolidated in Ukraine, it was necessary to conciliate the peasantry. Thus Lenin anticipated the idea of the *smychka* in the NEP period, when he stressed the need for a block with the peasantry of Ukraine. The Party was now to adopt a more tactful approach to the peasantry, with the aim of winning its confidence and support. Lenin also minimized the differences between the Bolsheviks

⁴⁹ For example, at the Eighth Congress of the RCP(b), Lenin called upon the Borotbists to disband the Ukrainian Teacher's Union, which was playing an important role in bringing about the Ukrainian national revival. This call was presented in the name of the "principles of proletarian communist policy." Lenin, "Speech Summing Up the Debate on Soviet Power in the Ukraine," *CW*, 30:193-94.

and the Ukrainian Borotbist Communists in order to make use of them in the improvement of relations with the peasantry.

Lenin's approach towards the Borotbists provides a very good example of his tactical adroitness and his lack of scruples about saying one thing and doing something quite different. In his "Letter to the Workers and Peasants of the Ukraine," Lenin wrote that:

... We Great-Russian Communists must make concessions when there are differences with the Ukrainian Bolshevik Communists and Borotbists and these differences concern the state independence of the Ukraine, the forms of her alliance with Russia, and the national question in general.

He explained that "the Bolsheviks will not make of this a subject of difference and disunity, they do not regard this as an obstacle to concerted proletarian effort." Dziuba, incidentally, includes this quotation in his study, adding that "the Borotbists met with a positive attitude" from Lenin.⁵⁰ What Dziuba fails to mention, however, is the fact that just two months later Lenin wrote about the Borotbists in quite a different tone:

The Borotbists shall be qualified as a party, which, by its propaganda aimed at splitting the military forces and supporting banditry, is violating the basic principles of communism, thereby playing into the hands of the Whites and international imperialism.

Also opposed to the interests of the proletariat is their struggle against the slogan calling for a close alliance with the RSFSR.

The whole policy must be systematically and steadily aimed at the dissolution of the Borotbists in the near future. To this end, not a single misdeed on the part of the Borotbists should be allowed to pass without being immediately and strictly punished. In particular, information should be collected concerning the non-proletarian and most disloyal nature of the majority of their party members.

The moment for their dissolution shall be determined within a short time by the Politbureau and communicated to the Ukrainian Revolutionary Committee.⁵¹

⁵⁰ Dziuba, p. 57.

⁵¹ Lenin, "Draft Resolution on the Ukrainian Borotbist Party," 6 February 1920, *CW*, 42:174-75. Several days later Lenin issued a secret directive: "I strongly urge that the Borotbists be accused not of nationalism, but of counter-revolutionary and petty-bourgeois tendencies." "Remarks on the Resolution of the Executive of the Communist International on the Borotbists," 22 February 1920, *CW*, 42:180-81.

Lenin's instructions, calling for greater tact in the application of the Bolshevik nationalities policy, proved to be largely ineffective due to his emphasis on unity and the continued insistence on centralism. Centralization increased rapidly in the next few years, and with it grew Great Russian chauvinism and Russification. The great majority of the members of the Party organization were Russians, and their behaviour seldom reflected Lenin's ideas about what constituted internationalism. Dziuba correctly points out that the early 1920s produced abundant complaints about the permeation of Great Russian chauvinism into the Party apparatus. Lenin's complaints about the growth of Great Russian chauvinism and about the way that the nationalities policy was being implemented remained, however, ineffective. This was only partly due to the fact that, within the structure of the unitary and centralized party that Lenin had created, Stalin and his close supporters were building up their own power base and were able to disregard Lenin's pleas for caution and tact.⁵²

Stalin was Lenin's pupil, and his first-hand experience of dealing with nationalism probably made him more aware of the fact that national feelings were deeply rooted in the non-Russian peoples. Yet he certainly lacked the finesse of his mentor, and was not as tactful in his pronouncements about the desired form of the new Soviet state. For instance, on 10 October 1920 Stalin wrote in *Pravda* that "Central Russia, that hearth of world revolution, cannot hold out long without the assistance of the border regions, which abound in raw materials, fuel and foodstuffs." As a result of this, he argued that "the interests of the masses render the demand for secession of the border regions, at the present stage of the revolution, a profoundly counter-revolutionary one." Like Lenin, though, he realized the need for concessions to be made to the border states, for without them "the real sovietization of these regions, and their conversion into Soviet countries closely bound with Central Russia in one integral state is inconceivable."⁵³

⁵² L. Schapiro, *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, 2nd ed. (London, 1970), p. 228. Richard Pipes notes that: "Of the three outstanding Communist leaders in the early 1920's, Stalin seems to have realized most clearly the contradiction inherent in the Communist nationality policy; Lenin approved all the measures giving priority to the Russians, though he winced at their inevitable consequences; while Trotsky showed little interest in the whole national question. Stalin, however, placed himself squarely on the side of the central apparatus and identified himself with the Great Russian core of the party and state bureaucracy." R. Pipes, *op. cit.*, pp. 280-81.

⁵³ Stalin, *Works*, 4:363. A clear example of Stalin's attitude is pro-

During the remainder of Lenin's active political life, the state relationships between the RSFSR and the Ukrainian Soviet state were strengthened. Complying with Lenin's call for the closest possible unity between the Ukrainians and the Russians, the Fifth Conference of the CP(b)U declared in November 1920 that "a complete separation of these two states is merely an artificial process, in contradiction with the entire past and future struggle of the Ukrainian workers and peasants."⁵⁴ On 28 December 1920 a Treaty of Alliance was concluded between the Ukrainian SSR and the Russian SFSR. It resulted in a close military and economic alliance between the two states. The Ukrainian SSR was left four areas of jurisdiction: foreign affairs, agriculture, justice, and education.⁵⁵ Subsequently though, violations of the Ukrainian state's rights became the rule rather than the exception, giving rise to bitter complaints from some of the leaders of the CP(b)U. Between 1921 and 1922 Ukraine was in fact treated by the Party leadership as an intrinsic part of Russia. In such circumstances, as R. McNeal points out, it was not surprising that:

When preliminary work on the transformation of the independent Soviet republics into a federal union began in September 1922, Stalin still took it for granted that the new federation would be merely an expansion of the RSFSR.⁵⁶

Lenin, however, insisted that the federal scheme contain a formal semblance of equality for the constituent states. He realized both the psychological importance of such a scheme in overcoming the distrust of the non-Russian peoples towards the Great Russians, and its propaganda value in winning the support of other nationalist movements in colonial or semicolonial areas. In actuality, though, national equality remained a legal fiction in the new Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in which the federal form of the Union was negated by virtue of the fact that the ruling party, police, and government remained unitary and centralized.

Even in his last notes on the nationalities question, Lenin did not face up to the fact that the shortcomings of the nationalities

vided on the occasion of his sending a telegram, as Commissar for Nationalities, to the Soviet Ukrainian government on 4 April 1918. Stalin exclaimed: "Enough playing at a government and a republic. It's time to drop that game; enough is enough." Reproduced in R. Medvedev, *Let History Judge* (London, 1972), p. 16.

⁵⁴ See I. Majstrenko, *op. cit.*, pp. 212-17.

⁵⁵ R. Sullivant, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-61.

⁵⁶ R. McNeal, "Stalin's Conception of Soviet Federalism," *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the USA*, 9(1961):17.

policy stemmed from his own peculiar understanding of the national problem in its entirety, and from the nature of the highly centralized system of rule which he had set up. Instead, he blamed "bourgeois and tsarist" elements in the Party and state apparatuses for producing "that really Russian man, the Great-Russian chauvinist, in substance a rascal and a tyrant, such as the typical Russian bureaucrat is."⁵⁷ Yet, those who had drawn out this statement from him by upsetting him with their handling of the Georgian problem were not former tsarist bureaucrats, but his pupils and high ranking Party officials.⁵⁸ Consequently, it is not surprising that Richard Pipes came to the conclusion that:

In the end, Lenin's national programme reduced itself to a matter of personal behaviour: it depended for the solution of the complex problems of a multinational empire upon the tact and goodwill of Communist officials. To Lenin such a solution seemed perfectly feasible, in part because he himself was a stranger to national prejudices, and in part because he believed that the establishment of Communism destroyed the soil in which nationalism could flourish.⁵⁹

Lenin's expectations proved to be naive and, what is worse, he does not seem to have considered seriously enough the possibility that Communists might fail to live up to his high standards.

In his last memorandum on the nationalities problem, Lenin insisted that the union of socialist republics must be retained and strengthened. As always, he emphasized the vital importance of the Russian proletariat, ensuring for it the maximum confidence of the non-Russians in the proletarian class struggle. In order to achieve this, Lenin stated that "in one way or another, by one's attitude or by concessions, it is necessary to compensate the non-Russians for the lack of trust, for the suspicion and the insults to which the government of the 'dominant' nation subjected them in the past." Having distinguished between the nationalism of an oppressor "great" nation and the nationalism of an oppressed "small" nation, Lenin argued that, in view of the latter's sensitivity to the feeling of equality, it was "better to overdo rather than underdo the concessions and leniency towards the national minorities." He also stressed how important it was that peoples

⁵⁷ Lenin, "The Question of Nationalities or 'Autonomisation' " (30-31 December 1922), *CW*, 36:605-11.

⁵⁸ For details on the nationalities problem at this time, especially the Georgian problem, see M. Lewin, *Lenin's Last Struggle* (London, 1973), especially pp. 43-63.

⁵⁹ R. Pipes, *op. cit.*, p. 277.

outside the USSR should not be given reason to doubt the sincerity of the Communists by lapses "into imperialist attitudes towards oppressed nationalities," which would undermine "all our principled sincerity."⁶⁰

Dziuba makes much use of this memorandum on the nationalities question to bolster up his image of Lenin.⁶¹ However, although Lenin vehemently condemned Great Russian chauvinism, he can hardly be said to have provided adequate remedies for the problem. In fact, the only practical corrective measures which he proposed were a detailed code of behaviour for Russian Communist officials working in the non-Russian republics, and strict rules concerning the use of the national languages in these areas. These regulations were to be drawn up by native officials. What Lenin was in fact doing, as Leonard Schapiro points out, was seeing, deploring, and trying to deal with the symptoms, but failing to diagnose the disease.⁶²

Lenin's instructions on the necessity to make concessions to the non-Russian peoples, so as to prevent their complete alienation from Soviet rule, had already been recognized by the Eighth Conference and the Tenth Congress of the RCP(b). In actual fact their pertinent resolutions remained only declarative. The years 1919 to 1923 saw the destruction or absorption of Ukrainian political, economic, trade union, and cultural organizations as independent institutions.⁶³ In 1921, for instance, a purge of the CP(b)U resulted in the removal of a large part of its Ukrainian element.⁶⁴ A Soviet historian of the time, M. Popov, actually describes the period between the Tenth and the Twelfth Congresses of the RCP(b) (1921-1923) as one of inertia as far as the implementation of the nationalities policy was concerned.⁶⁵ Thus, despite what Dziuba refers to as "a number of extremely sharp interventions" by Lenin against "the Party's national nihilism," the gap between theory and practice remained as wide as ever.

⁶⁰ Lenin, *CW*, 36:605-611.

⁶¹ See Dziuba, pp. 25, 30-31, 60-61, 104, 126.

⁶² L. Schapiro, *op. cit.*, p. 233.

⁶³ B. Dmytryshyn, *Moscow and the Ukraine 1918-1953* (New York, 1956), pp. 48-56.

⁶⁴ The Ukrainian Bolshevik leader M. Skrypnyk complained at the Twelfth Congress of the RCP(b) in April 1923 that of the 4,000 or so Borotbists that had joined the CP(b)U, only 118 remained members at the time of the Congress. M. Skrypnyk, *Statti i promovy z nationalnoho pytannia* (Munich-New York, 1974), pp. 23-28.

⁶⁵ N. N. Popov, *Narys istorii Komunistychnoi Partii Bilshovykiv Ukrainy*, 5th ed. (Kharkiv, 1931), p. 265.

The whole question of Ukrainization during the 1920s is treated superficially in *Internationalism or Russification?*, for the author's main concern is not to analyse this development, but to present it as a model policy that should be followed today. Apart from attributing it to Lenin's efforts to "re-orientate the Party's nationalities policy . . . to practical national construction and protection from Great-Power rapacity,"⁶⁶ Dziuba does not attempt to provide any detailed explanation why the policy of Ukrainization was adopted in the 1920s. Lenin, as has been argued in this article, was far from being sympathetic to any form of national development. His concessions to the non-Russian nationalities reflected his tactical flexibility, and were based on the principle of "one step forward, two steps back." Clearly then, if Lenin and his Bolshevik colleagues were not favourably disposed towards the perpetuation of national differences and peculiarities, Dziuba's interpretation of the genesis of Ukrainization is inadequate, and other reasons for its adoption need to be proposed.

By way of conclusion, a brief attempt will be made to explain why Dziuba wrote *Internationalism or Russification?* in a way that left his treatment of Lenin's nationalities policy open to serious criticism. The first and the least plausible reason is, of course, that Dziuba is a Marxist-Leninist, and as such may have genuinely given Lenin the benefit of any doubt. Secondly, the circumstances in which Dziuba wrote his study meant that this was the only relatively safe way of approaching such a sensitive topic. Dziuba intended *Internationalism or Russification?* to be seen by Ukraine's highest-ranking Party and state officials and therefore wrote his study accordingly. Moreover, his use of Leninist rhetoric made his arguments both embarrassing for the authorities and difficult to refute. Another reason connected with this seems to have been the intention to use the 1920s both as a precedent for what should be done today, and as a yardstick against which to measure how little of anything positive is in actual fact being done, and how much negative is.

But could there be another reason, one that would account for Dziuba's naive treatment of the Leninist nationalities policy, and also throw light onto the actual aims of his study? A closer examination of *Internationalism or Russification?*, of Lenin's nationalities policy, and of the 1920s in Ukraine does in fact suggest that there may be more to his study than first meets the eye. It is hard to accept that Dziuba was not fully aware of the biased manner in which he presented his material. But if the possibility is

⁶⁶ Dziuba, p. 31.

considered that *Internationalism or Russification?* was written for more than one audience and on more than one level, then Dziuba's tendentiousness may be explained in terms of an underlying purpose.

Firstly, it is plausible that in this study, by means of irony, insinuation, and the drawing of particular historical parallels, Dziuba is delivering a veiled criticism of a very important fact about Lenin's nationalities policy. Whilst Dziuba praises Lenin's statements in this area, he nevertheless criticizes the gap that persisted between theory and practice when Lenin himself was in power. For instance, he eulogizes Lenin's efforts to persuade his colleagues to combat Great Russian chauvinism and to make concessions to the non-Russian nationalities, yet he also implies that Lenin's statements remained only declarative. Thus, Dziuba includes Zatonsky's remark that Lenin's condemnation of promitive Russophilism (*rusotiapstvo*) came "unfortunately when it was already late in the day, only at the end of 1919, and even then only at the Party Conference."⁶⁷ Elsewhere, Dziuba describes Lenin as encountering in December 1922, after a lengthy absence from practical leadership due to illness, "the real state of affairs"⁶⁸ in the nationalities question and experiencing a profound shock. This suggests that Lenin had not anticipated the consequences of the nationalities programme of which he was the main author, and that his realization of the size of the gap separating theory from practice was belated.

Secondly, it appears that an important underlying theme of *Internationalism or Russification?* is the implicitly emphasized historical continuity of Great Russian chauvinism and concomitant Russification. Apart from declaring that "the intentional or unintentional confusion of the USSR with 'Russia, one and indivisible' " has "been absorbed into the bloodstream of many people and manifest themselves in a variety of ways,"⁶⁹ Dziuba reveals the extent to which tsarist and Soviet nationalities policies have overlapped. He states that Russian tsarist colonialism, being directed "towards neighbouring lands," was "not limited to the imposition of a colonial administration and to economic exploitation but developed into full assimilation, into a social digestion of conquered countries." Tsarist colonialism recognized its neighbouring peoples "generously as equal citizens of the Empire and bestowed all 'rights' on them, and only went to war against them to affix to

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

them by any means whatsoever this equality and these rights.”⁷⁰ On the question of equality, Dziuba comments sarcastically that “legally and formally everybody was ‘equal’ in the Russian Empire (that is to say, equal slaves).”⁷¹

It does not require much stretching of the imagination to see, for instance, the parallels between the “voluntary” reunions and annexations of tsarist times,⁷² and the “voluntary” union of Ukraine and Russia under Bolshevik rule. When Dziuba says that “it is known that in the Ukraine [tsardom] established serfdom, brought ravages, deprived the nation of its intelligentsia, and extinguished all the centres of cultural life,”⁷³ the parallels with the collectivization, famine, purges, and Russification that have taken place under its successor are evident. Thus, for example, Dziuba talks of the fact that the “necessity for regulation and intensification in the economic field was advanced as the main reason for abolishing the vestiges of Ukrainian home-rule in the times of Catherine II,”⁷⁴ yet he could just as well be talking about the reasons given for the destruction of Ukrainization in the period of collectivization and industrialization, or, what is even more significant, about the period from 1918 to 1922, during which Ukraine was absorbed by the Soviet system of rule. Dziuba stresses that “the artful contrivings of national oppression in tsarist Russia” were “concealed behind a very noble facade, so that not everyone saw it at the time.”⁷⁵ In striking at the very heart of the matter, the gap between theory and practice in the nationalities policy, Dziuba invites his readers to read between the lines and to draw their own conclusions from the parallels:

Marx, Engels and Lenin considered Russian tsarist colonialism and oppression to be the most dreadful in the world, not least because it reached the peaks of hypocrisy and cynicism in using the noblest phraseology for the basest purpose and because it was so efficient at concealing the reality behind the outward appearances of things.⁷⁶

Finally, it is interesting to note that when Dziuba’s house was searched in the early part of 1972, the complete works of V. I. Le-

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

⁷² For examples, see *ibid.*, p. 74.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

nin with "notes in the margins and phrases underlined" were confiscated.⁷⁷ It would seem that Lenin in the hands of an avowed Leninist is both a threat and an embarrassment to the present-day Soviet regime.

*London School of Economics
and Political Science*

⁷⁷ *A Chronicle of Current Events*, No. 24 (5 March 1972), pp. 138-39.

WHY CAPITULATE?: IVAN DZIUBA'S TRAUMA

In recent years there has been much discussion concerning the reasons for Ivan Dziuba's breakdown and capitulation. Valentyn Moroz was the first to try and convince Dziuba to remain that "uncompromising man of principle" that he was. Moroz quotes Dziuba himself about the significance of such persons: "people do not wait for anything as much as for a living example . . . because they need to be confident that today such deeds are necessary and possible, and that today they are not fruitless."¹ This was, according to Moroz, the role of the writers of the sixties: to give Ukrainian cultural and political life a spark of inspiration and melt the ice of indifference and nihilism. Ivan Dziuba became the symbol of the post-Stalin renaissance. Yet after Dziuba became threatened, encouraged by those who favour compromise in the face of repression, he wrote his petty "Statement" of 1969, this devaluation of words which inevitably leads to the devaluation of concepts. Moroz advanced the idea of a "total dedication" leadership, similar to the concepts of the interwar Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists. He asserted that what is needed to reawaken Ukraine and bring her out of the state of "permanent winter" is not people who compromise and call themselves "realists," but "Don Quixotes," people inspired, motivated by total conviction, commitment, and faith; people who would carry on against overwhelming odds in spite of seeming hopelessness and without fear of the consequences. Ukraine lives by the logic of the "totally inspired," not by the "realists"—those "wise piglets" who have always seen and been frightened by the "hopelessness" of reality. Moroz argued that Dziuba's book, *Internationalism or Russification?*, found its significance *not* in any new arguments against Russification, but rather in its "faith, charged with inspiration" and Dziuba's living example. Dziuba the apostle had ten times the strength of Dziuba the theorist! For Moroz the loss of fervour means spiritual death. To compare inspiration to daily work is to compare matches to firewood. Rare is the one who, like Dziuba, becomes a god for thousands of people. Without a god, there are no people. The "system" had to get Dziuba to poison the awakened

¹ Valentyn Moroz, "In the Midst of the Snows" in *Report from the Beria Reserve*, edited and translated by John Kolasky (Toronto, 1974), p. 88.

faith and return people into a state of dead nihilism. Ukraine does not need "realists." It needs aristocrats of the spirit.

If one carries Moroz's argument one step further, one can conclude that Dziuba's downfall was a direct result of his lack of Don Quixotic fervour and inspiration, a lack of that "faith charged with inspiration," and of too much logic and "realism." Yet Leonid Pliushch seems to argue quite to the contrary. He mentions that Dziuba had been furious at the poet Ivan Drach for writing an article against his conscience, yet he maintained contacts with Drach and company, justifying this with the argument that "otherwise they will turn into reactionaries." When one observed that opportunism toward opportunists morally harmed Dziuba himself, he only smiled. Pliushch calls the 1969 "Statement" the first opportunistic step, an effort to win at least a few years more of writing time. But Pliushch disagrees with any type of "personality cult," what Moroz called "Dziuba the god" or "Dziuba the apostle and symbol." Pliushch was never for any type of "Dziubism" because of its tremendous potential for harm. When Pliushch read of Dziuba's capitulation, he was not so shocked at the fall of a national symbol as he was at the fall of an unusually refined and previously dedicated civil rights defender.

Pliushch called Dziuba's capitulation "the ultimate in shameless treason." What led to Dziuba's "janissaryship"? According to Pliushch, it was first of all a lack of ideological foundation, combined with Dziuba's apoliticism and opportunism towards opportunists. The second reason was Dziuba's love of himself, his daughter, his wife, and Ukraine (that is its spirit and culture, but *not* nation). Pliushch sees the clarification of this problem in the innuendos of Dziuba's weakness demonstrated in his *Internationalism or Russification?* Is Dziuba a principled Marxist? Bohdan Stenchuk, in his official rebuttal of Dziuba's book, showed that Dziuba's Marxism is a "quotation-based" Marxism. Thus, Lenin could be quoted as both "for" and "against" Ukrainian nationalism. It was suggested that Dziuba show the evolution of Marxism on the national question from Marx to late Lenin, thereby demonstrating that there definitely was a development of theory from the nonrecognition of nationalities' rights to their fullest recognition. Naturally this meant that, without bowing to the "Marxist classics," Dziuba had to bring out the errors of views on the national question until Lenin, who himself only in his last years finally came to the correct conclusions. Unfortunately, Dziuba did not want to embark upon what he called "boring polemics" with Stenchuk. And this is precisely where, in Pliushch's opinion, Dziuba's weakness shows most clearly. Pliushch sees *Internationalism or Russification?* to be based too much on emotion

and too little on logic and reason. Therefore it is written in a language that technocrats really do not comprehend. Dziuba uses only one argument, namely, "if one is raping your mother, you do not ask whether she enjoys it, you beat the culprit." This is obviously an argument based on emotion, one that in fact rejects the use of logic in such situations. Pliushch thinks this is insufficient. These emotional arguments were enough perhaps for Dziuba to stand up for his mother's dignity, but they proved insufficient to defend Dziuba in the face of KGB pressure, terror, trickery, and "quotations." Dziuba simply did not have the ideological base to survive.

One can perhaps understand Moroz's "emotionalism" and Pliushch's "appeal to logic" if one considers their occupations (Pliushch is a mathematician, Moroz—a teacher-historian), yet neither seems to definitely account for Dziuba's actions. It is simple to speculate. There have been all types of explanations put forth by emigré commentators: the preachers, the mourners, the intellectual chastizers, and even the pessimistic gravediggers. Perhaps the most frequently expressed opinion is that Dziuba could not abide by the principle of "you can kill me, but I'll never give in!", and therefore he repented. Yet this reason seems too simplistic and shallow, though it cannot be totally ignored. One should not attribute it all to "personal tragedy" or to "poor state of health," for these factors hardly ever played the ultimate role for any "truly revolutionary dissident." Dziuba the prisoner had much time to think over and realize his historic role.

