

JOURNAL

OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Oleh W. Gerus: Ukrainians in Argentina:
A Canadian Perspective

Serge Cipko: The Legacy of the "Brazilian Fever":
The Ukrainian Colonization of Parana

Eugene Seneta: On the Number of Ukrainians in Australia
in 1979

Serge Cipko and Oleh Leszczyszyn: Survey of
Second-Generation Ukrainians in Britain

Bohdan Struminsky: Linguistics in Ukraine, 1980-85

Микола Мушинка: Маловідома стаття про початки
українських шкіл у Канаді

Lubomyr Y. Luciuk: An Annotated Guide to Certain
Microfiched Archives of the Association of
Ukrainians in Great Britain

Book Reviews

21

WINTER 1986

ЖУРНАЛ
УКРАЇНОЗНАВЧИХ СТУДІЙ

EDITOR

Myroslav Yurkevich

EDITORIAL BOARD

John-Paul Himka, *University of Alberta* • Andrij Hornjatkevyč, *University of Alberta* • Oleh Ilnytzkyj, *University of Alberta* • Bohdan Kordan, *Arizona State University* • Bohdan Krawchenko, *University of Alberta* • Manoly R. Lupul, *University of Alberta* • David Marples, *University of Alberta* • Bohdan Medwidsky, *University of Alberta* • Natalia Pylypiuk, *Harvard University* • Peter A. Rolland, *University of Alberta* • Frances A. Swyripa, *University of Alberta*

The *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* is published semiannually, in the summer and winter, by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. Annual subscription rates are \$10.00 for individuals and \$15.00 for libraries and institutions. Cheques and money orders are payable in Canadian or American funds only to *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*. Please do not send cash. Subscribers outside Canada: please pay in U.S. funds.

The *Journal* publishes articles on Ukrainian-related subjects in the humanities and social sciences. The criterion for acceptance of submissions is their scholarly contribution to the field of Ukrainian studies. The *Journal* also publishes translations, documents, information, book reviews, letters, and journalistic articles of a problem-oriented, controversial nature. Those wishing to submit manuscripts should observe the guidelines on the inside back cover.

Manuscripts, books for review, and all correspondence regarding subscriptions, changes of address, and editorial matters should be sent to: *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 352 Athabasca Hall, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E8.

© 1987 by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
ISSN 0228-1635

Typesetting by Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
Printed by Printing Services, University of Alberta.

Ukrainian Diaspora Settlements

Oleh W. Gerus. Ukrainians in Argentina: A Canadian Perspective 3

Serge Cipko. The Legacy of the "Brazilian Fever": The Ukrainian
Colonization of Parana 19

Eugene Seneta. On the Number of Ukrainians in Australia in 1979 33

Serge Cipko and Oleh Leszczyszyn. Survey of Second-Generation
Ukrainians in Britain 41

Bohdan Struminsky. Linguistics in Ukraine, 1980–85 47

Микола Мушинка. Маловідома стаття про початки українських
шкіл у Канаді 62

Guide to Research

Lubomyr Y. Luciuk. An Annotated Guide to Certain Microfiched
Archives of the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain 77

Book Reviews

Orest Subtelny, *Domination of Eastern Europe—Native Nobilities and
Foreign Absolutism, 1500–1715* (Marc Raeff) 93

J. Arch Getty, *Origins of the Great Purges: The Soviet Communist
Party Reconsidered, 1933–1938* (Bohdan Somchynsky) 95

Bohdan S. Kordan and Lubomyr Y. Luciuk, *A Delicate and Difficult
Question: Documents in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*
(Bohdan Harasymiw) 99

Studia Ucrainica 2 (1984) (Marko Pavlyshyn) 101

Yar Slavutych, *Anotovana bibliohrafiia ukrainskoi literatury v Kanadi*
(*Kanadski knyzhkovi vydannia 1908–1985*) and *Bibliohrafiia*
pysan pro Iara Slavutycha (1978–1985) (Jars Balan) 104

Contributors

SERGE CIPKO is a graduate student in the Department of History, University of Alberta, specializing in the study of Ukrainian settlements in Latin America.

OLEH W. GERUS is associate professor of history at St. Paul's College, University of Manitoba. He has published numerous articles and reviews, and has edited and updated Dmytro Doroshenko's *Survey of Ukrainian History* (1975).

IVAN LESZCZYSZYN, a former president of the Ukrainian Students' Union of Great Britain, is currently secretary of the London-based Ukrainian Graduates' and Professionals' Association.

LUBOMYR Y. LUCIUK is a lecturer in the Department of Geography at the University of Toronto, where he holds a post-doctoral fellowship. He is the author of *Ukrainians in the Making: Their Kingston Story* (1980) and editor of *Heroes of Their Day: The Reminiscences of Bohdan Panchuk* (1983).

MYKOLA MUSHYNKA is a folklorist and scholar of Ukrainian literature and culture living in Czechoslovakia. He has published widely and edited several volumes of *Naukovyi zbirnyk Muzeiu ukrainskoi kultury v Svydnyku*.

EUGENE SENETA is professor and head, Department of Mathematical Statistics, University of Sydney.

BOHDAN STRUMINSKY, a Slavic linguist by training, is the author of *Pseudo-Meleško: A Ukrainian Apocryphal Parliamentary Speech of 1615-1618* (1984). He is currently a translator and editor of the Millennium series of monuments of Ukrainian presecular literature (eleventh to eighteenth centuries) at the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA SETTLEMENTS

Oleh W. Gerus

UKRAINIANS IN ARGENTINA: A CANADIAN PERSPECTIVE*

Introduction

Apart from occasional journalistic accounts, little is known in Canada about the Ukrainians of South America. In fact, scholarly studies on the subject are scarce in any language.¹ This unfortunate situation is due partly to the self-absorption of Ukrainians in Canada and the United States and partly to the fact that ethnic studies, so advanced in North America, are only in their infant stage in South America. In the case of Argentina, the absence of scholarly interest in the ethno-cultural background of immigrants appears to be a product of the peculiar nature of the Argentine national psyche, for Argentines have developed a fierce patriotism and a strong belief in their national destiny. Although modern Argentina, itself a former Spanish possession, is a nation of relatively recent immigrants, largely of Italian and Spanish origin with a sprinkling of Indian blood, its perception of itself is that of homogeneous nation on the verge of greatness.² Cultural diversity, although tolerated, has not been encouraged. It is natural that in such circumstances little attention would be paid to the various ethnic communities which have integrated into Argentine society but have resisted total cultural assimilation.

*The author wishes to express his gratitude to St. Paul's College (University of Manitoba) and SSHRC for assisting with this research project.

There is also a statistical difficulty. As in Canada, available data on the number of Argentines who are actually of Ukrainian descent are incomplete and not totally reliable. In the first place, Argentine immigration officials recorded the citizenship or place of origin of immigrants rather than their nationality and, since parts of Ukrainian territory were ruled by a foreign power or powers during every phase of Ukrainian emigration, the nationality of many Ukrainians was incorrectly recorded. Thus, Ukrainians emigrating from Austria-Hungary before 1914, for instance, were registered as either Austrians or Hungarians; those from Polish-occupied Western Ukraine (Galicia and Volhynia) in the inter-war period were identified as Poles. Moreover, Argentina kept immigration records only of those immigrants arriving by ship. This means that thousands of Ukrainian settlers who fled Brazil for Argentina in the early 1900s were never statistically recorded.³ Finally, the Argentines in general have had a difficult time distinguishing among Ukrainians, Poles and Russians. How many Ukrainians were there in Argentina in 1986? We cannot be certain, but a figure of 200,000–220,000, more than 90 per cent of whom are Argentine-born and represent nearly one per cent of the total population, can be accepted as a minimum.⁴

As far as can be determined, the Ukrainian community in Argentina is the largest and most sophisticated of all Ukrainian enclaves in South America. This is due largely to the fact that, unlike its neighbours, Argentina is a modern state.⁵ It has abundant natural wealth and a strong heritage of European civilization, including vestiges of a class system. A predominantly agrarian country, Argentina has been undergoing extensive industrialization since the 1940s. Yet, despite its resources and economic potential, Argentina has been plagued by constant economic crises and the resultant political instability. Its history has been punctuated by periodic military dictatorships with their repressive regimes. In other words, the democracy enjoyed by Ukrainian immigrants to Canada and the United States has been sadly lacking in Argentina, with obvious detrimental consequences for all concerned.

Immigration and Settlement

Large-scale immigration and colonization in late nineteenth-century Argentina stimulated meat and grain production for European markets. Traditional sources of immigration—Italy and Spain—were supplemented by an influx from Eastern Europe. Unlike the Canadian

West, which abounded with unoccupied land, much of the land in Argentina had been parcelled out long before to large landowners of the old Spanish aristocracy. Under these circumstances the immigrants could not become homesteaders, as they would have done in Canada, but only tenant farmers or wage labourers (*campesinos*) on the huge privately owned estates, the *estancias*.⁶ This fact discouraged many of the peasant immigrants from venturing into the interior of the country, and they settled in the capital city, Buenos Aires. To encourage settlement of the interior, the Argentine government stepped in and opened the federal lands. One of the areas designated for colonization was the northern subtropical province of Misiones, sandwiched between Brazil and Paraguay, which had the hottest climate in the country. There, a new land-tenure system was in effect, whereby allotments of 50–100 hectares of virgin land were made available through private land companies. Colonists without capital could rent the land at a small fixed fee with an option to buy. The land companies also promised to provide the colonists with advances in livestock, food, and housing. In practice, however, they seldom did this, and the settlers' survival often depended on their own ingenuity.

The documented immigration of Ukrainians to Argentina began in 1897 and ended in 1950. Like Ukrainian immigration to North America, that to Argentina consisted of three distinct phases. During the period 1897–1914, an estimated 12,000 economically deprived peasants arrived, mainly from Galicia, then a province of Austria-Hungary. In the second phase, 1922–39, an estimated 50,000 immigrated. More would have come, but Argentina curtailed mass immigration in 1930 because of the depression. The inter-war immigrants, most of whom were economically motivated, also included representatives of the intelligentsia, among whom were veterans of Ukraine's unsuccessful struggle for independence. They came from Western Ukraine (occupied by Poland), Transcarpathia (occupied by Czechoslovakia), and Bukovyna (occupied by Romania). The last phase, 1946–50, saw the immigration of approximately 6,000 war refugees from all parts of Ukraine. These were essentially political exiles with pronounced anti-communist attitudes and an émigré mentality. That is to say, they saw Argentina as a temporary refuge which would allow them to make a living while their energies were devoted to the continuing struggle for Ukraine's liberation from Russian communism. Most of them settled in Buenos Aires.

The beginning of Ukrainian emigration to Argentina was almost accidental. While thousands of impoverished Ukrainian peasants were being lured to Brazil by exaggerated promises of free land, few in Galicia had heard of Argentina.⁷ A group of twelve Ukrainian and six Polish families—sixty-nine people altogether—from Tovmach county in Eastern Galicia were on their way to the United States when they were rejected by American officials in Hamburg, Germany.⁸ Stranded and confused, they were persuaded by an Argentine agent to try his country. After an arduous journey of nearly three months, this bewildered contingent arrived in September 1897 in the town of Apostoles in the newly opened province of Misiones. Thus the Ukrainian presence was established in Argentina.

An intensified campaign by Argentine immigration agents in Austria-Hungary stimulated a further influx of Ukrainian and Polish colonists to Misiones, eventually making that province the centre of Ukrainian life in rural Argentina. Currently numbering more than 55,000, the Ukrainians there represent approximately 9.5 per cent of the total population. In the inter-war period Ukrainian colonists settled in the adjoining provinces, especially Chaco, Mendoza and Buenos Aires. Today Ukrainians can be found throughout Argentina.⁹

In some respects pioneer life for Ukrainian settlers in northern Argentina was more difficult than for their counterparts in Canada. Their unfamiliarity with the southern hemisphere and with subtropical agriculture was not eased by the presence of unfriendly Indians, tropical diseases, insects, poisonous snakes, and an extraordinarily high humidity which sapped their physical strength and reduced their level of productivity.¹⁰ On their isolated homesteads they had little choice but to make the land productive in order to survive. Slowly, with remarkable tenacity, they came to terms with their environment and, in time, moved from subsistence agriculture to the cultivation of cash crops. Ukrainian farmers in the north became producers of Paraguayan tea (*hierba mate*), which is consumed in enormous quantities, as well as of tobacco, sugar cane, oranges, rice and oil-producing crops. Efforts to cultivate traditional Ukrainian crops failed, except for buckwheat and sunflowers. Eventually the Ukrainian sunflower developed into Argentina's most popular edible oil.¹¹ Unfortunately for the Ukrainian producers, Argentine big business took over that industry. In the cooler southern regions Ukrainian farmers became involved in wheat and beef production. The depression of the 1930s was particularly hard on those Ukrainian farmers who had finally begun to produce an adequate

surplus, as agricultural commodity prices fell drastically. Many farmers were wiped out and forced to relocate.¹² As they trekked into towns and cities, especially Buenos Aires, in search of elusive employment, many became part of the urban proletariat.

Proverbial sons of the soil, the Ukrainians of Argentina have remained disproportionately rural (50 per cent) in comparison with the general population (16 per cent).¹³ This phenomenon has been the greatest factor in the preservation of Ukrainian cultural identity, since farmers tend to be highly conservative and traditional. Contemporary Ukrainian rural communities in Argentina are reminiscent of rural Western Canada in the early 1950s. Mechanization and modern conveniences are recent phenomena and draught animals are still in use. Yet, in the South American context, the Ukrainian farmers of Argentina seem to be more advanced than their kinfolk in Paraguay and especially in Brazil. This conclusion is based only on the composite accounts of travellers, for no statistical data are available on the standard of living of Ukrainians in Argentina.

In the urban environment, the vast majority of Ukrainians have been part of the working class. Thousands of immigrants who arrived without families chose to remain in Buenos Aires, where they found irregular employment in the construction industry and meat-packing plants. Lacking the necessary linguistic and industrial skills, these Ukrainians constituted part of the menial labour force and were often at the mercy of their employers. Other Ukrainian workers, including failed farmers, were involved in railroad construction, where low wages and dangerous work were their daily companions. Argentina's recurring economic crises generated radical responses, including communism. The communist-influenced labour movements won support among the most unfortunate elements of Argentine society, including the Ukrainian proletariat.¹⁴

Ukrainian emergence into the entrepreneurial middle class can be traced back to the 1940s. Advertisements in the Ukrainian press reveal that Ukrainian businessmen are engaged in small business—in manufacturing (furniture and leather), food processing (meat and tea), and service industries (gas stations and garages). In a climate of economic instability and runaway inflation, the lot of Argentina's small business has been a hard one in recent years.

Ukrainian professionals are few in number. Those who emigrated with European degrees and training after the Second World War found that Argentina recognized only Spanish-language educational

institutions. Thus their European certificates were unacceptable, and this effectively forced middle-aged professionals to settle for menial subsistence jobs or to try to emigrate to North America, for "retooling" was generally beyond their psychological and material means. It was only in the 1960s that Ukrainian university graduates began to emerge in reasonably substantial numbers. This trend was due to the introduction of a tuition-free system in state universities. By 1979 more than 200 Ukrainian-Argentine professionals—lawyers, doctors, accountants and engineers—were working in Buenos Aires alone. While this represents an impressive increase from the previous figure, Ukrainian professionals in Argentina are proportionately far behind their kinfolk in Canada and the United States.¹⁵

Religious Life

Argentina is overwhelmingly a Roman Catholic country, and the Roman Catholic Church is a state institution. The Ukrainian population is estimated to be 65 per cent Catholic and 20 per cent Orthodox, the remainder being Protestants and non-believers. In Ukrainian life the mainstream churches have historically played a vital, almost all-embracing role. Yet the transfer of Ukrainian spiritual traditions and institutions to Argentina proved a difficult and frustrating task.

The first Ukrainian settlers in Misiones were without clergy for almost a decade. It was only in 1908 that the first Ukrainian Catholic priest arrived from Brazil.¹⁶ This inordinate delay was due to the Vatican's unpopular decision not to permit the Eastern-rite married clergy to serve in the Western Hemisphere. Since most of the Ukrainian Catholic clergy in Galicia consisted of married priests, eligible celibate priests were in short supply. Furthermore, it appears that an attempt was made to give the Polish clergy exclusive jurisdiction over Ukrainian settlers. Indeed, the aggressive Polonization carried on by Polish missionaries was so unpalatable that a group of Ukrainian Catholics in the rural community of Tres Capones placed itself under the authority of an Orthodox priest from the Russian embassy in Buenos Aires.¹⁷

Persistent efforts by Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky, primate of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church of Galicia, to meet Ukrainian needs, including his personal visit to Argentina in 1922, were constantly frustrated by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, which opposed a separate Ukrainian church organization in South America. The handful of Ukrainian Basilian missionaries, however, persisted in their difficult

task of serving the scattered colonies in Misiones and other provinces. Their work included providing Ukrainian education and community leadership. The situation improved appreciably after the Second World War. The clergy was strengthened by the arrival of priests from Europe and by the direct involvement of the powerful Basilian order in Brazil, which also included nuns. Years of Ukrainian pressure on the Vatican to create a separate diocese finally yielded the desired results when an exarchate was created for the Ukrainians of Argentina in 1968. Ten years later, the exarchate was raised to the status of an eparchy under Bishop Andrei Sapeliak.

The Ukrainian Catholic Church has created an impressive infrastructure. There are eleven parishes with many churches, chapels and schools served by twenty-two priests, mainly Basilians headquartered at Apostoles, Misiones. They are ably assisted by nearly one hundred nuns, who are responsible for catechism and education in both Sunday and parochial schools. There is also a network of parish lay organizations which help to amplify the church's presence in the community. Finally, there is even a branch of Rome's Ukrainian Catholic University in Buenos Aires.¹⁸

If the Ukrainian Catholic Church had to overcome serious obstacles in establishing itself in a Roman Catholic country, it is not surprising that the Ukrainian Orthodox Church faced even greater difficulties. First of all, the Orthodox presence itself has been rather small, since relatively few such faithful emigrated to Argentina in the initial period. The only sizeable group that can be identified as Orthodox consisted of immigrants from the province of Chernihiv, then under Russian rule, who arrived in Brazil in 1904. Many of them fled south to Misiones, where the climate was more tolerable.¹⁹ Another contingent of Orthodox Ukrainians arrived in the 1920s from Volhynia. Many of these people, however, were only nominally religious. Those who practised their religion did not have a high level of national consciousness and therefore tended to gravitate toward Russian Orthodoxy. Still others found Protestantism to their liking.²⁰

The beginning of Ukrainian Orthodoxy in Argentina can be traced to Tykhon Hnatiuk, a Ukrainian priest of the Russian Orthodox Church who organized the breakaway Catholic congregation at Tres Capones.²¹ Although under Russian jurisdiction, Hnatiuk was an active proponent of Ukrainian cultural activity in the several parishes that he organized. After a brief absence from Argentina, he returned in 1924, this time as a priest of the newly established Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox

Church (UAPTs). For nearly twenty years he was the only Orthodox priest to serve Argentina and Paraguay.

It was only in 1946 that several Orthodox priests arrived from Germany, and for the next decade Orthodox church life showed impressive growth, which culminated in the formation of the UAPTs of Argentina. Internal jurisdictional disputes, however, plagued the church. Formally under Metropolitan Polikarp Sikorsky of the UAPTs in Europe, the Argentine UAPTs refused to accept his appointment of a controversial priest as bishop of Argentina. The rebellious Argentine church eventually switched to the jurisdiction of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the USA under Metropolitan Teodorovych. In order to consolidate the scattered Orthodox parishes in Argentina, Paraguay, Venezuela and Brazil into a coherent body, a South American eparchy was created in 1969. Unfortunately for the UAPTs, the first two bishops died in quick succession and the eparchy fell on hard times. Still, eparchial councils have occasionally been held to discuss mutual problems and set common objectives.²²

Today, the UAPTs of Argentina is under the direct jurisdiction of Metropolitan Skrypyk of the USA, head of the UAPTs in the diaspora. A chronic shortage of priests has left only four active parishes in Berisso, Villa Caraza, Las Breñas and Buenos Aires. Desperately lacking candidates for the priesthood and the necessary financial resources to carry out its work, the UAPTs seems to be facing a bleak future.

Community Organizations

Initiatives for community organization came from the first Ukrainian priests, the traditional village leadership. In Misiones, for example, Father Karpiak organized in the town of Apostoles what was probably the first reading society (*chytalnia*) in Argentina. The development of early community organizations, however, was frustrated by the relative insufficiency of secular leadership, the low level of national consciousness of the settlers, their isolation on homesteads, and the general lack of time for activities not essential to their physical survival. Indeed, in the view of Petro Karmansky, the fund-raiser for the Western Ukrainian People's Republic, "the Ukrainian colony in Misiones in 1922 was seriously threatened with national extinction."²³

The influx of a large inter-war immigration revived the community. The Prosvita Society, patterned on the famous Western

Ukrainian cultural and educational institution, was established in Buenos Aires in 1924. The leadership of this Prosvita, however, was seized by Ukrainian communists and their sympathizers, who were making their presence felt at that time.²⁴ These were largely recent arrivals from Volhynia who had developed pro-Soviet attitudes as a result of Polish policies of ethnic discrimination and economic exploitation of that region. The intense struggle for control of the Buenos Aires Prosvita raged until 1928, when anti-communist Ukrainians finally prevailed. Concern about the possibility of communist takeovers led to the amalgamation of the Buenos Aires Prosvita with those established in Dock Sud and Berisso.

Nonetheless, Prosvita continued to experience difficulties. Its emphasis on cultural activities such as theatre, concerts, and Ukrainian-language schools did not satisfy the adherents of the European-based Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, who created a counter-organization. In the fashion of the day they established a sports association, Sokil, and a paramilitary group, Striletska hromada.²⁵ In 1928 these organizations merged into Vidrozhennia (*Renacimiento*), a political body dedicated to the promotion of Ukraine's independence. Vidrozhennia raised funds for Carpatho-Ukraine in 1938-9 and conducted vociferous anti-Polish and anti-Soviet campaigns. The militancy of Vidrozhennia, especially that of its newspaper, *Nash klych* (*Nuestro Llamado*), certainly helped to politicize the national consciousness of Ukrainians in Argentina. It also provoked the Polish embassy into seeking to suppress the organization. The Argentine government had been growing increasingly concerned about the political activities not only of the Ukrainians, but also of sympathizers of Nazi Germany and fascist Italy. Consequently, it placed all ethnic organizations under direct police control and disallowed the public use of languages other than Spanish.²⁶ This government action led to the severe curtailment of Ukrainian political activities. Vidrozhennia was transformed into a purely cultural body, at least officially.

Between 1946 and 1955 Argentina was ruled by the military strongman Juan Perón. His regime, a curious mixture of socialism, nationalism and plain old-fashioned dictatorship,²⁷ had a definite impact on the Ukrainian community. Perón re-established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, which had been severed in the 1930s, and this meant the revival of Ukrainian communist groups behind such facades as the Ivan Franko and Taras Shevchenko societies. Perón's regime also undertook a massive industrialization programme with a correlative

neglect of agriculture. This policy not only led to the eventual collapse of the national economy, but immediately struck at the small farmers who were the largest segment of the Ukrainian community.

Since 1945 the Soviet government had been waging a propaganda campaign designed to induce Ukrainians living abroad to return home. In Argentina there was little initial response, but with the worsening economic conditions of the 1950s voluntary repatriation did begin. It is estimated that between 3,000 and 5,000 persons chose to return to Ukraine.²⁸ These were generally, but not exclusively, single, older men who were motivated by poverty, loneliness, nostalgia and promises of a better life.²⁹ The stark reality of the Soviet system shocked many of the deluded younger returnees into scrambling to get back to Argentina. Surprisingly, the Soviet authorities relented, and perhaps as many as a thousand were readmitted to Argentina. The returnees' public repudiation of the Soviet system not only discouraged others from returning to the USSR but also strengthened the position of Ukrainian nationalist groups.