There is another interpretation, voiced by Kosach, which can be somewhat applied to Dziuba's case (though with a completely ulterior motive in mind).² For the birth of a revolutionary, what is necessary is an unbroken contact with the masses of his nation, society, or at least a group of the elite. The greatest tragedy of this type of revolutionary is not death, but the feeling of solitude." Imagine Ostap Bulba yelling to an alien, threatening crowd while in the last throes of death: "Do you hear father?" Knowing well the reply would be: "I hear, my son." The Decembrist martyrs knew very well they were not alone; so did Shevchenko. The martyrdom had allies and a cause. One may call this contact between the revolutionary and his group "mystical," but it is there. Letting imagination run wild, one can imagine Dziuba sitting in prison, looking out, and whispering: "Do you hear father?" And in response hearing nothing but damned, infinite silence. The "mystical" unity between the revolutionary and his people was not there.

² Iu. Kosach, "Elehiia na samitnist," *Ukrainske Zhyttia*, December 23, 1973.

Dziuba lost contact with his movement. Why? The answer is not that Dziuba was isolated in Ukraine as a dissident, which is probably what Kosach wanted to point out to his readers, but that the *Shelestivshchyna*, upon which all of Dziuba's "reformist" hopes were based, was purged in 1972. His protectors, his comrades-in-arms, the people he was pressuring for a more active support of Ukrainian national claims were deposed. So what was the use? The worst thing that can happen to a leader is for him to be forced to take the helm when the movement is "not up to it yet," or completely crushed, as was the *Shelestivshchyna*. How then does one explain the Morozes, who did not lose contact with the movement? Perhaps the Morozes were much more dedicated to the cause, more of the "Don Quixotic" type, who continue despite the worst conditions. But what was their cause? Where was it? If it had not disappeared with the hopes attached to the *Shelestivshchyna*, then where is the explanation for the Morozes? The answer lies in the fact that the Morozes saw the movement as being *not* necessarily through the party (i.e. Shelest), but through a general Ukrainian revival, regardless of what administration is at the helm. Dziuba's opposition was tied to the system, and as long as the system offered some minimal opportunities, the movement remained alive. The Don Quixotism of Moroz was tied to fundamental dissent. On the other hand, Dziuba, a citizen of Kiev and member of the Kiev branch of the Writers' Union of Ukraine, whose president was O. Honchar (author of the controversial *Sobor* and personal friend of Shelest), could not avoid contacts with the Soviet Ukrainian establishment. And when the system seemed to be offering genuine opportunities for reform, or at least a possibility of reform, then Dziuba naturally turned into a full-blown activist-lobbyist-reformer. The *Shelestivshchyna* could not possibly have gained many contacts with the Morozes living far away from Kiev, which explains in part the frequent arrests and persecutions of such Morozes but not the Dziubas, or at least not to the same degree. The Morozes became tied to the general dissident movement out of necessity; the Dziubas did not because of the greater opportunities offered to them by being in Kiev. The *Shelestivshchyna* fell in 1972, but not all of the dissident movement went down with it. Unlike Dziuba, Moroz could justifiably feel that the answer to the revolutionary's question would still be there.

What proof is there that Dziuba's Don Quixotism was based on the possibility for reform? It can be found in Shelest's own book *Ukraino nasha Radianska*, in Shelest's efforts to improve the status of the Ukrainian language in higher educational institutions of the republic (see Dadenkov's speech delivered at a meeting of the rectors of the higher educational institu-

tions in August 1965), and Shelest's speeches, especially the one given to the Fifth Congress of Ukrainian Writers in November 1966, in which he made his now famous programmatic statement:

We must treat our beautiful Ukrainian language with great care and respect. It is our treasure, our great heritage, which all of us, but in the first place you, our writers, must preserve and develop. Novels, short stories, and poetry of high ideological content written in our beautiful language on a high artistic level—all are indispensable for further development of the national culture and language. Your efforts in this direction have always been and will be supported by the Communist Party.³

How should a Dziuba react when he hears such a speech coming from the most important and powerful man in Ukraine? In no other way than to push for more—to pressure, badger, bargain, and compromise. For some reason, both Moroz and Pliushch assume that when Dziuba wrote his *Internationalism or Russification?* he was an “uncompromising” humanitarian, a fiery patriot. Yet this is where the two dissidents are misled. Of course he was a patriot, but he was more of a pressure diplomat than a dissident who leaves no room for compromise. No one can really believe that Dziuba's extremely verbose and repetitious eulogies and glorifications of Lenin in his book were honest expressions of respect which he could not resist from voicing. Certainly Dziuba is a Marxist, but his excessive praise for Lenin is uncalled for under “normal” circumstances. There is obviously a method in Dziuba's madness. Is it not a manifestation of his compromise with the system? Is it not characteristic of a reformist? Both Moroz and Pliushch condemned Dziuba's excessive quotation of Lenin, which proves their inability even to think along reformist or, at least, partially compromising lines. Moroz criticized this “bending and folding” in Dziuba's book because, from a “revolutionary's” standpoint or framework, this is unnecessary.⁴ In fact, for Moroz it is undesirable, whereas it is absolutely crucial when one is working within a reformist framework. It should also be remembered that while Pliushch called all the realistic compromisers in Ukrainian history “traitors,” and “janissaries,”⁵ Dziuba at least partially vindicated them with the words: “. . . though this is not

³ *Literaturna Ukraina*, November 17, 1966.

⁴ Moroz, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-113.

⁵ Leonid Pliushch, “Trahediia Ivana Dziuby,” *Suchasnist*, December 1976, pp. 41-62.

always done voluntarily, and not always is this person guilty.”⁶ Does this not indicate a completely different philosophy: on the one hand that of the Dziubas, and on the other that of the Morozes and Pliushchs? Indeed, there was a “polarity” in Ukrainian intellectual dissent. The Dziubas were those “reformists” or “revisionists” who, in their loyalty to Marxist-Leninist doctrine, wanted reform along lines which in principle may be contained within the system, while the Morozes did not want to make any compromise with the regime at all, for they believed that the regime was essentially evil. One must realize that this polarity is bound to influence the actions of each party. Therefore it is simply unfair to demand the same type of reaction to the system from these very different types of dissidents. One cannot compare Moroz’s stand to Dziuba’s, for they begin with totally different assumptions.

Briefly glancing over Dziuba’s activities of the 1960s, it becomes obvious that some contact must have existed between Dziuba and the then leaders of the CPU. Heads should have rolled for three-quarters of Dziuba’s numerous political activities, yet for a long time nothing happened. One must not forget that *Internationalism or Russification?* was addressed specifically to Shelest and the CPU leaders. If they had not agreed with it, they could have suppressed the book immediately. Yet Shelest ordered it to be distributed to oblast Party Secretaries, from where it also leaked to the public. This is all perfectly understandable if one only realizes that this document was actually an elaborate argument in support of Shelest’s efforts in 1965 to “Ukrainianize” the republic. Indeed, the first real attacks on Dziuba and his book came only in 1969, four years after *Internationalism or Russification?* was originally circulated. Why so late? One certainly cannot blame it on the lengthy preparation of Stenchuk’s official rebuttal, nor can one honestly say that the regime could not find flaws in Dziuba’s numerous citations from Lenin in his book. Many before Dziuba had written on the basis of Lenin’s statements and had been instantly “eliminated” for deviation.

How does one explain the 1969 capitulation (for the *Shelestivshchyna* was still very much alive then)? It was not a capitulation. Dziuba simply disassociated himself from the “nationalism” of the Ukrainians abroad, since accusations of his collusion with the émigrés impeded his efforts to continue the pressure for inner reform. Dziuba did not recant at all his *Internationalism or*

⁶ Ivan Dziuba, “U 25 rokovyny rozstriliv u Babynomu Iari,” *Su-chasnist*, November 1967, pp. 32-35.

Russification? in 1969, and he even explained the whole situation to Pliushch, making it perfectly clear that this was not a betrayal. Dziuba was not yet the “realist” of Moroz’s essay, and this is supported by Dziuba’s heated political activity after the 1969 affair. If he had been a “wise piglet,” he would have certainly lain low for a few years. There is no other explanation for Dziuba’s “statement.” Who knows, perhaps even Shelest suggested that Dziuba write such a statement, since it was beginning to be difficult to defend him in the face of all those ardent Russian chauvinists who were after his skin. However, by 1973 Dziuba’s *Shelestivshchyna* framework had all but disappeared. He was now experiencing the “revolutionary’s solitude.” It was no use to die. What for? Reform was no longer possible, and the metamorphosis from a “reformer” to a “revolutionary Don Quixote” was an impossibility in prison, cut off from even the “revolutionary dissident” movement. One can only imagine Dziuba sitting in prison for a year and a half, getting news every day of new arrests, new purges. It must have seemed to him as if the world was falling apart, and, indeed, he was correct, for his world of the *Shelestivshchyna* had fallen apart. If such was the case, what was the use of resisting, of being the last dying remnant of a “by-gone reformist age”?

It is worthy to note that Dziuba the reformist never turned into a separatist, nor could he have without changing his reformist status. Moroz the revolutionary did change into a separatist, and understandably so. In his third “Statement,” Dziuba wrote: “There is no neutral territory, no half-way place—one is either for or against.” In this little statement is hidden the entire explanation for what Dziuba is today. He could not remain a reformist after 1973 because the system did not permit it.

Then comes the question: Should Dziuba not have become a Don Quixote, another Moroz? Of course, everyone in the emigration would like to think that he should have. But then one must consider Bertolt Brecht’s wise words: “Woe unto the country that needs heroes . . . worse yet, if the only possible heroism is that of a martyr, the heroism of self-sacrifice.” With the fall of the *Shelestivshchyna*, the “other” (reformist) alternative fell apart. All that was left was Moroz’s tragic hero, the one who sacrifices everything to a movement that is not yet a movement, to a revolution of some distant future.

Yet there is one more question which places a cloud over Dziuba. How does one justify the harm he caused to the dissident movement’s solidarity of non-capitulation? I submit that no vindication is called for. All that should be clarified is what his self-imposed duty was, namely, that of a reformist, and that he fulfilled it to the end of its possible life. As for the duty others think

Dziuba should have performed, this is both irrelevant and unfair. Dziuba had a purpose which was bound to certain conditions. Once these conditions dissolved, so did his purpose. That Moroz chose an infinitely wider purpose was his own decision. That the conditions to which Moroz's purpose is bound will most probably not disappear for a long time means that his purpose likewise will not. But one must remember that if Dziuba emerges sometime in the future challenging all pressures, one will know that one is dealing with a new Dziuba—a reformist transformed into a revolutionary.

University of Alberta

КУЛЬТУРНО-ГРОМАДСЬКЕ ТА НАУКОВЕ ЖИТТЯ УКРАЇНЦІВ У РУМУНІЇ

ІНТЕРВ'Ю З ПРОФЕСОРОМ ТОРОНТСЬКОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ,
МИКОЛОЮ ПАВЛЮКОМ *

Пане професоре, нам відомо, що Ви тепер працюєте у Торонтському університеті, викладаєте українську мову і що Ви самі з Румунії, де працювали довгий час у Букарештському університеті; були головою українського відділу при кафедрі слов'янських мов та літератур; і брали участь в українському громадському й культурному житті. Знаємо також, що Ви брали активну участь у складанні підручників з української мови та літератури для шкіл загальної культури, ліцею та університету. Виходячи з цього, Вам відомі чи не всі питання, зв'язані з українським життям у Румунії.

Ми просимо Вас відповісти на кілька наших запитань, тобто, дати коротке інтерв'ю для нашого журналу...

1. Розкажіть нам, будь ласка, дещо про себе.

Я народився 11. 12. 1927 р. в селі Лузі на Мараморощині, в Румунії.

Початкову освіту здобув у рідному селі на румунській і мадярській мовах, а середню в м. Сігеу-Мармацієй на українській і румунській мовах (1950 р.).

З 1950 по 1955 рр. вчився в Харківському університеті на філологічному факультеті, а з 1955 по 1958 рр. проходив аспірантуру в цьому ж університеті. В аспірантурі мені довелося прослухати й успішно скласти екзамени з ряду загальних політичних та мовознавчих курсів і спеціальних курсів з української мови та її історії. Моє перебування в аспірантурі завершилося написанням і захистом наукової праці з ділянки діалектології про українські говірки в Румунії.

2. Що Ви робили після закінчення аспірантури і захисту дисертації?

Після закінчення аспірантури в листопаді 1958 р., я повернувся до Румунії і одержав призначення викладача української мови у Букарештському університеті. В той час на

* Інтерв'ю провів Роман Сенькусь.

філологічному факультеті Букарештського університету існувала, поряд з іншими катедрами іноземних мов, і катедра слов'янських мов, куди входили українська, польська, чеська, словацька, болгарська, сербська та старослов'янська мови.

3. Як довго Ви працювали в Букарештському університеті і які курси Ви викладали?

Я працював у Букарештському університеті 16 років, аж до 1974 р. За цей період мені довелося викладати майже всі курси української мови і провадити різні семінари теоретично-мовних та практичних курсів. Якщо пам'ять не зрадить, були такі курси: 1) *Курс сучасної української літературної мови*, який викладався протягом чотирьох років. У складі цього курсу (це один з найбільших курсів) я викладав фонетику і фонологію, лексику і фразеологію, граматику, тобто морфологію і синтаксус; 2) *Курс історичної граматики української мови*; 3) *Курс історії української літературної мови*; 4) *Курс української діалектології*; 5) *Вступ до української філології*; 6) *Курс порівняльно-історичної граматики східнослов'янських мов*; і 7) *Практичний курс української мови* як також різні теоретичні та практичні семінари.

За період моєї праці в університеті я займався й науковою діяльністю та складанням підручників з української мови і літератури для середньої школи, ліцею, а також для університету. Разом з іншими колегами ми забезпечили підручниками з мови та літератури учнів усіх рівнів.

4. Чому Ви зайнялися україністикою, будучи громадянином Румунії?

Ваше питання досить складне і на нього не легко відповісти.

Спочатку я планував стати інженером, але згодом змінив свою думку. Інженером може стати будь-котрий студент, а професором-мовником лише той, хто має на це певне покликання і хто любить днями й ночами сидіти за книжкою і працювати багато. Крім цього, я вважаю, що кожний українець, який живе поза межами України, не залежно через які причини він там опинився, повинен щось зробити для українців тієї країни, в якій він живе. Я народився, як Вам уже відомо, в Румунії, де живе понад сто тисяч українців — в Мараморошині, Сучавщині, Банаті та в Добруджі, в гирлі Дунаю.

Після закінчення ліцею я вирішив поступити на філологічний факультет і стати професором української мови, щоб,

таким шляхом, допомогти українцям, які живуть у Румунії, та іншим, що цікавились українською мовою, здобути освіти в галузі україністики. В такий спосіб, за час мого перебування в Букарештському університеті, нам вдалося випустити цілий ряд добре підготовлених студентів, одні з яких тепер працюють у науково-дослідних інститутах, в університетах, в ліцеях та школах, у видавництвах та редакціях і в інших наукових та культурних закладах Румунії.

Ось чому я вирішив зайнятися україністикою.

Однак, через певні причини я не зміг продовжувати свою наукову і викладацьку діяльність у Букарештському університеті, а змушений був опустити країну і тепер, як Вам відомо, викладаю українську мову на II і III курсах у Тонронтському університеті.

5. Як виглядало українське громадське і культурне життя в Румунії та в самому Букарешті до Вашого від'їзду?

Якщо за старих часів (маю на увазі період до II світової війни) в Румунії майже не існувало ніякого українського громадського і культурного життя, то після 1945 р. ситуація докорінно змінилася. Національні меншості Румунії одержали право організувати школи і провадити навчання на рідній мові. У всіх українських селах в Румунії (понад 100 сіл) після 1945 р. були організовані початкові школи з українською викладавкою мовою всіх предметів.

У м. Сиготі (тепер Сігету-Мармаціей) відкрились український ліцей і педагогічна школа.

Подібний ліцей і педагогічна школа існували і в м. Сереті на Сучавщині, а також українська секція при румунському ліцеї у м. Сучаві.

У Добруджі, в м. Тульчі, якийсь час існував український педагогічний ліцей. Таким чином, можна сказати, були створені всі необхідні умови для піднесення громадського, культурного і наукового рівня українського населення, що проживає в Румунії.

Педагогічні ліцеї виховували молоду плеяду майбутніх учителів, педагогів, а ліцеї готували абсолювентів з гуманістичних і суспільних предметів, які могли далі продовжувати своє навчання в університетах та різних технічних інститутах.

Згодом, в 1949 р., відкрився український відділ при кафедрі слов'янських мов Букарештського університету, а через рік заснувалась у Букарешті редакція української газети „Новий вік”.

Можна вважати, що період з 1950 по 1960 рр. був періодом найінтенсивнішого громадсько-культурного піднесення українського населення Румунії.

Крім теоретичних і педагогічних ліцеїв, частина з української молоді подалася і до професійних та технічних шкіл, в яких вони набули певної спеціальності і ремесла.

Для кращого уявлення про культурний зріст українського населення в Румунії в післявоєнний період, наведу один приклад з мого рідного села.

Моє село Луг над Тисою (Лунка ла Тіса), розташоване в гористій місцевості Мараморощини в долині річки Тиса, в якому нараховується понад 300 хат. Якщо до 1945 року в селі знаходилась лише одна особа з закінченою середньою освітою (вчитель) та інші три особи з неповною середньою освітою, то за наступні 15 років (до 1960) в селі вже знаходилось понад 100 осіб з закінченою середньою освітою, понад 20 осіб з вищою (університетською та інститутською) освітою і понад 50 осіб знаходились у стадії закінчення теоретичних і педагогічних ліцеїв, професійних та технічних шкіл.

Подібне явище спостерігалось і в інших українських селах. Отже, період п'ятидесятих років був початковим періодом формування нової української інтелігенції в Румунії.

Однак, це навчальне і культурно-громадське пожвавлення у наступному десятиріччі не утрималось на такому самому рівні; українські школи (як початкові, так і ліцеї) стали занепадати. У багатьох місцевостях вони були переведені на румунську викладову мову (у Добруджі українська мова не збереглась і як предмет викладання), а зі всіх ліцеїв і педагогічних шкіл лише у місті Сиготі збереглась українська секція при змішаному ліцеї (теоретичний ліцей з трьома секціями: румунською, мадярською і українською). За такий стан речей винні в якійсь мірі і самі батьки, які занедбали свою рідну мову і не прийняли жодних заходів для покращання ситуації.

Тепер українська мова вживається ще як викладова мова всіх предметів у ряді сіл Сучавщини та в переважній більшості сіл на Мараморощині, а в інших школах українська мова зберігається лише як предмет навчання.

6. Які газети і журнали виходять в Румунії українською мовою і яку роль вони відіграють у культурному житті українського населення?

В Румунії виходить лише одна українська газета — „Новий вік”. У перших роках своєї появи (1950) вона виходила

один раз на місяць, а через якийсь час і аж до сьогодні виходять один раз на два тижні. Протягом двадцяти років свого існування вона відіграла чималу роль у вихованні молодого покоління. Час від часу в ній з'являється і літературна сторінка, на якій молоді українські письменники і поети в Румунії друкують свої твори.

Крім газети „Новий вік”, українські письменники Румунії друкують свої твори і в літературному видавництві „Критеріон”, яке заснувалось наприкінці 1969 року з метою задовільнити культурні потреби співживучих національностей. „Критеріон” друкує твори п'ятьма мовами: мадярською, німецькою, українською, сербо-хорватською та жидівською мовами.

7. На якому рівні знаходиться українське літературне життя в Румунії?

Початки українського літературного життя в Румунії тісно пов'язані з розвитком українських шкіл в Румунії. Десь у другій половині 50-их років були створені сприятливі умови для появи ряду молодих українських поетів та прозаїків. В переважній своїй більшості це люди, що росли і виховувалися в українських школах у Румунії. У своїх творах вони оспівують життя українського населення в Румунії, оспівують свій рідний край — зелені гори і дрімучі ліси Буковини та Мараморощини, широкі простори Банату і дельти Дунаю. Багато з них присвятило свою поезію інтимним почуттям. Це основна тематика молодих українських поетів і прозаїків Румунії.

Значну роль у справі популяризації творів молодих початківців відіграла газета „Новий вік”, на сторінках якої почали друкуватися Ю. Павліш, І. Федько, В. Марущак, П. Шовкалюк, К. Регуш, І. Шимуляк, В. Баршай, В. Клим та В. Крикун; Д. Аріч, І. Серединчук (Непогода), Ст. Ткачук, Т. Малиш, І. Кожокар, І. Ковач, М. Михайлюк, М. Небиляк, М. Корсюк та І. Мойсюк, а також письменники старшого покоління, які почали писати ще до другої світової війни, але не мали змоги друкуватися: Д. Онищук, Г. Клемпуш, М. Коцар, Ю. Ракоча, М. Балан та О. Масикевич.

Окремими виданнями у Державному літературному видавництві (Букарешт) вийшли перші збірки творів Івана Федька („По новому шляху” — 1960), Юрія Павліша („У пісні, праці, в любові” — 1961), Гаврила Клемпуша („Мій рідний батьківщині співанки співаю” — 1964), Дениса Онищука („Полин і мед” — 1965). У 1964 р. окремим виданням

вийшов альманах „Серпень”, в якому була опублікована ціла низка цікавих творів.

В 1968 р. з'явилася збірка „Ліричні струни”, в якій були надруковані добірні поезії цілого ряду українських поетів, а в 1969 р. — збірка „Народні співанки”, упорядкування і вступна стаття якої належать І. Ребушапці.

Крім згаданих збірок, останнім часом у видавництві національних меншостей в Румунії „Критеріон” (Букарешт) вийшло цілий ряд збірок поезій і прозових творів (художніх репортажів, оповідань, нарисів...), антологій і критичних праць.

Серед них згадаємо, в першу чергу, збірки поезій Марії Балан („На самоті” — 1970); Стеліана Груї Яцентюка („Надра” — 1971); Степана Ткачука („Розколоте небо” — 1971; „Наврочені роки” — 1973); Івана Непогоди („Крапля в морі” — 1971); Ореста Масикевича („На місячних перехрестях” — 1971); Михайла Михайлюка („Інтермеццо” — 1971; „Мурчик-кіт упав з воріт” — 1975); Михайла Небиляка („Криниці моїх очей” — 1972); Миколи Корсюка („Нащадки сонця” — 1972); Івана Ковача („Поезії” — 1972); Корнелія Ірода („Вечірня молитва” — 1973); Василя Баршая („Поезії” — 1973); Оксани Мельничук („На перехрестях літ” — 1973); Івана Мойсюка („Літайте, орлята” — 1973); та Юрія Павліша („Акорди” — 1974).

В цей же самий період з'явився і ряд поетичних та прозових творів. Серед них варто згадати „Антологію української класичної поезії” (1970) і „З книги життя: антологія українського класичного оповідання” (1973), упорядкування і передмова яких належать викладачеві Букарештського університету Магдалені Ласло-Куцюк. Упорядкувачеві вдалося підібрати найкращі поезії та оповідання з української класичної літератури. Правда, ці антології не відносяться безпосередньо до поставленого запитання, але обминути їх було б не доцільно.

В 1972 році видавництво „Критеріон” випустило ще два збірники прози: один з них — „Наші весни” — містить прозові твори тринадцятиох українських письменників. У вступному слові до збірника М. Михайлюк вважає, що цей збірник „... можна б назвати книгою прози поетів”. Другий збірник — „Про хліб і землю”. Збірник включає художні репортажі шістьох письменників, присвячені десятиріччю завершення кооперативізації сільського господарства в Румунії.

Варто згадати ще такі збірники прозових творів, як збірник новел та оповідань Стеліана Груї „Пастух і дика че-

решня" (1973), збірник оповідань М. Корсюка „Роздоріжжя" (1973), роман М. Небиляка „Лорана" (1974), збірник оповідань К. Ірода „Світлотінь" (1974) та його ж роман „Передодень" (1975), повість І. Ковача „Чуга" (1976). Це перші збірки прозових творів, якими молоді письменники утверджуються як майстри художнього слова.

Ім'я Івана Ребушапки вже давно відоме українському читачеві не тільки в Румунії, а й далеко поза її межами. Іван Ребушапка — завзятий фолкльорист. Крім згаданого вище збірника народних співанок, видавництво „Критеріон" видало ще такі його збірки фолкльорних матеріалів, як „Ой у саду-винограду" — збірник світських величальних пісень (1971), „Відгомін віків" — збірник народних балад, історичних пісень та пісень-хронік (1974), а в 1975 р. він видав нову книжку, присвячену питанням фолкльору — „Народження символу: аспекти взаємодії обряду та обрядової поезії". Книжка дуже цікава і цінна тим, що авторові вдалося показати у порівняльному пляні деякі спільні мотиви в обряді багатьох народів, а особливо українського та румунського. Дана праця І. Ребушапки* є українським, дещо зміненим, варіантом його докторської дисертації, яку він спочатку написав на румунській мові і публічно захистив її в 1971 році на факультеті румунської мови та літератури в Букарештському університеті.

Остання збірка, яку я маю у своєму розпорядженні і хочу про неї згадати, це збірка народних прислів'їв та приказок („Народ скаже — як зав'яже" — 1976), яка охоплює біля 1300 народних дотепних висловів, зібраних покійним поетом-байкарем Денисом Онищуком серед українців в Румунії. Опрацювання і впорядкування матеріалів належать І. Ребушапці.

**
*

Як видно з наведених вище публікацій, семидесяті роки, здається, є чи не найплототворнішими роками в галузі українських публікацій в Румунії.

За останні десять років Українська літстудія при Спілці письменників Румунії домоглася значних результатів. Українські письменники в Румунії розширили свою тематику, глибше проникли в життя і поступово переходять від декля-

* У цій праці прізвище автора змінено з І. Ребушапка на І. Ребошапка.

ративної поезії до справжньої поезії — поезії, яка заслуговує на увагу читача.

Якщо не звертати уваги на ряд поезій, зв'язаних з різними присвятами партійного та державного характеру, то ми матимемо справу зі справжньою поезією — поезією, насиченою глибоким філософським змістом (І. Ковач, М. Небиляк, М. Михайлюк, Ст. Груя Яцентюк, М. Корсюк, О. Масикевич), ліричними почуттями (Ст. Ткачук, М. Балан, Ю. Павліш), а також з поезією для дітей (І. Шмуляк, І. Мойсюк, М. Михайлюк, І. Непогода).

Модернізм, глибока філософська насиченість і нова художня форма вірша проникнуті в ряді віршів І. Ковача, Ст. Груї Яцентюка та М. Корсюка.

На жаль, такого успіху українські письменники в Румунії ще не досягли в галузі прози. Мало кому з них вдалося вийти за рамки коротеньких оповідань та нарисів (К. Ірод, М. Небиляк, М. Корсюк, М. Михайлюк, Ст. Груя Яцентюк). Оскільки тематика прозових творів переважно зв'язана з життям народу, мова персонажів повинна б бути більш насиченою народною мовою, яка б надала творові певного місцевого кольориту. Шкода, що наші письменники не навчилися вплітати у тканину художнього твору таке багатство народної мови, як дотепні вислови, прислів'я, приказки та місцеві діалектизми. Адже народна мова така багата на різні вислови (що видно і з наведеної вище збірки „Народ скаже — як зав'яже”), що їх ніколи не можна вичерпати. Щодо використання народної мови не зашкодило б повчитися майстерності у В. Шухевича, Г. Хоткевича, М. Коцюбинського, В. Стефаника, Ст. Васильченка, І. Воробкевича, О. Кобилянської та ін.

Однак, незважаючи на це і маючи на увазі те, що майже всі згадані вище українські поети і письменники Румунії — початківці, зміст і мистецький рімень їхньої творчості відносно високий. Всі вони здобули середню освіту на українській мові, а частина з них закінчила відділ української мови та літератури при Букарештському університеті.

Деякі з них є провідниками і поширювачами українського друкованого слова в Румунії. Так, наприклад, Іван Ковач, Михайло Михайлюк та Іван Мойсюк працюють редакторами газети „Новий вік”, Іван Ковач є головою Української літературної студії при Спілці письменників Румунії, Микола Корсюк є відповідальним редактором української секції видавництва „Критеріон”, а Ст. Груя Яцентюк та І. Ребушапка працюють у Букарештському університеті.

8. Як би Ви охарактеризували науковий розвиток у Румунії в галузі україністики (початки, досягнення, перспективи)?

Це чи не одне з найскладніших питань. Постараюсь на нього відповісти і навести, якщо мені пам'ять не зрадить, деякі конкретні дані.

Так, як я бачу питання, тут треба говорити про досягнення в галузі дослідження з мови, діалектології, літератури і фолкльору та в галузі підручників з мови та літератури.

Основною науковою працею в галузі україністики займаються переважно викладачі українського відділу Букарештського університету та сектор славістики Інституту Мовознавства при Академії Наук Румунії. Питаннями україністики займаються також поодинокі мовознавці й інших наукових центрів Румунії (Клузький, Яський, Тімішорський університети, Бая-Марський педагогічний інститут).

Викладачі українського відділу Букарештського університету, особливо протягом останніх 15 років, зробили досить багато в галузі дослідження української мови і літератури, а також в галузі українсько-румунських літературних зв'язків.

Так, наприклад, я сам довгий час займався дослідженням з сучасної української мови та її історії, а також дослідженням українських говірок на території Румунії, результат яких був опублікований у спеціальних збірниках діалектологічних нарад у Києві та в різних мовознавчих журналах у Букарешті.

Питанням українсько-румунських мовних зв'язків крім мене займалися І. Ребушапка й Д. Мазілу. Серед публікацій цієї серії слід згадати бодай одну працю, що була представлена на міжнародному з'їзді у Празі 1968 року — *L'influence roumaine sur le lexique des langues slaves*. *

Питаннями дослідження української літератури та українсько-румунських літературних зв'язків займаються М. Ласло-Куцок та Ст. Г. Яцентюк. Вони опублікували цілий ряд статей українською і румунською мовами, присвячених як монографічному дослідженню окремих українських письменників, так і дослідженню їх прозових та поетичних творів. Вони також займаються і питанням дослідження української літератури в Румунії. Тут особливо треба б згадати оригінальний курс „Питання української поезики” М. Ласло-Ку-

* “Romanoslavica”, XVI, Букарешт, 1968, стор. 59 — 121.

цюк, виданий Букарештським університетом (циклоскопом) в 1974 р. Ст. Яцентюк, крім згаданих питань, займається і перекладами з української літератури на румунську мову (перекладає Л. Українку, І. Франка та ін.).

І. Ребушапка, крім загальних питань з мови та літератури, спеціально займається дослідженням українського фольклору та колядок в Румунії. Він опублікував кілька фольклорних збірок та студій, які заслуговують належної уваги (Див. 7 пит.).

Питаннями україністики, особливо української діалектології, займається і Букарештський Інститут мовознавства. Дослідники інституту І. Робчук, З. і К. Регуш, І. Нестореску та голова відділу славистики Г. Болокан зібрали і записали на магнітну стрічку діалектні матеріали майже зі всіх українських сіл в Румунії, частина з яких була оброблена, особливо І. Робчуком та Регушами, і опублікована у журналі інституту "Studii de slavistica" та в інших дослідницьких журналах.

Щодо підручників з української мови та літератури для всіх рівнів (початкового, середнього та вищого), треба сказати, що ми повністю забезпечили українські школи в Румунії всіма необхідними підручниками для початкових клас (I—IV класи) — букварем, читанкою і граматиною; для середнього циклу загальної культури (V—VIII класи) — граматиною української мови і читанкою для кожної класи зокрема; і для ліцею (IX—XII класи, тобто I—IV роки ліцею) — підручниками з української літератури.

Для початкового циклу підручників працювали такі досвідчені педагоги, як Р. і К. Драпака, Г. Кокотайло, Д. Горнечар; для середнього циклу — з граматики М. Павлюк, І. Грушкевич і Н. Бурлу-Лесену, а з читанки — М. Ласло, Е. Рей, І. Ребушапка, Ст. Яцентюк.

Над підручниками з української літератури для ліцею особливу працю вклали К. Драпака та М. Павлюк, а також М. Бодня, І. Ребушапка та Ю. Грінь.

Як висновок до цього питання, можна сказати, що початки були не легкі. Проте, результат на сьогодні непоганий. Дослідження з україністики в Румунії відомі і оцінені спеціалістами й за межами Румунії і я сподіваюсь, що набутий до сьогодні досвід і здобуті успіхи в цій галузі послужать зразком для дальшого розквіту україністики в Румунії. Той, хто „всмакувався” дотепер у цих дослідженнях, думаю, ніколи їх не покине, а буде їх продовжувати і ділитися своїм досвідом, де б то не було, в країні чи поза її межами, з іншими.

ТЕЗИ ПРО РУСИФІКАЦІЮ

СВІТЛИЙ ПАМ'ЯТІ ВСЕВОЛОДА ГОЛУБНИЧОГО (1928 - 1977)

Недавно скінчилося життя одного з найбільш видатних українських учених на еміграції, економіста і політолога Всеволода Голубничого. Замість некрологу передруковуємо тут одну з останніх записок покійного, яку він підготував і розіслав до членів редколегії збірника „Про русифікацію”, що має появитися заходами Українського Наукового Інституту в Гарварді. Хоч „Тези про русифікацію” не були написані для публікації, вони яскраво відзеркалюють погляди покійного на дуже важливу тему і тому й стимулюють наше думання.

1. Під „русифікацією” я схильний розуміти головним чином і переважно лише мовне питання, тобто перехід певної, ще далеко не переважаючої частини українців з української мови на російську мову вжитку. Чи це є явищем „асиміляції”, чи „акультуризації”, я схильний сперечатися. Мені здається, що ні одне, ні друге, бо обидва ці антропологічні терміни в антропології стосуються дрібних, диких племен, або ж щонайбільше невеликих етнічних меншостей, що живуть у культурному „морі” серед великої більшості. Українці, на мою думку, в такій ситуації не є. (Українці на еміграції в такій ситуації є, — це інша справа, — але і відносно таких меншин стара американська теорія „всерозтоплюючого котьолка” збанкрутувала. Це, мені здається, визнають сьогодні всі поважні вчені з галузей антропології.)

2. Якщо під „русифікацією” розуміти щось більше, ніж мовне питання, — наприклад, культурні зміни, зміни старих звичаїв, фолкльору і т. п., то в такому випадку треба пам'ятати про цілий ряд речей. Поперше, з бігом часу всі культури повільно змінюються, всі без винятку. Протестувати можна лише проти прискіплення таких змін штучними засобами (але це вже „політика”, про яку нижче). Подруге, культурним змінам підпадають не лише поневолені народи, а й поневолювачі. Конкретно кажучи, я особисто цілком розумію російських націоналістів, таких, як Солженіцин, коли вони бідкаються, що російська культура — „советизується”, бо це є факт. Російська культура в СРСР зведена сьогодні

до чималого примітивізму. Хоч, ясно, українська — ще більше. Але причиною такого стану, мені здається, є не стільки національні відносини в СРСР, як соціальні й політичні: над СРСР панує диктатура примітивів усіх національностей, хоч, ясно, що росіян серед них є найбільше.

3. Виходячи з цього, я пропонував би, щоб ми в передмові сказали не лише про „русифікацію”, а й про „совєтизацію”, від якої культурно терплять не лише українці, а й росіяни, — хоч українці — більше, ніж росіяни! Або скажімо так: концепція „совєтського народу” (що є штучно вигаданим безглуздом, — але про це далі), безсумнівно, означає „русифікацію” неросіян, але також і „совєтизацію” росіян, перетворення і їх на некультурних, диких держиморд, яким влада визначає й приділяє знання (напр., через школи) лише шматочків російської культури, літератури, історії, — таких шматочків, знання яких корисне владі. Повторюю, щоб не було непорозуміння: українцям, чи там, скажімо, татарам таких шматочків дають ще менше.

4. Варто також мати на увазі, що концепція „совєтського народу”, а отже й практична політика русифікації, що з неї випливає, є лєнінсько-сталінською вигадкою, як також вигадкою інших, російських і неросійських імперіалістів і шовіністів, але зокрема немає нічого спільного з марксизмом. Мені пригадується, наприклад, слова Соммерсета Моггема, який, живучи на Маляях, пророкував, що перед кінцем ХХ сторіччя цілий світ розмовлятиме тільки одною англійською мовою! Що ж до Маркса й Енгельса, то їх варто відділяти від Лєніна й Сталіна хочби вже тому, щоб ці останні не перебирали на себе Марксів світовий авторитет. Зараз я поволі перегриз майже всі існуючі 50 томів писань М. й Е. і, повірте, ніде не знайшов ні слова про те, що вони, навіть у будь-як віддаленому майбутньому, передбачали „злиття націй”. Найбільше, що в них є, так це в самих ранніх творах пропагування *політики* германізації чехів, мадяризації хорватів та інших „уламків неісторичних націй”, бо, мовляв, вони виступали проти революції 1848 року. За це Маркса й Енгельса зовсім слушно би назвати по-сучасному „німецькими буржуазними націоналістами”, а то й шовіністами. Однак, ніде й ніколи вони не говорили про будь-яке „злиття”, „історичних націй”, скажімо, німців із французами, чи там італійців з еспанцями. „Інтернаціоналізмом” у їхньому розумінні була рівність націй, а не їхнє зникнення. У гаслі I-го Інтернаціоналу стояло „Пролетарі всіх країн, єднайтеся”, а не зливайтесь! Ідея „злиття націй” належить Лєнінові, але

й він після досвіду 1917 року фактично від неї відмовився. А прийшла Ленінові ця ідея до голови тому, що, не знаючи досконало німецької мови, він витлумачив абзац „Комуністичного Маніфесту”, де мова йде про зникнення „різниць” поміж націями за комунізму (різниць у сенсі конфліктів, боротьби!), як зникнення „відмінностей” поміж націями, тобто „злиття націй”. Я колись писав про це в „Сучасності”. Я згадую про це на кожен випадок, щоб нам було ясніше, звідки походить „советський народ” і політика русифікації.

5. Інша справа — фактаж історії. Я, ясно, не можу сказати, що я знаю історію всіх народів усіх континентів. Але з того, що я читав, у мене склалося переконання (виправте мене, якщо я помиляюся!), що жоден народ у цілому світі ніколи не зникав *добровільно*, в спосіб якоїсь природної еволюції, якоїсь органічної асиміляції, чи якогось іншого нормального процесу. Такого не було. Натомість усі народи, що вже зникли, чи рештки яких зникають сьогодні (і то ще питання, чи зникнуть!), зникли лише в наслідок *насильства* над ними. Майже в усіх без винятку випадках такі народи були завойовані, знищені війнами, розторожені сильними агресорами, а рештки їх, якщо вони не розбрелися по світі й залишилися на своїй території, були потім знищені *політикою* завойовника, політикою сегрегації, дискримінації, насильницької асиміляції і т. д. Іншими словами, зникнення народів в історії було завжди наслідком *геноциду*. Про це говорю для того, щоб ми всі весь час пам’ятали, що русифікація України є наслідком завоювання України, наслідком насильства і є політикою геноциду. Я не сумніваюся, що ви всі про це думаєте, так як і я. Але поскільки в якійсь мірі, нехай навіть у посередній спосіб, тема про русифікацію України нам підказана т. зв. західньою наукою, і ми пишемо для неї, для західнього читача, та ще для американського, я певен, що ви всі розумієте, що це значить. Цей читач, безсумнівно, чекає, що ми йому скажемо, що русифікація — це процес природний, нормальний, що асиміляція чи акультуризація в СРСР проходить так само, як, наприклад, в Америці, і що при цьому ми і натяку не зробимо про початки й природу цього всього, про геноцид, бо ж то нагадає їм про долю індіан, а про це згадувати не є „бон тоном”. З другого боку, ясна річ, я в жодному разі не пропоную, щоб ми писали агітаційним тоном, щоб верещали, що нас, бідних, ріжуть, чи щось подібного. Ні. Що я лише хочу сказати, так це те, що ми всі однозгідні, що русифікація є актом насильства, що це є політичний, а не стихійний, природний процес.

6. Поскільки я розумію під „русифікацією” головним чином мовне питання (хоча погоджуюся наперед, що це ще не вся проблема!), то додаю кілька думок на тему мови. Не треба, ясно, й згадувати, що я — не лінгвіст, так само як і не історик. Але з того, що я читав, у мене склалося таке переконання. На скільки сьогодні сягає назад історія мов на світі, мені здається, що всі поважні лінгвісти зараз уже згодні з тим, що на нашій планеті ніколи не існувало якоїсь єдиної, однієї мови. Так як „гомо сапієнс” виникав і розвивався у різних частинах планети, так само і його мови. Якщо ретрогресію в минуле екстраполювати у майбутнє, також немає ніяких підстав думати, що людство прямує до якихось зональних мов, а далі — до єдиної світової мови. Ця геніальна ідея належить геніальному лінгвістові — Йосипу Віссаріоновичу та ще деяким, сьогодні живим, його учням в роді нашого Білодіда. Але русифікатори ще й сьогодні дуже часто виправдують політику русифікації тим, що це, мовляв, неминучий прогрес історії в майбутнє. В дійсності ж лінгвісти вважають, що ніякого майбутнього злиття мов не станеться просто хочби тому, що на це немає потреби. Міжнародна мова (чи мови) майбутнього буде мовою сигналів, знаків, чи кодів (а може й звуків), за допомогою яких відбуватиметься комунікація поміж комп'ютерами. А у звичайному вжитку люди порозуміватимуться між собою так само, як і зараз: звичайною людською мовою усіх і всяких національностей. Комп'ютери автоматичного перекладу з російської на англійську вже сьогодні можна купити за 30 000 доларів. Вони, правда, ще далекі від універсальності, запрограмовані наперед обмеженими словниками для окремих вузьких, головню технічних наук. Але фактом є те, що вони вже існують. Максимум років за 20-30 автоматичний переклад з різних мов буде так доступний, як кишенькові калькулятори сьогодні. Отже, на мою думку, тільки дурень може сьогодні говорити про неминучість і необхідність злиття мов! Навпаки, якщо не буде насильства, лінгвіциду, мови і все, що є на мовах, розквітнуть, вибувають до ще небачених розмірів. З цього погляду треба розглядати й русифікацію. Вона є не тільки насильством, вона є дурним, тупоголовим насильством, насильством не знати для чого.

7. Задля об'єктивності, гадаю, треба визнати, що тому, що ще механічний переклад покищо не розвинувся, і до того часу, доки він розвинеться, знання російської мови в деяких галузях вжитку є потрібне. Скажімо, офіцери Варшавського Пакту повинні знати російську мову, бо інакше не буде комунікації. Так само офіцери НАТО повинні знати й вивча-

ють англійську мову. Літуни на понадзвукових літаках, чи космонавти, чи капітани підводних човнів і т. д. повинні бездоганно володіти мовою команд, що надходять з керівного центру. Такі потреби є поза дискусією. Я б теж згодився, що наукові праці вчених на Україні, що мають світове значення, повинні виходити не на українській мові, а на мові більш поширеній у світі, може навіть і на російській, якщо не знають іншої. Хоча, наприклад, з цілком достовірного джерела я чув і такий парадокс. Демографи Академії Наук УРСР вимагали, щоб збірники їхніх праць видавництво „Наукова Думка” видавала російською мовою, але їм цього не дозволили й примусили видавати українською мовою. Чому? Та лише тому, що з тих демографічних праць виходило, що демографічна ситуація на Україні майже катастрофічна (відтворення населення наближається до нуля). Партійні цензори в „Науковій Думці” воліли, щоб про це було відомо якнайменше! Тому й не дозволили друкувати російською мовою. Однак, все це — виняткові ситуації. Загалом же кажучи, немає сумніву, що мовна русифікація є *політикою*, тобто — насильством. Навіть такі, на перший погляд — безневинні й „природні” явища, як те, що баби на базарі розмовляють покаліченою російською мовою, є *наслідком політики*, а не природного процесу асиміляції.

8. В історичному перекрої, мені здається, питання русифікації стоїть так. Скажімо, до 1917 року Україна не піддалася польонізації й русифікації головним чином тому, що українські маси були замкнуті на селі. Польонізувалася й русифікувалася лише панівна кляса та робітництво в містах, але й то — далеко не цілком. Скажімо, від 1917 року й до нині умови життя українців кардинально змінилися. Українці стали вже майже наполовину урбанізованими. Шкільництво, освіта опанували вже цілком навіть і село. Основні маси українського народу втягнуті до інформаційних процесів через школи, пресу, радіо, телевізію і т. д. Яку пропаганду, які обмежені і перекручені знання дають українцям усі ці джерела інформації, це є окрема справа. На мою думку, існування освіти, існування знань є важливіше, ніж те, з чого ті знання складаються. Попросту кажучи, українець, освічений в російській школі, є на вищому щаблі інтелектуального розвитку, ніж українець, який ні до якої школи ніколи не ходив. Українець, що читає російську газету, інтелектуально стоїть вище ніж той, що не читає ніякої газети. Отже, *незважаючи на русифікацію*, сучасні українці є вище розвинуті, ніж ті, що жили перед 1917 роком. Іншими словами, історично таки є поступ, а не занепад української нації.

Під цим кутом зору я дивлюся й на русифікацію сьогодні. Так, вона — загрозна, вона вклинюється в тіло української нації, українці повинні проти неї боротися і вони борються. Але порівнюючи з минулим, українська ситуація сьогодні є набагато краща, ніж була; українці сьогодні далеко сильніші, свідоміші й розумніші, ніж у минулому. Тому, побоюючи русифікацію, ми не маємо підстав бути песимістами, не маємо підстав припускати, що русифікація переможе. Доказів на існування такої тенденції я особисто ще не бачу.

9. Є ще тут і такий аспект. Навіть якби русифікаторам вдалося цілком закрити українське шкільництво, українську пресу, видавництва і т. д., тобто досягнути того стану, що був перед 1917 роком, — що мені насправді видається не можливим, — то й тоді це ще не гарантувало б їм перемоги. Візьмімо історичні приклади: англізація Ірландії досягла майже 100%, але Ірландія відокремилася. Не виключено, що й Шотландія та Уельс теж ще відокремляться. Німеччина й Австрія, Данія й Норвегія, Канада і США — країни з одною мовою, з дуже подібною культурою і пов'язані історично, але вони — окремі країни. Індія підтримала відірвання Бенгладешу від Пакистану, але, мабуть, собі на біду, бо Бенгал, що є індійським штатом і межує з Бенгладешом, є тією самою нацією, що й Бенгладеш, і зовсім не виключено, що Бенгал об'єднається з Бенгладешом і відірветься від Індії. І так далі. Іншими словами, я б схилявся до того, щоб ми казали русифікаторам, що не наша, а радше їхня справа є безнадійною. Або принаймні 50 на 50, тобто — ще побачимо, чия візьме!

10. Тепер щодо русифікації *України*, радше ніж *українців*. (Це я повинен був сказати на початку, в першій тезі). Треба ясно розрізнити русифікацію українців (мовну, культурну і т. д.) і русифікацію України, як країни. Під цим останнім я розумію іміграцію росіян на Україну, виїзд українців до Росії, переміщення населення. Це не те саме, що русифікація українців. Наїзд росіян на Україну, збільшення їх питомої ваги серед українського населення ще ніяк не означає русифікації українців, перетворення українців на росіян. Тут треба розрізнити такі речі.

11. Про економічні причини міграції росіян на Україну, а українців до Росії я говоритиму у своїй статті. Це складне питання, але я спробую його вияснити, думаю, що це мені вдасться зробити. Однак, знову ж таки, я думаю, що ми всі повинні бути однозгідні, що існує *політика* переміщення

населення, особливо освічених кадрів та молоді. Тобто, що перемішування населення в першу чергу є організоване й кероване Москвою і лише в другу чергу є в якійсь мірі спонтанне, природне. Але й це останнє — не є постійним.

12. Наїзд росіян на Україну призводить до певної міри до русифікації українців, тому що а) росіяни займають на Україні панівні пости при владі, в різних апаратах, тощо, і тим самим змушують українців вживати російську мову, пристосовуватися до смаків пана; б) російські імігранти сприяють поширенню на Україні російського шкільництва, видавництва і т. п.; в) російська іміграція сприяє поширенню мішаних подруж, діти яких, мабуть в більшості, стають росіянами, — але „українськими росіянами”. Тобто, існує тут і відворотній процес української акультурації росіян. В російських школах на Україні українська мова викладається, це — факт. Хоч як там вона погано викладається, але все ж таки багато росіян на Україні пізнають українську мову і при потребі навіть нею користуються.