The influence of the third emigration on the organized Ukrainian community in Argentina was remarkable. First, its strong nationalism intensified the ideological struggle against pro-communist factions. The communists responded with an extensive smear campaign, depicting the new immigrants as Nazi collaborators.³⁰ Secondly, the new immigrants brought about a reversal in the political orientation of the major societies, Prosvita and Vidrozhennia. The extreme nationalists, affiliated with the Bandera wing of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, took over Prosvita, while the more moderate Melnyk faction assumed leadership over the formerly militant Vidrozhennia. The open feuding of these OUN factions, which had been engaged in an intense rivalry in Europe, was transferred to Argentina. Perhaps the most serious disservice was done to efforts to maintain a nationally recognized umbrella organization for the Ukrainian community as a whole. Taking their example from the more successful Canadian and American experience, the Ukrainians of Argentina managed to form a Ukrainian Central Representation (*Representación Central de la Colectividad Ucraina en la Republica Argentina*) in 1947. However, the polarization of political forces made the once promising co-ordinating body rather less effective than it might have been. The feuding also appears to have also turned many Argentine-born Ukrainians away from ethno-cultural involvement altogether. Nevertheless, the departure of some of the more prominent activists for the United States and Canada in the 1960s

relaxed tensions somewhat and even contributed to a common drive to erect a magnificent monument to Taras Shevchenko in Buenos Aires in 1971.³¹

Of the various Ukrainian community organizations still in existence in Argentina, Prosvita remains the most visible. It has sixteen branches throughout the country with substantial property, as well as a number of youth and women's components. It publishes a bilingual Ukrainian-Spanish newspaper, *Ukrainske slovo (La Palabra ucrania)*, and attempts to inform the Spanish-speaking world about Ukrainian affairs. In 1984 the active membership of the Prosvita network numbered just over a thousand.³² The other major organization, Vidrodzhennia, consists of a central office which also publishes a newspaper, *Nash klych*, and four branches which operate Ukrainian weekend schools (*ridni shkoly*) and emphasize traditional cultural activities such as dancing and handicrafts. As in Canada, Ukrainian folk dancing has become very popular in recent years with the general public of Argentina, and it appears to be giving the Ukrainian community an identifiable public profile that helps reinforce its ethnic identity.

General Observations

Ukrainians in Argentina, like Ukrainians in the diaspora generally, can be divided into three classifications—the émigrés, the integrated and the assimilated. The émigrés still cherish the idea of an independent Ukraine and of their possible return there. The integrated category, which is probably the largest and most representative group, is primarily Argentinian in outlook but retains a degree of interest in Ukrainian ethnicity. However, most integrated Ukrainians or Ukrainian Argentines have always remained outside the existing community and religious structures.³³ The assimilated category, of course, has little, if any, sense of Ukrainian identity. It is totally Argentine, made so by such prevalent assimilative forces as mixed marriage, the educational system, compulsory military service, and personal ambition. Ukrainian community leaders, traditionally drawn from the ranks of the émigrés and the integrated category, have been strong proponents of cultural pluralism, a concept most Argentines find difficult to accept.

There are no reliable data on language retention among Ukrainians in Argentina. Superficial observation leads one to conclude that Spanish has become the working language of the organized

community, with Ukrainian generally used in a token capacity. Although in the more isolated rural communities Ukrainian is still spoken, most of the speakers do not read or write Ukrainian.³⁴ The language question is important not only to the preservation of Ukrainian ethnicity in Argentina, but also to the maintenance of contacts between Ukrainians there and those in other parts of the world.

A visitor gains the impression that the Ukrainians of South America have a strong sense of isolation from Ukrainians in the diaspora and in Ukraine. There are several reasons for this. The distance between Europe or North America and South America has always been compounded by the latter's economic instability. The weakness of the Argentine currency, for example, makes travel abroad prohibitively expensive for most Ukrainians, who as a group happen to be in the lower economic stratum. The weak currency also renders imported cultural materials such as Ukrainian books and records very expensive. This means that interaction between the Ukrainians of Argentina and their fellow Ukrainians in Canada and the United States has been minimal. As far as Soviet Ukraine is concerned, the erratic relations between Argentina and the USSR, as well as the strong anti-communism of the majority of Ukrainian-Argentines, have minimized whatever cultural influence can be exerted from the ancestral homeland.

Given the relative economic strength of Ukrainian communities in Canada and the United States, the onus for maintaining personal and group contacts would appear to devolve upon them. So far, disappointingly little has been done to cultivate meaningful cultural links. North American tourism in South America is still insignificant. Occasional visits by such leaders as the late Cardinal Slipy or Peter Savaryn, president of the World Congress of Free Ukrainians,³⁵ or by an artistic group such as the celebrated O. Koshets Choir of Winnipeg (1985), serve to point up the overwhelming appreciation of such "cultural exchanges" by Ukrainians in South America and the critical need to expand these exchanges for the benefit of all participants.

Personal observation suggests that years of separate development have already created certain attitudinal and cultural differences between the Ukrainians of Canada and those of Argentina. Acute impatience and insistence on precise scheduling among Ukrainian Canadians contrast sharply with the relaxed, easy-going attitude of the Ukrainian Argentines. Furthermore, there are problems of communication between younger Ukrainians of the two countries. Neither group knows enough

Ukrainian to communicate effectively in the common ancestral language, nor can either group reach the other in Spanish or English. Even those who do speak Ukrainian have difficulty, for the Ukrainian language has developed independently since immigration and now contains substantial numbers of Ukrainized Spanish and English words. Consequently, discussions between such Ukrainians are punctuated by extensive gesticulation, which both amuses and frustrates the participants. As the Ukrainian language diminishes in usefulness as a vehicle of communication, contacts between Ukrainians in North and South America will become even more difficult.

Assimilationist tendencies in Argentina are strong, and the majority of Ukrainians will eventually become as assimilated as the Italians or the Germans. However, there will undoubtedly remain a nucleus of people dedicated to the preservation of Ukrainian identity. As secular organizations dwindle, the leadership role may revert to the Ukrainian churches. Despite the general Argentine trend to religious indifference, many Ukrainians still regard the traditional Catholic and Orthodox churches as important to their spiritual and community well-being. The problem here, however, lies in the chronic shortage of priests. While the shortage is serious in the Catholic church, it has reached alarming proportions in the Orthodox church. For a variety of reasons, young men show no interest in religious vocations, and with the inevitable demise of the few remaining aged priests, the total collapse of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church is quite possible. It seems that at this stage only external assistance from North America can salvage the situation. So far, however, the hierarchy in the United States has not developed a program of effective missionary work in Argentina.

What have Ukrainians contributed to Argentina? Their impact on that nation can best be appreciated in the context of its recent history. Perpetual economic and political instability imposed specific hardships on the Ukrainian immigrants that were not duplicated in Canada. The remnants of the Spanish class system made vertical mobility for East European immigrants, particularly for the Ukrainian peasantry, more difficult than in Canada. Periods of political repression under military regimes not only discouraged organizational and ethnic activities but also posed a physical threat to the population. It is said by Ukrainian community leaders that during the repressive decade of the 1970s, a number of young Ukrainians were among the estimated 10,000–30,000 Argentines who “disappeared” at the hands of the police and right-wing death squads. The fragility of human and civil rights, which are taken

for granted by the Ukrainians of North America, has been a definite factor in shaping Argentina's Ukrainian community and in determining the nature and the scope of its contributions to that country.

By far the most obvious and significant contribution has been made in agriculture, especially in the provinces of Misiones and Chaco, and notably in the transformation of harsh subtropical territories into productive croplands. The pioneering efforts of Ukrainians in Misiones established them as respected and valuable colonists, and this enabled subsequent generations to attain a degree of political influence at the municipal and provincial levels. In other areas of political, economic and cultural life, the Ukrainian impact on Argentina has been less significant. This is, of course, understandable, given the socio-economic background of the Ukrainian immigrants and the historical context in which they found themselves in their host country.

Notes

¹ So far the only scholarly, though not entirely satisfactory, effort to study the Ukrainian community in Argentina has been made by Mykhailo Vasylyk of the Ukrainian Catholic University, who earned a doctorate for his *Ukrainski poselennia v Argentyni* (Munich, 1982). The late E. Onatsky gave some insight into organizational life in his article, "Ukraintsi v Pivdennii Amerytsi" in *Ukraintsi u vilnomu sviti* (Jersey City: Ukrainian National Association, 1954), 215-32. The special issue of *Ukrainskyi samostiinyk*, "Ukrainska diaspóra v Pivdennii Amerytsi," no. 46 (1961), examines the Ukrainian situation in South America from a nationalist perspective. An old study by S. Vaprovych, *Arhentina—ukrainska emigratsiia v nii* (Lviv, 1935), is still useful. A perplexing study concerned with Polish immigration to South America, which distorts the Ukrainian aspect, is E. Pyzik's *Los Polacos en la Republica Argentina y America del Sur desde el año 1812* (Buenos Aires, 1966). As for the Ukrainian colonization of Brazil, where cultural pluralism and racial toleration are quite advanced, Professor O. Boruszenko of the University of Curitiba has been conducting systematic research on the subject in Ukrainian and Portuguese.

² R.J. Alexander, *An Introduction to Argentina* (New York, 1969), 46.

³ P. Hubarchuk, "Ukraintsi v Arhentyini," *Zhovten* (Lviv), no. 12 (1956): 71.

⁴ A.M. Milianych *et al.*, ed., *Ukrainski poselennia: dovidnyk* (New York, 1980), 282.

⁵ J.R. Scobie, *Argentina—A City and a Nation* (New York, 1971).

⁶ Alexander, 124.

⁷ Osyp Oleskiv, the father of Ukrainian emigration to Canada, urged peasants not to go to Brazil or Argentina, where conditions were unacceptable. "There are no Ukrainian colonies in Argentina; emigration to Argentina is out of the question," *Pro vilni zemli* (Lviv, 1895), 29. Reprint, Winnipeg: Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, 1975.

⁸ Vasylyk, 15; M. Danylyshyn, "65-littia ukrainskoho poselennia v Misiones," *Kalendar T-va Prosvita* (Buenos Aires, 1963), 76. Other sources give somewhat different figures.

⁹ Milianych (*Ukrainski poselennia*, 28-82), gives the following estimates of the Ukrainian population of Argentina (1979) by province:

Buenos Aires (city and province)	99,000
Misiones	55,000
Chaco	30,000
Mendoza	7,000
Formosa	4,000
Córdoba	3,000
Rio Negro	3,000
Corrientes	2,000
Santa Fe	2,000

¹⁰ P. Karmansky, *Mizh ridnymi v Pivdennii Amerytsi* (Vienna, 1923), 164; Scobie, 113.

¹¹ *The Statesman's Year-Book, 1972-3* (London, 1972), 748.

¹² M. Danylyshyn, "Nashi zdobutky za 60 rokiv," *Ukrainskyi samostiinyk*, no. 31 (1960): 32.

¹³ Milianych, 282. The figures are for 1970; since then, Argentina has become even more urbanized.

¹⁴ Hubarchuk, 78-83; Onatsky, 220.

¹⁵ Milianych, 283.

¹⁶ Vaprovych, 17.

¹⁷ Ia. Lavrychenko, "Ukrainska emihratsiia v Arhentyni i volyniany," *Litopys Volyni*, no. 10-12 (1972): 55.

¹⁸ Vasylyk, 63-6.

¹⁹ Hubarchuk, 71.

²⁰ M. Soltys, "Ukrainskyi evanhelyzm v pralisakh Misiones," *Khrystyianskyi visnyk* (Winnipeg), no. 1-12 (1969).

²¹ Onatsky, 217.

²² "IV Zvychainyi Eparkhiiialnyi Sobor UAPT v Latynskii Amerytsi," *Novyi shliakh*, 18 January 1986.

²³ *Mizh ridnymy v Pivdennii Amerytsi*, 169.

²⁴ Onatsky, 217.

²⁵ Onatsky, 218; Vasylyk, 73–4.

²⁶ Onatsky, 218.

²⁷ A.P. Whitaker, *Argentine Upheaval: Perón's Fall and the New Regime* (New York, 1956), 65–180.

²⁸ An additional 3,000 emigrated to North America. Milianych, 284.

²⁹ M. Danylyshyn, "Kulturna ta ekonomichna diálnist nashykh hromad," *Ukrainskyi samostiinyk*, no. 23 (1959): 39.

³⁰ Hubarchuk, 81.

³¹ *Taras Shevchenko—Propamiatna knyha* (Buenos Aires, 1971).

³² "Zvit vyholoshenyi holovoiu Tovarystva "Prosvita" na zahalnykh zborakh," *Ukrainske slovo* (Buenos Aires), 5 October 1985.

³³ M. Danylyshyn, "Potreby i problemy nashykh hromad," *Ukrainskyi samostiinyk*, no. 20 (1959): 33.

³⁴ Vasylyk used a very small sample of 28 families in Misiones and Formosa to determine that 78 per cent still used Ukrainian, but only 14 per cent could read and 7 per cent could write in that language. *Op. cit.*, 110.

³⁵ P. Savaryn, "Moi vrazhennia z vidvidyn Argentyny, Paragvaiu i Brazilii," *Visnyk SKVU*, May 1985.

Serge Cipko

THE LEGACY OF THE “BRAZILIAN FEVER”: THE UKRAINIAN COLONIZATION OF PARANA

During the course of the nineteenth century, when the North American governments were promoting major structural changes and embarking upon programmes of modernization and immigration, several governments of Latin America, inspired by these moves, began to consider and later pursue similar policies. One of these governments, that of Brazil, decided that the impending abolition of slavery made it necessary to adopt alternative economic strategies in order to maintain the country's dynamic export sector, which at the time consisted of coffee and rubber. When slavery finally disappeared in the late 1880s, the subsequent growth of the wage economy and the continual expansion of coffee exports demanded the acquisition of extra manpower. The government therefore promoted an ambitious development programme that combined immigration, foreign capital investment, physical infrastructural improvements, and agrarian revolution to cater to its export economy.

At the same time, the government directed its attention to settling the sparsely populated frontier regions with Europeans as a means of confirming sovereignty over these areas and stimulating new types of farming of a European character. In the 1870s colonization laws were reformed, and from the late 1880s on, government and privately sponsored agents were dispatched across Europe to bring immigrants to Brazil. The newcomers were offered such incentives as pre-paid passage and land concessions. In Galicia, then an Austrian province, these recruitment efforts precipitated what is now commonly termed the “Brazilian fever,” also referred to in Polish historical texts as the “Parana fever,” given that most Slavic immigrants to Brazil settled in the state of Parana, which borders on the state of São Paulo to the north and the Argentine province of Misiones (where Ukrainians began to settle in 1897) to the south-west.

This article examines Ukrainian immigration to Brazil from the perspective of the colonization of Parana. In many respects the two events were synonymous. The Ukrainians were a founding settler people, especially in the south-eastern part of the state, where for a long time they constituted the majority. Indeed, as this paper demonstrates, the first immigrants and their descendants have left a profound imprint on many aspects of the Parana landscape and economy.

The First Immigrants

After the visit of Brazilian Emperor Pedro II to the Nova Polonia colony, the governor of Parana, Viscount Alfredo d'Escregnonle Tannay, was urged to encourage mass Polish immigration into Brazil. In 1885 a letter was distributed in Polish territories calling on Poles oppressed by the Prussian authorities to emigrate to Brazil.¹ At the same time, recruiting agents were sent to Eastern Europe. To further stimulate Polish immigration, the Brazilian government appointed Poles to posts of authority in the state administration. Wos-Saporski, for example, was appointed to the Government Commission for Colonization in 1907; in 1915 he became Commissioner for Agriculture in the Parana government.² Developments in Parana had an effect on the Polish population, and stories of concessions to immigrants spread from the western territories of Poland to the east. From there, the news reached the Ukrainian peasantry.

The first Ukrainians in Parana comprised a small group from Bukovyna which came with a larger contingent of Poles and settled in Curitiba, the state capital, in 1876.³ Another group of Ukrainian immigrants, this time from Chelm, arrived in Parana in 1884.⁴ But the beginning of mass Ukrainian immigration was signalled in 1891 by the arrival of a group of eight families from Eastern Galicia that established themselves in the colony of Santa Barbara (in the county of Palmeira, situated between Curitiba and Ponta Grossa). The years of the most intensive immigration to Parana were 1895–7 and 1908–10. Unfortunately, government records are an unreliable gauge of Ukrainian immigration for the period before 1950. The Immigration Division of the National Department of Labour, for instance, listed only 1,415 of the immigrants as "Ukrainian."⁵ More credible and better conceived are the figures presented by the Ukrainian Basilian priests, who conducted a census of the majority of Ukrainian settlers in 1913–14. This survey, which did not encompass all settlements,

concluded that of a total of 43,751 immigrants monitored, 33,529 had settled in the state of Parana, 2,245 in the southernmost state of Rio Grande do Sul, 211 in São Paulo, 160 in Santa Catarina and 70 in Espiritu Santo.⁶

Immigrants from Eastern Europe were usually accommodated in transient barracks in Ilha das Flores (literally Isle of Flowers, Brazil's equivalent to Ellis Island) near São Paulo. There they were temporarily sheltered and received food and lodging until they were ready to depart for their destination. Immigrant officials were expected to ask new arrivals where they wished to go, but this was not always done. Since most immigrants did not speak Portuguese and were unfamiliar with legal procedures, they were easy prey for unscrupulous agents who sometimes sent them to the *fazendas* (coffee plantations). Many Ukrainians were tricked into going to the plantations, but in most cases their stay was temporary. Once they had learned more about the country, they made their own way to Parana. They also attempted to prevent their countrymen from falling into the same trap. Warnings appeared in the form of messages scribbled on barrack walls in the hope that the literate among the immigrants would read them and advise the others.⁷

The immigrants were to be guided to the new sites in Parana, where they were to receive temporary government support and protection to enable them to adjust. They did receive transport to the new zones, but settlement aid was not always forthcoming. As Paul Hurvey Price explains, "Financial assistance that had been promised was not available. Frequently, even lodgings did not exist for the new settlers, who were abandoned in the virgin forest to their own luck."⁸ This absence of support proved fatal for the first Ukrainian immigrants in Parana. Deprived of medical facilities and sanitation, many were susceptible to diseases and subsequently perished, others could not survive without adequate food supplies and starved to death, while still others were caught in violent skirmishes with the indigenous inhabitants, who resented the intrusion of newcomers into what traditionally had been their territory. The death toll in the first years was exceedingly high. In 1897, only a year after the founding of the settlement of Prudentópolis by more than 8,000 Ukrainians, there were as many as 3,000 graves in the local cemetery according to one source,⁹ while another cites deaths at the rate of 15 per day over a long period.¹⁰ Life in Brazil was clearly not as rosy as the steamship agents had painted it. Some immigrants, feeling cheated and betrayed, returned home. The

majority, however, decided to remain and perforce became pioneers in south-eastern Parana, where they congregated.

With so many difficulties in the early years, it is a wonder that more Ukrainians came at all (one would have thought that efforts to deflect the course of emigration to Canada would have been much more effective). Why, then, did so many continue to arrive? One possible explanation is that some letters reaching the homeland still related stories of benefits to be expected in Brazil. Few would be willing to be branded as failures by admitting that they had been deceived. Correspondents therefore tended more to emphasize the advantages of the country than to elaborate on the difficulties and hardships encountered.¹¹ Accordingly, once the stories of hardships had diminished, immigrants continued to arrive in large numbers. As the first settlements began to adjust successfully to the new conditions, they became a focus for more Ukrainian immigrants. Eventually, block settlements developed similar to those on the Canadian prairies, and Ukrainians began to form a compact group in the south-eastern part of the state. The area in which most Ukrainians still live—"Brazilian Ukraine," as some call it—is about 6,000 sq. km. in size.¹² Other significant immigrant groups include Poles, Italians and Germans and, among the newest, Japanese, Lebanese, Syrians and Koreans.¹³ In some counties and colonies Ukrainians form a clear majority. In the county of Prudentópolis, for example, they constitute three-quarters of the total population; they form a plurality in several colonies of Mallét, Senador Correia, Lapa, Guarapuava, União da Vitória, São João do Triunfo, Palmeira, Irati and Paulo Frontin.¹⁴

Pioneers on the Land

The colonization of Parana began later than that of the other two states of southern Brazil. The state did not acquire a separate existence until 1853, and active colonization was not promoted until the 1860s. Germans, Italians and Poles were the first major groups to receive assistance in settling the lower *planalto* (a plateau region of grassland and forest) in the vicinity of Curitiba.¹⁵ These first projects were successful because a local market was assured and good roads linked the colonies with the city.¹⁶ Toward the end of the century, immigration to Parana took on massive proportions, and the government directed the newcomers to new pioneering zones (in the case of Ukrainians, to the second Parana *planalto*). The colonization of Parana was encouraged by

the government for several reasons: to check the further diffusion of the influence of the traditional ruling oligarchs; to put sparsely populated regions to productive use (at little expense to the state); to confirm government control of frontier zones; to introduce new crop varieties which in turn would generate new sources of export revenue (thus strengthening the republic's fiscal position); to alter the uneven distribution of the population; and to create a manpower resource base that could be drawn upon in future.

In many cases the colonization of the southern states became a spontaneous movement that involved little government planning. Immigrants who received neither credits nor supplies relied on their own resources, on assistance from their home governments (if available), or on mutual support. European settlement in the South followed similar patterns. Generally the immigrants elected the forest areas in the temperate zones, which were often correctly presumed to be more fertile and most suitable for European crops. The first stage in the evolution of the farmstead was what the agricultural geographer Leo Waibel calls the "land-rotation system," also known as "shifting agriculture" and "slash-and-burn," one of the oldest methods of agriculture in the world and a system the Europeans initially found most appropriate for their new surroundings. It is still practised in many parts of Latin America and in other tropical societies. The pioneer family buys land in an uninhabited forested area, levels the forest, burns the wood, and then plants local crops, e.g., corn, black beans, and *mandioca* (manioc or cassava), using such implements as the dibble and hoe. A temporary shelter is built of local materials such as palm leaves and sticks. Rudimentary pathways link the colonists to the nearest markets, where they may occasionally go to exchange produce for needed items. Isolation is characteristic of this first stage: the colonists seldom see one another, except for such occasions as Sunday church services.

The second stage, "improved land rotation," involves a transition from a subsistence (domestic) culture to an economic (capitalist) one. Population density rises as the land is cleared of trees and roads are upgraded. Agricultural techniques are improved and European crops are introduced as cash commodities; cattle raising also assumes importance. Small food processing plants are installed in local centres. Grains such as wheat and rye are cultivated in winter, rice in summer and potatoes the year round. The dibble and hoe are replaced with the horse-drawn plough and harrow. Housing structures are improved and modelled on patterns known at home. Community life begins to become more

vibrant. The soil, however, gradually becomes exhausted and yields fall, demanding further innovations.

The final stage is one that Waibel has labelled "crop rotation combined with stock raising." Animal manure is applied to fertilize the land, for which purpose the colonist buys additional cattle and grows fodder crops (alfalfa, vetch, broad beans and alsike, and cabbage and turnips in the winter). Profits accrued from commercial crops such as alfalfa and tobacco are invested in starting up agro-industries, as well as in various comforts for the family. The farmer steadily becomes more prosperous.¹⁷ Success in the third stage depends on several factors, primarily access to markets, adequate financing and fertility of the soil. Generally, the greater the proximity to a market, the more prosperous the colony.