13. При користуванні статистикою російського за національністю населення України (переписи) конче треба нам пам'ятати, що дуже великий відсоток росіян серед росіян є мігрантами, а не постійними мешканцями УРСР. Це особливо торкається Донбасу та Придніпров'я, куди росіяни приїжджають на заробітки і за якийсь час повертаються додому до Росії. Таке саме явище існує й серед українців, що їздять на заробітки у Сибір чи в Казахстан. Осідає на постійно лише частина цих мігрантів і я гадаю, що — меншість, а не більшість (хоч це ще треба дослідити).

14. Нам варт також ще мати на увазі, що політика партії перемішування населення має й відворотні від бажаних наслідки. Українці, що побували в Росії, повертаються назад національно свідомішими, ніж були перед тим, бо на власні очі бачать, що не „всьо равно”, що між Росією й Україною є різниця. З другого боку наїзд росіян на провідні пости на Україну, на кращі місця праці, помешкання, тощо створює явище національно-соціальної конкуренції. До війни антисемітизм був поширений на Україні тому, що українці скрізь на кращих позиціях бачили жидів. Напевно зараз таке саме ставлення розвивається в українців і щодо російських колоністів. Те саме було в довоєнній Галичині стосовно поляків. Очевидна річ, я свідомий того, що довести таке покликаннями на джерела тощо дуже трудно. Але я був би за тим, щоб ми висловлювали це принаймні у формі гіпотези, вірність чи помилковість якої докаже майбутнє.

15. І нарешті ще таке. Я хочу висловити побажання, щоб ніхто з нас у жоден спосіб не сугерував би думки, що українці є в якомусь сенсі якоюсь „національною меншиною”. (Мені особисто прикро, і навіть соромно, що я взяв участь — нехай і дуже успішною статтею — у відомому збірнику Е. Гольдгагена 1968 року, що вийшов під несподіваною для мене назвою „Національні меншини в СРСР”. Жиди є національною меншиною, це правда, але вони не повинні були накидати це поняття нам усім). Я певний, що ви розумієте, про що мені йдеться. Я стою на становищі, що українці є не просто навіть більшістю в УРСР, а росіяни є меншістю; я йду крок далі. Україна сьогодні не є просто собі якоюсь аморфною територією СРСР, заселеною в більшості українцями. УРСР є державною формацією, що має свою конституцію, свій уряд і — найголовніше — свої юридичні кордони, визнані цілим рядом державно-правних і міжнародних документів, включаючи ряд договорів з сусідніми державами, зареєстрованими й визнаними Об’єднаними Націями. Ми можемо сміятися з „державности” УРСР, бо вона є справді глумом над нами. Ми можемо бути політично льоляльними лише до УНР, чи там Гетьманської Держави, чи навіть до „Акту 30-го червня”. Однак, на мою думку, так чи інакше, якщо в майбутньому постане на практиці питання про незалежнення України, нам всім доведеться на практиці виходити з факту існування — юридичного існування — УРСР. Конкретно це торкається справи кордонів. Якщо би ми не визнавали кордони УРСР юридично державними і розглядали би УРСР як звичайну територію СРСР, то тоді виходило б, що міграцію росіян на Донбас, у Придніпров’я та Крим ми визнавали б, як фактичну й повноправну зміну кордонів України. Виходило б, що ми всерйоз приймали би „теорію” КГБівських „диссидентів” із „Голосу Нації” про те, що, мовляв, Україну можна звести до території північно-західнього Правобережжя, а Донбас і Чорне море відрізати, бо, мовляв, етнічно вони вже неукраїнські. Поперше, це — брехня. Я певний, що у тих районах велика кількість росіян, а то і більшість, є зайшлим елементом, тимчасовими мігрантами-заробітчанами, а не постійними мешканцями. Подруге, такі пісеньки ми вже чули не раз. Ще Катерина II носилася з думкою, щоб після розгрому Січі створити у північно-західніх губерніях якусь таку півавтономну Україну і так розв’язати українське питання. Ленін теж у 1918-19 рр. пробував творити ефемерні Донецько-Криворізькі, Одеські та Тавридські „республіки”, але М. Скрипник тоді зразу сказав, що — ні! „Українська Радянська Республіка в кордонах IV Універса-

лу!" Подобається це нам, чи ні, але юридично УРСР є спадкоємницею УНР і в чисто юридичній площині ми повинні це визнавати. А на практиці, повторюю, інакше й не буде. КГБівському „Голосові нації” ми повинні, навпаки, ставити вимогу вільного плебісциту на Кубані, на Вороніжчині, Курщині, в північному Казахстані, на Далекому Сході, якщо взагалі варта з такою публікою дискутувати. Крім того, маймо на увазі, як мені здається, що зараз і в зовсім недалекому майбутньому всі ці питання можуть раптово стати цілком практичними, бо СРСР в найближчі десять-п'ятнадцять років майже напевне переживатиме серйозні катаклізми у зв'язку з неминучим кінцем кремлівської геронтократії.

Ясна річ, я не маю ні найменшого наміру нав'язувати свої переконання й думки іншим. Все це я написав лише для дискусії.

15. XII. 1976 р.

UKRAINIAN CANADIANS, MULTICULTURALISM, AND SEPARATISM: SOME OBSERVATIONS

Academic conferences are normally dull, anemic affairs which appeal only to those with a special interest in the subject matter. Fortunately, this was not the case at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies conference, entitled "Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: an Assessment," which took place at the University of Alberta in Edmonton from September 9 to 11, 1977. Instead, it was a frank, sober, and at times emotional discussion of a nation undergoing a crisis in its development. In particular, the conference was important and timely for two reasons. First, it illustrated that the national unity debate is not solely a French-English affair but affects profoundly other ethnic groups in the nation as well. Secondly, and more to the point, it established the essential fact that ethno-cultural groups do have a tremendous role to play as the "third force" at this crossroads in Canadian history.

To distill the many subject areas covered by the participants at the conference, which featured papers by the Minister of State for Cultural Development from the Parti Quebecois government, a former commissioner of the federal government, and prominent Ukrainian-Canadian academics, would be a lengthy and difficult task. Yet, the central theme can be put quite compactly and precisely: What is the future path for Canada? Will it be a nation which fully recognizes ethno-cultural pluralism and moves consciously toward this goal by seriously implementing a policy of multiculturalism within the framework of bilingualism, or will it in fact move in the opposite direction and become two nations—one francophone and the other anglophone—where the "backlash" within each will submerge cultural and linguistic pluralism? This is the quintessential question that Ukrainian Canadians and other non-Anglo-Celtic, non-French groups must face in the debate over national unity.

In his address to the conference delegates, Dr. Camille Laurin, Quebec's Minister of State for Cultural Development, implied a strong possibility for the second alternative. He admonished the federal government's policy of institutional bilingualism, stating that it has failed to prevent the "erosion" of the French language and culture in Quebec. "Quebec," he noted, "was forced to become bilingual while the rest of the country remained unilingual and under no obligation to establish bilingualism as policy." He

cited in particular the example of English-speaking Quebecers who, although a linguistic minority, remain an economic majority, continuing their indifference to the Quebecois language and culture. To rectify this situation it is necessary, he argued, "to make Quebec as French as the rest of Canada is English." Clearly this is the Parti Quebecois' strategy in passing Bill 101, of which Laurin was the chief architect. If the rest of Canada objects to this policy, then, Laurin postulated, it may be necessary for Quebec to separate. This is the "trump card" that the Parti Quebecois is ultimately willing to play in the political game with the rest of Canada.

In the context of the "two founding nations" concept, Laurin's argument is both persuasive and cogent. Quebec is special and within its boundaries the language of business and communication must be French. No reasonable and thinking person would object to a new course of action which would make French the language of both the public and private sectors. Yet, in the "francophonization" of Quebec, there must be room for compromise—recognition that Quebec, like the rest of Canada, is a pluralistic society and that this plurality must be scrupulously respected.

In his address, Laurin implied that his government did not accept the policy of multiculturalism (as delineated by the federal government in November 1974) because it would reduce the status of French Canadians to another ethnic group, thereby undermining the original precepts of the BNA Act, a political agreement between two founding peoples. "Cultural pluralism" in Quebec, he declared, would be considered only after French Quebecers had secured their rights unequivocally. This policy reflects, to use Laurin's words, "the chronic sense of insecurity" French-speaking Quebecers have always felt in dealing with the ethnic element in their province. Their xenophobia stems from the perception that immigrant groups coming into Quebec tend to identify with the anglophone minority and to reinforce it. Consequently, a major thrust of the PQ language policy has been to force immigrant groups to embrace French as their first language in the province. Only after this is accomplished, Laurin stated, will the Quebec government encourage minorities to develop their languages and identities within a prescribed French cultural milieu.

Such a policy, no matter how reasonable it appears within the context of making Quebec French, poses a serious threat to minority rights. No matter how humane or generous the PQ government may wish to be toward its minorities, whether they be Anglo-Celtic, Jewish, Italian, Greek, or Ukrainian, the historically xenophobic pressures within Quebec society toward the ethnics would probably dictate a policy of assimilation. This would be

especially true in an independent or quasi-independent (in the political sense) Quebec. In this state the influence of the federal government and the anglophone community would diminish, and new scapegoats would have to be found for the inevitable economic and social pressures that would come to bear on Quebecois society; the ethnics would become the most eligible choice. Furthermore, in the past the Quebec government has not been particularly tolerant of its minorities; there is little reason to believe that it will be more so in the future.

Indeed, the unfortunate situation of ethnic minorities in Quebec was documented by Professor Ivan Myhul (Department of Political Science, Bishop's University) and Professor Roman Serbyn (Department of History, Université du Québec à Montréal) in their presentations on "Separatism and Ethnic Groups in Quebec." The Francophones do perceive a threat from the ethnic community and will continue to be intolerant of the "alloènes," at least until the PQ policies of "language engineering" have been successfully implemented. Meanwhile, the ethno-cultural linguistic groups become more and more fearful of isolation, economic deprivation, and total integration into the French milieu.

Moreover, the secession or quasi-secession of Quebec would have a disastrous psychological effect on the rest of Canada, where tolerance for bilingualism and multiculturalism would be ruled out. In the wake of this inevitable backlash, there would be enormous pressures in the rest of Canada for homogeneity—for assimilation of the ethnics. This would be a paradoxical tragedy indeed at the very moment when there is an emerging recognition in law as well as in spirit that Canada is a pluralistic society.

Given the high stakes involved—the survival of a pluralistic Canada—what position should Ukrainian Canadians and other non-Anglo-Celtic, non-French groups take on the national unity debate? There are three choices: to fatalistically await the outcome of the unity debate, support the "majority policies," or ally with the French in Quebec. Dr. Keith Spicer, former Commissioner of Official Languages, provided the correct course of action by strongly advocating the third alternative in his remarks to the conference delegates. Dr. Spicer's position is based on the realization that "the French fact has made Canadians more open to the idea of a multicultural society . . ." and that "other minority languages and cultures would not have survived had it not been for French Canada." It is a position based on "realpolitik" and should be supported as the only viable course open to ethno-cultural groups. The objective, as argued above, is to keep Canada united so that multiculturalism can continue to develop. In order to accomplish the objective, Quebec must be accommodated within the

Canadian federal framework. In defending the principles of cultural and linguistic pluralism, ethnic groups must aid French-speaking Canadians in securing any reasonable demands. These would include the unquestionable right of French as the language of business and communication in Quebec; the strengthening of institutionalized bilingualism whereby any Canadian of French descent would have the opportunity to deal with the central government in his or her language; and access to "total immersion" French language schools in any region of the country where there are sufficient numbers of French-speaking Canadians.

In supporting the linguistic and cultural aspirations of French Canadians, ethnic groups must realize that they stand or fall with the French Canadians in their ability to preserve their own identities. The PQ is playing for "keeps," and so should the "third force."

In formulating a policy of mutual support between Canada's ethnic groups and French Quebec, Dr. Manoly R. Lupul (Professor of Canadian Educational History and Director of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta) gave what one might describe as the most concrete proposal in a paper entitled "Canada's Options in a Time of Political Crisis and Their Implications for Multiculturalism." In it he outlined three possible political options for Canada—separatism, Trudeau federalism, and regional federalism.

Separatism is unthinkable not only for its implications for multiculturalism, as outlined above, but also for its implications for Quebec itself. If the province were to separate, Dr. Lupul postulated, then the rest of the country would be subjected to ever-increasing unilingual Anglo-American pressures. Quebec on its own could not resist and "would . . . be drowned in the anglophone sea of the American continent."

The second political option—"the status quo, cooperative federalism or Trudeau liberalism" (the policy of "multiculturalism within a bilingual framework" introduced by the Trudeau administration in 1971)—is also bankrupt, according to Dr. Lupul. The programme had been misdirected from its inception because it missed its most important mark—Quebec's Anglophones. This has had unfortunate consequences:

Left largely to their own voluntary whims, the unilingual Anglo-American minority of Quebec—rich, powerful, and urbane—became the natural model for Quebec's venturesome immigrants, whose linguistic preference for English at the time of declining French-Canadian birth rates has provoked . . . bewilderment, acrimony, and ill-feeling.

Thus, Dr. Lupul concluded that "in failing to deal with Quebec's cultural problems at its core (the province's anglophone minority), the Liberal government has been directly responsible for a separatist government . . ."

Within a bilingual concept, the federal administration mis-managed the multicultural programme as well. "The real implications of Trudeau Liberalism for multiculturalism," he stated, "are to co-opt the so-called 'ethnics' with fine-sounding slogans while rendering the implementation of multiculturalism as innocuous as possible." The end result of Trudeau Liberalism has been a nation which is "hardly more bilingual now than it was ten years ago, and its multicultural reality, though recognized, is only slightly more respected than it was ten years ago." Clearly, then, a new approach is necessary.

Dr. Lupul advocates the concept of "regional federalism." This approach entails the redefinition of bilingualism from its narrow English-French focus to encompass all languages other than English outside the province of Quebec. "The concept," according to Dr. Lupul, "recognizes French to be the language of communication in Quebec and Acadia, with English the language of communication in the rest of Canada," without in any way negating the Official Languages Act, which gives French Canadians the right to communicate in French with the federal government and its agencies from coast to coast. The concept of "regional federalism," then, rejects the institutionalization of French in regional jurisdictions outside of Quebec and argues instead that ethno-cultural groups should be allowed to interpret bilingualism to mean second language instruction in their "ancestral tongue" wherever feasible. Dr. Lupul cited the English-Ukrainian bilingual immersion programme in Edmonton's public and separate schools as an example, where pupils are taught in English for one half of the day and in Ukrainian for the other half. Similarly, where numbers warrant, Dr. Lupul suggested that other bilingual schools be established, whether they be English-French, English-Cree, English-German, or any other combination, each varying "from region to region, according to how people themselves perceive their needs." In this way, bilingualism and multiculturalism would become a viable concept throughout the whole nation.

The concept of "regional federalism," Dr. Lupul argued, would receive a favourable response from Quebec because it would recognize "the primacy of French, and the absolute necessity that all who live or settle in Quebec speak French well."

The concept of "regional federalism," as described by Dr. Lupul, is a desirable one. However, like any other wide-reaching scheme, its implementation would entail the surmounting of a

number of major obstacles. First, there would be the financial implications of such a proposal; the costs would be enormous in terms of facilities, appropriate teaching aids, and teaching personnel if regional bilingual schools (in the multicultural sense) are to operate effectively. This would necessitate cost-sharing agreements between the municipal, provincial, and federal governments. Secondly, there would be the question of the status of these bilingual schools from the point of view of the federal government, which would be requested to participate financially in an essentially provincial jurisdiction. It would be impossible, for example, to operate at the federal level on a spectrum of official languages or to provide equal services for all. And thirdly, to implement such a concept, the historical inertia, retrenchment, and prejudice of the Anglo-Celtic populace and the "traditional" school system in many regions of the country would have to be overcome. This would require a concentrated publicity campaign and a good "selling" job in the various regions of the country, not only to the Anglo-Celtic group, but to other ethno-cultural groups as well. Policies and strategies could be devised to surmount these obstacles, but it would require much more study and debate of the "regional federalism" concept than was given at the conference.

Professor W. S. Tarnopolsky (Osgoode Hall Law School, York University), in a paper entitled "A Multicultural Canada: the Basic Issues," approached the debate over national unity from a different focus—what may be termed the humanist perspective. Viewing Canada as basically a humane society, which possesses enough potential "goodwill" among its populace to overcome the approaching crisis and remain a united nation of many cultures in the future, Professor Tarnopolsky called on Canadians to recognize Quebec's right to self-determination first and foremost, and then to make a sincere effort to convince Quebecers that their destiny lies within the Dominion. This, he stated, was the only sensible course Canadians can take. An expert on constitutional law, Professor Tarnopolsky noted that "Canada cannot keep Quebec in Confederation by legislation or court orders," and although the federal government may declare secession unconstitutional, it cannot reasonably enforce its declaration. Economic sanctions would prove ineffective, while using military force "would destroy the country." Professor Tarnopolsky viewed the national unity debate from the international level when he stated that Canadians have a duty to show the world that they can live together in one society which encompasses bilingualism and multiculturalism. If Canada cannot remain united, then, according to Professor Tarnopolsky, one of the most advanced experiments with democracy in the world would have failed.

One might argue that Professor Tarnopolsky's "humanist" approach may yet work if there is enough time to create the proper spirit of goodwill. The Parti Quebecois itself may give Canadians that time, if Dr. Laurin's speech to the delegates was any indication of how far the separatist debate in Quebec itself has progressed. After listening to the Minister of Cultural Development, one was struck by the fact that he gave no clear definition of separatism. Indeed, Dr. Laurin's notions of separatism waffled from "associate state status," to some nebulous interdependence with the rest of Canada "in economic and social spheres," to complete and unequivocal national sovereignty. This seems to indicate that there is a degree of fuzziness in the PQ's own position on the question, and that it may take some time for the PQ and, indeed, for the citizens of Quebec to define precisely the kind of relationship they desire with the rest of Canada. The feeling in Quebec may still very much be separatist if necessary, but not necessarily separatist. Perhaps the PQ will define their position more clearly with the wording of the referendum; but until then, the position taken by Canadians must be tempered and measured by this realization. In this context, Professor Tarnopolsky's plea for "goodwill" is particularly relevant and, if followed, may play a crucial role in ultimately deciding which path Quebec will take. The warm and respectful welcome which Dr. Laurin received in what was his first public speech in western Canada is therefore to be applauded, for it is part of the process in establishing a favourable psychological climate in which the PQ and the citizens of Quebec would make their decision.

The papers of Professor B. Bociurkiw (Department of Political Science, Carleton University) and Mr. W. Roman Petryshyn (research associate, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies) focused on Ukrainians in Canadian society. In his paper entitled "Multiculturalism and the Response of the Ukrainian-Canadian Community," Professor Bociurkiw meticulously unravelled the leading role played by Ukrainian Canadians in the evolution of the government's multicultural policy, especially the contributions of Senator Paul Yuzyk and the Ukrainian Canadian University Students' Union.

Mr. W. Roman Petryshyn, in a paper entitled "The Ukrainian Canadians in Transition," analyzed the Canadian social structure and the mobility patterns of Ukrainians and other ethno-cultural groups within that structure. From his analysis he arrived at three major conclusions: first, "that Canadian society from its inception has been a class and ethnically stratified society" and that "those in Canadian elites conduct policies . . . which reinforce their ethnic control of the public sector"; secondly, that although Ukrainian

Canadians "have entered the ethnic stratification system in the middle, below those in power, but above indigenous native people" and have "experienced some occupational mobility," it "does not mean that Ukrainians will eventually penetrate the Canadian power elite"; and thirdly, that "the enforced conformity of Canadian society has forced Ukrainian-Canadian life to withdraw from the public into the private sector, where assimilation has profoundly affected such basic elements of Ukrainian identity as language usage and religious affiliation." Mr. Petryshyn's discussion of the Ukrainian Canadians' niche in Canada's "vertical mosaic" was both stimulating and provocative; stimulating because it illustrates, to a degree, the societal constraints under which Ukrainians must labour in working out their linguistic and cultural identities in Canada, and provocative because his analysis may apply more appropriately to one region of the country than to others. For example, his arguments may hold true for the older, more entrenched Anglo-Celtic society of central Canada, but not necessarily for western Canada.

The three-day conference ended with a panel discussion on the topic "Multiculturalism and Separatism: the Search for a Ukrainian Consensus." The panelists included Professors B. Bociurkiw, I. Myhul, R. Serbyn, W. S. Tarnopolsky, and Mr. W. R. Petryshyn. A consensus was reached among the participants on three points: that Ukrainian Canadians should support the right of the French in Quebec to self-determination within a federal framework; that further dialogue on the topic of separatism vis-à-vis multiculturalism is essential; and that, for multiculturalism to survive, the involvement and support of Ukrainian Canadians from all walks of life is necessary.

The purpose of the conference was to provide a forum for discussion and an exchange of ideas. In this endeavour it can be judged a success. The proceedings of this conference, which will be published by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies in the near future, will no doubt add immeasurably to the debate on national unity.

*Department of History
University of Alberta*



F. Humeniuk. *Ivan Mazepa*. Oil. 140 x 120 cm. 1976. (Unfinished.)
Photo by John-Paul Himka.



F. Humeniuk. *Carolers*. Oil. 1975. Photo by John-Paul Himka.

John-Paul Himka

UKRAINIAN ART IN THE SOVIET UNION: MAKARENKO AND HUMENIUK

In the spring 1977 issue of the *Journal*, a welcome, but incomplete note on Volodymyr Makarenko appeared. The text and accompanying reproductions rightly called attention to a new development in Soviet art: paintings that blend Ukrainian tradition with Western avant-garde and have nothing in common with socialist realism. Somewhat misleading, however, was the complete identification of Makarenko with the Peterburg group and the understatement that "the young artist has not neglected his cultural roots." In fact, Makarenko is not only part of the Peterburg group, but is also a representative of a specifically Ukrainian school of Soviet painters. The author of the note in the *Journal* could not have known this from Shemiakin's essay in the Hardy catalogue. My own information comes from a conversation with Makarenko himself in May 1976, and from discussions with his associates in Leningrad in 1975 and 1976.

It is not generally known abroad that there exists a specifically Ukrainian avant-garde in the Soviet Union. Yet such a group not only exists, but it holds exhibitions. And it occasionally formulates a manifesto:

The group of the Ukrainian avant-garde continues the traditions of the high Ukrainian renaissance; it relies on the traditions of the school of Mykola Lvovych Boichuk and develops these traditions on the level of modern art. . . .

We are not discovering new territory. We are Ukrainians, satisfied with our own territory and culture. We only want to hold on to what the Lord God gave us.

God put in our hands the artist's talent and we are only doing his will. . . .

The Ukrainian avant-garde held two exhibitions in Moscow, where artists enjoy freer expression than they do in Kiev. Both exhibitions were held in private quarters, not in official galleries. At the first exhibition (held from 22 November to 7 December 1975), six Ukrainian artists displayed their works: Volodymyr Makarenko (Tallin), Feodosii Humeniuk (Leningrad), Natalka Pavlenko (Moscow), Volodymyr Strelnikov (Odessa), Liuda Iast-rub (Odessa) and Vitalii Sozonov (Moscow). Artists from Kiev

were prevented from attending. All told, over eighty paintings and graphics were on display. Many foreign visitors—American, Spanish and French—purchased these works for their private collections. Immediately following the Ukrainian exhibition, Jewish artists held their own exhibition in the same quarters. One Ukrainian artist later told me, with understandable dismay, that while Jews outside the Soviet Union immediately published a catalogue of the Jewish exhibition, the Ukrainians overseas completely ignored the Ukrainian exhibition. Undaunted, the Ukrainian avant-garde put on a second exhibition (12-22 March 1976). This time thirteen artists, including a larger contingent from the Ukrainian SSR, displayed over 200 works. The six veterans of the previous exhibition (including Makarenko) participated in the second exhibition as well. Again, works sold well and the exhibition was a success.

Abroad, Volodymyr Makarenko is the best known of the Ukrainian avant-garde painters—he is one of the most talented of the group and the only one to hold an exhibition, in absentia, in Paris. But also very talented is the leader of the group and the organizer of both exhibitions, Feodosii Humeniuk.

Feodosii Humeniuk, born in the village of Rybchyntsi (Vynnytsia oblast) in 1941, received his professional training in Leningrad's Academy of Art. He has exhibited in Czechoslovakia as well as in Leningrad and Moscow; recently he illustrated the Ukrainian calendar published in Warsaw (*Ukrainskyi kalendar*, 1977). After organizing the two Moscow exhibitions, Humeniuk was deprived of his residence permit in Leningrad and went to live in Dnipropetrovsk. Humeniuk feels especially close to seventeenth century Ukrainian painting, the influence of which is readily discernible in the majority of his works. He is currently painting a series of Cossack hetmans; Doroshenko, Vyhovsky, and Mazepa have already been completed. Other historical and semi-historical figures appear in his canvases: Shevchenko, Ostrianytsia, Roksoliana and the Cossack Mamai. Humeniuk's works are replete with symbolism. In his "Mazepa," for example, a rooster symbolizes Resurrection, and a globe in the hand of Tsar Peter I speaks for itself.

University of Alberta

**DOCUMENTATION FOR UKRAINIAN STUDIES:
REFLECTIONS ON THE BACKGROUND, PROBLEMS, AND
PERSPECTIVES OF THE HARVARD EXPERIENCE***

Bibliological work in Ukraine has a long, interesting, and virtually unexplored history. Since the beginning of printing in Ukraine (1574), the focus of printing and bibliographical activity has moved back and forth between the eastern and western Ukrainian lands. Thus, while in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the centers were for the most part in western Ukraine (Lviv, Ostrih), in the eighteenth century, the Ukrainian typographies in Kiev, Chernihiv and the newly established cities of Ekaterynoslav, Mykolaiv, and Kharkiv became important publishing and bibliographical centers.¹ However, with the second half of the nineteenth century, the focus shifted again to Galicia.² Here the less oppressive hand of the Austrian government permitted the relatively unfettered development of learned organizations, such as the Bibliographical Commission of the Shevchenko Scientific

* This paper was presented to a "Workshop on Ukrainian Library Collections," April 30-May 1, 1977, sponsored by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and held in Toronto, Canada. For partial documentation on some of the issues raised in this paper see: the essays and bibliography collected in *Recenzija*, V, No. 1 (Fall-Winter, 1974), devoted to the four-hundredth anniversary of printing in Ukraine, as well as the bibliography in E. Kasinec, "Skhidnoslovianska knyzhkova kultura visimnadtsiatoho stolittia: na prykladi Ukrainy," a translation of a paper delivered at the sixteenth annual convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, St. Louis, October 9, 1977. For information on the development of serial publications in Ukraine see the review essay by E. Kasinec in *Recenzija*, VI, No. 1 (Fall-Winter, 1975):41-53; on manuscript holdings see *Recenzija*, VII, No. 1 (Fall-Winter, 1977).

¹ For a useful review of the history of old Ukrainian printing, see the essays collected in *Recenzija*, V, No. 1 (Fall-Winter, 1974).

² On modern Ukrainian bibliological developments, see essay by E. Kasinec in *ibid.*, VI, No. 1 (Fall-Winter, 1975), and section IV in "Jurij O. Ivaniv-Mezenko (1892-1969) as a Bibliographer During his Kijivan Period (1919-1933)," by the same author. This unpublished manuscript was originally read as a lecture at the University of Oregon, October 1, 1976, and then repeated at Harvard University as the First Bohdan Krawciw Memorial Lecture, December 14, 1976.

Society, as well as the creation of historical museums, and the publication of serials on a large scale. In the absence of a single national bibliography, serials served as surrogates for national bibliographic registration. Consequently, by the beginning of this century, Galicia boasted a number of important bibliographers, among them I. O. Levytsky, I. Svetsytsky, and Vasyl Domanytsky, and their ranks grew in the 1920s. Here we might mention Ivan Kalynovych, Ivan Krevetsky, Stepan Siropolko, Ivan Ohienko (Metropolitan Illarion), Lev Bykovsky, and the prolific E. Iu. Pelensky. To the degree that Ukrainian bibliography was transplanted to the West, it was done so through the efforts of some of these individuals.

In eastern Ukraine, important institutional library collections existed in Kharkiv, Kiev, and Odessa, while private collectors such as V. V. Tarnavsky in Chernihiv, S. A. Pol in Ekaterynoslav, and Metropolitan Flavian of Kiev developed important collections of manuscripts and printed books. Research in bibliography was conducted at the Novorossiiia Bibliographical Society, founded in 1898 by I. A. Lynnychenko. Important work in bibliography was pursued by individual enthusiasts such as V. S. Ikonnikov, the bio-bibliographer Ivan Pavlovsky, the Taurica bibliographer Academician Arsenii Markevych, the didactic bibliographer Khrystyna Alchevska, and the important literary bibliographer M. Komarov (pseudonym Umanets). Still, the restrictive policy of the tsarist regime towards the development of the *Ukrainian-language* book served to arrest the creative development of Ukrainian book culture. With the initiation of "Ukrainization" by the Soviet government in 1923, this policy was partially rescinded and the tsarist fetters broken. This led to the creation of substantial research collections of Ucrainica and the development of a Ukrainian national school of bibliography. This school is best represented by Iu. O. Ivaniv-Mezhenko and his colleagues in the Ukrainian Scientific Institute of Bibliology (UNIK) which was founded in 1922. Unfortunately, these developments in Soviet Ukraine were short-lived. By 1931 Mezhenko had been denounced as a negative force in Ukrainian bibliography, and both he and his colleagues—M. Iashuk, Dmytro Balyka, Kost Dovhan, Olena Maslova, and Mykhailo Iasynsky, to name but a few—were later either purged and exiled from the centers of Ukrainian bibliological work, or, as in the case of M. V. Heppener, Mykhailo Hodkevych, and F. P. Maksymenko, were transferred from research to administrative positions.³

³ For a review of developments in Soviet Ukraine in the last decade, see E. Kasinec, "Library and Information Sciences in the Soviet Ukraine

After the Second World War, attempts to reconstitute Ukrainian bibliological work in the West began in Germany with the founding of *Ukrainski bibliolohichni visti* (1948) by Volodymyr Doroshenko and the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences. Unfortunately, this publication, like the *Ridna knyha na chuzhyni: orhan knyhotsentru* (1949), survived only its debut issue. Within the next decade, quite a number of the figures who were so active in bibliological and publishing activities in interwar Galicia and Czechoslovakia—Iu. Tyshchenko (Siry), A. P. Zhyvotko, E. Iu. Pelensky, Stepan Siropolko, Petro Zlenko, and Vitalii Levytsky—were to pass from the scene.

A significant number of the Ukrainian émigré professionals who came to the United States and Canada in the postwar period entered the library profession here in the late fifties. The situation which greeted them was not an altogether happy one. There existed in all of North America and Europe only a handful of documentary collections which identified themselves clearly as "Ukrainian," and even the substantial holdings of *Ucrainica* in some of the major Western repositories—the Library of Congress, the Institut des Langues et Civilisations Orientales, the Pontifical Oriental Institute, the British Museum Library, the University Library in Vienna, and the Helsinki University Library—were often not clearly delimited from the Russian collections, or—what was even worse—unclassified. This situation can only in small portions be explained by malice or political prejudices: for the most part it was a product of ignorance or lack of interest. Still, there were some reasons for optimism.

By 1956 J. B. Rudnycky had completed an unpublished survey of *Ucrainica* at the Library of Congress (this would later be supplemented by the unpublished works of Andrew Fessenko and Vasyl Nadraga) and several bibliological serials began to appear: *Biblios* (New York, Spring, 1955), the *Bulletin* of the Library Commission of the Shevchenko Scientific Society (New York, Fall, 1959), *Ucrainica Canadiana* (Winnipeg, 1953), and the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences' *Richnyk Ukrainskoi bibliohrafi* (New York, 1960). In the following decades several bibliographical tools were published. Among these were *Ucrainica bibliographies* by the Human Relations Area File (1956), V. J. Kaye-

(1964-1976) and the Tasks of Ukrainian Bibliology in the West," *Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies Held at Harvard University During the Academic Year 1975-1976*, No. VI, pp. 61-64. Also see *idem.*, "Istorychnyi rozvytok biblioteknykh nauk v sovetskii Ukraini," *Svoboda*, August 16 and 17, 1977.

Kysilewsky (Winnipeg, 1961), Andrew Gregorovich (Toronto, 1964), O. Kravcheniuk (New York, 1964), Roman Weres (Chicago, 1967) and Alexander Sokolyszyn (New York, 1973). In 1963 the Society of Ukrainian Librarians of North America was founded, while the quarterly journal *Ukrainska knyha* (taking its name from Pelensky's journal) began publication in 1971 (in Philadelphia) as its official organ. The growth in the number of Ucrainica reference aids, as well as the development of a large body of professional Ukrainian bibliographers and librarians and an émigré book market contributed to create factors for positive change in the world of Ukrainian émigré bibliography. Greater attention began to be paid by Slavic bibliographers of non-Ukrainian descent to problems of transliteration, classification, and the building of Ukrainian holdings of both émigré and Soviet provenance. In some collections, such as the Library of Congress, the New York Public Library, and the Harvard University Library, the base on which to build dated from the beginning of this century when exchanges were conducted with learned institutions in Ukraine. Of course, some materials had been purchased in the late twenties and thirties by such pioneers as A. C. Coolidge at Harvard. This growth continued through the boom years in Slavic studies during the sixties and early seventies and has only recently begun to level off. As a result, substantial collections of Ucrainica were created at the University of Illinois (Urbana), the University of Toronto, the University of Alberta, and by the late A. A. Granovsky at the University of Minnesota.⁴ Unfortunately, limitations of space do not permit us to deal with such issues as the types of Ucrainica collections in the West, the structure of publishing, and the impact of this publishing on documentary collections.

Despite these important achievements, I would still contend that those concerned with Ukrainian documentation are in a professionally "vulnerable" position. Let me point to some of the reasons for this vulnerability. First, recent years have seen the death of some of the major figures in the field of Ukrainian documentation in the West—V. Doroshenko (1963), V. Mijakovs'kyj (1972), and, most recently, B. Krawciw (1975). Secondly, of the dozens of librarians of Ukrainian descent who are employed in North American repositories, the most talented are frequently employed in administrative and technical rather than research capac-

⁴ Some of these developments are treated within the larger context of Slavic bibliography in E. Kasinec, "The Slavic Bibliographer in an Age of Ethnicity: New Problems and New Perspectives," an address given at the University of Alberta, October 5, 1976.

ities. Thirdly, collections in Soviet Ukraine, with only some exceptions, still remain little used by North American researchers, while some collections in our own country are virtually inaccessible because of the eccentricity of the curators. Furthermore, only a fraction of the upwards of two dozen major Ucrainica archival and manuscript collections in the United States have adequate descriptions.

Last but not least, a state of professional *anomie* also prevails among Ukrainian bibliographers. Although the best of their number must be acquainted with a large amount of documentation in linguistic groups ranging from the Turkic to the Germanic, there is a severe paucity of sophisticated "pilot" or reference tools with which to establish the parameters of their discipline.

This anomie has important consequences for individual collections of Ucrainica. Much of the Ukrainian collection-building activity for retrospective materials has taken on an erratic quality: either it is a function of the research interests of one individual, or it assumes a "shotgun" quality, where everything is indiscriminately collected. It is a rare collection indeed that has carefully made a target for its collections and has proceeded to work consistently towards this goal. In this respect, the luckiest collections are perhaps those which, like the Immigration Center at the University of Minnesota, have a prescribed external profile to which to conform.

The building of a research collection should be the product of at least two determinants. The first and most obvious of these is the specific needs of the teaching and research activities of both faculty and students; the second—certain well-established norms of collection building for research libraries.⁵ An attempt should be made, for example, to be exhaustive in the development of reference aids of all types. The important point to be remembered here is flexibility in the notion of Ucrainica reference aids: essentially these are tools that are "information heavy" and are more frequently consulted than read. This definition should link such formally disparate material as indices to legal and archaeographic collections, schematics of dioceses, annual listings of works published in Ukraine, or even works of a textological nature, such as the several fascicules published by Pelensky in his *Ukrainska knyhoznavcha biblioteka* (1937—1942). Because language is a prime factor in the retention of national culture, it is imperative to continue to build important collections of dictionaries, especially those published by the Academy of Sciences in Ukraine

⁵ Stephen Ford, *The Acquisition of Library Materials* (Chicago, 1973).

during the twenties and collected in the checklist by M. Pezhansky and O. Hryhorovych. Also of great importance are the catalogues of book publishers and sellers. Here we might mention the Tyshchenko (1942), *Ukrainsko-ruska vydavnycha spilka* (1913), *Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy* (1930), or even the more recent *Karpaty* (1946-1970) catalogues. Serial literature, too, is especially important because it holds interest for a wide clientele. On the pages of newspapers, periodicals and almanacs, the area specialist can find both source material and secondary studies; the student of publishing will find advertisements; and the bibliographer—reviews and listings of currently received publications. Especially important are bibliographical and bibliological publications, as well as those that have a registrative function.⁶

These general considerations now aside, let us turn to the specific case of collection building at Harvard.

II.

Although our primary interest at the Harvard University Library is in written materials, we fully appreciate that information about the Ukrainian experience is found in iconographic, photographic, phonographic and tape forms as well. We have attempted to approach this documentation phenomenologically, that is, as something which exists and should be studied because it exists. At Harvard, *Ucrainica* is defined by the following four criteria: documentation in the Ukrainian language; documentation which has as its provenance the Ukrainian ethnic territory; documentation concerning Ukraine; and, finally, works by individuals of Ukrainian descent irrespective of the theme of their writings. Some aspects of our acquisitions program have been fulfilled better than others. Thus, some important successes have been achieved in the acquisition of old (pre-1800) and rare books, as well as modern first editions. These are now housed in the Houghton Rare Books and Manuscript Library.⁷ On the other hand, our acquisition efforts have not been sufficiently concentrated on North Amer-

⁶ See Lev Bykovsky, *Ukrainski knyhoznavchi periodyky i zbirnyky pershoi polovyny XX-ho stolittia (prynahidni notatky)* (Denver, 1978) (a typescript reproduced in ten copies).

⁷ On these publications, see E. Kasinec, *Ukrainian Books (XVI-XIX Centuries): A Checklist of an Exhibition Held in the Houghton Rare Books and Manuscripts Library December 3-6, 1976* (Cambridge, Mass., 1976) and *id.*, "Unikalna kopiiia Lvivskoho 'Bukvaria' Ivana Fedorovycha v Harvardi," *Svoboda*, August 30, 1974.

ican imprints, Ucrainica in Western languages, works in the pure sciences published in Ukraine, and juvenilia. Since 1973, the antiquarian collections have been built for the most part by gifts from members of the Ukrainian community. Some of the several hundred individual gifts and collections have been very large and impressive. Here we might mention the Bazansky Library and Archives (1974), the Krawciw collection (1977), the Dmytriv, Lysohir, Prosvita and TSESUS libraries (all upwards of a thousand items), and, most recently, the Shandor and Chopek collections.⁸ Substantial gifts and monies have also been donated by such individuals as Dr. Ihor Galarnyk for the purchase of rare books and manuscripts.⁹

Needless to say, this active solicitation of Ucrainica gifts by the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute has had a significant impact on the physical size and excellence of the Ucrainica collections of the Harvard University Library. In June 1971, the published "Slav" shelflist registered approximately 7,000 volumes in the field of Ukrainian literature and history. Because the collections at Harvard are arranged according to subject, form (hard copy, microform), and rarity, much Ucrainica was catalogued in collections outside the "Slav" classification. If we *conservatively* calculate that the annual intake of Ucrainica is 1,500 volumes, we can estimate an addition to the catalogued collections of more than 9,000 volumes since June 1971. This figure of 16,000 volumes *does not include* the collections of the Ukrainian Research Institute Reference Library, vast uncatalogued collections, nor the holdings of Ucrainica in the many departmental collections of the Harvard Library system. It is probably no exaggeration to state that, after the Library of Congress, the Harvard University Library has the largest and best balanced Ucrainica collection in North America.¹⁰

⁸ On some of these gifts, see "Vartisne popovnennia biblioteky UNI," *Svoboda*, January 16, 1974. The same issue contains a description of the Dmytriv collection.

⁹ On the DeCamillis *Cathechism* donated by Dr. Galarnyk, see the recently published article by Paul R. Magocsi and Bohdan O. Struminskyj, "The First Carpatho-Ruthenian Printed Book," *The Harvard Library Bulletin*, 25, No. 3 (1977):292-309.

¹⁰ Rev. Dmytro Blazejowsky and E. Kasinec, with the assistance of I. Struminskyj, have compiled a catalogue of the monographic accessions to the Ucrainica collections of the Harvard College Library from 1970 to November 1, 1977. This 16mm microfilm catalogue contains upwards of 9,000 entries.

Soviet Ukrainian and antiquarian publications are purchased regularly. Current Soviet Ukrainian publications are obtained on standing orders from Les Livres Etrangères in Paris, as well as through exchanges with Soviet libraries and individual purchases from dealers in the United States and Canada. Individual antiquarian items are purchased as they appear in the antiquarian catalogues of more than fifty dealers. Thus far, exchanges between the Harvard College Library and the Library of the Academy of Sciences (Kiev) have been restricted for the most part to microfilms of nineteenth century serial publications (especially the *vedomosti* series), reference aids, archaeographic collections, and, most recently, belles lettres from the 1920s. In addition, through the efforts of Paul R. Magocsi, the library was successful in obtaining microfilms of many rare Galician Ukrainian and Carpatho-Ruthenian serial publications of the nineteenth century.¹¹ All microform materials are housed in the Lamont Library. Exchanges have permitted us to build a unique collection of "semipublished" (non-trade) and "fugitive" publications issued in small printings or for internal use within the Soviet Union.

The collections of the Institute Reference Library have been built almost exclusively on the basis of gifts from the Ukrainian community and exchanges with research collections in the United States. The Reference Library now exchanges duplicates from its collections with other large collections such as the Yale University Library, the University of Illinois, and the Ohio State University libraries. The Gifts and Exchanges Division of the Library of Congress also has materials which are available gratis.

The existence of the Ukrainian Studies Fund has also helped the collection-building effort in at least two ways. First, it has provided a high degree of visibility for collection-building activities, both through its many publications and advertisements, and by allowing Institute staff the opportunity to travel to virtually all major centers of the Ukrainian immigration in the United States and Canada. In each of these centers there exists a nucleus of Studies Fund volunteers familiar with the terrain, who also serve as a mine of information on local bibliophiles, institutional collections, and other academically related matters. Very frequently these individuals can be mobilized to physically move a collection (as was the case in 1974 with the Bazansky collection in Detroit and the Krawciw collection), and they are also often able to assist with local transportation and lodging. Secondly, the Studies Fund

¹¹ See Paul R. Magocsi and Olga K. Mayo, *Carpatho-Ruthenica at Harvard* (Englewood, New Jersey, 1977).

has been a source of funding for "special purchases" of rare materials when the modest yearly library budget for acquisitions was depleted. Efforts are now being made, in cooperation with the Development Office of the Harvard University Library, to create endowed funds for the purchase of both current and retrospective *Ucrainica*. The creation of these endowed funds will ensure the perpetual growth of *Ucrainica* at Harvard without having to rely on the vagaries of the current budgets for Ukrainian studies. Unfortunately, it sometimes happens that those involved with the collection of funds for Ukrainian studies must be made to realize that, without the documentation *for study*, there can be no research on a sophisticated level.

The question of fund raising leads to the issue of the interface of the collection-building effort with the larger Ukrainian community. This is a very subtle and difficult problem which can be dealt with on several different levels. Precisely because of the high degree of exposure given to collection building by the fund raisers, any criticism of the shortcomings of *their* activities can potentially turn into a questioning and criticism of the collection-building efforts as well. Thus, at times individuals have made invidious comparisons between the vast outlay of community funds for documentation at Harvard with the ostensibly generous governmental funding of Ukrainian collections at national repositories and at some state universities. In making these accusations, they seem insensitive to the fact that significant processing costs are covered by the Harvard College Library, as well as to the advantages of having significant *Ucrainica* in the world's most outstanding university library. As well, potential donors or sellers frequently have an excessive notion of the value of their books. I empathize with Leona Rostenberg's story of once having received a six-page description of a Bible from a potential seller: "We would have purchased this 1579 Bible for an appropriate price [she adds], but could not meet the hopes of the owner who wished 'only to realize a reasonable price offer which would enable my husband, myself and our four young children to purchase a small home.'" I might add that our Institute does not appraise gifts, but does make the technical arrangements for the potential gifts to be appraised by dealers.

Were it necessary to summarize my personal attitude towards the general academic public and the Ukrainian community in particular, I would use the term "activist." It is my fervent belief that Ukrainian librarianship now has an important function to play in shaping the needs of the academic specialist by creating new and better collections of documentation, and by honing extant

systems of classification and analytics so that these collections become more accessible.

Documentation is not the province of the subject specialist alone: librarians must emphasize that documentation has a historical and physical aspect which is as susceptible to systematic study as the subject contents of that documentation. Thus, as Serhii Maslov contended, the bibliographer must be educated to deal with the paper, ink, watermarking, and typeface of books, and must be equally conversant with the history of Ukrainian publishing, art, graphic history, and writing. In pursuing this goal over the last several years, an attempt has been made to encourage the reviewing of reference and library science-related material in the semiannual journal *Recenzija*. Indeed, one entire issue (Vol. V, No. 1) was given over to a discussion of the four-hundredth anniversary of book printing in Ukraine. An attempt has also been made to create a series of Library and Information Science lectures at the Institute, in cosponsorship with the Harvard Library Club. These have dealt with "Publishing in the Soviet Union" (presented by G. P. M. Walker of the Bodleian Library), the "Library of Congress Classification and Subject Headings and Slavic Studies" (A. Turchyn), the "Information Marketplace and the Obsolescence of Libraries" (K. K. Kalba), and "The Computer and the Humanist: Problems and Perspectives" (J. Raben).¹² The latter seminar in particular raised many important suggestions. It included such ideas as the use of the computer in serials of a given period. Another possible application of the computer might be the creation of subject and alternate array catalogues (e.g., by date of publication) on the basis of the following large body of main entry cards: (1) the shelf lists of the New York Public Library; (2) the Harvard Ucrainica collections union catalogue housed at the Ukrainian Research Institute; and (3) the Nadraga files at the Library of Congress.

Another goal of our program has been the promotion of Ukrainian documentation through the organization of exhibits within the Harvard Library system. We have also assisted in the organization of exhibits for various organizations within the Ukrainian community. Since the establishment of the Institute in 1973,

¹² The Walker and Raben lectures are summarized in the *Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies Held at Harvard University During the Academic Year 1975-1976*, No. VI, pp. 76-79, 107-109 respectively.

The Kalba lecture was published as "Libraries in the Information Marketplace," in Leigh Estabrook, ed., *Libraries in Post-Industrial Society* (Phoenix, 1977), pp. 3061-320.

at least six such exhibits have been mounted, and have dealt with such diverse themes as Ukrainian immigration in the United States, Ukrainian rare books and manuscripts, and documentation on the Ukrainian religious experience.¹³

III.

Travel to Ukraine should be among the most important priorities for librarians and bibliographers. With the expansion of the Fulbright system to the Soviet Union, and the growing number of exchanges between Canada and the United States on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other, now is a propitious time to travel. Several individuals of my personal acquaintance have already had an opportunity to work in archives and libraries in Soviet Ukraine. One should not automatically assume, however, that the best collections of Ucrainica in all areas will necessarily be found in Ukraine: war, centralization of holdings, and fires have all taken their toll. Nonetheless, the bibliographer or librarian who does visit Ukraine can expect to find much important reference material of a "semipublished" or archival nature. The existence of such items as the galleys of I. O. Levytsky's unpublished works, the Korduba historiographical card file in Lviv, the Nikolsky file in Leningrad, and the remains of reference aids begun in the 1920s by the Academy of Sciences are well known. Hence, better exchanges of materials must be arranged with collections other than those in Kiev, especially if they contain provincial serial publications.