The Formation of *quistos*

Lack of government intervention in the establishment of European colonies in southern Brazil led to the formation of clusters of immigrants bound together by their common origins. This occurred even at the most basic level, with immigrants from a particular village forming the core of a particular colony in Brazil. Foreign enclaves were thus segregated from the Brazilian population, and even inter-immigrant contacts were minimized. Certain immigrant groups agglomerated in specific areas: Germans in Rio Grande do Sul, Latin groups in Santa Catarina, and Slavs largely in Parana.¹⁸ Each wave of immigrants reinforced existing colonies or founded new ones nearby.

In their studies of immigrant group settlements in southern and south-eastern Brazil, Aristoteles de Lima Camara and Arthur Hehl Neiva emphasize the creation of *quistos* (cysts) as a result of the lack of government planning. These were to be found predominantly in the state of São Paulo, with its large Japanese nuclei, and in the states of Rio Grande do Sul and Santa Catarina, with their large concentrations of Germans and Italians, among others. For Parana, they list the following: a) Germans in the counties of Curitiba, Londrina, Paranagua and Ponta Grossa, b) Japanese in the counties of Cornelio, Procepio, Londrina and Geronimo, c) Poles in the counties of Curitiba, Prudentópolis, Reserva, São José dos Pinhais, São Mateus and Vitoria, d) Ruthenians (*sic*) in the counties of Curitiba, Rio Negro and São Mateus, and e) Ukrainians in the counties of Curitiba and Prudentópolis.¹⁹

The emergence of these ethnic islands was no mere accident. "The explanation of the segregation of these colonies," notes Robert Hall, "is a complex one of language, religion, social customs, geography, and above all economics."²⁰ Indeed, the government initially did little to prevent the formation of immigrant block settlements. It mattered little if *quistos* developed as long as the soil they occupied was put to productive use. The immigrants were brought mainly for economic purposes, to inhabit sparsely populated territories and create a class of yeoman farmers. That they retreated into exclusive colonies was not regarded as a problem, but rather proved to be an advantage. The immigrants were frequently settled at their own expense, built their own physical infrastructures, created their own schools, services and amenities, and became self-sufficient with little recourse to the exchequer. The government could later consolidate and incorporate these settlements.

It was only in the 1930s that the government changed its attitude to foreign enclaves because of what it perceived as threats to national security. This was due to suspicions about and actual incidents of agitation and secessionist movements among Germans, Italians and Japanese,²¹ as well as among Poles.²² The government of Getulio Vargas implemented a law in 1938 that banned most foreign associations, foreign-language newspapers, and non-Portuguese-language sermons in church, prohibited teaching in any language but Portuguese, and declared that no single colony should be composed of more foreigners than native-born Brazilians. This policy hampered cultural and educational work in immigrant communities. The foreign-language press, for example, was unable to play its role in preparing the immigrant for citizenship in his new country. The energies of community leaders, which had been directed toward forming a bridge between the old country and the new by means of educational programmes, were curtailed.

If *quistos* posed a problem for the authorities, who now wished to assimilate them, or if they created tension with native Brazilians, who resented their exclusiveness, they had nonetheless arisen as a response to the immigrants' needs, offering an environment in which they could adapt to their new, alien surroundings. Some have argued that by settling in compact communities the immigrants made greater progress than they would have if they had been dispersed. Leo Waibel, who has carried out a good deal of research in southern Brazil, affirms: "Germans, Italians, Poles, and Ukrainians have done best both for

themselves and the country of adoption where they have settled in compact communities—it suffices to mention Blumenau, Caxias, the Polish colony of Araucaria, and the Ukrainian one of Prudentópolis, the last two in Parana.”²³

Adjustments and Transculturation

Considerable adjustments had to be made to cope with life in an alien environment. Coming from densely populated areas, immigrants entered sparsely inhabited territory and became isolated from one another by distance and poor communications. The subtropical climate was also different—continental in the southerly part of the Parana plateau, where Ukrainians settled, but with the notable absence of the severe East European winters.

In areas where they constituted a majority, Ukrainians were certain to exert an impact on the landscape. Once the land was cleared, the lot (the standard size of Ukrainian landholdings was 25 hectares) was divided into cropland, pasture and woodland. European crops and farming techniques were introduced and, as in other zones of European colonization, a landscape based upon stable family-operated farms, diversified agriculture and distinctive architecture was created. Ukrainian settlement structures did not correspond to any single plan, but took the form of grouped villages, separate farms or chains of them, and urban-type settlements.²⁴ They are identified by particular types of buildings: the church with cupolas, whitewashed houses resembling those of the homeland, and orchards enclosed by wooden fences. Many European farming implements were used, such as the plough, harrow, disc, flail, sickle, and spade. In some Ukrainian settlements where there is not enough capital to purchase more sophisticated and modern farming equipment, these implements continue to be used to this day.²⁵ In some cases, Ukrainians introduced features of their material culture unknown in Brazil, such as the four-wheeled horse-drawn tilt cart (*arba*), which replaced the cumbersome and much slower ox-wagon and rapidly gained acceptance in southern Brazil.²⁶ This also had the effect of substituting the horse for the ox and mule as the most common draught animal.

Another important feature of transculturation was the introduction of new crops. It is said, for example, that Ukrainians were the first to introduce buckwheat to the Latin American continent.²⁷ A popular crop in Ukraine since medieval times, buckwheat can grow in many types of

soil, maturing rapidly (2–3 months). Many other crops that were widely cultivated in Western Ukraine in the late nineteenth century, whether grains, tubers or fodder, were transplanted to Brazil. Usually these were grown for subsistence. A wide range of grains was brought over, including wheat, rye, barley, oats, and buckwheat. Animal fodder crops—vetch, esparcet and clover—were re-established to feed cattle and enrich the soil with nitrogen. Among transplanted crops that featured predominantly in the Ukrainian diet were cabbage, potatoes, beetroot and orchard fruits. Some Galician industrial crops also assumed importance as cash crops in Brazil: tobacco, hemp, sunflower and flax. However, most of the cash crops cultivated in Brazil tended to have local origins: *hierba mate* (Paraguayan tea), coffee, mint and manioc. Animal husbandry is another feature that characterizes Ukrainian and other European settlements in Brazil. Even today, Brazilian Ukrainians continue to raise livestock that was extensively bred in the homeland, especially hogs. Poultry farms are also maintained, and apiculture, practised in Ukraine since prehistoric times, has become popular in Parana as a result of its diffusion by Ukrainian immigrants.²⁸

There have been three further notable changes in Parana that have been attributed to Ukrainians. The first is the introduction of small-scale grain milling,²⁹ as could have been expected of immigrants from the “granary of Europe.” Indeed, Ukrainians in Parana have exercised an extremely important role in grain cultivation. Even as recently as the 1950s, Parana produced 60 per cent of Brazil’s wheat. The county of Prudentópolis (at that time 80 per cent Ukrainian), with barely two per cent of the state’s rural population, produced seven per cent of its wheat.³⁰ Secondly, Ukrainian experience with horticulture had an impact in Brazil, where the immigrants developed new species of fruit trees by grafting and cross-breeding.³¹ Finally, it is said that Ukrainians gave birth to producers’ co-operatives in Parana. The co-operative movement, spearheaded by the agronomist Valentyn Kuts, was an important force in the welfare and progress of Brazilian Ukrainians. Co-operatives were very active in the second and third decades of this century, numbering fourteen when the movement was at its height.³² In Western Ukraine they emerged in the late nineteenth century as a response to the socio-economic needs of peasants, petty artisans and town labourers. In Brazil they served similar functions: dispensing aid and information, maintaining communal warehouses, buying and selling produce. Yet the Ukrainian co-operative movement

did not last very long and disappeared soon after the death of key leaders.³³ However, the spirit of co-operation is still intact among other groups in Parana, especially the Japanese.

Ukrainian settlements in Parana began to grow apace with the expansion of new pioneer zones. The downward movement of the São Paulo coffee frontier into Parana in the 1930s and 40s opened new opportunities for land ownership in the north-western part of the state. Among the private companies, state firms and migrants from other states that responded to the new developments were more than 500 Ukrainian families,³⁴ most of them Brazilian-born, who were obliged to seek new land because of the subdivision of their original holdings. Their presence is articulated by the name of one of the colonies, Nova Ukraina, which was founded by some 100 families in Apucarana. Economic conditions for these Ukrainian colonists were good until the 1960s, when recurrent frosts, the exhaustion of the sandy soil, overproduction and price fluctuations ruined many coffee planters. Many went to the cities, while others managed to switch from coffee monoculture to mixed farming; still others sought alternative staple cash crops such as cotton and mint, which is important to the pharmaceutical industry.

Nevertheless, coffee, cotton and mint remain the basis of livelihood for those Ukrainians who stayed in north-western Parana. Their standard of living is generally superior to that of their counterparts in the south-east.³⁵ There, the community has recently been affected by a drought followed by flooding in 1983–4, acute inflation and the persistent subdivision of plots. Migration to the cities does not provide a solution because of high unemployment and the migrants' lack of industrial skills.³⁶ Efforts to reactivate a co-operative movement would probably fail in a community whose capital and resources are scarce. The progress of the Ukrainian community in Parana thus depends more on market forces at the national and international levels than on its own initiative.

Future Prospects

As in Argentina, Canada and the United States, immigration has had profound implications for the shaping of Brazilian society. To take the most obvious effect, Brazil's population grew sixfold in less than a century (1869–1959). Between 1841 and 1940, immigration accounted for 9.4 per cent of Brazil's natural increase, a percentage close to that

of Canada (9.8 per cent) in the same period.³⁷ Immigrants have also played a leading role in colonization, urbanization, generating growth in the export sector, diversifying agriculture, breaking down the rigid two-class system by creating an intermediate level, and promoting cultural pluralism.

In the process of immigration there were, of course, many losers. The indigenous population of rural Brazil was frequently displaced by the newcomers. The Afro-Brazilian population, freed from slavery but not emancipated in many respects by the new conditions, often reverted to bare subsistence agriculture or, in migrating to the cities, found it difficult to compete for jobs with the immigrants and became alienated (this was also the fate of Argentina's small black minority). Resentment on the part of some of the native-born was further inflamed when many small industries (usually family-operated garment and textile businesses) were outpaced by new and more dynamic establishments introduced by the immigrants. Much of the criticism levelled at the immigrants should properly have been directed toward the government, which failed to consider the welfare, livelihood and interests of many Brazilians in the development strategies it pursued. The same could be said of many governments that promoted immigration during that period.

There was no uniformity in the Brazilian government's attitude toward the immigrants: some received preferential treatment (e.g., the English, French and Germans), while politically weaker and less desired groups such as the Ukrainians were paid less attention. Because not all immigrants entered on an equal footing, their progress was uneven. The Ukrainians, though by no means the poorest of Brazilians, nonetheless evolved as one of the least prosperous immigrant groups in the south. On a national level, with a population of about 250,000, Ukrainians are not demographically significant in a country of 137,000,000. On a local level, however, they have exerted an enormous impact in the state where most of them settled.

Parana, with a territory about half the size of Newfoundland, has a population almost one-third as large as Canada's. Today, the 200,000 Ukrainians there constitute less than three per cent of the 7,630,000 inhabitants, but largely because of their efforts Parana remains the leading producer of wheat, rye, and potatoes for the republic and is the nation's second major agricultural zone.

Unfortunately, Ukrainians have not shared to any significant degree in the prosperity of the state. Regarding farming more as a way

of life than as an enterprise, the Ukrainian community has not been able to adjust to modern agricultural standards. Given the present economic climate and changes in market emphasis, the position of Ukrainians in Parana is precarious. Brazil is rapidly becoming industrialized, and for the first time exports of industrial manufactured goods are exceeding the agricultural volume. For a community that is still 75 per cent rural (in contrast to the national average of 40 per cent), the implications are clearly negative. Indicative of this are demographic developments in the state of Parana, which has doubled its population every 10–20 years since the arrival of the first immigrants, but is now beginning to lose people to other parts of the country. The decline of “boom” crops such as frost-prone coffee and soya, as well as the turning over of tracts of land for large-scale cattle ranching and other non-labour-intensive ventures, have led to the displacement of many rural workers, among them Ukrainians. The continual subdivision of plots, the incontingencies of the climate and the absence of a social security system have impelled the Ukrainian community to seek new ways of improving its lot. Some Ukrainians have migrated to the urban conglomerates of Curitiba or São Paulo, while others have moved westward to land concessions in the Amazon region.

There is, however, room for optimism, since the plight of Brazil’s Ukrainian community has been widely publicized by the Ukrainian press in Canada and the United States. In 1985, support for Brazil from Canadian, U.S., Argentine and Australian sources amounted to the value of \$217,439 U.S.)³⁸ Prospects for tourism in the Prudentópolis area, as well as the tiny but growing number of university graduates and professionals, may have some effect in contributing to a reversal of the community’s current decline, or may help it define a new course of development.

Notes

¹ E. Trzeciak and J. Wańkiewicz, ed., *Poland: A Handbook* (Warsaw, 1974), 146.

² *Ibid.*, 147.

³ V. Burko, *A Imigração Ucraniana no Brasil* (Curitiba, 1963), 47.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ F.L.B. Basto, *Sintese da Historia da Imigração no Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro, 1970), 87.

⁶ A. Strelko, "Primeros Inmigrantes Ucranianos en Latinoamerica" in *America Latina* (Moscow) 1 (1975): 94-5. The actual number of arrivals prior to 1914 was about 20 per cent higher than the Basilian Fathers' census figure. Difficult conditions caused a high mortality rate; departures to Argentina and returns to the homeland further reduced the Brazilian Ukrainian community to between 45,000-50,000. Fewer than 20,000 arrived between 1920 and 1950. These immigrants were more urban-oriented than their predecessors.

⁷ V. Mozil, *Ukrainci v Ivai* (Prudentópolis, 1958), 4.

⁸ P.H. Price, "The Polish Immigrant in Brazil: A Study of Immigration, Assimilation and Acculturation," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1950-51, 53.

⁹ Strelko, 94.

¹⁰ Burko, 53.

¹¹ See M. Kula, "El Brasil y la Polonia de fines de siglo XIX en las cartas de los campesinos emigrados," *Jahrbuch für Geschichte von Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Lateinamerikas* (Berlin) 13 (1976): 38-55.

¹² For a map of the area, see O. Boruszenko, "Brazil" in *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia* (Toronto, 1963-71), 2:1196.

¹³ O. Boruszenko, "Brazil" in *Encyclopedia of Ukraine* (Toronto, 1984), 1:292.

¹⁴ T. Ribas, ed., *Historia de Parana* (Curitiba, 1969), 4:164-8.

¹⁵ J.H. Holloway, "Brazil" in *Latin America: Geographical Perspectives*, ed. H. Blakemore and C. Smith, 2d ed. (London, 1983), 355.

¹⁶ P.E. James, "The Expanding Settlements of Southern Brazil," *Geographical Review* 30 (1940): 623.

¹⁷ L. Waibel, "European Colonization in Southern Brazil," *Geographical Review* 40 (1950): 532-6.

¹⁸ A. Ramos, *As Culturas Europeias e Europeizadas* (Rio de Janeiro, 1975), 248-9.

¹⁹ Price, 56-7.

²⁰ R.K. Hall, "Foreign Colonies in Brazil: a North American View," *Inter-American Quarterly* 3, no. 1 (1941): 6.

²¹ B.W. Diffie, "Some Foreign Influences in Contemporary Brazilian Politics," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 20, no. 3 (1940): 402-29.

²² R. Stemplowski, "Enlistment in Brazil to the Polish Armed Forces 1940-1944," *Polish Western Affairs* 17, no. 1/2 (1976): 167.

²³ Waibel, 545.

²⁴ Boruszenko, in *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia*, 2:1196.

²⁵ O. Boruszenko, "L'Immigration ukrainienne au Brésil," *Echanges: Revue Franco-Ukrainien* (Paris), no. 35 (July 1978): 14.

²⁶ A.H. Neiva and M. Diegues, "The Cultural Assimilation of Immigrants in Brazil" in *The Cultural Integration of Immigrants*, ed. W.D. Borrie (Paris, 1959), 187.

²⁷ Strelko, 93.

²⁸ O. Boruszenko, in *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, 1:294.

²⁹ T. Batista, "Parana: Viagem a Terra dos Ucrânicos," *Revista Geografica Universal* (Rio de Janeiro), no. 134 (January 1986): 32.

³⁰ Burko, 78.

³¹ Boruszenko, in *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, 1:294.

³² O. Boruszenko, *Os Ucrânicos. Boletim Informativo da Casa Romario Martins* (Curitiba), no. 53 (April 1981): 7.

³³ Boruszenko, in *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, 1:294.

³⁴ Boruszenko, in *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia*, 2:1203.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ S. Plakhtyn, "U brazyliiskykh pralysakh," *Ukrainski visti* (Detroit), 21 April 1985, 2.

³⁷ G. Germani, "Mass Immigration and Modernization in Argentina" in *Masses in Latin America*, ed. I. Horowitz (Oxford, 1970).

³⁸ *Pratsia* (Prudentópolis), 4 September 1986, 3. For a discussion of the prospects for tourism in the Prudentópolis area, see *Pratsia*, 6 February 1986, 5 and 28 September 1986, 3-4. For a brief English-language account, see my article, "How the Other Half Live: Ukrainians in Brazil," *Ukrainski visti* (Edmonton), 24 September 1986, 13.

Eugene Seneta

ON THE NUMBER OF UKRAINIANS IN AUSTRALIA IN 1979¹

1. Introduction

Notions about the number of Ukrainians in Australia have remained vague because questionnaires used in Australian censuses prior to 1986 (that is, up to and including 1981) have not been adequate to determine whether a given person is or is not of Ukrainian origin. Only responses to "ethnicity surrogate" questions (e.g., "Where was each person born?") gave information in this direction. The inclusion in the 1986 census (30 June) of the question "What is each person's ancestry?" may clarify the situation,² but the results will not be known for some time, and some doubts remain.

What notions there are at present about the number are generally based on the collection *Ukrainci v Avstralii* (1966). Here Bishop Ivan Prashko³ (p. 136) gives an estimate of 34,000; and Ihor Hrynevych⁴ states on the basis of official documents (not cited by that author) that up to 30 June 1964 Australia accepted 21,424 Ukrainian immigrants, and that (p. 820) on the basis of church and community counts, there lived in Australia more than 35,000 persons of Ukrainian origin at the time of writing (approximately 1965) of Hrynevych's article. His article, however, does not specify how the church and community counts were made, and concerns itself only with persons who figure as Ukrainians in official documentation, shedding little light on the question of concern to us.

Substantially later accounts⁵ sometimes use Hrynevych's assessment of 35,000 and sometimes a higher number. Mykytowych gives a figure of 40,000 persons of Ukrainian origin, on the basis of 20,000 postwar immigrants, and simple doubling.

Radion⁶ (pp. xii–xvii) uses the criterion of mention of family surname in Ukrainian church and community sources in Australia, and concludes that there were, in 1978, 31,190 persons corresponding to these surnames. (He adds 5 per cent = 1,560 persons not included in his *Dictionary*, on the basis of a substantially complete enumeration of persons of Ukrainian descent for Tasmania by Komysan. This gives a final total estimate of 32,750.) Radion's methodology is in essence that of a *sample survey*⁷ on the basis of a sampling frame of Ukrainian surnames for Australia collected by him.

The above discussion illustrates that one may in theory attempt to estimate the total number of Ukrainians in Australia from several standpoints. One may try to estimate the number of persons of Ukrainian descent or the number which is in some way in contact with the Ukrainian community in Australia. Further, one may proceed using the number of immigrants and their descendants, or by some method of complete enumeration, or on the basis of a sample survey.

Our intention is to assess the question of total number as of 1979. In particular, we refine Radion's conclusions on the basis of his data. In our opinion, with the availability of a sampling frame, procedure by a properly designed sample survey is particularly useful for a difficult (given the circumstances) question of this kind.

In the sequel, "first generation" will denote *immigrants of all ages*; "second generation," offspring born in Australia to the first generation; and "third generation," offspring in Australia of the second generation.

2. The Number of Arrivals and Their Descendants

One of the best sources of official statistics about Ukrainians is the annually produced *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics*. In this publication⁸ we find that arrivals with country of citizenship "Ukraine" were, prior to 1949–50, included under the heading "USSR," which makes it impossible to deduce from the corresponding table the total number of Ukrainian arrivals. However, the same source states that the "Country of Former Citizenship of Persons Granted Australian Citizenship" was Ukraine for 20,608 people in the period January 1945 to June 1979. The number of arrivals from June 1956 to June 1979 who gave their country of citizenship as Ukraine is recorded as 249. It seems, then, that the number of Ukrainian arrivals—since only a small number would not have been naturalized—was about 21,000, in

accordance with Hrynevych.

To calculate the number of persons who were "Ukrainian by descent" in 1979 by doubling the figure of 21,000 would very likely give an overestimate.

Firstly, the arrivals included a number of people of the age of grandparents on arrival, who did not reproduce further and have since died. Out of the remainder, say 20,000 as a generous estimate, there is evidence from Radion's data (see Section 4 below) that the average family size in 1979 was very close to 5. We can envisage this as consisting on the average of two parents and one child as first generation (new arrivals), with a second child born in Australia (second generation), and one third-generation child. (In 1979 the number of third-generation Ukrainians by descent would still be small.) *Thus if x is the total number of Ukrainians by descent, $20,000 = (3/5)x$, so $x = 33,300$, should be a reasonable approximation.*

3. The Number of Ukrainians According to Official Statistics

On the basis of 1976 census statistics of birthplace and parentage, taken to 1978 by net migration and mortality statistics, figures⁹ give USSR or Ukraine as the birthplace of a total of 26,974 migrants; they also give 13,971 second-generation persons with this origin. The stated figures are underestimates, since many Western Ukrainians would have listed their birthplace as elsewhere, primarily Poland. The total figures for Poland as birthplace are: 57,439 migrants and 36,187 second-generation persons with this origin.

While we cannot distinguish Ukrainians from the other nationalities in these totals, we may apply the *proportion* of second to first generation to the Ukrainian immigration figures of approximately 20,000, allowing for deaths, to arrive at a corresponding *Ukrainian* second-generation figure.

- a) "USSR, Ukraine" proportion applied:
 $20,000 \times (13,971/26,974) = 10,358$, which gives a total of
 $20,000 + 10,358 = 30,358$ for first and second generation.
- b) "Poland" proportion applied:
 $20,000 \times (36,187/57,439) = 12,600$, which gives a total of
 $20,000 + 12,600 = 32,600$ for first and second generation.

A calculation using pooled figures as in (a) and (b) gives 31,884.

The source cited in giving second-generation figures states that these comprise (i) persons born in Australia with *both* parents born in the country for which the figure is given; plus (ii) half those persons born in Australia with *one* parent with this origin.

Since for persons of "Ukrainian descent" for second generation we would count *all* children of a mixed marriage, the above figures underestimate this number.¹⁰ However, the number of second-generation children from mixed marriages may be relatively small, and allowing for third generation as well, the figures obtained are consistent with the previously obtained figure for *the total number of Ukrainians by descent* of at most 34,000.

The actual figure of about 32,000, obtained *directly* from the calculation, from the manner of recording of second generation, would give a generous estimate of the number of Ukrainians who have maintained some minimal connection with the Ukrainian community.

4. Radion's Data

Radion's *Dictionary* contains 6,238 separate family surnames in Australia as of the end of 1978. In fact, this total reflects to some degree a tendency to overestimate the number of *distinct* surnames appearing in the sources cited by Radion (various church/community bulletins, lists, parish records, newspapers) for reasons such as the duplication of surnames owing to correct and incorrect Ukrainian spelling in diverse sources, e.g., SENETA (S.A., p. 116), SANETA (S.A., p. 114); SALEHA (S.A., p. 113), SALYHA (S.A., p. 114).