Still another important question confronting Ukrainian bibliographers is the coordination of collection-building efforts. For all practical purposes, Ukrainian collections in Canada are concentrated in Ontario, with significant collections in British Columbia and Alberta; older private religious collections such as those of the Basilian Fathers in Mundare, and the Orthodox College of St. Andrew's in Winnipeg contain important materials, but, for a variety of reasons, are not fully accessible. One of the top priorities of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies must be to

¹³ Several catalogues for these exhibits are available. See, for example, those compiled by E. Kasinec, with Jan Stepan and Oksana Grabowicz, *Masarykiana: a Checklist of an Exhibition March 6-14, 1975* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), and with Rostyslaw Sochynsky, M.D., *Ukrains'ki Likari: Vystavka Drukovanykh Tvoriv; An exhibition of the Publications of Ukrainian Physicians. Hotel Americana, New York City, May 24-25, 1974* (Cambridge, Mass., 1974).

bring to light some of these existing materials, and to assist and encourage the publication of descriptions of these holdings. Indeed, I would go so far as to urge that even private collections of Ukrainian Canadiana should be *deposited* (if not donated), catalogued, and made fully accessible to qualified researchers within university or academic libraries. Finally, collection building must proceed conservatively: that is, it must be based on the previously existing strengths of the collection. These strengths might be in a particular geographic area of Ukraine (e.g., Bukovyna, Subcarpathian Rus), subject, chronological field (e.g., belles lettres of the twenties at the Universities of Toronto and Illinois), type of material (rare books at the Library of Congress and Harvard), or even provenance (the immigrant imprints at the University of Minnesota). We should begin to route materials to one another and to practice occasional abstinence in collection building. But in order for this coordination to be as fully realized as possible, I would suggest that the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies cosponsor a symposium on *Ukrainian Accessions and Bibliology* to be held in Cambridge or Edmonton in early 1978. In this connection, I should emphasize that such a symposium should invite not only individuals from the field of Ukrainian librarianship, but also persons working for governmental agencies in the United States and Canada whose activities impinge upon Ukrainian documentation.

Another important bibliographical desideratum should be the creation of a research guide to Ukrainian studies in the humanities along the lines of the guide to Russian studies by J. S. G. Simmons (published in 1973). Still another important desideratum should be the creation of a *select* union list of Ucrainica found in the major North American library collections. At this juncture in the development of Ukrainian studies, we must not fatuously insist upon comprehensiveness or exhaustiveness in such a project: we must *do what is possible*. The union list does not need even to appear in hard copy, but could be reproduced and distributed in microfiche. The same could be done for catalogues of Ucrainica in individual libraries. The bibliographical portions from the many Ucrainica dissertations should also be placed on microfiche, thereby to serve as an important indication of the type and pattern of materials being used on the graduate research level.

Finally, some of the major bibliographical tools in Ukrainian studies exist only in unique copies in American repositories, and their condition is rapidly deteriorating. One of the major projects of the Canadian Institute might be the creation of a *Library of Ukrainian Reference Tools*. This library should have as its aim to make more readily available those reference aids in the field of

Ukrainian studies that have either gone "out of print" or were initially published in limited printings.¹⁴ Included in the first category are many reference aids published by the various divisions of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences during the period of Ukrainization, indices to such periodicals as the *Zapysky* of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* and other such tools listed in my work coauthored with Professor Łesiów and entitled *Ucrainica in the Harvard University Library: Reference Aids* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975).

When seen against the sometimes dismal background of modern Ukrainian bibliographical and library work, some of the challenges and promises presently available to Ukrainian librarians and bibliographers seem impressive indeed. The growing number of potential users of Ukrainian scholarly books and reference aids, the existence of a large, historically minded, and generous Ukrainian community, and the endowment of two major scholarly Institutes all indicate that the efforts of Ukrainian bibliographers to create collections of Ukrainian documentation will be appreciatively received. Certainly this has been one of the important and edifying lessons of the Harvard experience.

Harvard University

¹⁴ *Ucrainica* works that have been republished are listed in E. Kasinec, *Preliminary Checklists of Ucrainica in Reprint and Microform*. No. 1: *Ucrainica in Cyrillic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1974); and No. 2, Part 1: *Ucrainica in Microfilm* (Cambridge, Mass., 1974).

PRIMARY SOURCES TO IMMIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT AT THE PUBLIC ARCHIVES OF CANADA

(WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO UKRAINIANS)

The Public Archives of Canada (PAC), located at 395 Wellington Street in Ottawa, has evolved to become the official national repository for documentation of Canadian history following its creation by Order-in-Council of June 20, 1872. For this reason, it is the logical source for the study of immigration and settlement in Canada.

Being the source to Canadian history that it is, the PAC has a responsibility to acquire, protect, and preserve documentation relating to all developments within the Canadian experience. Thus all forms of documentation are collected, regardless of their medium of information transferral. Consequently, the evolution of the "total archives" principle has led to the establishment of eight divisions, in order to facilitate the efficient administration of historical data and to maintain a unity among independent, yet inter-related areas. These eight divisions are: the Manuscript Division, which includes the Ethnic Archives; the Public Records Division; the Archives Library; the National Map Collection; the Picture Division; the National Film Archives (56 O'Connor Street, Ottawa), which includes the Sound Archives (344 Wellington Street, Ottawa); and the Machine Readable Archives (Larivière Building, Hull).

The editorial board of the Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies is introducing a series of articles about sources to immigration and settlement in Canada to be found in government documents located in the Public Archives of Canada. Emphasis will be placed on the process of immigration, that is, on the soliciting, screening, and administration of immigrants. A corollary of the immigration process is the commencement of settlement and socialization of the immigrant. Both facets will be explored through the use of government records and by stressing certain themes.

The articles have a three-fold purpose. The first section will cover the evolution of the administrative and political structure of a government department since Confederation, but only as it pertains to immigration and settlement. Many departments were involved directly at some point in time in some aspect of immigration and settlement. Since responsibilities have shifted considerably among government departments, it is necessary for a researcher to know the many nuances in the application of government policy. Certainly a knowledge of government administrative

history would facilitate the researcher's understanding of a department's material. Government records have been organized according to the principle of respects des fond, a regard for the original order of classification used by a department, so that their activities and the methods of administration are reflected accurately. Adherence to the principle of provenance guards against the separation of material according to themes and leaves it as a distinct group.

The second section will consist of a description of the contents and the physical extent of the documents, with an annotation of themes which arise in a particular record group.

The last section will illustrate how this material may be utilized in the study of Ukrainian immigration to and settlement in Canada.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PUBLIC RECORDS DIVISION

In recent years, students of Canadian history have begun to stress the importance of understanding the structure and functioning of Canadian society as a mirror of given social conditions, religious mores, and political concerns. This interest in Canadian social history has placed emphasis on the wide-ranging effects of the environment on the common man and how his role is reflected within society. History, so it would appear, is no longer to be seen through the deeds of great men alone. Because of this shift in interest, the study of the process of immigration and subsequent rural or urban settlement has gained respectability and has become concomitant with studying the history of the Prairie region, an area hitherto largely ignored.

Many researchers have been oblivious of the wealth of material pertaining to immigration and settlement located in government records. It is erroneous to support the belief that all government documents report on routine business matters. The contrary is the case, if the researcher takes the time to sift through the material. Government records provide interesting insights, which complement personal papers about various aspects of government activities pertaining to the appraisal and implementation of policies.

At present, the Public Records Division of the PAC is responsible for 119 record groups (collections), of which forty-three touch upon the subject of immigration and settlement. There are several collections which, by the very nature of their composition and the departments they represent, are designated as major sources to immigration and settlement. These major sources are as follows: (1) RG 15, Department of the Interior; (2) RG 17, Department of Agriculture; (3) RG 26, Department of Citizenship

and Immigration; (4) RG 76, Immigration Branch; and (5) RG 82, Immigration Appeal Board.

The following article is an introduction to the Department of Agriculture, the *first* government department to be responsible for immigration and settlement.

*THE BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE—THE PRECURSOR
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE*

Redirecting Agricultural Interests, 1852-1867

In the mid-nineteenth century, financial stakes in the United Provinces were closely associated with the traffic of primary goods and not with the attainment of economic self-sufficiency and political independence. However, the channeling of commerce via the traditional St. Lawrence trade route was no longer efficient or profitable. As well, the effects of abandonment of the British system of colonial preference, the repeal of the Navigation Act, and crop shortages due to a steady decline in soil productivity created an economic crisis for Canadian trade. To remedy the problem, attempts were made to attract American trade by utilizing recently completed canals along the St. Lawrence (1848) and new railways. It was clear, however, that the St. Lawrence thoroughfare could not compete with American eastern ports, nor could a Canadian agricultural basin be recreated in the St. Lawrence Valley to match the advancing American frontier. Thus, it was not surprising that Canadian business concerns found the thriving American industrial and agricultural market, and the cheap export canal down the Hudson River via New York particularly inviting.

Directing economic interest to the United States was detrimental to the survival of the provinces as a British colony. They were thus vulnerable not only to American expansionist interests, but also to the prevailing vision that commercial gains were tied intrinsically to immigration and the opening of the American frontier. A redirection of interests was imperative for the survival of the colony.

While it was futile to hope that the pace and extent of commerce and colonization could at least be maintained, if not expanded, efforts were, nonetheless, made to stimulate the economy and to open lands on the margin of the Pre-Cambrian Shield. This activity became the principal responsibility of the Bureau of Agriculture, created in 1852¹ in the two parts of the United Provinces.

¹ *Statutes of Canada*, 16 Vic., c. 11 and c. 18, 1852.

It was organized to centralize and coordinate separate agricultural institutions and societies in order to facilitate the collection and dissemination of funds, facts, and statistics; the publication of useful information; the establishment of agricultural museums; the supervision of local societies; and the conduct of annual exhibitions. In this way parliament assumed a greater responsibility for controlling the activities of county and township agricultural associations by allocating funds through the Bureau. In 1857, the Bureau of Agriculture was also assigned the duty to promote mechanical science and to set up boards of arts and manufactures.²

In addition, the Bureau of Agriculture, under the Minister of Agriculture, was assigned the "official superintendence and management of all matters relative to Immigration into this Province from Europe or from America or any other Country."³ It was believed that a steady flow of immigrants, particularly itinerant agriculturalists en route to the mid-western United States, would ensure commercial prosperity. There was initiated a colonization policy in the United Provinces. Due to the exhaustion of better crown lands in the Upper Canadian peninsula, the land-sale policy was abandoned in 1854 in favour of granting free homesteads along the Ottawa-Huron tract to encourage more immigrants to settle there. The prospective immigrant was to have some capital, and stamina for the climate and terrain of the northern bushlands. A small number of Norwegians and Swedes did emigrate to the area since it was similar to their native environment. Other settlers came from Germany, Prussia, Ireland, Great Britain, and France. The situation was different in Canada East, where funds were dissipated on local projects rather than on attracting immigrants, whom, it was believed, would endanger the local French culture. While it seemed that, on that whole, much energy was spent on encouraging immigration, the tone of thirteen House committee reports, submitted between 1857 and 1865, were steeped in pessimism and overall defeat.

It was opportune that, at that time, certain opinion supported the transferal of a sizeable portion of land belonging to the Hudson Bay Company to the Canadas. Thus, a Select Committee on the Hudson's Bay Company was appointed in 1857 to initiate the exploration of timber, mineral, and agricultural prospects in the western region. The exploitation of these natural resources could be achieved through investment and colonization.

² *Ibid.*, 20 Vic., c. 32, 1857.

³ *Ibid.*, 16 Vic., c. 11, 1852, s. 6.

As a result of the disappointing results in agricultural development in the Canadas, one of several interests supporting Confederation proposed the union of the eastern provinces with the western region. Expansion could only occur westward. Prosperity lay in the development of the prairies: it was hoped that colonization and frontier expansion would develop a strong, profitable, and self-sufficient financial base for Canada. This became synonymous with agriculture and immigration, both of which were dependent on outside stimuli, particularly financial, industrial, and transportation interests.

The discussions at the Quebec Conference (1864) resolved that the Dominion government would be responsible for immigration in general, while the old provinces would be left with the administration of crown lands and the few remaining land titles, the encouragement of agricultural development in the region, and provision of agricultural education. The British North America Act (1867) provided concurrent powers to the legislatures of the provinces and the Dominion to introduce laws on agriculture and immigration, but in cases of conflict the law of the legislature of the provinces in these matters was subordinate to the Parliament of Canada.⁴ Mineral rights, as well as the sale and management of public lands and timber, were the responsibility of provinces.⁵

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Immigration Services and the Division of Responsibility, 1868-74

The Act for the Organization of the Department of Agriculture was assented to on May 22, 1868.⁶ To facilitate the establishment of the Department of Agriculture at the Dominion level, the personnel and the offices of the provincial Departments of Agriculture were transferred. The functions of the new Department were almost identical to those of the previous Department. There would be a need to define specifically the areas of jurisdiction held by the Department at the Dominion and provincial levels, as conflicts became more numerous. Originally, however, the scope of authority of the Department of Agriculture was limited to nine

⁴ *British North America Act*, 1867, s. 95.

⁵ *Ibid.*, s. 92, part 5, and s. 109.

⁶ *Statutes of Canada*, 31 Vic., c. 53, 1868.

areas, namely: (1) agriculture, (2) immigration and emigration, (3) public health and quarantine, (4) the marine and immigrant hospital at Quebec, (5) arts and manufactures, (6) census, statistics, and the registration of statistics, (7) patents of invention, (8) copyright, and (9) industrial design and trade marks. By 1918, all of these responsibilities, except for agriculture, had been transferred to other departments.

The establishment and supervision of immigration agencies in foreign countries and throughout the Dominion, and all other activities connected with encouraging immigration were transferred to the Department of the Interior in 1892.⁷ The financing and care of immigrants upon landing in Canada was looked after by the Marine and Immigrant Hospital at Quebec. The hospital was under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture until it was transferred to the Department of Marine in 1872.⁸ The keeping of statistics on the number and the health of immigrants fell under the heading of quarantine work. In 1900 this work was expanded to deal not only with the health of immigrants, but also with public health in general. In 1919 quarantine duty was transferred to two new departments: Immigration and Colonization, and Pensions and National Health.⁹ The collection and tabulation of population statistics, particularly in the field of immigration, was the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. In 1913 work connected with census and statistics was taken over by the Department of Trade and Commerce.¹⁰ Patents, copyrights, trade marks,

⁷ Order in Council, Privy Council (hereafter referred to as P.C.) 680, March 14, 1892.

⁸ The Marine and Immigrant Hospital at the Port of Quebec was open to three classes of patients—sick and disabled seamen, sick immigrants who arrived at Quebec without being sent to Grosse Isle or who fell ill after leaving Grosse Isle (quarantine station on the St. Lawrence River), and residents of Quebec. Because immigrants and residents formed a large percentage of the patients at this hospital, its management and control was placed under the Department of Agriculture in 1868. In 1872 it was suggested that, since sick mariners also formed a sizeable portion of the sick, responsibility for the Marine and Immigrant Hospital should be transferred back to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

No Order in Council could be located for the transferral of duties and responsibilities. Mention of this matter is made in the *Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries* for the year ending June 30, 1872. See *Sessional Papers*, Vol. 4, session 1873, No. 8, p. 41.

⁹ Order in Council, P.C. 1348, June 3, 1918.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, P.C. 712, March 30, 1912.

and industrial designs became the responsibility of the Department of Trade and Commerce in 1918.¹¹

Within a few years of the creation of the Department of Agriculture, it was necessary to resolve conflicts arising from concurrent powers related to immigration. The Dominion Department of Agriculture considered its main activity to be the administration of immigration, an area of concern coinciding with provincial interests to increase their population. The matter was to be resolved by means of conferences at which, it was hoped, the four eastern provinces could be persuaded to cede their immigration activities to the Dominion.

During the first Immigration Conference (October, 1868), the delegates representing the Dominion, Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick agreed that the Dominion should administer and finance quarantine stations, and should maintain and finance immigration agencies in Europe and the Dominion of Canada. After much discussion, the three provinces assented to limit their activities to the development of "an efficient system of Emigrant Agenc[ies] within their respective Territories,"¹² but they refused to relinquish their right to appoint immigrant agents in Europe.

The result of the conference was the enactment of the first Act respecting Immigration and Immigrants,¹³ which enumerated the arrangements between the Dominion and the provinces. The act empowered the Dominion government to maintain: (1) immigration offices in the United Kingdom and on the continent of Europe; (2) quarantine stations at Halifax, St. John, Grosse Isle, etc.; and (3) immigration offices at Quebec, Montreal, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, Halifax, St. John, etc. The provincial governments had duties in the following areas: (1) to determine the settlement and colonization policy of their virgin lands; (2) to appoint agents accredited by the Dominion government for Europe and Canada; (3) to furnish literature dealing with immigration and colonization; and (4) to use, as directed, provin-

¹¹ *Ibid.*, P.C. 1478, June 17, 1918. This Order in Council amended the Order in Council, P.C. 1349, which had given responsibility for patents etc. to the Department of Justice.

In 1876 the Department of Agriculture assumed responsibility for the examination and registration of timber marks for those engaged in work with timber. This responsibility was transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce by Order in Council, P.C. 1347, June 3, 1918.

¹² Report of the Standing Committee on Immigration and Colonization, Canada House of Commons, *Journal*, 1869, App. No. 7, p. 4.

¹³ *Statutes of Canada*, 32-33 Vic., c. 10, June 22, 1868.

cial money for food, clothing, and transportation of immigrants intending to settle in that province which furnished the money.

Other aspects of the act dealt with the capitation duty for vessels arriving in Canada; the proportion of passengers to the size of the vessel; the obligation of masters of vessels bringing in immigrants; the report of the master; the special duties of quarantine officials; the landing of pauper or destitute immigrants; the provision for protecting immigrants; and the recovery of duties and penalties.

Cooperation was virtually nonexistent between the provincial and the Dominion governments in the area of immigration after 1869. While the provinces insisted on special grants from the Dominion for immigration services, they were unwilling to agree upon a just distribution of the costs for inland transportation of immigrants. Problems also existed in many other areas. They were resolved, in part, by a series of acts passed in 1872.

An amendment to the Immigration Act of 1869 was assented to on June 14, 1872.¹⁵ It touched upon such matters as the imposition of duty on the master of a vessel not carrying a surgeon and not taking proper measures to preserve health on board; the recovery of money or bond given by immigrants before leaving for Canada; means to defray immigrants' expenses incurred during emigration; the sale of passage tickets; methods of complaint against railway companies; and provisions for the prevention of sexual contact between seamen and female immigrants.

This Immigration Act of 1872 was amended again on April 8, 1875¹⁶ to deal with the imposition of duty on shipping vessels at the port of entry into Canada.

The Act to provide for the incorporation of Immigration Aid Societies, assented to on June 14, 1872,¹⁷ was to facilitate immigration into Canada. The Minister of Agriculture was to divide the provinces into several immigration districts, which were to have Immigration Aid Societies. The Societies were empowered to lend and borrow money, receive applications for the employment of immigrants, and to transmit applications with funds advanced to agents in Europe.

Various aspects of quarantine regulation and punishment of persons disobeying them were dealt with by An Act relating to Quarantine of June 14, 1872.¹⁸

¹⁵ *Statutes of Canada*, 35 Vic., c. 28, June 14, 1872.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 38 Vic., c. 15, April 8, 1875.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 35 Vic., c. 29, June 14, 1872.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 35 Vic., c. 28, June 14, 1872.

In spite of the attempts to remedy Dominion-provincial relations with respect to immigration, there was little success. By 1874 it was imperative to solve the deadlock situation. At the Immigration Conference of 1874, it was finally agreed that all matters pertaining to immigration would be transferred from the provinces to the Dominion.¹⁹ This decision was related directly to the acquisition of the North West Territories by the Dominion government, and the creation of the province of Manitoba in 1870. The eastern provinces had little choice but to retreat from participation in matters related to immigration and colonization, since the Dominion government was no longer interested in appeasing their complaints. It was preoccupied with the prospects of developing and settling the West. Together with the Department of the Interior Dominion Lands Branch, which conducted surveys and allocated western agricultural lands after the adoption of the homestead policy in 1872,²⁰ the Department of Agriculture became one of the most important federal departments involved in opening up the Prairies. The Department of Agriculture remained responsible for immigration until 1893, at which time it relinquished its authority in this area to the Department of the Interior.²¹

The responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture with respect to immigration are best understood within three time periods—1852-1869, 1870-1874, and 1875-1893. The activities of the Department may be broken into five general areas. The organization and administration of quarantine stations was one of the main areas of concern. Information in RG 17 on this topic contains reports of the medical superintendent, accounts for the administration of the hospital, reports of diseases, and the number of immigrants inspected. The work conducted by emigration agents seeking immigrants to the Canadian provinces from Great Britain, the Scandinavian Kingdom, and Germany were of primary interest to the Canadian government. Special arrangements were made for Icelanders and Mennonites from Russia. The reports of the emigration agents contain information on assisted immigration schemes, cooperation with colonization and philanthropic associations, lectures in the British Isles and Europe, distribution of literature, and administrative matters pertaining to the maintenance of numerous

¹⁹ The Report of the Minister of Agriculture, Canada, *Sessional Papers*, 1875, No. 40.

²⁰ *Statutes of Canada*, 35 Vic., c. 23, April 14, 1872. There were numerous amendments to the Dominion Lands Act.

²¹ Report of the Deputy Minister of the Interior, *Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the year 1893* (Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1894), pp. ix-xliv.

emigration agents abroad. Much discussion centered on the type, qualities, and qualifications of immigrants. A major activity associated with emigration was the organization of suitable rates of passage on various shipping lines, and the establishment of guidelines for accomodation and treatment of passengers, and the responsibilities and liabilities of shipping lines. The fifth area of concern reflected in the records of the department was the delineation of Dominion and provincial responsibilities in immigration.

After 1893, the Department of Agriculture was concerned primarily with agricultural matters, such as the Central Experimental Farm, livestock, contagious diseases, irrigation, entomological reserach, and manufacture, storage, and sale of dairy products. While this became the main area of concern, it is erroneous to assume that the Department was freed of responsibilities in immigration. For well over a decade after the transfer of duties, the Department of Agriculture received numerous enquiries about opportunities for settlement in Canada as they pertained to agriculture.

The Records of the Department of Agriculture as a Source to Ukrainian Immigration

A steady flow of Ukrainian immigrants began to arrive in the Prairies in 1896, following tenuous arrangements made between the Canadian government and Dr. Oleskiw on behalf of the Emigrant Aid Society and the Prosvita Society in Lviv. While the administration of immigration policy affecting Ukrainians from Halychyna and Bukovyna became the responsibility of the Liberal government in 1896, arrangements for entry had been made by the defeated Conservatives. Very little work has been done on the immigration policy advocated by the Conservative government in the 1870s and 1880s. It is for this reason that an understanding of federal policy for settling Manitoba and the North West Territories is necessary, if its effects on Ukrainian immigrants are to be known.

Even though responsibility for immigration was transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior by 1893, the researcher interested in the evolution of Canadian immigration policy would do well to analyze the numerous qualifications and contradictions in immigration policy, particularly as responsibility shifted and as the two political parties changed office. Ukrainian immigration began at this unsettling moment.

It is known that the government of Austro-Hungary was not favourably disposed to commercial activities encouraging the mass exodus of their agriculturalists to Canada. Even so, pamphlets and

brochures supplied by Canadian emigration agents in Germany filtered into Austro-Hungary. The reports of encounters, with detailed analysis of existing political, social, and economic conditions in Europe by these emigration agents may be found in the Records of the Department of Agriculture. There are numerous series in the Records of the Department of Agriculture, but the best sources to immigration are found under the following headings: Records of the Minister, Deputy Minister, and Secretary, General Correspondence, 1852-1920, 141.9 m., Volumes 1-1489, 2729-2809; General Letterbooks, 1852-60, 1862, 1865-94, 12 ft., Volumes 1490-1626; Secret and Confidential Letterbook, 1873-95, 2 in., Volume 1631; English and Continental Letterbooks, 1873-83, 5 in., Volumes 1665-67; Deputy Minister's Correspondence, Letters Received, 1885-95, 6 ft., Volumes 1668-85; Miscellaneous Records, 1852-1925, 7 ft., Volumes 1953-87. Shelf lists, indexes to registers, and the registers themselves are the tools for locating specific titles.

It is generally accepted that the first Ukrainians in Canada were Wasyl Elyniak and Ivan Pylypiw, who came in 1891 and were responsible for encouraging thirty-three other families, known as the "Nebyliv Group" (from Nebyliv, District of Kalush in Halychyna), to emigrate. There is a possibility that some material about them may exist in the above mentioned sources.

Dr. Oleskiw pressed for state assisted passage for Ukrainian immigrants, and some financial aid, in the form of a grant, bonus, or long term loan, upon their arrival in Canada. The federal policy of assisted passage rates has not been fully researched. Special arrangements were made for some immigrants and none for others. Extensive documentation on this subject is found in the Records of the Department of Agriculture.

Much controversy arose over the mishandling of bonuses given to steamship agents for each adult immigrant. Initially Ukrainians sailed from Hamburg on ships owned by Messrs. Spiro and Company, Hamburg American Steamship Company, Allan Lines, and Hansa Lines. Both the Allan Lines and Hansa Lines competed for clients and conducted negotiations with the Canadian government. Discussions centered on financial matters, the treatment of passengers, medical arrangements, the sale of tickets, and the method of complaint. Little is known about the conditions on board ship or the treatment of immigrants by the steamship companies.

Correspondence relating to the administration of health measures, and reports of the inspection of vessels, with detailed lists giving the name of the immigrant, nationality, age, and place of departure, are found in discussions of quarantine stations. Virtually nothing has been known about the problems in imposing quar-

antine regulations, the reasons for rejecting immigrants at port of entry, accommodations at the quarantine stations, and method of care. Research in the application of health procedures on the eve of Ukrainian immigration is necessary for a comparison of changes in subsequent years.

In essence, the Records of the Department of Agriculture should be viewed as an introductory source to Ukrainian immigration and settlement. The Records contain material which is necessary for an understanding of the environment and conditions which existed at the time of Ukrainian immigration. Information related directly to Ukrainians coming to Canada after 1896 is found in the Records of the Department of the Interior, Immigration Branch.

THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The distribution of legislative powers by the British North America Act gave the Dominion authority over criminal law and the establishment, maintenance, and management of penitentiaries,¹ while the provincial legislatures were given responsibility for the administration of justice and enforcement of the law within their respective provinces.²

Even though delineation of responsibility in the areas of law and justice was extremely vague in the BNA Act, the broad distribution of power gave rise to the authority assumed by the Department of Justice, established by act of Parliament on May 22, 1868.³

The Minister of Justice was appointed Attorney General of Canada *ex officio* and was charged with four areas of responsibility: (1) advising heads of department about all legal matters; (2) settling and approving all instruments issued under the Great Seal of Canada; (3) superintendence of penitentiaries and prisons; and (4) regulation and conduct of all litigation for the Crown or any government department.

The primary functions of the Department were: (1) to ensure that the administration of public affairs is in accordance with the law; (2) to superintend the administration of justice in matters outside provincial jurisdiction; and (3) to be official legal counsel to the Governor and Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada. The duties assumed by the Department of Justice ensured that it would have complete control of the law. The Department thus became

¹ *British North America Act*, 1876, sec. 19, pt. 27 and pt. 28.

² *Ibid.*, sec. 92, pt. 14 and pt. 15.

³ *Statutes of Canada*, 1868, 31 Vic., c. 39.

involved in drafting the law, providing its official interpretation, and, finally, in implementing the law.

While the duties of the Department are known, what courses of action were taken to fulfill its mandate and policy formulation has not been made public. Unlike other government departments, including the RCMP, the Department of Justice is not required by law to file an annual report with the Privy Council. Neither has the Department of Justice been generous in publishing literature about its activities. This lack of information seriously hampers knowledge about the Department.

It is a stated fact that in 1868 the Department assumed the duties associated with the offices of the Attorney General for the Province of Canada, which necessitated a transferral of records as well as personnel. It would appear that the Department of Justice was superimposed on the old legal structure existing before Confederation; however, any modification in its composition was not recorded. Its four main branches, which carry out various legal functions are: the Legal Branch, Bankruptcy Branch, Penitentiaries Branch, and the Combines Branch. Time and circumstance would give rise to other formations within the Department, as well as assumption of additional responsibilities in law enforcement.

The first addition to the federal judiciary was the establishment in 1875 of the Supreme Court and Court of the Exchequer for the Dominion of Canada.⁴ The Supreme Court was to be the final court of appeal. Areas of conflict between provinces, between the provinces and the Dominion, or suits questioning the validity of an act of provincial legislature or of the Dominion were to be heard by the Supreme Court.

The need to ensure law and order in the territory acquired from the Hudson's Bay Company in preparation for peaceful settlement of that region was the primary reason for the creation in 1873 of the North West Mounted Police.⁵ This idea originated with John A. Macdonald. Provisions were made to place the administration of and responsibility for the NWMP under the Department of Justice; however, other members of the Privy Council could obtain jurisdiction over the force. Consequently, John A. Macdonald was able to assume responsibility for the NWMP as he changed portfolios throughout his career. The force has been under the Department of Justice without changes since 1922.

It could appear that the NWMP was a substitute for the Department of Justice in the West. However, though the NWMP was

⁴ *Statutes of Canada*, 38 Vic., c. 11, April 8, 1875.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 36 Vic., c. 35 and P.C. 1134, August 30, 1873.

responsible for ensuring a hospitable climate for immigrants and establishing the legal system of law enforcement, the Department of Justice assumed an advisory role to the force and was directly responsible for the enforcement of federal law. In many cases, immigrants, not familiar with the political structure and separation of authority between the provinces and the Dominion, believed that their complaints would be attended to and resolved by the highest legal power in Canada. Hence, the Department was responsible for channelling correspondence to the proper departments.

As a result of the lack of information about the Department of Justice, the best source is material organized in Record Group 13. These records have been maintained in their original order to reflect the administrative operations of the department and to reflect changes in policy over time.

The Central Registry Files

The bulk of material in Record Group 13 is found in the *Central Registry Files*, 1859-1934, 83.2 m., Volumes 1-413 and 416-18. This series consists of numbered files of incoming correspondence to the office of the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice. Registers to this material are located in volumes 420-553, which contain the number assigned to each document, the date of receipt, the subject matter, and course of action taken. These registers are to be used as indexes to the Central Registry Files.

Thematically, the Central Registry Files contain specific reference to the processing of immigration, that is, to the soliciting, screening, and administration of immigrants. There are files on the subject of quarantine stations, immigration sheds, emigration agents, foreign labour, and the implications of the Alien Act of 1881. A sizeable portion of this series complements the above mentioned subject, as it contains information on the transportation, administration, and location of settlers on land. From this follows the process of socialization of immigrants. Government policy, immigrant grievance, and the resolution of problems, in addition to institutional and individual biases within the Department, are well reflected in the Central Registry Files. This series contains material on the alien enemy question, charges of sedition during World War I, requests for change of name, internment camp operations, maintenance of language rights, elections, strikes, deportation and extradition cases, and various criminal and civil charges.

It is without doubt that much of the material in the Central Registry Files contains sources directly related to the designated role of the Department of Justice. By law the Department was responsible for appointments of major government officials, such as the Lieutenant Governor, sheriffs, coroners, magistrates, and crown land agents, to name a few. The establishment of penitentiaries, courthouses, and judicial districts falls under the same jurisdiction. The Department was involved also in law enforcement on the Prairies as investigator, consultant, and executor. These files shed light on the social conditions of the time and the Department's perception of immigrants. With respect to law enforcement, the Central Registry Files deal with the illegal production and sale of liquor, prostitution, control of firearms, trespassing, vagrancy, taxation, mineral rights, the transfer of lands, and the implementation of credit systems.

While the Central Registry Files consist of data about matters affecting all immigrants, there are numerous references to Ukrainians under headings referring to Ruthenians, Bukovinians, Galicians, Austrians, Russians, and foreigners. A selected cross section of some of the file titles in this series are listed below, purely for the purpose to show the type of material to be found on Ukrainian settlers. The titles chosen represent about ten percent of the files which can be easily identified as relating to Ukrainians.

RG 13 A2

Date	Vol.	File	Subject
1918	224	1279	Status of person born in Austria of Ukrainian parentage.
1918	227	2021	Proposed regulations of Bolsheviks, Russians, Finns, Ukrainians.
1919	231	102	Bolshevist utterances of Bishop Budka of Ukrainian Church.
1919	233	448	Draft patent to Ruthenian Greek Catholic Parish of St. Phillips.
1919	233	466	Draft patent to Ruthenian Greek Catholic Parish of St. Demetrius.
1919	240	2015	Draft patent to Ruthenian Greek Catholic Episcopal Corporation.
1919	242	2600	Petition to be freed from Polish barbarians.
1921	263	2371	Legality of remittances to Russia & Ukraine through Soviet representations.
1927	314	1169	Proposed deportation of Peter Zlotar to Ukraine.
1928	322	1287	Activities of Ukrainian Farmers & Labour Temple Assn.
1929	328	683	Complaint re: anti-British sentiment among some Ukrainians.
1931	355	835	Ukrainian propaganda.
1931	359	1379	Ukrainian Labour Temple Association protests against deportation.

The Remission Branch Files

A sizeable portion of the Remission Branch files, 1885-1962, 17.5 m., Volumes 1128-1366, contains information on the probation and pardon of prisoners. These files contain petitions and supporting documentation (brief personal history with data about age, place of birth, parentage, religion, occupation, psychological report, picture, doctor's certificate) submitted to the Minister of Justice. The registers of remission for persons involved in criminal offences, which contain a brief description of the crime committed, sentences imposed, and whether a ticket of leave was granted can be found in volumes 1326-61 and 1365-66.

There is also a considerable amount of information about judicial proceedings dealing with conscientious objectors to war, Breach of Immigration Act, treatment of communist sympathizers, contravention of the Military Service Act (1917), violation of laws passed during times of war (breach of Alien Act, possession of prohibited literature, failing to report under War Measures Act), breach of National Selective Service Mobilization, and protests staged by Doukhobors.

Access to this material is under consideration.

Negative microfilm copies of letters advising the Dominion Police that certain prisoners have been released on tickets of leave (M-1776 to M-1895, 120 reels) is not in circulation until a positive copy has been made.

There are numerous case files about Ukrainians during World War One.

In conclusion, while the function of the Canadian judicial system in ensuring order, security, and stability is not known in detail, what little information there is available from the records of the Department of Justice may be well utilized.

Nadia Kazymyra
Public Archives of Canada

A NOTE ON MISSING AND UNEXPLOITED ARCHIVAL SOURCES RELATING TO THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD OF UKRAINIAN HISTORY

A major problem in studying Ukrainian history of the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries is the relative paucity of written sources. The effect these missing materials have upon our understanding of the past varies. It is doubtful, for example, that a gap of six months in Kapnist's correspondence in 1791, the loss of the first Ukrainian draft of the Pereiaslav Articles of 1654, or the loss of the original copy of Pylyp Orlyk's constitution seriously circumscribes our knowledge of these particular events. In other instances, however, a lack of materials does present an obstacle to understanding the Ukrainian past.

During the 1590s, Prince Ostrozhsky conspired with Michael the Brave of Wallachia and Cardinal Radziwil in pro-Habsburg and anti-Ottoman intrigues. Yet, because both Ostrozhsky and Radziwil either refused to commit ideas to paper, or destroyed their correspondence out of fear of discovery, later generations have been left with little information concerning this aspect of Ukrainian history. The destruction of Patriarch Filaret's correspondence shortly after his death and the fire in the Swedish Royal Archives in Stockholm (1697) have deprived historians of important material concerning events during the years from 1622 to 1632 in Ukraine. As well, the disappearance of the archives of the Crimean Khanate sometime before the middle of the nineteenth century results in a gap in our understanding of Crimean Tatar-Ukrainian relations during the early modern period. Similarly, the fact that there exists only one known contemporary Ukrainian account of the events of 1648—that of Colonel Muzhylivsky—and that there are no records of the discussions which occurred in Kiev during the winter of 1648-49 among the Cossack officers and the Orthodox clergy, nor of the Hungarian-Ukrainian discussions during the years 1648 to 1651 results in a less than satisfactory interpretation of the early years of the Khmelnytsky period.

The list of events for which there is a lack or paucity of affirmative historical evidence may be extended. However, the examples given demonstrate sufficiently the extent of the problem posed by missing archival sources, a problem compounded by the tendency to insert ahistorical judgements at those points where empirical data is scarce or missing. Destroyed documents are irrevocably lost. A consideration of what and how much has been lost, however, can in itself serve as a means to achieve a more scientific understanding of the Ukrainian past. Such consideration

not only questions the extent to which still existent evidence is representative of Ukrainian history, but also raises the issue of alternative conceptual approaches to the evidence which does remain.

The basic source for Ukrainian socio-economic history of the early modern period is the *Aktovi Knyhy* of the various regions. Their numbers, however, have been severely depleted. Approximately one to twenty books remain for each year of the sixteenth century, fifteen to thirty-five for each year of the seventeenth century, and, in contrast to this, over 250 for each year in the last decades of the eighteenth century.¹ Furthermore, these figures represent only the *Knyhy* of the major towns, since the records of ecclesiastical courts, the provincial *bratstva* and the smaller towns have simply disappeared.² Between 1887 and 1939, over 8,217 registers were compiled as guides to the remaining *Knyhy*. During the Second World War however, all but eighty-three of these registers were destroyed.³ Thus, the historian is faced with considerable difficulties when studying Ukrainian socio-economic history, since he lacks not only a considerable amount of data, but also a guide to available data.⁴

Documents relating to Ukrainian political history have also been destroyed en masse. Some were intentionally destroyed; for example, the already mentioned correspondence of Prince Ostrozhsky, and the records of the Lviv Armenian community, which dealt with the first decades of the seventeenth century.⁵ However, indiscriminate destruction through war and fire accounts for the

¹ V. O. Romanovsky, ed., *Tsentralnyi arkhiv starodavnykh aktiv u Kyivi* (Kiev, 1929). These figures were given on the basis of pre-1939 holdings in Ukraine. Because 4,123 *Knyhy* were destroyed during the war, the average now is somewhat less.

² I. Levytsky, "Ob aktovykh knigakh otnoshashchikhsia k istorii Iugo-zapadnogo kraia i Malorossii," *Trudy XI Arkheologicheskogo sezda*, 2:60-67.

³ O. A. Kupchynsky, "Z istorii stvorennia naukovo-dovidkovoho apyratu . . . XVI-XVII st.," *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, 1 (1976): 31-34.

⁴ There are only two works of any consequence written on Ukrainian socio-economic history: V. O. Holobutsky, *Ekonomichna istoriia Ukrain-skoi SSR* (Kiev, 1970), and M. Slabchenko, *Organizatsiia khoziaistva Ukrainy* (Odessa, 1922).

⁵ For an interesting reference concerning the purposeful destruction of Ukrainian Orthodox schools in Galicia during the second half of the seventeenth century by the Jesuits see: Ia. Isaievych, "‘Navity’, nevidoma pamiatka ukrainskoi publitsystyky XVII st.," *Naukovo informatsiinyi biuleten arkhivnoho upravlinnia URSR*, No. 6 (1964), p. 57.

vast bulk of archival losses. Perhaps the earliest comment on the repercussions of these losses upon the knowledge of the past was made in the 1630s by the French engineer Beauplan, who wrote:

I would be interested to examine studies about Ukrainian (Rus) history, and to discover something about its past, but this is impossible, for, in reply to my queries, learned men told me that the wars which swept the length and breadth of the land had not spared even the libraries, which were usually the first to burn.⁶

Fires swept all or part of every major political center in the Ukraine and, in their wake, valuable documents were destroyed. Kiev had major fires in 1169, 1240, 1416, 1482, 1608, 1638, 1718, 1811, and 1943. Ovruch had a major fire in 1684, Lutsk had one in 1788, and Lviv burned in 1848. The capitals of the Cossack republic were similarly ravaged. Subotiv was destroyed by Czarnecki in 1664, and along with it perished the archives of Khmelnytsky and Vyhovsky. Chyhyryn was destroyed in 1677. Baturyn was destroyed by the Russians in 1708, and a valuable collection of Turkish-Ukrainian correspondence perished along with it. Hlukhiv had major fires in 1748 and 1784. The archives of the Cossack republic, as a result, were seriously depleted; when, in 1786, a catalogue was compiled, it was discovered that only 753,347 items remained, and most of these were printed books. Moved to Chernihiv that year, the collection was stored in a building called the "Mazepa Manor" which,

according to one observer, seemed to have been built for the express purpose of destroying documents. It had three floors, each with its own climate; the basement was cold and damp, the ground floor was temperate, while the top floor, a loft under a tin roof, was inordinately hot. Anything left in the basement became so sodden that water could be squeezed from its bindings, and if something was put upstairs to dry, it was transformed and soon looked as if it had been soaked in a pot of Crimean tea.⁷

No written records were kept at the *Sich* until the eighteenth century, but the monasteries at Trekhtymyryv and the Samara river, which were the political centers of the Zaporizhian army in the

⁶ Z. Wojcik, ed., *Opisanie Ukrainy* (Warsaw, 1972), p. 112.

⁷ D. O. Bagalei, "Neobkhodimosti prevrashcheniia Kharkovskogo istoricheskogo arkhiva v tsentralnyi arkhiv," *Trudy XII Arkheologicheskogo sezda*, 2:12.

late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, did have libraries of Cossack documents. Trekhtymyryv monastery, however, was completely destroyed in 1637, and the Samara Monastery was ravaged by the Tatars in 1709 and then again in 1736. Finally, the private libraries of many left-bank Cossack gentry have been either destroyed or dissipated. For example, in Hlukhiv district of Chernihiv province alone, the archives of over a dozen families had vanished before the end of the nineteenth century. Among these were the collections of the Skoropadsky, Umanets, and Lazarevych families.⁸

The definite lack of affirmative historical evidence concerning Ukrainian history of the early modern period suggests a need for extreme caution when ascertaining the importance of events and tendencies during this period. Missing documents should be duly noted and systematized,⁹ as the lack of affirmative evidence is closely related to the persistence of great-power, nationalist-populist, and vulgar Marxist undertones in Ukrainian historiography. Knowledge of what materials are missing can also provide convenient starting points for the reexamination and reevaluation of Ukrainian political history of the early modern period, when considered alongside hitherto unexploited sources. Collections in Rumania, for example, provide one rich and unexploited area for Ukrainian history. Regarded as the heir of the Roman empire, centre of plans for international crusades and the restoration of

⁸ The private archives of the magnate families of the Polish commonwealth have also been depleted. Those of the Mniszech, Wiśniowiecki and Lubomirski families have been either lost or destroyed. The history of the Wiśniowiecki holdings was done by W. Tomkiewicz, "Dzieje zbiorów zamku Wiśniowieckiego," *Rocznik Wotyński*, 3 (1934): 413-433.

⁹ It would not be possible to construct a detailed composite picture of destroyed documents from the years before 1921. However, the forty-six million items held in state collections in Ukraine which were destroyed during the Second World War (O. Mitiukov, *Radianske arkhivne budivnytstvo na Ukraini*, p. 140) have been catalogued in the individual libraries. See, for example: Ia. Dashkevych, ed., *Katalog kolektsii dokumentiv kyivskoi arkheohrafichnoi komisii* (Kiev, 1971), p. 12; O. Kupchynsky and E. Ruzhytsky, eds., *Katalog perhamentnykh dokumentiv derzhavnoho istorichnogo arkhivu u Lvovi* (Kiev, 1972), pp. 6-8; H. Lysenko, "Z istorii arkhivnogo budivnytstva na Zaporizhzhzi," *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, 4 (1970): 6. Similar work has been done in Poland on the losses incurred by Polish libraries during the war. See, for example: *Straty archiwów i bibliotek warszawskich w zakresie rękopiśmiennych źródeł historycznych*, (Warsaw, 1957), vol. 1. Major losses in Warsaw included three-quarters of the Archiwum Aktów Dawnych, and the entire collection of the Biblioteka Ordynacji Krasieńskich.

the Byzantine commonwealth, Rumania played an important role in Ukrainian political history during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹⁰ Similarly, to the extent that Ukraine was party to European political intrigues up to the nineteenth century, collections in England and France provide important sources of information about Ukrainian history.¹¹ But perhaps foremost among the collections which are unexploited from the point of view of Ukrainian history are the Turkish archives in Ankara and Istanbul. Although the government of the Ukrainian SSR had accepted plans for a research commission to study these archives during the 1920s, these were later cancelled and, to date, Turkish collections remain unexploited.

Stepan Velychenko
University of London

¹⁰ A considerable number of Rumanian documents have been published: E. Hurmuzaki, *Documente Privitoare la Istoria Romanilor* (Bucharest, 1887-94), 33 vols.; N. Iorga, *Studii si Documente* (Bucharest, 1901-13), 23 vols.; *Documente Privind Istoria Romaniei* (Bucharest, 1936-56), 26 vols.; *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (Bucharest, 1966-74), 24 vols.

¹¹ E. Borshchak, "Zvidomlennia," *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka*, 134 (1924): 241-248 provides a valuable starting point for research in Western Europe.

late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, did have libraries of Cossack documents. Trekhtymyriiv monastery, however, was completely destroyed in 1637, and the Samara Monastery was ravaged by the Tatars in 1709 and then again in 1736. Finally, the private libraries of many left-bank Cossack gentry have been either destroyed or dissipated. For example, in Hlukhiv district of Chernihiv province alone, the archives of over a dozen families had vanished before the end of the nineteenth century. Among these were the collections of the Skoropadsky, Umanets, and Lazarevych families.⁸

The definite lack of affirmative historical evidence concerning Ukrainian history of the early modern period suggests a need for extreme caution when ascertaining the importance of events and tendencies during this period. Missing documents should be duly noted and systematized,⁹ as the lack of affirmative evidence is closely related to the persistence of great-power, nationalist-populist, and vulgar Marxist undertones in Ukrainian historiography. Knowledge of what materials are missing can also provide convenient starting points for the reexamination and reevaluation of Ukrainian political history of the early modern period, when considered alongside hitherto unexploited sources. Collections in Rumania, for example, provide one rich and unexploited area for Ukrainian history. Regarded as the heir of the Roman empire, centre of plans for international crusades and the restoration of

⁸ The private archives of the magnate families of the Polish commonwealth have also been depleted. Those of the Mniszech, Wiśniowiecki and Lubomirski families have been either lost or destroyed. The history of the Wiśniowiecki holdings was done by W. Tomkiewicz, "Dzieje zbiorów zamku Wiśniowieckiego," *Rocznik Wotyński*, 3 (1934): 413-433.

⁹ It would not be possible to construct a detailed composite picture of destroyed documents from the years before 1921. However, the forty-six million items held in state collections in Ukraine which were destroyed during the Second World War (O. Mitiukov, *Radianske arkhivne budivnytstvo na Ukraini*, p. 140) have been catalogued in the individual libraries. See, for example: Ia. Dashkevych, ed., *Kataloh kolektsii dokumentiv kyivskoi arkheohrafichnoi komisii* (Kiev, 1971), p. 12; O. Kupchynsky and E. Ruzhytsky, eds., *Kataloh perhamentnykh dokumentiv derzhavnoho istorichnoho arkhivu u Lvovi* (Kiev, 1972), pp. 6-8; H. Lysenko, "Z istorii arkhivnoho budivnytstva na Zaporizhzhzi," *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, 4 (1970): 6. Similar work has been done in Poland on the losses incurred by Polish libraries during the war. See, for example: *Straty archiwów i bibliotek warszawskich w zakresie rękopiśmiennych źródeł historycznych*, (Warsaw, 1957), vol. 1. Major losses in Warsaw included three-quarters of the Archiwum Aktów Dawnych, and the entire collection of the Biblioteka Ordynacji Krasieńskich.

the Byzantine commonwealth, Rumania played an important role in Ukrainian political history during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹⁰ Similarly, to the extent that Ukraine was party to European political intrigues up to the nineteenth century, collections in England and France provide important sources of information about Ukrainian history.¹¹ But perhaps foremost among the collections which are unexploited from the point of view of Ukrainian history are the Turkish archives in Ankara and Istanbul. Although the government of the Ukrainian SSR had accepted plans for a research commission to study these archives during the 1920s, these were later cancelled and, to date, Turkish collections remain unexploited.

Stepan Velychenko
University of London

¹⁰ A considerable number of Rumanian documents have been published: E. Hurmuzaki, *Documente Privitoare la Istoria Romanilor* (Bucharest, 1887-94), 33 vols.; N. Iorga, *Studii si Documente* (Bucharest, 1901-13), 23 vols.; *Documente Privind Istoria Romaniei* (Bucharest, 1936-56), 26 vols.; *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (Bucharest, 1966-74), 24 vols.

¹¹ E. Borshchak, "Zvidomlennia," *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka*, 134 (1924): 241-248 provides a valuable starting point for research in Western Europe.