In addition to the list of surnames, a sample of families corresponding to distinct surnames in each of the states of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Southern Australia and Western Australia was obtained and the "size" of each family was measured. An average family size of 5 was deduced, giving a total of $6,238 \times 5 = 31,190$, which with "5 per cent not covered by the dictionary" gives 32,750. While the figure of 6,238, as noted, may tend to overestimate the number of *surnames*, in counting the number of distinct *families* this tendency is countered by the fact that there may be several *unrelated families* corresponding to the *same surname*. The average family size of 5 may however be an overestimate, tending to increase the final figure. This can arise if care is not taken in assessing family size. For example: non-Ukrainian marriage partners may have been included in family

counts in some states; married daughters in a purely Ukrainian marriage might be counted in two Ukrainian families. Non-Ukrainian surnames which are contained in the dictionary and have arisen as a result of mixed marriages will tend to contribute to the inflation in being counted as a separate family, but their Ukrainian (female) partners being counted as part of some other family for purposes of family size.

Finally, the following analysis, which leads to a 95 per cent confidence interval for the total number of Ukrainians whose surnames appear in the *Dictionary*, depends on the usual assumption of stratified sampling:¹¹ that the families investigated for family size in each of the five states were a random (representative) sample in that state; and that the stratified sample mean is approximately normally distributed. The sample sizes n_h are not all sufficiently large to presuppose this with any degree of confidence, nor for the replacement by the sample estimates s_h^2 of the population variances s_h^2 .

Nevertheless, the analysis may serve as a guide for a carefully designed procedure of the same kind for the future, which may come as close as it is possible to do in giving a correct assessment of the number.

State	N_h Total surnames	n_h Sample size	Sample total ¹²⁾	\bar{x}_h Sample mean	s_h Sample s.d.
NSW (incl. ACT)	1798	70	360	5.1429	3.0988
Vic	2151	63	310	4.9206	2.8977
Qld	504	20	109	5.4500	3.3635
SA	1180	30	152	5.0667	3.4535
WA	394	35	166	4.7428	3.3811
	$N = 6027$	$n = 218$			

In the sequel $W_h = N_h/N$ $f_h = n_h/N_h$.

$$\bar{x}_{st} = \sum_h W_h \bar{x}_h = 5.0482$$

$$\text{Var } \bar{x}_{st} = \sum_h W_h^2 \frac{S_h^2}{n_h} (1 - f_h) \approx 0.04813.$$

Hence a 95 per cent C.I. for \bar{x} , the overall population average family size of the five states is

$$5.0482 \pm 1.960\sqrt{0.04813} = 5.0482 \pm 0.4300.$$

Hence a 95 per cent C.I. for the total of five states is

$$6027 (5.0482 \pm 0.4300) = 30,426 \pm 2592.$$

If we add Komyshan's figure¹³ of 464 persons from Tasmania as known exactly, and assume that the 123 families not listed by state amount to $123 \times 5.0482 = 621$ persons exactly, we get $31,511 \pm 2,592$. Allowing for rounding error in the calculations we get finally:

$31,510 \pm 2,590 = (28,920, 34,100)$

Thus with 95 per cent confidence, the number of Ukrainians by descent who have some connection with the Ukrainian community (and possibly of *all Ukrainians by descent*) is in this interval. This agrees with the figures given in Sections 2 and 3 above.

5. Conclusion

There is little factual evidence supporting an assertion that there were more than 35,000 *Ukrainians by descent* in 1979 (Hrynevych's statement of this number for 1966 is very likely an overestimate). It is possible that a substantial number of additional "Ukrainians" regard themselves as part of some other community (most obviously the Russian) for nationality and/or community purposes and no trace of them in the Ukrainian community is available. There would be little purpose in attempting to include these in our count, even if this were possible.

Acknowledgements: My thanks for source materials go to Dr. I. Gordijew, Dr. L. Mykyta, Dr. R. Mykytowycz and Mr. S. Radion.

Notes

¹ This is a slightly modified version of the Ukrainian-language paper "Vidnosno chysla ukraintsiv v Avstralii v 1979 r." delivered at the National Conference of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Australia, Sydney, 1–3 April 1983, which is to appear in its proceedings. That is the paper referred to by J.E.M. Clarke in his article, "Ukrainian Studies at Monash University—An Historical Introduction," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, no. 18 (Summer 1985), 3–7, and by other authors.

² Eugene Seneta, "Ukrainians in Australia's Censuses" in M. Pavlyshyn, ed., *Ukrainian Settlement in Australia: Second Conference, Melbourne, 5–7 April 1985* (Melbourne: Monash University, Department of Slavic Languages, 1986), 15–27.

³ I. Prashko, "Ukrainska Katolytska Tserkva v Avstralii i Novii Zelandii" in *Ukrainci v Avstralii (Ukrainians in Australia)* (Melbourne: NTSh—SUOA, 1966), 74–168.

⁴ Ihor A. Hrynevych, "Ukrainci v derzhavnii avstraliiskii statystytsi," *ibid.*, 820–30.

⁵ O. Volovyna, I. Hordiiv, and L. Hordiiv, "Ukrainci v Avstralii" in *Ukrainski poselennia—dovidnyk* (New York: Ukrainian Sociological Institute and Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1980), 327–38. R. Mykytowych in *Ameryka* (Philadelphia), no. 147, 25 August 1982.

⁶ S. Radion, *Dictionary of Ukrainian Surnames in Australia* (Melbourne: UMMAN, 1981).

⁷ W.G. Cochran, *Sampling Techniques* (New York: Wiley, 1963).

⁸ Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics* (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1979).

⁹ Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs, *Multiculturalism for All Australians* (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1982), Appendix B, Table 1.

¹⁰ The author is grateful to Dr. Charles A. Price (Department of Demography, Australian National University) for the information that the *total* number of children (second generation) of marriages in which at least one partner is born in a specified country is recoverable from Australian Bureau of Statistics publications.

¹¹ W.G. Cochran, *op. cit.*

¹² The "Sample total" and "Sample s.d." columns were obtained from the original data of 218 readings kindly personally supplied by S. Radion. The remaining columns are available from his *Dictionary*.

¹³ S. Radion, *op. cit.*

Ukraine During World War II History and its Aftermath

Edited by Yury Boshyk

Examines Soviet and Nazi occupations of Ukraine; relations between Ukrainians and Jews; and North American perspectives on bringing war criminals to justice.

291 pages	paper	\$ 9.95	ISBN 920862365
	cloth	\$19.95	920862373

Order from:

University of Toronto Press,
5201 Dufferin Street,
Downsview, Ontario,
Canada M3H 5T8

Published by Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
University of Alberta

SURVEY OF SECOND-GENERATION UKRAINIANS IN BRITAIN

Introduction

Following the fourth conference of second-generation Ukrainians, which was held in Wales in 1985, it was decided that a survey of as many second-generation Ukrainians as possible be conducted. During November-December 1985, a group of the second generation from London met to decide what questions ought to be asked. The final draft was formulated in December and subsequently 300 copies were distributed around Britain. A deadline of 1 January 1986 was set for their return, but few adhered to it. Accordingly, people were left to return questionnaires at their own discretion. By the beginning of March, some 47 were remitted, and it was decided not to wait for more to arrive or to expend further time and energy on follow-up contacts, but rather to start work on the ones already in our possession.

The importance of the survey lies in the fact that it is the first of its kind concerned with testing the opinions of the second generation on a nation-wide scale. No one involved in its preparation pretends that this is a professional piece of work, and we acknowledge mistakes in both design and distribution, but hope that this is an experience from which we can learn and that enough interest will develop for another, greatly improved survey to follow.

Fortunately, the composition of our sample was sufficiently diverse to preclude any charge of bias or misrepresentation. The people who returned their questionnaires were of varied ages (youngest: 18, oldest: 37), of both sexes (30 males and 17 females), included both single and married persons (ratio 33:14), and came from various walks of life, ranging from doctors to the unemployed. Although most of the questionnaires returned came from people whose parents were both

Ukrainian, 8 of the 47 had a parent who was non-Ukrainian. Perhaps more importantly, the questionnaires tested the opinions of people who are (or were) linked to different and even opposing poles of the community and, in addition, solicited the views of those who have had little connection with the Ukrainian community: 24 or 51 per cent were members of the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain (SUB) or the Ukrainian Youth Association (SUM), 10 or 21.3 per cent were members of either the Federation of Ukrainians in Great Britain or the Federation of Younger Ukrainians, one belonged to both SUB and the Federation, and 12 or 25.5 per cent were not members of either group but still had connections with community organizations (e.g., Plast, Ukrainian Students' Union) or had no links whatever.

With such a heterogeneous sample, the reader will find the main value of this survey in its depiction of the ways in which young Ukrainians of different backgrounds perceive the Ukrainian community. Of particular interest are those points at which views converge and those at which they contrast acutely.

The following, subdivided into thematic sections, are the results of those parts of the survey that deal directly with issues related to the community where an attitude is expressed. The results speak for themselves, and only occasionally have we contributed an explanation to clarify a point.

Residence

With one exception, the respondents were born in Britain (including Scotland and Wales), but the marked mobility of young Ukrainians is striking. Migration has affected 49 per cent of the sample, so that only 51 per cent still remain in their home towns. Just over one-third (34 per cent) have considered a move overseas, with Canada a popular destination.

Selection of Friends and Marriage

42.5 per cent claim to have more friends of Ukrainian origin, 32 per cent said approximately half their friends are of Ukrainian origin, and the remaining 25.5 per cent stated that most of their friends are of non-Ukrainian origin.

Of the nearly 30 per cent of the sample that are married, the majority (64 per cent) selected a Ukrainian partner. Among the single,

48.5 per cent hope to marry a Ukrainian, 39 per cent do not know, and the remaining 12.5 per cent answered in favour of exogamy (or perhaps prefer not to marry at all, since the question did not offer this option).

Level of Fluency in Ukrainian

38 per cent claim fluency in Ukrainian, 44.6 per cent speak it well, 14.8 per cent poorly and 2.7 per cent not at all.

Among the fluent speakers, two-thirds have not read a book in Ukrainian in the past year. However, 38.8 per cent read Ukrainian-language journals regularly (i.e., at least once a month), 27.7 per cent read them irregularly and 33.5 per cent do not read them at all. When asked, "If the Ukrainian newspaper or journal was in English, would you read it more often?" 44.4 per cent answered yes, 27.7 per cent did not know, and a minority, 27.7 per cent, said no.

Among those who speak Ukrainian well, 28.5 per cent have read one Ukrainian-language book or more in the past year. More tend to read newspapers and journals in Ukrainian. 47.6 per cent read them regularly, 19 per cent irregularly and 33.4 per cent never do. In the last category, 47.6 per cent would read them more often if they appeared in English, 23.8 per cent do not know, and 28.6 per cent would not.

Only one of the seven poor speakers read books or journals in Ukrainian. However, no one affirmed that he would not read these if they appeared in English. On the contrary, five of the seven answered positively to this question, and the other two did not know.

Assimilation

There was no consensus in the answers to whether the Ukrainian community would assimilate completely. 42.5 per cent do not know, 34 per cent believe that it will (62.5 per cent of these believe it will in 30 years' time, 31.2 per cent in 20 years, and 6.2 per cent in 10 years), and 23.5 per cent think it will not assimilate.

Leadership

The respondents were asked to give their ratings of the national executive and local leaders of the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain and the Federation of Ukrainians in Great Britain. Options: excellent, good, average, bad, do not know.

Those who belong(ed) to SUM or SUB* gave the following ratings:

SUB national: 37.5 per cent bad, 33.3 per cent do not know, 29.1 per cent average.

SUB local: 37.5 per cent do not know, 33.3 per cent bad, 16.6 per cent good, 8.3 per cent average and 4 per cent excellent.

The SUB local and national leaderships were perceived by those linked to the Federation as follows:

SUB national: 82 per cent bad, 9 per cent average and 9 per cent do not know.

SUB local: 54.5 per cent bad, 18 per cent do not know, 18 per cent average and 9.5 per cent good.

Those not connected with either SUB/SUM or the Federation gave these answers:

SUB national: 38.5 per cent bad, 31 per cent do not know, 23 per cent average and 7.5 per cent good.

SUB local: 38.5 per cent bad, 36.5 per cent do not know, 15.5 per cent good and 7.5 per cent average.

The Federation's local and national leaderships were perceived by those connected with it as follows:

Fed. national: 36.5 per cent bad, 36.5 per cent do not know and 27 per cent good.

Fed. local: 45.5 per cent do not know, 27 per cent bad, 18 per cent good and 9.5 per cent average.

The Federation as perceived by SUB/SUM members:

Fed. national: 83.5 per cent do not know, 12.5 per cent average and 4 per cent good.

Fed. local: 83.5 per cent do not know, 8.5 per cent good and 8.5 per cent average.

The Federation as perceived by the others:

Fed. national: 61.5 per cent do not know, 23 per cent bad, 15.5 per cent average.

Fed. local: 61.5 per cent do not know, 23 per cent bad, 7.75 per cent average and 7.75 per cent good.

* The person who had ties with both is included as a member of both SUB and the Federation.

Priorities

The answer to Q. 30 of the questionnaire was dealt with by a points system whereby first choice of priorities was given a score of three, second choice a score of two and third choice a score of one. The results were as follows:

Bilingual newspaper	49
Welfare centres and advice for elderly	43
A library and documentation centre	37
Adult educational courses	34
A Ukrainian studies centre in a British University	32
A Ukrainian scholarship fund	18
A book, record and video shop	14

Concerns

A similar method was used for Q. 33, but because the options were fewer, it was decided that first choice should receive two points and second choice one point:

Overcoming community fragmentation	48
Better communication	30
Struggle for an independent Ukraine	20
Renewal of leadership	19
Creating a new community organization	9

Quality of Ukrainian Institutions

Quality of Ukrainian Institutions (in Percentages)

	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Know
Ukrainian schools	2.0	30.0	40.5	12.5	15.0
Youth organizations	0.0	36.0	36.0	17.0	11.0
Youth camps	8.5	36.0	27.5	8.5	20.0
Ukrainian clubs	12.5	38.0	23.5	15.0	11.0
Bookshops	0.0	6.0	25.5	23.5	45.0
Dance groups	17.0	51.0	10.5	2.0	19.0
Choirs	15.0	51.0	8.5	6.5	19.0

The results of the questionnaire will be one of the central themes of discussion at the next conference. The attitudes and concerns of British-born Ukrainians, of which the present survey offers a glimpse, deserve to be studied in greater depth. However, we are inclined to doubt whether a larger sample would produce conclusions substantially different from those given above.

LINGUISTICS IN UKRAINE, 1980-85

When dealing with linguistics in Ukraine, one must bear in mind that the discipline is practised by what Leonid Brezhnev called “a new historical community of human beings—the Soviet people.” A member of the Soviet people (*sovetskii narod*) is not free to pursue his own intellectual interests, but is used by the state according to his abilities and within the framework of the current five-year plan (*piatiletka*).

This overview must therefore begin with a summary of an article by I. Andersh that appeared in *Movoznavstvo* (Linguistics), the organ of the Institute of Linguistics of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, in 1981 under the self-congratulatory title “Na providnykh pozytsiiakh (Zdobutky i zavdannia ukrainskykh lingvistiv)” (On Leading Positions: Achievements and Tasks of Ukrainian Linguists). There we read that “in the new five-year plan more attention must be devoted to the development of theoretical problems of the study of the system and structure of language from the viewpoint of dialectical materialism,” to “criticism of the concepts of foreign (*zarubizhnykh*, which always refers to the West) linguists concerning the essence of language as a social phenomenon, etc.” The article further promised, for the eleventh *piatiletka*, “deeper sociolinguistic research on Ukrainian-Russian bilingualism” and a number of works on improving the culture of the Russian language in Ukraine. The article announced that the *Etymolohichnyi slovnyk ukrainskoi movy* (Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language) would be among the dictionaries published in the period covered by the five-year plan. It further promised comparative research on East and West Slavic languages, as well as a book on Serbo-Croatian syntax. Revealing that in the previous *piatiletka* a new sector, that of Romance-Germanic linguistics, had been created in the institute, the article promised works on English and French in Canada and on German in Switzerland, “co-ordinating its work with the Institute of Linguistics of the USSR Academy of

Sciences and its Leningrad branch.” Promising to continue the publication of historical texts in the Middle Ukrainian language (the well-known green series), the article also announced a plan to begin a series of texts dating from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries (in what is officially called the Old Rus’ language) with Hilarion’s *Sermon on Law and Grace*. This was part of the commemoration of the so-called 1500th anniversary of Kiev, invented to divert attention from the millennium of Christianity in Ukraine. There were no promises of work on Indo-European linguistics, classical languages, languages of the Middle and Far East, Africa, etc. One can conclude from this plan that the Institute of Linguistics in Kiev is basically a Slavic institute which has taken on some recently added tasks in modern Western languages.

The theoretical and ideological part of the five-year plan has resulted in several books criticizing the theory of linguistic codes espoused by the British sociolinguist Basil Bernstein (on different codes used in different social classes); Noam Chomsky’s theory of language acquisition; Italian neolinguistics or spatial linguistics (which is now dead even in Italy); the theory of speech acts of British linguists and philosophers such as J. Austin; etc. These books were accompanied by similar articles in *Movoznavstvo*. Some of the criticism might be convincing if it were not marred by obsessive and categorical references to Marxism-Leninism as the only correct basis of general linguistic theory.

The second task of the five-year plan has resulted in the book *Funkcionirovanie russkogo iazyka v blizkorodstvennom iazykovom okruzenii* (The Functioning of Russian in the Environment of a Closely Related Language) (Kiev, 1981), half of which is devoted to bilingualism. Since the book, like some of the articles on this subject, acknowledges the major problem of “interference” (i.e., the making of mistakes in both languages, which is inevitable in bilingualism), the interesting but as yet unanswered question is how the Soviets can reconcile this analysis with the task of “improving the standard of Russian in Ukraine.”

The first volume of the promised seven-volume etymological dictionary was published in 1982. The dialectological and bibliographical parts of the volume make a good impression, but it does not give enough data on chronology and ignores Jaroslaw Rudnytsky’s etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language.

Data on book production from *Drukovani vydannia URSR* (Printed publications of the Ukrainian SSR) were available to me only

for the period 1980–83. They show some books on East Slavic languages, but nothing on West Slavic or Serbo-Croatian. It remains to be seen whether the plan was fulfilled in this area. The analysis of articles in *Movoznavstvo* (of which more will be said later) suggests that the study of West and South Slavic languages is rather neglected.

Some scholarly books on Germanic and Romance languages did indeed appear as planned, but most of them were mere university textbooks.

It seems that Hilarion's patriotic-religious text of the eleventh century, which was slated for publication in 1982, has not appeared, and thus the new archeographic series has not materialized. Perhaps it was decided to revert to the established policy of publishing the monuments of the Kievan Rus' language in Moscow or Leningrad rather than in Kiev. So much for the fulfillment of promises.

But certain publications not promised in the programmatic article did appear. After more than 30 years of promises, the first volume of the four-part *Atlas ukrainskoi movy* (Atlas of the Ukrainian Language) appeared in 1984. It was produced on a good technical and linguistic level. The colour maps even venture into the Ukrainian-populated areas of the adjacent Soviet republics and satellite states, which are rarely discussed by Soviet Ukrainian linguists. The atlas includes historical maps in which any mention of the Cossack state is carefully avoided, although its outlines can easily be recognized under the name of Little Rhoassic governorship (*Malorosiiska huberniia*).

In 1983, a sample fascicle of the *Slovyk ukrainskoi movy shistnadtsiatoho ta pershoi polovyny simnadtsiatoho stolit* (Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language of the Sixteenth and the First Half of the Seventeenth Century) also unexpectedly appeared. Its preface announces that work on the dictionary commenced in 1975, continuing Humetska's *Slovyk staroukrainskoi movy chotyrynadtsiatoho i piatnadtsiatoho stolit* (Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries), which appeared in the previous *piatiletka* (1977–8). The dictionary is to be published in installments. The preface does not say whether the rich files compiled for Tymchenko's historical dictionary of the Ukrainian language, whose publication was interrupted in the early 1930s, were utilized. The terminal date of the dictionary's chronological scope was selected for political reasons (the annexation of eastern Ukraine to Muscovy), which are concealed by a number of false historical assertions, such as the disappearance of the common Ukrainian-White Ruthenian language or

the end of the West Rus' period in the history of the language. In fact, the common Ukrainian-White Ruthenian language continued to function until the demise of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1795.

The above-quoted programmatic article in *Movoznavstvo* says a good deal about the achievements of Soviet Ukrainian linguists in the previous five-year plan, which ended in 1980. Since we are interested here in the period from 1980 on, I should mention only two of those achievements, which were completed during the *piatiletka* of 1981-5 or just on its threshold. In 1980 the 11-volume *Slovyk ukrainskoi movy* (Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language) was completed; in 1983 a state prize for science and technology was bestowed on the editors, and their bemedalled portraits were published in *Movoznavstvo* in 1984. The dictionary lacks grammatical and accentological information, ignores aspect in verbal substantives (because it does not exist in Russian), and has a biased selection of literary sources, but it is the first large Ukrainian-Ukrainian dictionary and contains much information. The other important project completed in the *piatiletka* of 1981-5 was the four-volume *Istoriia ukrainskoi movy* (History of the Ukrainian Language). The title is a misnomer, as this is a historical grammar. More precisely, it is a farewell to the historical grammar of Ukrainian for the time being, for this discipline almost ceased to be practised in the *piatiletka* under consideration, as the contents of *Movoznavstvo* make clear.

In order to check which disciplines have been studied, I have prepared statistical charts on the basis of *Movoznavstvo*, the only prestigious linguistic journal in Ukraine. Its quality has improved since 1969 and 1971, when George Shevelov wrote his two memorable review articles in *Suchasnist*, calling *Movoznavstvo* a regional *Landkunde* (*regionalno-kraieznavchy*) periodical limited almost exclusively to the Ukrainian language and replete with popularizations, inaccuracies and banalities. Now it seems to have attained a reasonably good provincial level, behind Moscow and Leningrad, of course, but ahead of Dnipropetrovsk or Yakutsk. There has been no noticeable change for the better or worse since the director of the Institute of Linguistics and editor-in-chief of *Movoznavstvo* died and was succeeded in 1982 by his deputy, Vitalii Rusanivsky, a somewhat better linguist than Bilodid, who was rather a propagandist. One can only note that when Bilodid was already ill in 1981, new instructions to authors were published in *Movoznavstvo* in order to show them how to prepare full scholarly bibliographical references for their articles. Thus *Movoznavstvo* has

finally reacted to Shevelov's criticism of 1969 that it lacks "elementary knowledge of elementary scholarly methods of documentation."

Is *Movoznavstvo* still a journal devoted almost exclusively to the Ukrainian language, as Shevelov characterized it? At first glance the list of languages studied in it appears impressive. But if we count the number of articles on Ukrainian, Russian, Ukrainian and Russian, Old Ruthenian and East Slavic (where White Ruthenian is added for ornamentation), then articles on the local languages of Ukraine (a total of 312) outnumber the others (166 articles) almost two to one. Thus *Movoznavstvo* is still primarily a journal of regional studies, but the concept of regional studies has changed: it now includes Russian studies to a much greater degree than in the late 1960s.

In the area of non-regional languages, only a few West European languages are treated seriously—English, German and French in sharply descending order (60, 26 and 11 articles respectively)—which certainly has something to do with the above-mentioned creation of a Germanic-Romance sector in the Institute of Linguistics. Spanish is almost completely neglected in spite of the apparent importance of Latin America to the Soviets. And despite the importance of Asia and Africa, the languages of those continents are almost completely ignored. Palestinian terrorists may be trained in Ukraine, but only one and one-half articles were published in *Movoznavstvo* on the Arabic language in the *piatiletka* of 1981–5.

The professed brotherly love for the COMECON countries is not reflected in the languages studied by *Movoznavstvo* in the period under consideration: there were only 5 articles on Czech, 2 on Bulgarian, 1 on Slovak, one-half each on Romanian and Polish, and none on Hungarian. In any case, the languages of Husák and Zhivkov are valued more highly than those of Jaruzelski, Ceaușescu or Kádár. The almost total absence of Polish is particularly striking after 600 years of strong Polish influence on Ukraine, which has changed the whole character of the Ukrainian language from an East Slavic to a rather West Slavic language in vocabulary, word formation and even inflection and syntax.

The complete or almost complete lack of study of classical languages, languages important for the reconstruction of common Indo-European (such as Lithuanian, Sanskrit, Hittite, Gothic) and of comparative Indo-European linguistics reveals the anti-historical, anti-cultural and anti-humanistic trend of Soviet Ukrainian linguistics, which is also confirmed by the chart of subjects represented in *Movoznavstvo*. True, classical languages are studied in Lviv, but articles

on them are relegated to a non-prestigious, technically poor and very provincial series, *Inozemna filolohiia* (Foreign Philology), also published in Lviv. When it commenced publication, *Movoznavstvo* quite rightly thundered against the dehumanization and dehistoricization which were spreading among Western linguists. Now its own words can be turned against it.

The subjects studied in *Movoznavstvo* display the same flight from historicism and the humanities (i.e., from historical-comparative linguistics, historical grammar, etymology and dialectology) as the languages studied. Among historical subjects, only onomastics and language history were still decently represented, owing to the efforts of such people as Stryzhak and Nimchuk. Some traditional disciplines in both historical and descriptive linguistics such as phonetics, accentology and inflection have also been pushed aside. The preferred disciplines are those with vague criteria which present good potential for geniuses on the one hand and mediocrities or charlatans on the other (syntax, semantics, phraseology, stylistics, artistic language). Since people in the first category are unknown in Ukrainian linguistics, the field belongs to the latter. Articles classified within the category of artistic language (for a lack of a better term) are often congratulatory jubilee panegyrics under pretentious pseudo-poetical titles (e.g., "Like a Catchword, like an Oath, like a Law" / on Bazhan /, "The Immortal Power of the Word" / on Shevchenko /, "A Bright Star of Ukrainian Letters" / on Vovchok /, "The Word has an Armed Force" / on Rylsky /). The same style is used on other occasions as well, not only in ideological articles normally skipped by readers, e.g., "The Treasury of the People's Word" (on the language of folk songs), "In the Vanguard of Soviet Ukrainian Linguistics" (on the eleven-volume Ukrainian dictionary), "In Spite of the Union and Jesuit Expansionism" (on the Ukrainian language of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and not on the Uniate church, as one might think). Many articles are written in such a poor, Russianized Ukrainian that one would prefer to read them in Russian. Many use a pseudo-scientific, pseudo-technological jargon with unnecessary new terminology in place of the traditional one, a practice criticized even by one of the *Movoznavstvo* authors (Isaev of Moscow) in 1984.

Since the journal *Movoznavstvo* has a separate section on "Research by Young Scholars," I have prepared separate charts for them in order to establish whether any hopes should be pinned on the future successors of the Bilodid-Rusanivsky generation. They do not seem promising, but it must be noted that a few forgotten languages

(Arabic and Gothic) have been reintroduced into scholarly discourse precisely by these young people. The fact that semantics heads the list of their subjects instead of syntax, which dominates among the older generation, is readily explained by the fashionable character of this direction of study, which is considered a reaction to the "linguistic extremism" of such formalistic tendencies as Chomsky's generative or transformational grammar (as the book *Marksytsko-leninska metodolohiia vyvchennia* [*sic*, instead of *vyvchannia* = Russian *izucheniia*] *lingvistychnykh obiektiv*) (The Marxist-Leninist Methodology of Studying Linguistic Objects, Kiev, 1983) suggests).

The language in which linguistic studies are originally written cannot be determined by reading *Movoznavstvo*, because its articles have so far been published exclusively in Ukrainian. We can, however, obtain some indication by perusing the titles of books on linguistics listed in *Drukovani vydannia URSS* (see chart). We see that works on the Ukrainian and Russian languages are published in Ukrainian and Russian respectively. Works on Soviet and classical languages are mostly in Ukrainian (classical languages are studied in Lviv, notorious for its attachment to Ukrainian), but works on modern Western languages are mostly in Russian. This confirms the regional character of Ukrainian as compared with the putative universal character of Russian as a passport to the world.

Note on the charts: Statistics for 1985 are based on the first four issues of *Movoznavstvo* (compiled when the last two were not yet available).

Articles in *Movoznavstvo* by languages studied, 1980-85
 (Studies on more than two languages omitted)

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	Total
Ukrainian	44	29	25	26	38	20	182
Russian	7	14	11	12	8	8	60
English	7	6	7	7	10	8	45
Ukrainian/ Russian	6	7	4	6	3	4	30
German	6	5	6	3	5	1	26
East Slavic	6	1	7	6	5		25
Slavic	2	6	2	5	2		17
French	3	3			2	3	11
Ukrainian/ English	2	3		1	1	2	9
Old Ruthenian	2	2			1		7
Ukrainian/ German	3	1	1				5
Czech		1	1	1		2	5
Church Slavonic	1					3	4
Spanish		1		1	1	1	4
Russian/ English		1	1		1	1	4
Russian/ German		1	2				3

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	Total
Turkic				1		1	2
Germanic	2						2
Urumian (Cumanic)	1	1					2
French/Spanish	1					1	2
Ukrainian/ Bulgarian		1		1			2
Bulgarian			1	1			2
Indoeuropean			1	1			2
Slovak	1						1
Old Ruthenian/ Church Slavonic			1				1
Slavic/Rumanian				1			1
Serbo-Croatian		1					1
Arabic		1					1
Romance						1	1
French/Rumanian						1	1
Ukrainian/ South Slavic		1					1
Ukrainian/ Uzbek						1	1
Russian/ White-Ruthenian		1					1

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	Total
Slavic/						1	1
Finno-Ugric							
Church Slavonic/					1		1
Gothic							
Ukrainian/			1				1
Polish							
English/French				1			1
Ukrainian/				1			1
Czech							
White Ruthenian			1				1
French/Arabic				1			1
West Slavic				1			1
Ukrainian/				1			1
White-Ruthenian							

Articles in *Movoznavstvo* by subject, 1980-85

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	Total
Syntax	16	8	9	11	8	8	60
Semantics	10	8	13	11	7	11	60
Lexicology	12	6	10	8	13	5	54
Word formation	11	9	7	8	2	6	43
Phraseology	7	8	5	1	11	1	33
Onomastics	5	8	2	6	3	2	26
Interlinguistics	2	7	6	6	2	2	25
Stylistics	4	6	2	5	6	1	24
Language history	5	3	2	3	3	7	23
Lexicography	4	3	3	1	5	6	22
Artistic language	1	4	3	1	4	7	20
History of linguistics	2	3	4	2	4	2	17
Contrastive linguistics	1	4	3	1	1	5	15
General linguistics	4	5	1	2	1	1	14
Phonetics	2	3	2	3	2	1	13
Politics, ideology	3	3	1	3	3		13
Dialectology	2	3		6	1		12
Accentology	4	1	1	2	1	1	10
Inflection		2		3	3	2	10
Sociolinguistics			1	4	2	2	9
Mathematical linguistics		1	2	1	2		6

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	Total
Historical-comparative linguistics	2		1	1	1		5
Translation	1				1	2	4
Etymology	1	1			2		4
General guidebooks		2	1		1		4
State of linguistics		1	1	1		1	4
Language culture	2		1		1		4
Language methodics		1	1		1		3
Miscellaneous					3		3
Historical grammar	3						3
Psycholinguistics		1		1			2
Semiotics	1						1
Palaeography			1				1
Establishment of authorship			1				1
Bibliography				1			1

Articles of young linguists in *Movoznavstvo* by languages studied, 1980-85
 (Studies on more than two languages omitted)

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	Total
Ukrainian	6	3	3	5	4	2	23
Russian		5	2	3	1	1	12
English				2	5	3	10
Ukrainian/ Russian	3	3	1	1			8
French	2				2		4
German	1		1			1	3
Old Ruthenian	1					1	2
Slavic	1						1
French/Spanish	1						1
Ukrainian/ English		1					1
Arabic		1					1
Russian/German			1				1
Ukrainian/ Polish			1				1
Church Slavonic/ Gothic					1		1
Indoeuropean					1		1
French/Rumanian						1	1
Czech						1	1

Articles of young linguists in *Movoznavstvo* by subject, 1980-85

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	Total
Semantics	8		1	1	3		13
Lexicology	2	1	3	1	3	3	13
Word formation	3	1	2	3		2	11
Stylistics		3	1	1	4	1	10
Syntax	2	2	1	3		1	9
Onomastics		1	1	2		1	5
Phraseology		2			1	1	4
Mathematical linguistics		1			1		2
Interlinguistics		1		1			2
Contrastive linguistics		1				1	2
Lexicography			1		1		2
Dialectology				2			2
Language history	1						1
Phonetics	1						1
Translation	1						1
Bibliography				1			1
Psycholinguistics					1		1
Historical-comparative linguistics					1		1
Etymology					1		1
Inflection						1	1

Language of linguistic books by languages studied, 1980-83

	1980		1981		1982		1983		Total	
	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R
Ukrainian	11	-	9	-	10	-	19	-	49	-
Slavic	2	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	5	1
Church Slavonic	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	3	-
Classical (Greek, Latin)	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	3	-
East Slavic	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	2	1
Ukrainian/ English	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Ukrainian/ Russian	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	2	2
Russian	-	1	-	-	-	4	-	5	-	16
English	2	3	-	2	2	6	-	5	4	16
German	2	2	2	2	1	4	-	-	5	8
Romance/Germanic	1	1	-	2	-	1	-	3	1	7
Spanish	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	3
French	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Germanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1

МАЛОВІДОМА СТАТТЯ ПРО ПОЧАТКИ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ШКІЛ У КАНАДІ

У травні 1930 р. у Празі було засновано Українське педагогічне товариство, одним із основних завдань якого було “студіювати питання з теорії і практики педагогіки, а також минуле й сучасне становище народньої освіти на українських землях і на чужині” (“Статут УПТ”, No. 5).

Товариство під головуванням С. Сірополка розгорнуло широку діяльність: організувало наукові семінари, лекції, нав'язало стосунки з педагогічними установами Закарпатської України, Галичини, Буковини та на еміграції.

В 1932 р. Товариство видало науковий збірник під назвою “Українське шкільництво на Буковині, в Галичині, на Закарпатті та в Канаді”, як перший (на жаль, і останній) том новозаснованої серії “Праці Українського Педагогічного Товариства в Празі”.

Цей 72-сторінковий літографований збірник, що вийшов дуже обмеженим тиражем (за свідченням С. Сірополка лише кілька десятків примірників), містив чотири розвідки: В. Сімович — “Українське шкільництво на Буковині” (с. 5-33); Ст. Сірополко — “Українське шкільництво в Галичині” (с. 34-48), Ю. Гуспоя — “Шкільництво на Підкарпатті” (с. 49-59) та М. Кумка — “Українські школи в Канаді” (с. 60-71).

Перші три розвідки були поширеними доповідями дійсних членів УПТ, зачитані на загальних зборах Товариства 1931 р. Інформаційну статтю про українські школи в Канаді написав на прохання Товариства учитель “рідних шкіл” у Вінніпезі Михайло Кумка. Була це перша стаття, що інформувала європейського українського читача про стан української освіти в Канаді, де в той час було найбільше скупчення української еміграції, перш за все трудової. Стаття побудована на деяких статистичних даних та 10-річному досвіді автора з педагогічної та громадської

діяльності в українських школах Канади. Її зміст розподілено до тринадцятьох коротких розділів.

Правда, М. Кумка як учитель не мав доступу до всіх офіційних даних про українське шкільництво в Канаді, тому його статтю аж ніяк не можна вважати вичерпною. В ній, наприклад, не згадано про діяльність учительських семінарій у Манітобі, Саскачевані, Альберті заснованих ще на початку ХХ ст., про урядове скасування українських шкіл в деяких провінціях Канади напередодні та під час першої світової війни тощо. Та все ж таки стаття М. Кумки дає в цілому вірну картину українських шкіл в Канаді на переломі 20-30-их років.

Основна увага в ній присвячена діяльності т.зв. “українських рідних шкіл”. Стаття написана з позиції українського патріота, якому не байдуже виховання у дітей любови до рідної мови та культури. Кілька розділів побудовано виключно на власному досвіді і спостереженнях автора. Він пише про піднесення інтересу до української освіти в Канаді в 1918-22 рр., про масове заснування рідних шкіл при церквах, монастирях, культурно-освітніх організаціях та установах, про піонерську працю учителів, які часто у дуже несприятливих умовах, при мінімальному фінансовому забезпеченні, навчали дітей, про способи запису дітей у школи, їх розподіл на групи, шкільну і позашкільну діяльність, шкільні приміщення, підручники, приладдя тощо.

Правда, він не закриває очі і перед негативними явищами: пише про поступовий занепад українських шкіл в Канаді у другій половині 20-их років, про байдужість переважної більшості батьків до рідної освіти, про стихійність і безпляновість у навчанні, про недостатнє фінансове забезпечення шкіл, нестачу підручників та приладдя, підкреслює відсутність центрального керівництва школами.

Основний шлях виходу українських шкіл із несприятливої ситуації він бачить у подоланні їх розпорошеності та встановленні центрального керівництва. “Рідна школа в Канаді потребує мати один провід, щоби всі рідні школи мали одноцільний плян, одноцільний розклад годин, ті самі підручники і ту саму методу науки” (с. 68).

Сьогодні, коли українська освіта в Канаді досягла небувалого розвитку, коли існують державні інститути та катедри українознавства при вищих учбових закладах, прекрасно

обладнані школи, шкільні підручники, педагогічні товариства та журнали, стаття М. Кумки може здаватися анахронізмом. Та воно не так. М. Кумка був першим педагогом, який накреслив картину стану української освіти в Канаді. Саме завдяки його статті багато українських учителів із Європи, перш за все з Чехословаччини, вирушило в Канаду, а там зайнялись педагогічною діяльністю в ділянці українських рідних шкіл.

Оскільки маловідома стаття М. Кумки є сьогодні вже бібліографічною рідкістю, нижче передруковуємо її повністю.

УКРАЇНСЬКІ ШКОЛИ В КАНАДІ

I.

Переглядаючи “Звіт з позички національної оборони в Канаді”, виданий Представництвом Західно-Української Республіки в Вінніпегу, 1924 року, — я завважив, що на ст. 9-й цього звіту говориться: “...начисляється 2050 місцевостей в Канаді, де живуть українці”.

Точне число українців, які живуть в Канаді, годі подати, але загально говоримо, що живе нас тут понад 350.000. Число всього населення в Канаді переходить десять мільонів.

II.

В альманаху “Фарма”, виданім Товариством Опіки над українськими переселенцями ім. св. Рафаїла в Канаді, 1930 р., на ст. 97-й — проф. І. Н. Боберський умістив “Спис просвітніх товариств в Канаді”. Ці товариства носять різні назви: “Народний Дім”, “Читальня”, “Просвітне товариство”, “Січковий Дім”, “Інститут”, “Українська Хата”. Є також товариства з інтернаціональною закраскою, які з малими виїмками, носять назву “Товариство Український Робітничо-Фармерський Дім”, або в скороченню “ТУРФДім”. В описі подано число товариств в кожній провінції зокрема, а разом представляють вони такі числа на цілу Канаду: українських національних товариств 160 в 140

місцевостях. Українських товариств з інтернаціональною закраскою 90 у 86 місцевостях. Разом 250 товариств у 226-тьох місцевостях.

В тому самому альманаху, на ст. 53, проф. І. Боберський подав усі “Українські Греко-Католицькі Церкви в Канаді”. В списі вичислено церкви в кожній провінції зокрема, а разом в Канаді є: 241 укр. гр.-кат. церков у 232 місцевостях. (Під списом є дата: “Вінніпег, Канада, дня 25.XI.1929”). Українських православних церковних громад в Канаді є 157. Це число одержав я від голови консисторії укр. православної церкви в Канаді о. В. Савчука.

III.

Українські Рідні Школи в Канаді є при просвітніх товариствах і при церквах. Але не всі вичислені організації мають у себе зорганізовані школи. Я обчислив, що при українських товариствах з національним напрямком і при церквах є зорганізованих 43 рідних шкіл. При товариствах з інтернаціональною закраскою є зорганізованих 18 шкіл, разом 61 шкіл. Коли определимо пересічно по 35 дітей на школу, то вийде 2185 дітей, які вчащають на науку до рідних шкіл, де учаться по-українськи читати, писати, одержують перші відомості з історії й географії України, вчаться також співати українські пісні.

Величезна більшість українських дітей цілком не ходить до української школи. Причина цьому — байдужість батьків. Багато з батьків одверто говорять: “На що йому тут знання рідної мови придасться? Коби добре по-англійськи навчився”. Інші кажуть: “Не добре учити дитину рівночасно по-українськи й по-англійськи, бо це обтяжує і плутає пам'ять у дитини”. А ще інші навіть не знають, чи існує Українська Рідна Школа в Канаді, бо ніколи нею не цікавилися, ваги й потреби знання матірньої мови для своїх дітей не відчують.

Тому величезна більшість української молоді в Канаді виростає без знання рідної мови, письма, не знає елементарних відомостей про бувальщину свого народу. Наслідки такі, що вже тепер по 35-тьох літах життя української еміграції в Канаді, сильно помітне відчуження нашої молоді, яка вже відійшла душою далеко-далеко від всього, що українське, помітує своїми рідними родичами. Вихована в чужій школі, бачить ідеал у чужому, воно

присвічує їй і своїм блиском притягає до себе, як нетлю до світла. Однак, є також невеличка частина українських батьків, які розуміють потребу знання рідної мови, посилають своїх дітей на науку до Української Рідної Школи, платять точно належитість за науку, яку школа на них накладає, і у всякий інший спосіб піддержують діяльність школи. Ті родичі — це ясна зірка, яка присвічує на українським овиді.

ІV.

Перші українські школи

В 1905 році сестри служебниці почали вчити дітей української мови у Вінніпегу, в салі під церквою св. Миколая, ріг вулиць Стелла і МекГрегор, а в 1914 році зорганізовано другу Рідну Школу при товаристві “Інститут Просвіти ім. Тараса Шевченка” в Бруклендс, Манітоба, при вул. Вілліям, ч. 1960 (передмістя Вінніпегу).

Найбільше українських Рідних Шкіл зорганізовувалося в роках 1918-1922, коли то український нарід на рідних землях провадив війну з ворогами за здобуття своєї держави. Тоді очі української еміграції були звернені в сторону до рідної землі, вона з великою увагою слідувала за подіями, які відбувалися на Україні, й думала: “Буде вільна українська держава, то будемо вертати домів, тому треба вчити своїх дітей рідної мови і письма, бо там їм буде цього потрібно”. Цього аргументу вживали також організатори рідних шкіл, ним легко було переконувати родичів про потребу знання рідної мови для їх дітей, кожний відчував потребу рідної школи і помагав їй різними способами.

По невдачних змаганнях українського народу за здобуття своєї держави, настає знов байдужість української еміграції в Канаді посилати своїх дітей на науку рідної мови й дбати про Рідну Школу. Це завважив я, працюючи девять років у двох рідних школах у Вінніпегу.

V.

В школі ім. князя Володимира і княгині Ольги при вулиці Стелла в Вінніпегу учив я від березня 1921 до кінця серпня 1925 року, а в школі при Українським Народнім Домі в Вінніпегу від вересня 1925 до кінця березня 1930 року, — отже кругло дев'ять років учив я українських дітей в рідних школах у Вінніпегу.

В перших роках мав я все повно дітей в школі так, що місця для них бракувало, і треба було багато дітей відправляти, а десь від 1924 р. почало число дітей зменшуватись, і в класі видно було порожні місця. Приміром, першого й другого року на науку вчало постійно 120 до 130 дітей (і ще зголошувалися до запису на науку, але не приймав, бо й це число буде вже понад сили) так, що я мусів ділити дітей на два рази: перша й друга групи приходили на науку в понеділок, а третя й четверта приходили у вівторок на перемену через цілий тиждень, бо всіх дітей учити нараз було б неможливо та й в салі не було перегороджі, щоби можна було прийняти другу учительську силу до помочі і вчити одночасно всіх дітей. Від 1924 року число дітей в школі почало меншати, і 1929 року я мав лише 64 дітей в школі при Українським Народнім Домі, так що ділити їх на два рази було вже за мало. Я говорив з [нерозбірливо] учителями Рідних Шкіл у Вінніпегу, і вони мені сказали, що спостерегли менше число дітей у себе в школі і слабше дбання батьків про посилення дітей на науку.

VI.

Заряд Рідної Школи

Заряд Рідних Шкіл в Канаді виглядає різно.

Парохіяльною школою звичайно займається сам священник. Він збирає дітей, призначає шкільну оплату від дітей, добірає учителя, призначає [нерозбірливо] для учителя, дбає про салю і все, що є потрібне для науки. Отже весь тягар школи спадає лише на одного чоловіка, який при найліпшій волі не може виконати того всього, чого школа потребує і що може виконати легко

комітет шкільний, зложений з кількох осіб.

Рідні Школи при Читальнях і Народних Домах є звичайно під опікою старшини товариства. Лише при декотрих товариствах члени на загальних річних зборах вибірають зпоміж себе шкільного референта, який входить також в склад старшини товариства. Його завданням є провадити шкільні справи, дбати про те, щоби діти ходили до школи і платили за науку, дбати про приладдя, нараджуватися спільно з учителем щодо уладжування шкільних пописів, полагоджувати всякі справи між родичами, дітьми і учителем, здавати справоздання про стан і потреби школи на засіданнях старшини і на зборах членів товариства, — словом, дбати про все, що є потрібне для успішного ведення школи. Робота шкільного референта є не-платна.

При Робітничих Домах існують Шкільні Комітети (Шкілкоми), зложені з кількох осіб. Обовязком Шкілкому є час від часу давати звідомлення на засіданнях виділу про стан школи і предкладати свої пляни про те, як поліпшити школу й науку в школі.

У деяких товариствах школою займається старшина товариства настільки, що дбає лише про учителя, а учитель сам має збирати учеників, сам має старатися про приладдя до науки, уладжувати шкільні пописи, полагоджувати всякі справи між собою, учениками, родичами і товариством, сам має дбати про розвій школи, має бути учителем, організатором, суддею і господарем школи. Яким способом він дає собі з тим всім раду, — це нікого не обходить. Заряд товариства цікавиться школою остільки, що хіба деколи питає учителя, кілько дітей має у школі. Коли в школі є багато дітей, то значить, що учитель добрий, а як у школі дітей мало, то знак, що учитель зле веде школу. Кілько грошей учитель збирає від учеників, а кілько пропадає, про це ніхто не дбає. Що учитель не збере, то це його втрата.

На такий лад ведення школи ніякий учитель не може посвятитися на довший час праці, тому учителі часто змінюються. Часта зміна учителів відбивається шкідливо на науці й поступі учнів.

VII. Школярі

Школярі є найважливішою частиною Рідної Школи. Але щоби школярів мати, треба їх збирати. Наука української мови в Рідній Школі є добровільна, а не примусова. Діти ходять добровільно, для того треба їх з'єднати для школи. Слід згадати, що діти ходять до публічних державних шкіл, в яких наука є обов'язкова, від 9-ої години рано до 4-ої години по-полудні. Тому наука в українських рідних школах відбувається вечерами від 5 до 7 години, то є дві години науки.

Одна зі шкіл, в якій я учив, збирала дітей цим способом: священник заповів в неділю на богослуженню, щоби родичі, які мають дітей в шкільній віці, привели їх в наступний день, щоби в понеділок, до школи і записали на науку. Оголосив також платню за науку.