REVIEW

Bohdan Antonych, *Square of Angels: Selected Poems*. Translated by Mark Rudman and Paul Nemser with Bohdan Boychuk. Introduction by Bohdan Rubchak. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1977. xx + 69 pages.

English translations of Ukrainian literary works are rarities. Good translations are rarer still. And if this holds true for prose, then it holds even truer for poetry. For such reasons, the appearance of this translation is an event worthy of note. Unlike some translations which quickly turn from literary events into literary embarrassments,¹ this slim and unassuming volume warrants the reader's serious attention. For although it cannot and will not satisfy the needs of the serious student of Antonych, it will convey to the English reader some of the elements that make Antonych an important figure in Ukrainian poetry. This is said despite the fact that the translations are not uniformly good. Some (e.g., "Square of Angels," "Ritual Dance") are marred by inaccuracies and ambiguities. A few editorial oversights and an uncertain introduction also detract from what is otherwise a very competent effort.

There are forty-nine poems in this volume. During his short life, Antonych wrote more than 360. Despite this obvious imbalance, *Square of Angels* succeeds in being fairly representative. It includes a few poems from every important collection of Antonych's poetry, leaving aside only his earliest (*Pryvitannia zhyttia*) and one which he himself never published (*Velyka harmoniia*); both are generally considered to be poorer than the rest of his work. Sixteen of the poems in *Square of Angels* come from the collection *Zelena evanheliia*; thirteen from *Knyha leva*; ten from *Try persteni*; seven from *Rotatsii*; and three of the poems found here were never part of any of these collections.

Square of Angels uses an arrangement that originated with Antonych in his *Knyha leva* and *Zelena evanheliia*: poems are organized into "chapters" that alternate with "lyrical intermezzos." Of course, the poems appear here in an entirely different order than they did in Antonych's original collections. This is not necessarily a drawback, except when obviously related poems are placed several pages apart, as in the case of "Monumental Landscape" (p. 26) and "Square of Angels" (p. 21).

¹ Vasyly Symonenko, *Granite Obelisks*. Selected, translated, and annotated by Andriy M. Fr.-Chirovsky (Jersey City: Svoboda, n.d.).

The translators have succeeded in avoiding two very common mistakes. They have refrained from making too literal a translation (although, on the whole, the poems follow the originals rather closely) and they have not tried to slavishly imitate Antonych's rhythm and stanza (although, again, their departure from the original is not radical). The emphasis of the translators was, as it should have been, on Antonych's unusual imagery. In contrast to Antonych's rhythms (which are rather regular and show a predisposition towards rhymes), the translations are much freer, less regular, and mostly without rhymes. On those occasions when the translators do use rhyme, the effect is rather trite: greening—meaning; spring—sting. Sometimes, especially in poems which have a short line, the translators seem to be aiming at more or less reproducing Antonych's regular rhythm. The results are not always smooth:

THE CUPS

Green ashtree, sickle, horses.
A boy glued to a windowpane.
Spring pours into silver cups,
some crimson, some transparent.

And the boy wants very badly
the key to the gates of spring.
Suddenly the sun jumps off the grass
like a scared pony.

In general, it might be said that the translations are more successful when they deal with Antonych's longer lines. It is then that the free verse of the translation appears more natural and its use more appropriate. Poems such as "Graveyard of Cars," "Song on the Indestructibility of Matter" and "The House Beyond the Stars" are, for that reason, definitely preferable to the translation cited above.

There is, however, a more important problem confronting these translations—one that has to do with their tone. Antonych, as is well known, is a poet whose discourse is always emotionally elevated. Even imagery which is permeated with a spirit of naïveté and childish innocence is couched in staid and formal diction. Colloquial expressions and slang are not characteristic of his poetry. *Square of Angels*, however, fails to maintain this lexical decorum throughout. As an example, we can compare "The Poplars" with the Ukrainian original "Kleny" (i.e. "Maple Trees").

Two lonely poplars bend down
reading the ABC of spring.
Green myself, I pray to the green earth,
And feel the grassblade's sting.

Mossy-backed, the learned fox croons
poetics thorough his bristles.
The day draws back a poplar bow.
An arrow of sun whistles.

Схилились два самотні клени
читаючи весни буквар
і знов молюсь землі зеленій
зелений сам, немов трава.

Оброслий мохом лис учений
поетику для кленів склав.
Співає день, співають клени
лопоче соняшна стріла.

While, admittedly, the translation is clever, it is basically untrue to the original. Frivolous and light (made even more so by the extemporaneous last line of the first stanza), it does not correspond to the obviously more sober version by Antonych. The syntax of the Ukrainian original is purposely formalized, as is the vocabulary. The English translation, on the other hand, is more colloquial, both syntactically and lexically. The same criticism can be leveled at the poem mentioned earlier: "The Cups." In the original, even the title sounds less mundane: "Charky." Line six of that same poem ("the boy wants very badly") is quite conversational and not a very adequate rendition of "I khochetsia khlopchyni konche / vid vesnianykh vorit kliucha." In the poem "Houses," the translators render the last line in this way: "but rulers still *squash* the rebels." "Squash" hardly equals Antonych's serious "karaie." In fact, one can argue that "squash" does not even make stylistic sense in the English translation.

A similar incongruity occurs in the solemn poem "Sign of the Lion."

Wind from Sinai, smash the open tablets!
Without you I am no more than an empty jar.

Synaiskyi vitre, byi v vidkryti karty!
Bez tebe ia porozhnii posud formy.

“Smash”? “Empty jar”? Certainly neither correspond to Antonych’s expressions. “Strike” and “urn” or “vessel” would definitely have been preferable.

Such insensitivity to the stylistic value of words can be considered one of the most serious flaws in the translations because it is one which, in most cases, could have been easily avoided. By giving us such lines as “to write elegies on *stumps*” (p. 13) and “*we’ll shuck* the superfluous and carry ecstasy to the stars” (p. 40), the translators not only “jar” the ear of the English reader, but they also do a great disservice to the integrity of Antonych’s verse.

Ironically, the poem that gives this collection its title, “Square of Angels” (p. 21), is the worst translation in the volume. Without going into details (which a simple reading of the original will reveal), this translation can be characterized as inaccurate, incomplete, and totally devoid of the atmosphere of the original. The problems begin with the very title. “Square of Angels” apparently inspires visions of everything from heavenly creatures arranged in the shape of a square to angels raised to the fourth power (according to actual tests conducted by this reviewer). It does not, however, seem to suggest what it should —namely, an open space in a city or town (as in “Times Square”). The ambiguities could have been avoided had the poem and the collection been called “Angel Square” (*Ploshcha ianholiv*).

If the title “Square of Angels” helps to catapult that poem into the ranks of dubious translations, then a line in “Ritual Dance” (*Khorovid*) does the same for the latter. “The bracken covers the girls’s steps like palms of earth” is unpardonable not only for the sound it produces and the possessive form it uses, but also because “palms of earth” introduces confusion among Antonych’s Muses: contrary to what one may think, “palms” in this line does not refer to “palm trees,” but to “the palm of the hand” (*zemli dolonia* in the original). The poem is also ambiguous in line one, when it employs the expression “square of memory” for Antonych’s *maidan mrii*. In fact, there are a number of other instances in this volume when the translation becomes rather opaque. This is in sharp contrast to the original, which is nearly always clear and transparent.

The introduction by Bohdan Rubchak is provocative, but inadequate for the audience that will probably make use of this book. Its basic thrust is interpretative and philosophic rather than factual. Although it gives the reader a brief (but sound) sketch of Antonych’s literary life, it does not attempt to place him in the context of the development of Ukrainian literature, much less of Ukrainian history. For readers familiar with Ukrainian literature

and history, this will pose no problem. For those who are not, the introduction may prove to be perplexing at times. For example, it is asserted that at the outset of his poetic career, Antonych's "knowledge of his own culture had been sketchy" (p. xi) and that his earliest poems were written in Polish (p. x). A reader who has no knowledge of the social and political conditions that existed in western Ukraine during this period will probably be surprised that a Ukrainian poet could have such rudimentary problems. Similarly, it is doubtful that neophytes to Ukrainian literature will glean the significance of the 1920s for Ukrainian culture from a statement which merely says that "excitement of experimentation and the new national spirit . . . blew in from Kharkiv and Kyiv" (p. x); or, for that matter, that they will grasp the tragedy of Stalinism for Ukraine from the astonishing understatement that "Stalinism put an end to the growth of modern culture in the Soviet Ukraine . . ." (p. x). Certainly, if the prospective reader of this volume needs to be told that "Ukrainian priests are allowed to marry" (p. ix), then he probably also needs a better explanation of the political and cultural context in which Antonych worked.

There is also a problem with Rubchak's description of Antonych as an "Orphic" poet. Here, too, a more complete explanation and definition would have been helpful. Like other commentators before him, Rubchak underscores the most salient feature of Antonych's poetry—the sense of unity the poet feels with the whole universe and with all creation. The difference is that Rubchak calls this unity "Orphic": he speaks of "total Orphic unification" (p. xvi), of "Orphic meanings" (p. xv), and argues that Antonych consciously forged in his poetry a "*persona* of the poet as Orpheus" (p. xx).

Antonych's sense of unity with the world around him is not in question here. A question arises when it is designated as "Orphic." Rubchak never precisely defines what he means by "Orphic" unity (or how it differs from just plain unity) and does not explain why it is necessarily a better designation of Antonych's poetry than, say, "pantheistic" or "materialistic" or "mystic"—all of which it has been called at one time or another. The necessity for a definition is crucial, for, unlike the terms enumerated, the Orphic myth, with its numerous transformations and interpretations, is fraught with allusions which are not all very apparent.

Rubchak compounds the confusion and destroys whatever concept the reader may have had of the Orphic myth by calling nearly every great Western and Ukrainian poet "Orphic." For him, Taras Shevchenko, Pavlo Tychyna, Volodymyr Svidzinsky, and a host of other European and American poets (Nerval, Novalis, Hoelderlin, Slowacki, Yeats, Rilke, Khlebnikov, Guillen, Stevens)

"reverberate [the song of Orpheus] . . . in their poems" (p. ix). Such a broad definition makes communication impossible and comparisons meaningless. The only real common denominator that Rubchak provides to link all of these poets is "nature" (he speaks of Shevchenko, for example, as "another poet of nature" [p. xvi]). If by "Orphism" Rubchak means only nature or nature poetry, then he not only sows confusion by using the term in this way, but also impoverishes the myth as well.

This is not to suggest that Rubchak's characterization of Antonych is without merit. Quite the contrary. The idea as such is very appealing. In fact, if Antonych is read in the context of some recent scholarship on this subject,² then Rubchak's thesis actually becomes convincing. But in its present state, it elicits more reservation than agreement.

Finally, there are some minor problems, such as missing quotation marks ("A Lullaby," lines 4 and 9; "Morning in the City," line 1); a reversal in the order of lines ("St. George Square," lines 13-14); and inconsistency in the transliteration of Antonych's birth place (*Novici* on the back cover, *Novycja* in the introduction); and, for some reason, no acknowledgement is given (to L. Hutsaljuk?) for the cover design. One might also add that the usefulness of this volume could have been extended tremendously had the translations been accompanied by the Ukrainian originals.

In 1967 Sviatoslav Hordynsky noted that Antonych's poetry is still waiting to be discovered by non-Ukrainians through good translations. It would be presumptuous to state that this translation constitutes that discovery. But even so, it certainly is a hopeful sign pointing at the right direction.

Oleh S. Ilnytzkij
Harvard University

² Elizabeth Sewall, *The Orphic Voice* (London, 1960); Walter A. Strauss, *Descent and Return* (Cambridge Mass., 1971). It should be noted that both these authors carefully define the manner in which they understand and interpret the Orphic myth.

DMYTRO IVANOVYCH CHYZHEVSKY (1894-1977)

There will be few students or enthusiasts of Ukrainian culture to whom the name of this eminent Slavist and Ukrainian scholar will not be familiar. Most of us will have spent many a rewarding hour with his numerous books and articles on Ukrainian subjects. Dealing with a wide variety of topics, always erudite and perceptive, these contributions have ensured him an honoured place among Ukrainian scholars. But Dmytro Chyzhevsky was, of course, more than this—more than an outstanding Ukrainian scholar—he was a Slavist in the true sense of the word, who in his over 800 articles, reviews, and monographs made outstanding contributions to a wide variety of fields. In all the areas of his scholarly activity, Chyzhevsky revealed exceptional erudition, unceasing energy and enthusiasm, and a fidelity to his ideals of scholarly excellence. Characteristically, when a member of the editorial board of this journal tried to obtain an interview with him earlier this year, Chyzhevsky replied that, before agreeing, he would like to see the first issue of the journal. By then it was too late. Dmytro Ivanovych Chyzhevsky died on April 18, 1977, in Heidelberg.

Born on March 23, 1894, in Oleksandria, Ukraine, Chyzhevsky (Tschizewskij, Čizevsky) studied philosophy and philology first at the University of St. Petersburg (1911-13) and then at Kiev University from which he graduated in 1919. Leaving Ukraine after the Revolution, he continued his studies in Germany. Among his teachers were Edmund Husserl, Karl Jaspers and Martin Heidegger. Having obtained a Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Freiburg, Chyzhevsky began his teaching career in 1924 at the Ukrainian Pedagogic Institute in Prague as a teacher of philosophy. From there he went to Halle University (1932-45) where he taught Slavic languages, linguistics and literatures. From 1935 to 1937 he also taught at the University of Jena. Subsequently he went to Marburg University (1945-51) as Professor of Slavic languages and literatures, and then to Harvard University (1949-56) as Visiting Professor, where he taught courses in Ukrainian language, Russian and Ukrainian literature, and comparative Slavic literature. From 1956 until his retirement, he was Professor at Heidelberg and later (from 1968 on) at Cologne as well. For his contributions to scholarship he was granted several honorary degrees.

From the early stages of his career Chyzhevsky was a member and active participant in many scholarly societies and academies. From 1931 to 1938 he was a member of the German Society for

Slavic Studies; from 1932 to 1939—of the Slavic Institute in Prague; from 1936—of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. He worked with the Scientific Institute in Warsaw, participated actively in the Prague Linguistic Circle and the Ukrainian Historical-Philological Society in Prague, and was a founding member of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Arts and Sciences as well as the director of its philosophical section.

His truly monumental and multifaceted scholarly activity, whose beginnings date back to the 1920s, was mainly within the areas of the history of Slavic philosophy and Slavic literatures. Although his contributions in both these areas were immense, it is for his works on Russian, Ukrainian, and Czech literature, and for his comparative studies that he was best known. It has legitimately been said that within these areas his primary interests were in the Baroque and old periods, but there are few literary epochs and movements which his scholar's pen did not touch. In all of his major studies, questions of style and genre were among his principal concerns but never as ends in themselves, for Chyzhevsky always sought to penetrate to the essence of a literary epoch—to the world view that shaped it. From this focus on *Geistesgeschichte* came his tendency to see recurring patterns in Slavic literatures—waves of opposing styles following one another through history in modified forms.

Both his approach to the study of Slavic literatures and his phenomenal knowledge are perhaps most dramatically exemplified in his wide-ranging comparative studies, the latest of which appeared in English translation in 1971. But in each of those areas of Slavic studies in which he worked, his contributions were vast. In the Russian field there were his discerning studies of Pushkin, Gogol, and Dostoevsky; his investigations of the influence of Hegel on Russian thought; his history of Russian literature from its beginnings to the Baroque; and his recently translated history of nineteenth-century Russian literature. In the West Slavic area there were his numerous studies of Czech literature, where his interest in the Baroque manifested itself in his outstanding work on Comenius; his sallies into Slovak literature, which yielded a series of articles and a monograph on Štur; and his studies of Mickiewicz. In Ukrainian studies as well, Chyzhevsky's scholarly endeavour was wide-ranging and estimable. His two early monographs on the history of Ukrainian philosophy were of a pioneering character. His enduring interest in Skovoroda generated dozens of articles and books. (The latest appeared in 1974.) He contributed studies of Shevchenko, Panteleimon Kulish, Ivan Vyshensky, Drahomanov, and Edvard Strikha. His literary-historical bent yielded a series of works on the Renaissance, Ba-

roque, and old periods, which ultimately grew into his authoritative history of Ukrainian literature from its beginnings to the period of Realism and, subsequently, in the 1975 English edition, to the end of the nineteenth century.

His legacy is thus one that will be shared equally by Russians, West Slavs and Ukrainians. Yet, in Ukrainian scholarship and, more particularly, in the realm of Ukrainian literary history, more than in any of the other fields of his scholarly endeavour, he will occupy a singular position. In this field, where Ukrainian scholarship has seldom broken out of its nineteenth century populist (socio-political or socio-nationalist) shackles, his contribution was indeed unique and rivals that of the neoclassicist poet and literary historian Mykola Zerov. In fact, although their approaches differed significantly, these two outstanding twentieth century scholars had much in common. In his own way, Chyzhevsky continued the best traditions embodied by his predecessor—his respect for solid scholarship, and his synthetic approach to literary history, in which the aesthetic fact played as important a role as the biographical or socio-historical detail.

Dolly M. Ferguson
University of Toronto

LETTER TO THE EDITORS

Dear Sirs:

I was glad to see (Vol. 2, No. 1) you encouraging scholars to make use of the various diplomatic archives holding material of Ukrainian interest.

I would like to add a few comments to the information given on German Foreign Office archives, and to correct one or two errors.

The archives of the German Foreign Office (Auswaertiges Amt) are held not by the Bundesarchiv, as stated, but by the Political Archives of the German Foreign Office (Politisches Archiv, Auswaertiges Amt, Bonn). Since this is not a public archives, permission to carry out research there should be obtained beforehand from the Director of the Political Archives. This is perhaps best done under the auspices of the Canadian Embassy in Bonn (in the case of Canadian students, of course) and with a supporting letter from one's supervisor.

As mentioned, microfilm copies of the archives are held by several North American university libraries, as well as St. Antony's College (Oxford). Some of these repositories may not be well known, such as North Texas State University Library in Denton, Tex., but library staff in Canadian universities should be able to direct students to appropriate holdings. These collections are not complete. Not only have matters considered unimportant been omitted, but many annexes to the files, such as maps, have been "souvenired." It is not difficult to envisage where some such items are now held.

The Bundesarchiv (Federal Archives) is situated at Koblenz (54 Koblenz, Am Woellershof 12), some 70 km. from Bonn, which makes it feasible to work in both places. The holdings of the Bundesarchiv are described in:

Das Bundesarchiv und seine Bestaende. 3. Aufl., Neubearb. u. wesentl. erw., Boppard: Boldt, 1977. DM 60,— (Schriften d. Bundesarchivs, Bd. 10.)

A word of warning about the guides mentioned in the article. Although the Political Archives uses both guides, known respectively as "Oxford" and "Kent," intending users can forget Volume 4 of "Kent." Not only does the Political Archives regard this volume as full of errors, but they have completely revised their cataloguing system for "post records" since Volume 3 appeared. They have their own internal guide to these records.

I realise that the author of the article was referring to the copies held by the Foreign Office Library in London, but there is nothing like working with the originals.

Several other archives in Germany (both BRD and DDR) no doubt have holdings on Ukrainian matters, ranging from the Bundesarchiv-Militaerarchiv (Federal Archives-Military Archives) in Freiburg i. Br. to the various Staatsarchive (e.g., Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv) to private collections. In East Germany the Zentrales Staatsarchiv (formerly, Deutsches Zentralarchiv) in Potsdam, the Militaerarchiv der DDR (Military Archives of the DDR) and regional archives (e.g., Staatsarchiv Dresden) may also prove rewarding, especially in such fields as army archives (WW2).

Anyone contemplating extended research in German archives might like to study the following:

Archive. Archive in deutschsprachigen Raum. 2 Bde. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974.
(Minerva-Handbuecher.)

Die Nachlaesse in den deutschen Archiven. Bearb. v. Wolfgang A. Mommsen. Boppard: Boldt, 1971.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Underdown
Department of History
University of Melbourne

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Bohdan Antonych. *Square of Angels: Selected Poems*. Translated by Mark Rudman and Paul Nemser with Bohdan Boychuk. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1977. xx + 69 pp. \$2.95 paper.
- A. Baran, O. W. Gerus, J. Rozumnyj, eds. *The Jubilee Collection of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in Canada*. Winnipeg: UVAN, 1976. 657 pp.
- Helen Potrebenko. *No Streets of Gold: a Social History of Ukrainians in Alberta*. Vancouver: New Star Books, 1977. 311 pp. \$5.95 paper.
- Nicholas Prychodko. *Good-bye Siberia*. Markham, Ont.: Simon and Schuster of Canada, 1976. 346 pp. \$2.50 paper.
- Walter Smyrniw. *Ukrainian Prose Manual: a Text for Intermediate Language Studies*. Oakville, Ont.: Mosaic Press, 1977. 192 pp. \$5.00 paper.
- Alexander Sydorenko. *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1977. 194 pp.
- The Book of Vles*. Translated by Victor Kachur. Columbus, Ohio: Victor Kachur, 1973—Parts 1 & 2, 1975—Part 3.

MASTER'S AND DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS

The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies invites applications for five Master's thesis fellowships (\$3,500 each), non-renewable, and three Doctoral thesis fellowships (\$5,000 each), renewable, to be awarded in 1978-79. The awards are intended to aid students to complete theses on Ukrainian and Ukrainian-Canadian topics in the disciplines of education, history, the humanities, law, library sciences, and the social sciences. Fellowships will be awarded only in the thesis year of an academic program and only for thesis work.

The fellowships may be held at any institution of higher learning in Canada or elsewhere. Candidates must be Canadian citizens or landed immigrants at the time of application. Only in exceptional circumstances may an award be held concurrently with other awards.

Closing date for receipt of applications is January 31, 1978. For application forms, write to the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 335 Athabasca Hall, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E8 or phone (403) 432-2972.

UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS

The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies invites applications for ten undergraduate scholarships (\$1,500 each), renewable, to be awarded in 1978-79. The awards are intended for students interested in an undergraduate degree with a major in Ukrainian studies, consisting of a combination of at least five full courses in a three-year Arts program in Ukrainian, East European, Soviet and/or Canadian studies (depending on whether Ukrainians or Ukrainians in Canada is the main concern) and at least eight full courses in a four-year Arts or Education program.

The awards are intended to cover tuition fees and to subsidize the cost of room and board beginning in the first year. Scholarships of \$500 to students residing at home will increase the number of scholarships available.

The scholarships are for an eight-month period of study at any Canadian university. Candidates must be Canadian citizens or landed immigrants at the time of application. Only in exceptional circumstances may an award be held concurrently with other awards.

Closing date for receipt of applications is January 31, 1978. For application forms, write to the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 335 Athabasca Hall, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E8 or phone (403) 432-2972.

UKRAINIAN FILMS IN CANADA

Shirley Zaporzan of Winnipeg is currently compiling a filmography of Ukrainian Canadian films for the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta in Edmonton. The list will serve as a comprehensive guide to all Ukrainian film production in Canada and will include, as well, films produced anywhere in the world about or relating to Ukrainians and the Ukrainian experience in Canada.

Anyone having information about old, forgotten, or little-known films that should be included in the above filmography is invited to send pertinent details to: Shirley Zaporzan, 125 Academy Road, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, R3M 0E2.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF UKRAINIAN
STUDIES

Mykola Zerov, *Lectures on the History of Ukrainian Literature (1798–1870)*
271 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)
260 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 1920s who spearheaded 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 November, 1977.

FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS—SPRING 1978

Orest Zilynsky (ed.) *An Anthology of Ukrainian Lyric Poetry*
Part One (in Ukrainian)

Appr. 600 pp.; \$13.95 hardcover, \$6.95 paper.

A selection of the finest Ukrainian poetry from the earliest period to 1917. Chosen and edited by a leading Ukrainian scholar, who also provides a long introduction. A rich sampling of lyric verse in the original Ukrainian.

Danylo Husar Struk, *Ukrainian for Undergraduates*

Appr. 200 pp.; \$8.00 hardcover, \$3.50 paper.

A text aimed at university students with some background in Ukrainian. Through numerous drills, written and oral exercises, it leads the student through basic morphology. Although points of grammar are explained in English, grammatical terminology is given in both Ukrainian and English. Includes grammatical tables and vocabulary.

All books may be ordered from

Mosaic Press
P.O. Box 1032
Oakville, Ontario
Canada
L6J 5E9

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