Наступного дня родичі приводили дітей, я записував їх і рівночасно при записі ділив на групи, бо приходили й такі діти, що вже раніш ходили до української школи. Діти, що не мали читанок, купували їх при вписі. Дітей приймалося в віці від 6 до 12 літ. Ділив я їх на чотири групи.

В другій школі збирав я дітей так: оголосив у часописі день запису, переглянув членську книжку товариства, вибрав адреси й написав листи до тих родичів, що мали дітей в шкільній віці, з проханням щоби прислали їх на науку. Предсідник товариства оголосив про запис дітей на найближчих зборах і подав умови щодо платні. Пізніше оголошено це на кількох виставах і концертах, уладжуваних цим товариством. Дітей прибувало по трохи з кожним днем.

Пізніше було вже легко збирати дітей, бо коли я підготував школярів і почав уладжувати шкільні вечорі, то майже на кожнім вечері чи то я, чи котрий з урядників товариства взивали присутніх батьків, щоби посилали дітей на науку до Рідної Школи.

Звичайно, коли вечір був удачний і школярі добре пописались, то вже наступного дня приходило кільканадцятьеро дітей до запису на науку.

Це знак, що такі шкільні пописи, як концерти і вистави, починаються у великій мірі до з'єднання дітей для Рідної Школи.

VIII. Саля

Тому, що Рідні Школи в Канаді містяться звичайно при всяких просвітніх товариствах і при церквах, то й шкільні салі є звичайно власністю цих організацій. Спеціально збудованих будинків для шкільного ужитку є дуже мало. Ті самі салі, в яких містяться школи, є побудовані в першій мірі на те, щоби відповідали вимогам товариства, і тому не завше вони відповідають шкільним вимогам. Приміром, у Вінніпегу і на передмістях є 17 українських шкіл. З того числа лише одна (школа сестер з правом прилюдности) є призначена для шкільної науки. В кожній иншій з цих саль провадять товариства свою діяльність, роблять аматорські й хорові проби, базари, збори, віча, танці, вистави й концерти. Шкільні лавки треба часто виносити на двір, а шкільні прибори, як стіл, таблицю, стінні карти та ин., треба ховати десь в кути, щоб не заваждали і щоби не знищилися. Лавки звичайно старого вигляду, довгі, незграбні, на одній лавці міститься 5-6 дітей. В декотрих саях наука відбувається на сцені, а декотрі салі містяться під будинками у пивницях. Очевидна річ, в таких саях бракує відповідного освітлення, а про розміщення шкільних приборів, як бібліотеки, стінних карт, гльобів, образів і т.п. не може бути й мови.

Також болюче дається відчувати брак відповідних площ для забав і рухової гри.

IX. Учителі

Учителі по різних школах є різні. Лише кількох є таких, що вже від літ посвятилися тому ділу, — вчать гарно молодіж і з'єднали собі признання учнів і родичів.

Під цю хвилю вчать у Канаді деякі учителі й учительки, що покінчили семінар в Старім Краю і провадять науку взірцево. Уміють вчити й тримати молодіж в порядку. Приїхали тому 6-7 років. Багато учителів учить лише якийсь час, поки не знайдуть собі іншого заняття, і між ними трапляються люде, що вчать добре, з успіхом, але лучаються також нетерпеливі і дразливі, що знеохочуються серед дітвори і серед родичів, які знов рідко коли вміють прийти учителям на поміч.

У рідних школах вчать також сестри служебниці. Вчать пильно, спокійно, витривало і кладуть вагу на молитви і катехізм.

Учитель, що вміє співати, має добрий голос, уміє провадити хор, як диригент, або уміє провадити оркестр, може найти в Канаді заняття при кожному товаристві, яке хоче розвиватися і притягати до себе старших і молодіж.

Яку платню одержують учителі?

Не в кожній школі і не кожний учитель одержує однакову платню. Це залежить від числа дітей, від кількості годин науки, від хисту вчителя. Більше дітей — більше праці. Коли учитель веде науку щодня і працює лише в школі, то річ ясна, його платня повинна бути така, щоби міг вижити. Учитель, що веде школу, уладжує з дітьми вистави і концерти, крім того працює в товаристві, веде старших, — повинен діставати відповідну нагороду. Є й такі учителі, що через день мають інше, постійне заняття, а вечерами працюють в школі. Тому учителів і висоту платні дасться поділити на три групи:

1) Учитель, що вчить дітей читати, писати, співу, руханки, гри на музичних інструментах, уладжує шкільні вечери, працює в товаристві, — дістає платню від 80 до 100 доларів на місяць.

2) Учитель, що працює лише в школі, веде науку кожного дня, уладжує шкільні виступи і свою працю зводить лише до ведення школи, одержує платню від 50 до 75 доларів на місяць.

3) Учитель, що вдень має інше заняття, а в школі працює 2 або 3 рази на тиждень вечорами, вчить дітей лише читати і писати, — одержує від 25 до 40 доларів на місяць.

Є також українські учителі й учительки, що покінчили тутешні школи і вчать в англійських державних школах. Число їх сягає поверх чотири сотні, і всі вони майже розкидані і вчать по місцевостях, де живуть в переважаючій числі українські поселенці, головно в трьох західних провінціях: Манітобі, Саскачевані й Альберті. Від них жадають українці поселенці надобовязкової науки української мови бодай одну годину по обовязкових годинах. Звичайно вчать по-українськи від 4-5 години по полудні. Вони сповняють велику місію для українського народу, бо, маючи дітей під своїм проводом кожного дня, мають більшу нагоду вчити їх, ніж учителі по рідних школах. В чисто українських оселях часто й Шкільна Рада складається з українців, і коли вони запрошують учителя до державної школи, то звичайно роблять з ним угоду, що по

обовязкових годинах має вчити також української мови. За те учитель одержує кілька доларів місячної платні більше. Ті учителі роблять важну роботу по українських громадах в Канаді.

Х. Наукові середники

Не всі рідні школи вживають однакових читанок. Одні школи вживають читанок М. Матвійчука, виданих видавництвом “Нова Українська Школа” у Львові (окреме видання для Канади і Злучених Держав). Другі школи вживають читанок А. Крушельницького, виданих видавництвом “Чайка” у Відні. Інші вживають старих читанок, уживаних в Галичині перед війною, але передрукованих в Канаді зі зміненим правописом (“Буквар”). Для старших учнів вживають Історію України І. Крипякевича, “Географію України” Ст. Рудницького, а деякі школи для доповнення уживають “Лиса Микиту” і “Захара Беркута” І. Франка. Граматику до недавна вживали найбільше Коцовського й Огоновського, тепер багато вживають проф. В. Сімовича і О. Поповича, видану у Львові 1925 року в трьох частих: перша часть для II. року науки, друга часть для III. року науки, третя часть для IV. року науки. Співаників вживають: І. Воробкевича, М. Гайворонського, Стеценка, Ф. Колесси, М. Кумки. Образів до науки історії, ні моделів не уживають, бо це тяжко дістати, а по-друге, все “нема грошей”.

Деякі рідні школи уладжують шкільні іспити, на яких діти одержують шкільні свідоцтва. Я уряджував шкільні іспити три рази, на яких були присутні родичі дітей і запрошені поважні українські громадяне. На двох іспитах 1927-1928 рр. був присутній недавно прибувший зі старого світа генерал Володимир Сікевич, бувший посол Української Народньої Республіки на Уграх. Діти одержали свідоцтва пильности.

ХІ. Потрібний один напрям

Рідна Школа в Канаді потребує мати один провід, щоби всі рідні школи мали одноцільний плян, одноцільний розклад годин, ті самі підручники і ту саму методу науки.

В тій справі говорив я з учителями, які вчать в рідних школах у Вінніпегу, і набрав переконання, що найліпшу раду дає мій знайомий проф. І. Н. Боберський, з котрим я не раз про те докладно говорив. Він є такого погляду на цю справу:

“Серед наших відносин в Канаді можуть самі учителі, які провадять Рідну Школу у Вінніпегу, сходитися на наради в шкільних справах і рішати спільно що-найменше ті питання, які відносяться до шкільних підручників, до мап, образів, до методи навчання, до видачі нових підручників для Канади, до тілесного виховання.

Книжки для канадійської молоді мусять бути писані тут в Канаді. Тому що наука української мови в провінції Квебеку для українців обовязкова, можна би при помочі квебецьких властей видати підручники для українських дітей в Монреалі, які придалися б опісля всім рідним школам в Канаді. А що українці будуть творити в Канаді велику громаду, нема сумніву. Як поживете лише 100 літ, побачите, що то буде за сила. Шкільні підручники потрібні. Тут є поле для інтелігентної роботи над вихованням народу.

Учительський збір у Вінніпегу став би з часом повагою для всіх українських шкіл в Канаді”.

Це є погляд мого знайомого, і я поділяю його вповні. Він висказався також, що з часом учительський збір рідних шкіл в Вінніпегу міг би тактовною діяльністю здобути собі рішаючий вплив на організацію рідних шкіл в цілій Канаді і на добір учительських сил до тих шкіл, навіть на висоту платні учителів. Можна би таку Шкільну Раду утворити зі шкільних делегатів товариств у Вінніпегу. Це було би правдиво по-громадянськи, але серед тутешніх відносин делегати занедбували би свої обовязки, не доцінювали би своєї відвічальности, а при сходинах зводили би зі собою порахунки в імені товариств. Лише учителі у Вінніпегу при добрій волі можуть дати добрий почин до одноцільного пляну в науці. Розуміється, що в тій своїй діяльності мають шанувати особисті й релігійні почування громадянства. Рідна Школа є найважнішою організацією для українських емігрантів. На жаль, вони присвячують їй дуже мало уваги. Навіть інтелігенти не доцінюють її вартости.

ХІІ. Кошти

На доходи Рідної Школи складаються гроші, які платять батьки за своїх дітей, а також гроші, які учитель заробляє своєю школою.

Головними видатками є оплата салі на школу, оплата учителя і закуп наукових середників та видатки на улаштування шкільних виступів, свят і прогульок.

А). ДОХОДИ. — У деяких рідних школах родичі платять протягом десяти місяців по 50 центів, а за два місяці — липень і серпень — коли діти вільні від науки в публічній школі і до Рідної Школи учащують щодня, оплата в Рідній Школі виносить 75 центів, а декуди платять один долар на місяць від одної дитини.

Коли школа улаштує виставу чи концерт, то дохід також іде для школи. Пересічний дохід зі шкільних вечерів буває 20-40 долярів.

Підчас різдвяних свят посилають дітей колядувати. З коляди також приходять 20-30 долярів для школи.

У деяких школах є так, що кожний член товариства є оподаткований і платить призначений даток згори на школу на цілий рік, без огляду на те, чи він має дітей в шкільнім віці, чи ні. Ці гроші вкладають до банку, і їх відтак уживають на виплату для учителя і на закуп потрібних приборів шкільних. Цей спосіб збирання грошей дає запоруку, що ніхто не буде уникати виплати за школу, не буде неприємних випадків, які при збірці шкільних оплат часто лучаються, а також цим члени доказують, що розуміють вагу школи.

Щоби придбати потрібний гріш на утримання школи, улажують по декотрих школах базари, прогульки, добровільні збірки та ин. Є й такі школи, де товариство не бере на себе жадних зобовязань щодо збірки грошей від дітей, не робить ніяких заходів на удержання школи, тільки лишає це самому учителю, який займається збіркою грошей, і що він збере, то для себе, а що пропаде, то це страта учителя. Це є непрактичний спосіб, бо учитель сам мусить дбати не тільки про науку, але має журитися також збіркою грошей, при чім приходиться терпіти нераз багато неприємностей, які при цій збірці лучаються. Це понижує учителя, бо дитина, котра платить безпосередньо учителю гроші за науку, має вражіння, що учитель є низьким

слугою і що вчить лише тому, що хоче грошей. Це є злий спосіб. Належить його уникати.

Б). ВИТРАТИ. — Школа має такі витрати: на салю, світло, опал, учителя, прибори до науки, на улаштування дитячих свят, прогульок і т.и.

Школи, які містяться при церквах, Народніх Домах, Читальнях і Робітничих Домах, — не оплачують саль зі своїх доходів, бо салі є звичайно власністю цих організацій, а родичі дітей, що ходять до школи, є звичайно членами або бодай симпатиками тих організацій. Найважливіший видаток школи — це утримання учителя. Коли школа потрапить з доходів оплачувати учителя, то її існування є запевнене. Де школа не може утримати учителя власними доходами, там товариство мусить докласти зі своєї каси.

Отже ясно, що доля кожної Рідної Школи в Канаді залежить від долі товариства, при яким школа існує. Коли товариство добре розвивається, тоді й школу може краще утримувати, а коли товариство підупадає, то й школа підупадає, або й цілком перестає існувати.

Коли школа має такі доходи, що сама оплачує учителя і ще дещо її гроша лишається, то за ці гроші старається про різні приладдя до науки, як: бібліотека, стінні мапи, прилади до руханкових вправ, гор та забав.

Коли ж школа бореться з недостачами, то не може старатися про такі прибори до науки, і наука в такій школі обмежується лише читанками, які діти приносять з собою з дому і які є їх власністю.

ХІІІ. Українські виховничі Інститути в Канаді

Є в Канаді також українські виховничі Інститути, а саме: Український Інститут ім. Петра Могили в місті Саскатуні, провінція Саскачеван, заснований в 1916 р. В 1931 році число студентів і студенток в Інституті було 44. Управителем Інституту є п. Юліян Стечишин.

Український Інститут ім. Мих. Грушевського в м. Едмонтоні, провінція Алберта, заснований 1918 року (філія Інституту ім. П. Могили в Саскатуні). В 1931 році студентів і студенток в Інституті було 32. Управителем Інституту є п. І. П.

Лазарович.

Український Інститут ім. Петра Могили в місті Вінніпегу, провінція Манітоба, заснований 1926 р. (Це є друга філія Інституту ім. П. Могили в Саскатуні). В 1931 році студентів і студенток в Інституті у Вінніпегу було 23. Управителем Інституту є п. А. Павлик.

Український Інститут ім. Тараса Шевченка в місті Едмонтоні, провінція Алберта, заснований 1926 року. В 1931 році студентів в Інституті було 32. Настоятелем Інституту є п. П. Мітенко.

В згаданих інститутах мешкають і харчуються українські студенти і студентки, які учащують на науку до високих державних шкіл. В українських інститутах побирають науку української мови, історії, географії і літератури. Науку уділяють управителі інститутів, а від часу до часу на запрошення українські визначні громадяне виголошують для студентів лекції з українознавства.

На тім місці вважаю за відповідне згадати також, що в місті Йорктоні, провінція Саскачеван, є Колегія св. Йосифа, побудована 1920 року і є під проводом християнських братів. Всіх студентів в Колегії 1931 року було 50, з цього числа 36 студентів-українців. За інформацією о. Методія, попередніми роками було в Колегії 80-90 студентів, з них 85% українців.

М. Кумка

GUIDE TO RESEARCH

Lubomyr Y. Luciuk

AN ANNOTATED GUIDE TO CERTAIN MICROFICHE ARCHIVES OF THE ASSOCIATION OF UKRAINIANS IN GREAT BRITAIN

Introduction

The Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain (AUGB) or *Soiuz Ukrainsiv u Velykobritanii* (SUB) was incorporated on 20 December 1947 for the purpose of providing Ukrainian Displaced Persons (DPs) relocated in the United Kingdom with a centralized organizational structure. An important role in the formation of the AUGB was played by Ukrainian-Canadian servicemen stationed in England during the Second World War who remained afterward to undertake refugee relief and resettlement operations on behalf of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee (UCC) and its affiliated Ukrainian Canadian Relief Fund (UCRF). One such individual was G.R.B. Panchuk, who became the second President of the AUGB in mid-1948, a position he retained until March 1949, when he was deposed by those AUGB members who favoured the ideological platform of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists-Revolutionaries (OUNr), known popularly as the *banderivtsi*.

Before factional quarrels split Ukrainians in Great Britain into competing groups, considerable welfare work on behalf of the DPs was accomplished by Ukrainian Canadians working overseas, assisted by

individuals drawn from the refugee population (e.g., George Salsky). W. Roman Petryshyn's doctoral dissertation, "Britain's Ukrainian Community: A Study of the Political Dimension in Ethnic Community Development" (University of Bristol, 1980), provides some of the historical background to the Ukrainian experience in the U.K. However, this subject has yet to be fully explored. The major impediment to such a study has been the inaccessibility of pertinent records dating back to the formative years of the AUGB.

During the course of doctoral research on the post-Second World War migration of Ukrainian refugees (1982), I obtained access to the AUGB's archives. The documents were located at the AUGB's "Invalids' Farm" in Chiddingfold, Surrey, just outside London.

Regrettably, no effort seems to have been made to preserve these materials. The archives were found in a deteriorated condition. Whatever their original order may have been, the filing arrangement was disrupted when the documents were moved out of London and transferred to the building's attic. Furthermore, the materials viewed do not represent the complete files of the AUGB. At least some files were taken to Canada by several Ukrainian Canadians, some of these eventually resurfacing in the Archives of Ontario (The G.R.B. Panchuk Collection), the Public Archives of Canada (as part of several collections), or at the Ukrainian Cultural and Educational Centre, "Oseredok," in Winnipeg. Others were destroyed in a fire in the AUGB offices at 49 Linden Gardens, London, or reportedly lost during the Winnipeg flood of 1950.

Certain constraints made it possible to copy only those records judged to be of particular significance to the Ukrainian refugee experience after the Second World War, i.e., records of organizations such as the Central Ukrainian Relief Bureau (CURB), UCRF, the UCC and the AUGB. After preliminary sorting *in situ*, the selected papers were transferred to London and entrusted to the National Reprographic Centre for Documentation, where microfiche copies were made for the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta. Two copies exist: one has been deposited in the Rutherford Library at the University of Alberta, while the other remains in the care of L.Y. Luciuk.

Describing the Collection

As noted above, the documents selected for microfiching represent only a sample of a larger collection which remains at the "Invalids' Farm." While it is probable that most historically pertinent documents were discovered and copied, there can be no guarantee that all relevant documents have now been preserved. Housed in unsatisfactory conditions, the collection will continue to decay. Since documents from the mid-1950s on were excluded from the selection process, it is not known what may still be lost. If the history of Ukrainians in Great Britain is ever to be written adequately, this material *must* be properly stored.

The documents placed on microfiche represent some 10,500 individual pages. There is some unavoidable repetition, and not every document is significant. Despite these caveats, it is clear that what has been preserved represents a body of historical material that is not, for the most part, replicated in other archives. A considerable portion relates to Ukrainian-Canadian efforts between 1945 and 1952, when attempts were made to help Ukrainian DPs and European Voluntary Workers (EVWs) adjust to the conditions awaiting them upon resettlement. Other material details the organizational interests and activities of successive AUGB executives.

Of particular importance is the material which relates to Ukrainian-Canadian efforts to help former members of the Ukrainian Division "Galicia." Held as Surrendered Enemy Personnel (SEPs) near Rimini, Italy until 1947, they were subsequently relocated to Great Britain and reclassified as POWs. Most spent at least one year working in various locations around the United Kingdom before being "civilianized." These fiches contain a number of memoranda, reports and correspondence regarding the migration experiences of this Ukrainian military formation which are not otherwise available.

What follows is an annotated description of each fiche, arranged in conformity with the original AUGB filing code, the framework of which is described below. Each envelope of microfiches is identified with a Roman numeral and labelled to indicate its contents.

It should also be noted that the majority of the documents are written in English, with only 15-20 per cent in the Ukrainian language.

Description of the Microfiches

The AUGB Filing Code divided the organization's correspondence into seven general categories, labelled Blocks. These dealt with the following subject matter:

Block 1: Administration and General Business.

Block 2: U.K. Organizations.

Block 3: Official Correspondence.

Block 4: U.K. General Correspondence.

Block 5: Ukrainian Relief Committees and Ukrainian Organizations Abroad.

Block 6: General Correspondence, all countries other than U.K.

Block 7: AUGB Official Documents.

Each of these blocks was further divided into separate files. These further categorizations can be found in Envelope VII, *Fiche* 11. The microfiched materials have been organized and described using this original AUGB Filing Code as a reference. Each envelope is labelled with the appropriate block, file and fiche numbers.

Envelope I

Block 1: **File** 1-12-0 (Staff)

Fiche 1: Correspondence, including letters between Danylo Skoropadsky and G.R.B. Panchuk, Miss Ann Crapeleve and the AUGB, material pertaining to CURB, and confidential AUGB newsletters (e.g., no. 1, dated 14 May 1948).

Fiche 2: Continuation of *Fiche* 1. Material includes a report on a visit to the Sheffield Hostel by Vladimir de Korostovetz, statutes of the Association of Ukrainian Students in Great Britain, documents pertaining to the employment of Mr. S. Jaworski by the AUGB and documents relating to Mr. M. Oparenko.

Fiche 3: Continuation of *Fiches* 1 and 2. Contains material such as letters from George Salsky, material on the Association of Ukrainian Journalists in Great Britain, and additional material on Mr. S. Jaworski.

Fiche 4: Continuation of *Fiches* 1, 2, and 3. Correspondence of the AUGB.

Envelope II

Block 1: **File** 1-15 (Press Correspondence)

Fiches 12-15

These four microfiches contain press clippings, correspondence

with the editors of various newspapers (e.g., *Time and Tide*), as well as reports on meetings with Sir George Rendell and other influential officials regarding the Ukrainian DPs. *Fiche* 14 contains Mr. N. Nahnybida's booklet on Ukraine under Soviet rule (1917-39). This same fiche also has material on the Ukrainian Information Service, as well as various International Refugee Organization reports and documents. *Fiche* 15 has correspondence with the National Union of Mineworkers, and material on the Confederation of Ukrainian Free Trade Unions in Exile.

Block 2: File 2-16, Orthodox Church

Fiches 11 and 12

Fiche 11 contains a nominal roll of Ukrainian Greek Orthodox priests, correspondence with the Rev. Ihor Hubarshewskyj, with the British Council of Churches (Foreign Workers Committee), as well as a number of letters and materials on the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in the U.K. There are some letters by Tracy Philipps and the Rev. S. Sawchuk on this fiche.

Fiche 12 continues with this type of material. There is also some material on the Ukrainian Division "Galicia" and a report about a conference held with Sir Herbert Emerson, Director of the Intergovernmental Committee (11 December 1948).

Block 3: File 3-17-1, IRO and File 3-20-5, Memoranda and Reports

Fiche 14 and *Fiche* 15 contain various IRO materials and documents, as well as CURB memoranda and reports. There is also some material of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

Envelope III

Block 1: File 1-16, London City Council, County Councils and Borough Councils

Fiche 26 contains miscellaneous correspondence between the AUGB and various city and municipal councils relating to Ukrainians resettling in such locations.

Block 5: File 5-7-0, Belgium; File 5-9-0, Italy

Fiches 21-26 preserve correspondence between CURB and the Ukrainian relief committees organized in Belgium and Italy. In *Fiche* 21 there is material on the Union of Ukrainian Workers in Belgium and reports on the committee's activities in 1949, 1950,

and 1954–5. *Fiche* 22 holds material from 1955–7. There is also some archival material on the Ukrainian community in France, which is also covered on *Fiche* 23. Correspondence between the AUGB and Dr. V. Kubijovyč (at Sarcelles), with the Ukrainian Christian Movement, the Shevchenko Scientific Society and other groups is also found here. *Fiche* 24 has material on the Committee in Defence of the Memory of S. Petliura (1958) and on the Ukrainian Relief Committee in Italy (1948). *Fiche* 25 continues with material on Italy, containing information about the refugee camp at Lipari, correspondence with Italian Prime Minister A. de Gasperi, and the Refugee Defence Committee. *Fiche* 26 has material on the Ukrainian Relief Committee in Trieste (1952), a list of Ukrainian refugees in Italy (1951), and letters to the UNHCR regarding the situation in Trieste and relations with Yugoslavia.

Envelope IV

Block 2: File 2–14, CARE

Fiche 1 has correspondence between CURB and the Co-operative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc., in 1948.

Block 3: File 3–16, Embassies, Consulates and Legations

Fiche 1 contains miscellaneous correspondence between the AUGB and various officials.

Block 3: File 3–6, Hostels

Fiches 2–5 represent AUGB correspondence with various hostels, hospitals and organizations across the U.K. where Ukrainian EVWs, POWs and DPs were being settled. For example, in *Fiche* 2 there are letters regarding the Bolsey and St. Martins Hostels (1948). In *Fiche* 3 there is an AUGB report on conditions at the Annsmuir Hostel. The EVW camp at Newhaven, Sussex, is described in documents found in *Fiche* 5 (1949).

Block 4: File 4–1, Agricultural Executive Committee

Both *Fiche* 1 and *Fiche* 2 contain AUGB correspondence with this committee for 1948.

Envelope V

Block 2: File 2–15, Council for British Relief Societies Abroad

Fiche 5 contains correspondence with this Council.

Block 2: File 2-20, Welfare Organizations in England

Fiche 5 contains correspondence with various other British welfare organizations. There are also reports on interviews held with the Uruguay Council (Mr. Panchuk and Anthony Hlynka participating, in December 1946), on a meeting held with Norman Robertson of the Canadian Department of External Affairs, and related materials.

Block 3: File 3-1, War Office

Fiche 1 contains a number of reports and memoranda from 1947. For example, there is a paper entitled "Moral and Psychological Persecution of Minority National Groups in the Polish Forces and Polish Resettlement Corps," a report on a visit to Ukrainian POW Camp No. 298 (25 June 1947), correspondence between CURB and Major General MacLeod. There is also a memorandum by G.R.B. Panchuk on Ukrainian POWs (3 July 1947) and information on the special case of Yaroslaw Petriw (1947).

Fiche 2 contains a list of families and next of kin of Ukrainian SEPs, letters between Ukrainian Canadians and Bishop Mstyslaw, minutes of a meeting with the Directorate of POWs (11 July 1947), a report on Ukrainian priests for the United Kingdom and a memorandum on the release of Ukrainian POWs to enable them to rejoin their families in Germany and Australia.

Fiche 3 preserves correspondence between CURB and Major Harding of the War Office, letters on the release of Professor Moncibowych (16 September 1947), material on the question of Polish interpreters and their dealings with Ukrainians, a report on the POW Hospital at Naburn, North York, and on the disposal of funds earned by the POWs while they were interned in Italy. There is also information on the tour of Bishop Buchko, T. Philipps's comments to the War Office about Ukrainian POWs and Ukrainian POW complaints about their treatment.

Fiche 4 has a memo to the Hon. L. St. Laurent concerning the Ukrainian Division "Galicia" and its immigration to Canada, material on Panchuk's tour of POW camps in the U.K. (December 1947), general remarks regarding the screening of Ukrainian SEPs, Panchuk's letters to the Apostolic Delegate and his appeal on behalf of Mr. Y. Petriw.

Block 3: File 3-14, Allied Control Commission for Germany

Fiches 4 and *5* contain assorted correspondence with the CCG.

Block 3: **File 3-19, Trade Unions**

Assorted correspondence with various British trade union groups concerning Ukrainian workers.

Envelope VI

Block 2: **File 2-17, Catholic Church**

Fiche 8 and *Fiche 9* record correspondence between the AUGB and Cardinal Griffin (1948), protests over the proposed deportation to Germany of invalid and sick Ukrainian POWs, and letters from Panchuk to the Bishop of Nottingham. *Fiche 9* continues with such material, including correspondence with the War Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Committee and the Catholic Committee for Relief Abroad.

Block 3: **File 2-18, Protestant Churches**

Fiches 9 and *10* contain information on contacts between the AUGB and various Protestant denominations. In *Fiche 9* there is correspondence with the Lord Bishop of London, a memorandum regarding the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, a memorandum on the "Spiritual Welfare and Care for Ukrainians in Great Britain of the Orthodox Faith," a list of Ukrainian POWs who were to be deported, another memorandum on Ukrainians in Great Britain, and letters to the World Council of Churches and the Archbishop of Canterbury. *Fiche 10* continues with letters to the Ecumenical Refugee Commission in Geneva (1947), CURB to the World Council of Churches, and the Office of the Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church to CURB.

Block 3: **File 3-16, Hostels**

Fiches 6, 7 and *8* contain general correspondence between the AUGB and various British hostels, primarily in 1949.

Envelope VII

Block 2: **File 2-20, Miscellaneous Welfare Organizations (including Doctors and Hospitals)**

Fiches 6-10 contain material such as a memorandum on the "Immigration of Ukrainian POW," correspondence regarding various individual cases, material on EVWs who became mental patients, the Ukrainian Convalescent Home at Chiddingfold, Surrey, the status of Ukrainian mental patients at Bracebridge,

care of Ukrainian EVW mental cases (1949), and related health and welfare matters.

Block 6: General Correspondence and Filing Code Tables

Fiches 10 and 11 have material regarding EVWs, and letters between CURB, the AUGB and Ukrainians in Spain (1948), Australia (1949), and Palestine (1949).

Envelope VIII

Block 3: File 3-5-0, Ministry of Labour, HQ

Fiches 6, 8, 9 and 10 contain material about individual cases involving Ukrainians in Great Britain and the Ministry of Labour and National Service. For example, *Fiche* 6 contains letters on the situation at the Northwood Hostel (1949). *Fiche* 8 is largely a collection of depositions by Ukrainians regarding working conditions and their experiences in the U.K., which continues on *Fiches* 9 and 10 (in Ukrainian).

Block 3: File 3-5-1, Ministry of Labour, Regional Offices

Fiche 7 contains correspondence with various regional offices of the Ministry and the AUGB, e.g., letters regarding the Byefeld Camp Hostel (1949).

Envelope IX

Block 3: File 3-5-0, Ministry of Labour, HQ

Fiches 11-13 contain various depositions made by Ukrainians to the Ministry of Labour and National Service (1948). There are also summary reports regarding a meeting held at a hostel in Scotland between Ukrainian representatives and camp leaders (October 1948).

Envelope X

Block 3: File 3-5-0, Ministry of Labour, HQ

Fiches 1-5 contain a variety of letters dealing with CURB's relations with the Welfare Department of the Ministry of Labour, the "Westward Ho" scheme, reports on various hostels (e.g., the EVW Hostel at Crawle near Scunthorpe), the movement of family dependents, and various individual cases.

Envelope XI

Block 3: File 3-5-0, Ministry of Labour, HQ

Fiches 6-10 are a continuation of the fiches listed above. There are letters regarding the immigration of Ukrainian EVWs from the U.K. to Canada, educational facilities for the EVWs, Ukrainian doctors, the civilianization of Ukrainian POWs, various hostels (e.g., High Hurstwood, Sussex), and lists of families and dependents for reunion.

Envelope XII

Block 3: File 3-17, International Refugee Organization

Fiches 1-4 contain extensive alphabetical lists providing the names and locations of AUGB members in the U.K. along with their dates of birth.

Block 3: Official Correspondence

Fiches 4 and 5 are largely concerned with individual immigration and welfare cases. There are letters concerning the resettlement of various individuals from the U.K. to the United States, as well as correspondence with the Refugee Defence Committee, Tracy Philipps, the Scottish League for European Freedom, memoranda on Ukrainian POWs and a nominal roll of Ukrainian POWs in the U.K.

Envelope XIII

Block 3: Official Correspondence

Fiches 6-11 contain miscellaneous correspondence. For example, *Fiche* 6 contains correspondence with the Russian Refugees Relief Association, Essex Packers, material on the Ukrainian Choir "Burlaka," and the Cunard White Star Lines. *Fiche* 7 contains letters to the British Home Office, material on the threatened deportation of invalid Ukrainian POWs to Germany, a letter to Mrs. E. Roosevelt (11 April 1948), and information on the civilianization of Ukrainian POWs. *Fiche* 8 includes correspondence between Panchuk and Tracy Phillipps, material on EVW dependents still in Germany, and information on the immigration of Ukrainian POWs to Canada. *Fiche* 9 continues with this type of correspondence, including letters between Panchuk and Anthony Yaremovich, Panchuk to Mr. F.M. Chapman of the Ministry of Labour and National War Service,

and to Mr. W.A. Tucker, M.P. *Fiche* 10 has correspondence with Dr. O. Fundak, as well as letters to the UCC and to Mr. Joliffe of the Canadian Department of Mines and Resources. *Fiche* 11 contains letters to Dr. R. Smal-Stockyj, Dr. W. Gallan, and correspondence with the Tolstoi Creamery in Manitoba (1948).

Envelope XIV

Block 1: **File** Mr Salsky (August/September 1948)

Fiches 1–5 contain various correspondence written by the Executive Director of the AUGB, Mr. George Salsky. *Fiche* 1 concerns Ukrainian POWs, EVWs and emigration questions. *Fiche* 2 has material on Ukrainians in the Polish Resettlement Corps, letters to the Home Office (Aliens Department), Canada House (London), the newspaper “Ukrainian Thought,” travel documents for Ukrainian POWs, and the relationship between the AUGB and CURB. *Fiche* 3 includes correspondence with the Pan-American Ukrainian Committee, British Railways, the Federation of Poles in Great Britain, the War Office, and a report on G. Salsky’s interview with W. Krasniw. *Fiche* 4 has considerable material on individual cases, letters to John F. Stewart of the Scottish League for European Freedom, and correspondence with R.R. Stokes, M.P. *Fiche* 5 preserves correspondence with the UCC, the Commandant of POW Camp Victoria No. 85 in Suffolk, the Foreign Office and the American Embassy.

Envelope XV

Block 3: **File** 3–16, Embassies, Consulates and Legations

Fiches 1–3 contain AUGB correspondence with the Ukrainian community in Istanbul (Nikola Zabello), as well as letters to Chile, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, and Uruguay.

File 3–4–0, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

Fiches 3–5 contain correspondence dealing with such matters as the spiritual welfare of Ukrainian Voluntary Workers in Scotland, conditions at the Annsmuir Camp and the Lincoln House EVW hostel, on the suicide of a Ukrainian EVW at the Little Addington Hostel, and on the observance of Ukrainian Easter holidays.

Envelope XVI

Block 3: File 3-20, Memoranda and Reports

Fiche 1 and *Fiche 2* contain a variety of CURB, AUGB and Ukrainian Bureau reports and memoranda. *Fiche 1*, for example, has a copy of the Memoranda and Articles of Association of the Ukrainian Bureau and Central Office of Anglo-Ukrainian Clubs in Great Britain (16 April 1949), various reports of the Canadian Relief Mission for Ukrainian Victims of War (1946), aide-memoires on meetings with the Apostolic Delegate, memoranda to the British Foreign Secretary, Ernest Bevin, and the Articles of Association of the AUGB. There are also letters by T. Philipps and material on CURB and the voluntary repatriation of certain Ukrainians to Germany.

Envelope XVII

Block 3: File 3-17-1, International Refugee Organization, and File 3-20-5, Memoranda and Reports

Fiches 16-19 deal with social services organized by the AUGB, the collection of foodstuffs for the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), reports on the AUGB in 1950-52, the Winter Relief Campaign, questions pertaining to health insurance of AUGB members, letters on the condition of Vladimir de Korostovetz (1953), various claimants' requests, and some IRO material.

File 5-7-0 and File 5-9-0, Belgium and Italy

Fiches 19-20 contain letters between CURB and the Ukrainian Relief Committee in Belgium (N. Hrab), correspondence with Dmytro Andriievsky (1948), and various reports and statistics on Ukrainians in Belgium (1949).

Envelope XVIII

Block 5: Ukrainian Relief Committees Abroad

Fiche 1 contains letters between CURB and Mr. J. Trytiak, in Montreal, the UCRF, the Ukrainian Canadian Veterans' Association, and Panchuk to such Ukrainian Canadians as Dr. M. Mandryka and J. Karasevich. The material in this file shows considerable evidence of fire damage and of a subsequent attempt to preserve what was not burned by clipping the surviving papers.

Envelope XIX

Fiche 1 contains information on "Operation Jankala" and the question of supposed Ukrainian "war criminals." A considerable portion of this *fiche* is composed of various United Nations declarations and amendments on this issue.

Envelope XX

Block 3: **File** 3-5-0, Ministry of Labour, HQ

Fiches 11-15 contain correspondence on the civilianization of Ukrainian POWs, a report on an EVW who proved "unsatisfactory," movement of Ukrainian dependents of EVWs to England, repatriation of EVWs to Germany, and considerable correspondence on individual cases considered by the Ministry of Labour and National Service (1948).

Envelope XXI

Block 3: **File** 3-5-0, Ministry of Labour, HQ

Fiches 16-17 continue with material similar to that found on the previous *fiches* and contain correspondence, much of it in Ukrainian, regarding individual cases considered by the Ministry.

Envelope XXII

Block 3: **File** 3-5-0 and **File** 3-5-1, Ministry of Labour, HQ and Regional Offices

Fiches 1-4 contain CURB reports on visits to the Venezuelan Embassy (in the company of Dr. W. Gallan), material on individual cases, employment of experienced Ukrainians in forestry, and information on the Ukrainian Convalescent Home at Chiddingfold ("Invalids' Farm").

Fiches 4-5 contain Mr. Huzar's report on a visit to the Chatteris Gas Company near Cambridge (1949), problems with certain ex-POWS, and information on the future of three Ukrainian EVWs transferred to Germany.

Concluding Remarks

Systematic efforts aimed at preserving Ukrainian and Ukrainian-Canadian archival materials have only been initiated recently. Many documents of critical historical significance have already

been lost or destroyed. Recognizing this fact, the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies has initiated an archival preservation program. While saving a portion of AUGB's archives was not part of this process, this effort has confirmed the existence of collections requiring preservation and underlined the urgency of the situation. Even if original documents cannot be relocated permanently to suitable storage facilities, durable copies should be made. It is well known that there are other important collections being kept under unsatisfactory conditions. Establishing and maintaining the environmental and security conditions required for the preservation of archival materials is beyond the means of most Ukrainian organizations. Therefore, the transfer of such materials to professionally organized and managed repositories is imperative. Since many of these documents are irreplaceable, their loss would make it very difficult to undertake scholarly analyses of the Ukrainian experience in the diaspora.

References

W. Roman Petryshyn's dissertation, "Britain's Ukrainian Community: A Study of the Political Dimension in Ethnic Community Development," Department of Sociology, University of Bristol, England (1980), covers aspects of the history of Ukrainian community life in Great Britain.

An account of Ukrainian-Canadian refugee relief and resettlement operations can be found in *Heroes of Their Day: The Reminiscences of Bohdan Panchuk*, edited by L.Y. Luciuk (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1983).

The *G.R.B. Panchuk Collection* is preserved in the Archives of Ontario, Toronto. A preliminary description of this material was published in the *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 7 (1982), no. 1, by L.Y. Luciuk and Z. Zwarycz. A more detailed finding aid is available from the MHSO or the Archives of Ontario. The collection is closed to researchers at this time.

S.W. Frolick provides an account of CURB in "Saving the Displaced Persons: the Central Ukrainian Relief Bureau," mimeo. (Toronto, 1978).

Taped oral evidence pertaining to the documents is contained in the following interviews:

1. Teodor Danyliw, London, England, 4 August 1982.
2. Illya Dmytriw, London, England, 17 June 1982.

3. Michael Dobriansky, London, England, 21 June 1982.
4. S.W. Frolick, Toronto, Canada, 1 July 1981, 16–24 December 1983, and 4–6 January 1984.
5. O. Fundak, London, England, 4 August 1982.
6. Andrew Kostiuk, London, England, 19 June 1982.
7. H. Melnyk-Kaluzynska, London, England, 6 August 1982.
8. Ivan Rawluk, London, England, 16 June 1982.
9. George Salsky, Aylmer, Quebec, 16 September 1982.

These tapes are stored at the Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 43 Queen's Park Crescent East, Toronto, Ontario. Most are subject to restrictions, information on which is available from the MHSO.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies for logistical support. The Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain graciously allowed access to its archives. The Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine introduced me to the Ukrainian community in England. I am particularly thankful to the late Andriy Bandera and to Dr. Oleh Romanyshyn in this regard. Dr. Robert Harney and Ms. Paula Groenberg of the Multicultural History Society of Ontario provided support for the oral history research effort. In England, Volodymyr and Olya Lyczmanenko and Dr. and Mrs. Hugh Macdonald extended the hospitality of their homes and assisted with the removal of the AUGB archives. Financial support was provided by a doctoral fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Finally, I would like to thank Bohdan Panchuk, who alerted me to the existence and whereabouts of the AUGB archives.

Chernobyl and Nuclear Power in the USSR

David R. Marples

Analyzes the April 1986 nuclear accident at the Chernobyl plant in the context of the development of nuclear power in the USSR and Eastern Europe. Examines the nature and consequences of the disaster and comments on the economic and political repercussions of the event for Soviet society.

This edition available in Canada only.

xii, 228pp, cloth \$39.95, paper \$14.95

ISBN 920862-48-9 (cloth), 920862-50-0 (paper)

Order from the University of Toronto Press, 5201 Dufferin Street, Downsview, Ontario M3H 5T8

Published by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies in association with the Macmillan Press, London.

BOOK REVIEWS

OREST SUBTELNY, *DOMINATION OF EASTERN EUROPE—NATIVE NOBILITIES AND FOREIGN ABSOLUTISM, 1500–1715*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press; Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1986. xii, 270 pp.

Historical events appear at first glance as a bewildering kaleidoscope of disparate and often incomprehensible (i.e., illogical) human actions. Little wonder that finding similarities, formulating "regularities," or establishing a coherent pattern has always been particularly alluring to historians. Hence the appeal of comparative studies to detect similarities and of structural-functional analyses to bring out coherence and regularities. But in order to achieve their aims, such approaches to history must have recourse to other, more generalizing disciplines such as economics, sociology, and anthropology, to mention but the most popular ones. The danger for the historian is the mechanical transfer of the conclusions of these disciplines to his variegated factual material. Professor Subtelny has attempted to make sense of five major political events in Eastern Europe in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries with the help of a comparative and sociological methodology. In the process, however, he has not escaped some of the pitfalls inherent in such an approach.

The book's argument may be summarized as follows: in the course of the last decade of the seventeenth and the first of the early eighteenth century there occurred five major attempts at revolt on the part of local elites against the domination of foreign, absolutist powers. These were the efforts of Johann Reinhold von Patkul to wrest Livonia from Swedish control, Ivan Mazepa's design to gain Ukraine's independence from Peter the Great's Russia, Ferenc Rákóczy II's anti-Habsburg revolt, Dimitrie Cantemir's siding with Peter I against Moldavia's Ottoman overlord, and Stanisław Leszczyński's failure to replace August II of Saxony as King of Poland. These rebellions, Professor Subtelny believes, have so many traits in common that they can best be described and understood if seen as specific instances of an all-European, general socio-historical phenomenon: they are the East European variant of a set of events that occurred in Western Europe about half a century earlier and that had similar causes and etiology. Indeed, the emergence of "modern" Europe has been characterized by the coming into being and triumph of the centralist, absolutist state. Absolutism endeavored to institute the monopoly of power and political authority of the ruler by eliminating the leadership role played heretofore by the local nobilities.

The traditional nobilities, however, based their predominance not only on superior physical power and economic resources but also on a political culture

which Professor Subtelny labels “associative” and which stressed the values of group solidarity and regional autonomy. Not unexpectedly, the process of such “modernization” brought in its wake lengthy and serious conflicts between monarchs and nobilities, between the state and the estates. As the absolutist governments succeeded in securing their domination, the only way to resist left open to the local and regional nobilities was revolt and appeal to foreign powers. Such were, in Professor Subtelny’s opinion, the Catalan and Dutch revolts and the Fronde in the first half of the seventeenth century. It is this pattern that recurred, with some variations, of course, in Eastern Europe in the five cases listed. However, in these five instances regional resistance was to “foreign” absolutisms (of the Ottoman, Habsburg, Vasa, Romanov, and Wettin dynasties), and they became involved in international conflicts and themselves made appeals for foreign help. Consequently they could later be labelled alternatively as treason or national struggle.

The thesis is both suggestive and challenging. It does push the political events connected with the five revolts into a new light and reveal some common tendencies and patterns. Furthermore, the thesis has the merit of departing from the constricting perspective of nineteenth- and twentieth-century nationalisms, as well as providing useful qualifications to the generalizations of a “whig” historiography that considered the emergence of the centralized modern state preordained and desirable.

However, for one reviewer at least, the case made by Professor Subtelny is much weakened by some flaws in execution. To begin with, the book’s organization is rather unfortunate. Professor Subtelny deals *seriatim* with the socio-economic conditions, the historico-political framework, and the actual events of each of the the five revolts. The result is a mechanical listing and juxtaposition that reveals neither the development nor the interconnectedness of the events presented. Professor Subtelny relies almost exclusively on secondary literature, and naturally he has a firmer grip on some events (Ukraine, Poland) than others (Hungary, Livonia). However, one may at times question his uncritical reliance on some recent historiography. In particular I found his discussion of socio-economic matters, as well as his “comparisons” with Western European counterpart phenomena, to be rather superficial and indebted to questionable *marxisant* interpretations. More serious, in my opinion, is the absence of a serious analysis of the diplomatic context of the revolts. Professor Subtelny’s sketchy mention of this dimension does not do justice to the determining role played by the military and political interests of the great powers.

Last, but not least, the comparisons between the revolts and their backgrounds rest on somewhat simplistic sociological generalizations that stretch the evidence and leave no room for the complexities of time and place. This is particularly true of the military and administrative features of absolutism, which can no longer be viewed in as simple and global a way as Professor Subtelny does. Also I would add that an interpretation which argues for

similarities in behaviour patterns on the part of diverse social groups and individuals cannot ignore the specific cultural dimension in each case. After all, intellectual and spiritual norms set the limits of psychologically possible responses and define the basic values in whose light decisions are taken. Professor Subtelny only blandly states, without either elaborating or providing adequate evidence, that the nobilities valued “associations” and “autonomous” ways. But even in Eastern Europe the elite’s mental framework had been shaped, or at any rate affected, by the intellectual currents of Western Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There is no question that the “foreign absolutisms” involved in Professor Subtelny’s story had been much influenced by these currents, which could not but have played a role in the minds of the “rebel” leaders as well.

Professor Subtelny has been daring; he has had the courage to attempt a comparative analysis and interpretation of events that have been mired in the swamp of nationalist and whig historiography. He has drawn our attention to new and interesting facets that require further research. It is a pity that his own efforts cannot be termed conclusive or comprehensive enough to do justice to the important subject he has pinpointed.

Marc Raeff
Columbia University

J. ARCH GETTY, *ORIGINS OF THE GREAT PURGES: THE SOVIET COMMUNIST PARTY RECONSIDERED, 1933–1938*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1985. 275 pp.

Dr. Getty has performed a valuable service in re-examining a crucial period of Soviet history, for the mid-1930s were a time of social and political upheaval. Collectivization and industrialization completely transformed the social structure of Soviet society, while the purges eliminated most of the Bolshevik veterans in the Communist Party. This period has been traditionally described as one of advancing totalitarianism which resulted in the complete elimination of all forms of opposition to Stalin’s rule. Most historians, in relying on the personal recollections of survivors, have stressed the great tragedy of countless Old Bolsheviks and innocent citizens victimized by the secret police. Dr. Getty has attempted to challenge the prevailing interpretation by scrupulous adherence to primary sources and by examining the structural relations between regional party organizations and the centre in Moscow, as well as the functional aspects of periodic purges.

Dr. Getty has tried to bring the study of the 1930s back within traditional academic methodology by pointing out the problems of relying on reminiscences and hearsay to explain policy decisions by the party leadership. The NKVD

defector Orlov blamed Stalin for Kirov's assassination, and this spawned a whole theory of conflicts within the leadership in 1934 that is little supported by the evidence. Dr. Getty wishes to avoid the notorious unreliability of such accounts by restricting his empirical sources to the Soviet daily press, official documents and, most importantly, the Smolensk archives.

Whereas previous histories have painted a picture of permanent purges, rising in a crescendo and culminating in the Great Purge of 1936–8, Dr. Getty has stood everything on its head. He correctly points out that the Soviet term for "purge" is *chistka* (more accurately translated as "cleansing"), a process of expelling unreliable elements from the party. What we call the "Great Purge" has never been referred to by the Soviets in this manner; they usually call it *Ezhovshchina*. This is no scholastic distinction for Dr. Getty, but one that distinguishes between a process whose targets were drunken, slothful and corrupt party members and a series of trials of supposed traitors and oppositionists. The former process was aimed at clearing out the baggage accumulated by periodic mass recruitment drives and reached its peak in 1933. The trials themselves involved leading oppositionists and higher party functionaries, ignoring the rank-and-file party member to a large degree. In Dr. Getty's view, the purges were a separate episode and actually declined in their impact on the mass of the party.

The basis of Dr. Getty's interpretation is his analysis of the *chistka* of 1933, the Verification of Party Documents of 1935, and the Exchange of Party Documents of 1936. These three campaigns reveal tensions between the central party leadership and the local party secretaries. The Central Committee became displeased with the purely formal character of the review in 1933 and with the uncooperative attitude of the local party bosses. By 1935 the centre had introduced a new element into its attempt to control the regional organizations: the mass participation of rank-and-file members in a campaign of criticism and self-criticism of the local leadership. Yet this new approach did not overcome the problems of bureaucratic inertia and self-protection.

Dr. Getty relates these problems to policy disputes in the higher party leadership. Previous historians have interpreted these disputes as being between radicals and moderates, for example, between Molotov the proponent of higher rates of industrial growth and Ordzhonikidze the defender of moderate and realistic growth rates. Although Dr. Getty considers these disputes relevant, he places much more emphasis on the differences between the two known proponents of radicalism, the Leningrad party boss Zhdanov and the head of the Party Control Commission and secret police chief Ezhov. The former stressed the ideological and educational work needed to prepare proper party cadres and criticized the prevailing trend, which had transformed party activists into economic administrators. In contrast, Ezhov searched for "enemies of the people" within the party as the cause of all difficulties. As the party leadership proved unable to bring the local bosses into line, the two different and even conflicting radical policies converged into a ritual of mutual denunciation as the

secret police rounded up the middle and higher ranks of the party. Although the purges and *Ezhovshchina* had different origins, *Ezhovshchina* was the culmination of a process that included increasingly higher levels of the party apparatus, eventually extending even to the Politbureau.

The main theme of Dr. Getty's argument is that the party leadership had little control over what was happening on its periphery. Instead of increasing totalitarian control, the Soviet Union was characterized by anarchic administration buttressed by bureaucratic inertia and self-preservation, occasionally prodded by short-lived campaigns initiated by the centre. This interpretation complements other work by Sovietologists such as E. Zaleski, who analyzed the reactive and *ad hoc* nature of economic planning during this period. Certainly the party leadership recognized the dangers of local despotism, corruption and moral degeneracy, which were rife among the lower ranks. The purges were an integral response to this phenomenon and the party went to great lengths in searching for a foolproof approach to deal with this problem. Dr. Getty's contention is that the leadership finally understood that the rank-and-file member was not the ultimate cause of the problem and therefore increasingly curtailed mass expulsions, preferring to attack the middle and higher ranks of the party in a fruitless attempt to bring its bureaucratic machine under control. "Inefficiency, confusion, and local self-protection also meant that other campaigns (like the populist *kritika/samokritika* effort or the *Ezhovshchina*) could easily run out of control."

While it should be recognized that Dr. Getty's interpretation does provide a sophisticated alternative explanation to the totalitarian school of thought, he has overreached himself in asserting that he has discovered the "origins" of the Great Purges. Although he himself admits that other factors, such as Stalin's personality and the promotion of a communist technical intelligentsia, were important, his argument is nevertheless flawed by its narrow focus. The foundation of his analysis rests on the documents contained in the Smolensk archive, which provide him with a quantitative estimate of those expelled for moral reasons as opposed to those expelled for political deviation. These, certainly, must be taken with a grain of salt. While it must be admitted that the majority were not expelled for oppositionist activity, there is no way of surmising to what degree the categories "class-alien elements who hid their origins from the party" or "untrustworthy betrayers of party interests" conceal expulsions of party members who actively or passively opposed certain party policies. During the 1930s the party was faced not only with moral degeneracy but, more importantly, with mass opposition to collectivization and draconian labour laws. This was never admitted by the party, which always referred to such opposition in Orwellian language. The character of this opposition within the party is another matter, but by taking the party's definition at face value, Dr. Getty has avoided the problem, not clarified it.

Even within his analysis of regional-centre conflict, Dr. Getty's reliance on the Smolensk archive results in a distorted view of the purges. There are

many indications that other important regions underwent a process different from the one which Dr. Getty describes. The only possible implication of Dr. Getty's analysis is that regional-centre conflict stemmed from a policy dispute over the fulfillment of the purging process. Yet there existed much more serious policy disputes involving the central questions of the day. The years 1932-3 saw the devastating results of the policy of collectivization. As famine raged over the countryside in Ukraine and the North Caucasus, the local party leaderships actively opposed the central leadership's grain quotas. In Ukraine during 1933 this resistance was overcome with the appointment of Postyshev as second secretary and the resulting purge of more than half the district party secretaries. Obviously, this purge of "petty-bourgeois" elements was not aimed at moral degeneracy, but concealed an attack against the national leadership of the Communist Party of Ukraine and was inextricably connected with major policy issues. The purge within the party apparatus coincided with the decimation of cultural and intellectual institutions and a whole series of trials of supposedly underground nationalist organizations. The accusations by leading party figures that Skrypnyk, who had been a long-time supporter of the Stalin tendency, was guilty of concealing nationalist deviations only strengthen the interpretation that the trials and purges of the early 1930s in Ukraine were politically motivated and interdependent and that the purges were not merely a non-ideological "cleansing."

Certainly, only a comparative analysis of the purges in different regions can reveal the true character of this decade. Too much attention has been focused on the principal leaders of the opposition and their fate, while the contribution of regional and non-Russian national leaders has been ignored. A fuller understanding of policy debates and concealed tensions within the party apparatus still awaits us. Notwithstanding its defects, Dr. Getty's contribution provides an important balance in the study of this period by its emphasis on the structural and functional aspects of policy debates and institutional upheavals. It is to be hoped that other scholars will be motivated to continue this line of research.

Bohdan Somchynsky
University of Glasgow

BOHDAN S. KORDAN and LUBOMYR Y. LUCIUK, *A DELICATE AND DIFFICULT QUESTION: DOCUMENTS IN THE HISTORY OF UKRAINIANS IN CANADA*. Kingston, Ont.: Limestone Press, 1986. 174 pp.

Ostensibly, the fifty-five documents assembled in this tome are meant, according to the preface, to show "the nature of Ukrainian identity in Canada, and . . . the state's role in shaping the nature of ethnic identity" (p. v). Gathered from various governmental and private archives in Canada and the United States, these documents—letters and memoranda (some by RCMP and OSS spies) within the federal government and between it and representatives of the Ukrainian community, public speeches, and editorials from the Ukrainian-Canadian press—actually offer, because of their very nature, more information on public policy formation than they do about ethnic identity. As such, they fall short of meeting the compilers' aim of illustrating how the Ukrainian Canadian "ethnic community has been worn down and altered through its unequal interaction with the state and its own internal divisiveness" (p. v). The collection is really the record of a case study in unsuccessful interest-group activity: to be effective in influencing policy, a group must first be seen by government as legitimate; Ukrainian ethnicity, these documents tell us, has not been perceived as a legitimate interest.

This collection of documents is particularly effective in exposing the resistance of officials in the Department of External Affairs not only to domestic public pressure regarding the direction of foreign policy, but most especially to the interests of the Ukrainian community. In these matters the Department, as revealed in the records culled here from its own archives, seemed to be guided by three precepts: don't rock the boat; don't offend the Russians; and don't interfere in External's affairs—Ukraine may not be (nor ever in the past have been) sovereign, but External has been, is and ever will be. For these officials Ukrainian matters were in a separate category: inconvenient, unnecessary, and—most important—illegitimate.

For example, in 1952 the Ukrainian Canadian Committee made a request to be recognized "as an authoritative representative body of the Ukrainian democratic group in Canada." This was rejected because, according to External's advice, "Government recognition in the form requested is not given to private organizations in Canada" (p. 157). The official concerned conveniently forgot about the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Canadian Bar Association, the Canadian Medical Association, and the host of other pressure groups which are not only recognized but some of them even funded by the government and live a comfortable symbiotic life on the boundary between bureaucracy and society in what has been called our corporatist-style political system. In 1962, Norman Robertson rejected recognition of the Ukrainian SSR in part because "the Ukraine has had no separate national existence since the 17th century" (p. 172). The fact that virtually the same statement could have applied equally well at that moment to such recognized states as Norway,

Czechoslovakia, and Poland did not seem to clutter his mind.

Canadian government policy was thus fashioned on the basis of inflexible bureaucrats' prejudices (evidently passed on down the years by plagiarism, so we cannot even give these bureaucrats credit for originality in their prejudices). "It is hard to know how much nationalist sentiment persists in the Ukraine," Undersecretary Robertson wrote laconically to the Secretary of State in 1962, implying that its level was commonly overstated. This on the eve of the appointment of Shelest as First Secretary. It is extraordinary that officials whose primary task was the implementation of foreign policy should have become so involved in the pros and cons of the historical definition of a particular national identity and the strength of nationalism among that group. Readers sensitive to this question will not likely enjoy the patronizing tones used by these influential (or at least self-important) mandarins. In this way, the volume under review may be able to succeed in spite of its own limitations. It may thus be an antidote to the century-long process during which the Ukrainian-Canadian identity has been "worn down . . . through its unequal interaction with the state." In any case, it will serve well in courses on the history of Ukrainians in Canada as supplementary reading, forming the basis for discussion and giving students first-hand contact with important historical materials that have not been already predigested.

There are two apparent shortcomings to this collection. One of these is conceptual, the other editorial. (There are also a good dozen typographical errors, but the type is so small that they are not really noticeable.) It is puzzling that Kordan and Luciuk characterize Canadian society as ethnic, but not the Canadian state. Surely both are infused with ethnicity. Otherwise the rejection by the Canadian government of political pressure from particular ethnic groups is inexplicable. Thus the compilers find it "paradoxical" (p. 11) that the Canadian government should, particularly at the height of the cold war, have turned aside the Ukrainian Canadian Committee's lobbying on behalf of the independence of Ukraine. The state is not neutral in terms of ethnic coloration; in the period in question the Canadian government was distinctly Anglo-Saxon and the Department of External Affairs even more so. Why did not officials merely take the position that the Canadian government could not challenge the integrity of the USSR, any more than it would tolerate a challenge to its own integrity? Why did they allow themselves, as mentioned, to be drawn into the debate on Ukrainian identity if they and the state were neutral?

On the editorial side, this reviewer would have preferred some elaboration to the annotations explaining the historical context for each document. This would have made the collection more self-contained as an historical source and less fragmentary. One wonders, for instance, what happened after the Ukrainian Socialist Alliance was formed in 1907—did it survive? When an Edmonton MP advocated rescinding the War-Time Elections Act of 1917, was he influential? When UNF President Volodymyr Kossar wrote to O.D. Skelton in 1939 regarding Ukrainian independence, what was the response? When Lord

Tweedsmuir flattered the Ukrainians in 1936, and his "remarks were perceived as official legitimization for ethnic distinctiveness within Canada" (p. 63), was this perception accurate? All of which suggests that the eventual book presumably yet to be written by one or other of the compilers of this collection and based on these documents will prove to be fuller, more interesting, and more significant than the documents standing alone as they do here.

Bohdan Harasymiw
University of Calgary

STUDIA UCRAINICA 2 (1984). Editorial board: Theofil Kis, Irene R. Makaryk, Bohdan Plaskacz, Boris Schneider, Paul Yuzyk. University of Ottawa Ukrainian Studies, No. 5. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1984. 278 pp.

Like its predecessor, *Studia Ucrainica* 1 (1978), this volume is a multidisciplinary collection of essays with a sprinkling of other materials: reviews, documents and translations. The articles are arranged in four sections of unequal length, entitled, respectively, "Literature" (eight items), "The Arts" and "Philology" (one item each), and "History" (five items).

In the literature section, the figure of Oles Berdnyk has special prominence: Olena Sasiuk's article, "The Sky Blue Blacksmith: Genre and Motif in Berdnyk," is augmented by her biographical sketch, Kenneth Paskurak's translation into English of Berdnyk's letter to Pope John Paul II, and Maria Gerych-Bussièrè's translation of poems from *Blakytnyi koval* into French. The biographical sketch highlights the fact that we know very little about Berdnyk's life before he achieved fame—and, in the West, a certain fashionableness—as a dissident; the information presented does not go beyond what had been marshalled by, for example, Jurij Dobczansky (*Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies* 4 (1979), no. 1, 77–8) or Iwan Hrynioch (*Mitteilungen* 17 (1980), 71–8). Berdnyk's extraordinary missive to the Pope, on the other hand, is a document of considerable interest. It is the product of an evolution which many a Romantic had traversed before Berdnyk: in it, by transcending an earlier, mystical, but essentially secular view of nature and history as realms in which man's godliness can reveal itself, Berdnyk embarks on a path toward traditional Christian religiosity. He even espouses a certain dedication to the Church as an institution: it is an authority capable of promoting two of his favourite ideas, the spiritual nation and alternative (non-exploitative) evolution.

Olena Sasiuk's article contributes to our knowledge of the variety of genres whose traces are evident in Berdnyk's prose: the ghost story, the historical, gothic, or detective novel, and the fairy tale. It is difficult to concede, however, that a proliferation of genre markers, together with an "organic integration of motifs," are themselves evidence of Berdnyk's "mastery of the craft of fiction" (p. 15). Berdnyk's narrative competence still awaits critical evaluation, but it has been the impression of this reviewer that Berdnyk

experiences difficulty in telling a story of any length—a difficulty which results in such generic hybrids as book-length “novels” that are actually series of novellas or short stories.

Whether by chance or design, most of the other essays on literature are united by a comparativist methodology of the traditional style: they document thematic and formal similarities between works, often with the aim of mutual elucidation, and sometimes in order to establish a relationship of influence. Thus, Irene Makaryk, in her study of the theme of psychic murder in Lesia Ukrainka's *Blakytna troianda*, unveils parallels to the drama of Strindberg. Mainly textual in their orientation are the studies of George A. Perfecky, who examines the nature of the dependence of the *Bykovets Chronicle* on the Galician-Volynian Chronicle; Volodymyr Shelest, who reflects on the formulaic correspondence between the *Lay of Ihor's Campaign* and the Mahabharata, and discusses their implications for the medieval epic genre; Diane Nemeč-Ignashev, who reinstates Hryhorii Kvitka-Osnovianenko's *Priezzhi iz stolitsy* (1827) in the family tree of Gogol's *Revizor*; and Romana Bahrij-Pikulyk, whose meticulously documented article demonstrates two contrasting uses of Ukrainian historical and folkloric sources—Gogol's romantic exploitation of such materials in *Taras Bulba* and Panteleimon Kulish's utilization of similar sources within the framework of his critical and realistic aesthetics.

As several of the authors note, investigations such as these do not have as their object the literary work as a work of art; nor, one should add, does their method focus attention on the communicative and argumentative function of literature in its historical context. The latter goal is, however, less remote from the concerns of two studies on the refunctioning of myths in literature: Boris Schneider's “Doktor Faust i ukrainska radianska literatura” and Iaroslav Rozumnyi's “Mity u poezii Leonida Kyselova.” Schneider's essay depicts, together with numerous other renderings of the Faust figure and the Faustian quest, the inversion of the positive (progressive, rebellious) Goethean Faust into a figure of bourgeois obscurantism (Tychyna in the 1920s), capitalist dehumanization (Oleksa Vlyzko in the 1930s), and triumphant evil (Sava Holovanivsky in the 1960s). Rozumnyi, who selects for treatment those of Kyselov's myths which have a social and historiosophical content, observes three approaches to myth in the poet's work: reinterpretation (Prometheus, Don Juan), destruction (Andrei Rublev, Stepan Razin, Peter I), and reaffirmation (Galileo, Shevchenko, the Shevchenkian mother and child).

The historical section of the collection contains two articles on Ukrainian participation in the parliamentary bodies that were established in the last, constitutional phases of the tsarist and Habsburg empires: Oleh W. Gerus writes on the Ukrainian question in the Russian Duma, 1906–17, while Theodore B. Ciuciura considers the Western Ukrainian situation in “Galicia and Bukovina as Austrian Crown-Provinces: Ukrainian Experience in Representative Institutions, 1861–1918.” Two studies deal with the (at times colourful) early history of Ukrainians in North America: Paul Yuzyk's “The Expansion of the Russian

Orthodox Church among the Ukrainians in North America to 1918” and John C. Lehr’s “The Role of Clifford Sifton in Ukrainian Immigration to Canada 1896–1905.” Roman Serbyn analyzes data on Kiev University’s enrolments in 1858–63 and shows that the absolute majority of students were Right-Bank Polish nobles; the university’s primary political role, evidently, was to russify them. Figures on the participation of Kiev’s Ukrainian students in the Saturday schools movement throw light on the prominent part played by populist sentiment in Ukrainian student activism. The sole article in the section dedicated to the arts, written jointly by Myroslaw Antonowycz and Irene Makaryk, is also historical in character; it brings together information from many primary and secondary sources to survey Ukrainian influence on Russian church music from the seventeenth to the early twentieth century.

John A. Barnstead’s “Ambiguities in the Universal Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy: The Ukrainian Evidence” uses Ukrainian examples to take issue with, and refine, the definition of the relative clause advanced by Keenan and Comrie (*Linguistic Inquiry*, 1977). The only linguistic contribution to the collection, this article differs from the others by appealing to a strictly specialized reader.

Studia Ucrainica 2 is a handsomely presented volume, but it would have gained from a stricter control of printer’s errors—the repetition of lines (p. 14), an incorrect running head (p. 139), the confusion of fonts (p. 150) and the omission of some translations of Ukrainian text in Barnstead’s article (pp. 146, 149, 154). More painstaking editing and proofreading should have eliminated such deviations from the 1928 orthographic convention as “Hete” (=Goethe), “faustiana,” and gen. sg. “partiinosti (especially as the Kiev orthography is not adhered to systematically either), not to mention such infelicities as “svobodnoi” (p. 34), “za zdalehid” (p. 45), or “poet transformuvav Shevchenko (p. 77). It is not clear why, in Diane Nemeč-Ignashev’s article, Ukrainian personal and place names have been transliterated from the Russian spelling (“Grigorii Kvitka-Osnovianenko,” “O.I. Gonchar,” “Khar’kov”), nor why, in two successive footnotes, the same publishing house is transliterated once as “Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn’oi literary” and once as “Derzhavne vydavnyctvo xudozhnoi literary” (p. 89).

These are, of course, technical details which detract only marginally from this generally appealing and useful volume.

The present reviewer found the section of *Studia Ucrainica 2* dedicated to his own discipline, literary scholarship, rewarding as much for the often illuminating insights provided by some essays as for the prudent and well-documented demonstration of hypotheses that is characteristic of others. And while it would be difficult, not to say impertinent, to offer a judgement on the scholarly merit of the other essays in this multidisciplinary collection, this reviewer read them with interest and profit.

Marko Pavlyshyn
Monash University

YAR SLAVUTYCH, *ANOTOVANA BIBLIOHRAFIIA UKRAINSKOI LITERATURY V KANADI (KANADSKI KNYZHKOVI VYDANNIA 1908–1985)*. 2d enlarged ed. Edmonton: Slavuta, 1986. 155 pp. With added supplement: *BIBLIOHRAFIIA PYSAN PRO IARA SLAVUTYCHA (1978–1985)*. Compiled by Vira Slavutych. 2d enlarged ed. Edmonton: Slavuta, 1986. 23 pp.

This reference book is Yar Slavutych's latest contribution to the study of Ukrainian-Canadian literature. The prolific poet, publisher, critic and scholar (recently retired from the University of Alberta) is well known as the author of numerous articles and pamphlets on the subject of Ukrainian writing in Canada. Indeed, he is one of the few people committed to doing research in this field, so it is not surprising that his annotated bibliography is an inaugural effort.

The listings are organized by author or title (the latter in the case of anonymous works, collections and anthologies), both of which are most easily located by using the index. Material is further grouped according to genre under such headings as "Poetry," "Prose," "Dramaturgy," and "Memoirs." The alphabetically arranged entries contain pertinent dates (birth, year of arrival in Canada, death), pen-names, alternate spellings, and occasional critical sources. Cited works are presented in order of their year of publication, and relevant details are provided when deemed helpful by the compiler. A respected authority on the Ukrainian language, Slavutych offers his evaluation of the linguistic quality and literary merit of many of the works, his terse remarks somewhat resembling a teacher's comments on a report card. Although not everyone will agree with all of his assessments, they do give a general indication of the technical sophistication of various works and authors.

The second edition corrects mistakes made in the first (mostly typographical errors) and contains several new entries. As Slavutych himself acknowledges in the introduction, his catalogue is undoubtedly incomplete despite efforts to be as thorough as possible in his scouring of different libraries. In fact, some publications from the pioneer era are probably lost forever, leaving few, if any, traces behind them. (A search of publishers' catalogues, ads, and articles in the press would more than likely turn up some interesting omissions.) Readers are requested to volunteer any information they might have regarding books that escaped the compiler's attention.

One title conspicuously overlooked in the section dealing with criticism and literary history is Peter Krawchuk's monograph on Ukrainian Canadian theatre, *Nasha stsena* (published in Toronto by Kobzar Press in 1981), which has been available in English since 1984. A handful of English-language works with Ukrainian themes could also legitimately have been included, as they fall within the stated selection criteria of the bibliography. Among them are George Ryga's *A Letter to My Son* (1984), Andrew Sucknaski's *In the Name of Narid* (1981), and Ted Galay's plays *After Baba's Funeral* (1981) and *Sweet and*

Sour Pickles (1983). At the same time, listing Mary Paximadis's book, *Look Who's Coming: The Wachna Story*, in the prose section somewhat stretches the definition of fiction. The work more properly belongs in the realm of non-fiction, which unfortunately is not covered in the bibliography.

One can think of many ways to improve on this first attempt to document Ukrainian literary activity in the New World. Sections on translations and Ukrainian classics issued under Canadian imprints would reveal much about the interests and tastes of immigrant publishers and shed light on the range of literature available to Ukrainian readers. Furthermore, by restricting his focus to books printed in Canada, Slavutych gives us only a partial picture of the émigré literary milieu. Entries on authors could be rounded out to include titles that appeared outside Canada (in Ukraine or elsewhere), thereby providing a better indication of their output and accomplishments. And surely Soviet Ukrainian books on emigrant literature such as *Poety Kanady* (1958), *Ukrainska literatura v Kanadi* (1964), and *Ukrainski kanadski pysmennyky* (1971) logically belong in a reference work that is of primary interest to students of Ukrainian-Canadian literature.

The main part of the bibliography is followed by a supplementary listing of works written about Yar Slavutych in the period 1978–85. Compiled by his wife, Vira, this catalogue will be an invaluable source for anyone wishing to add to it with an article of his own. If only such detail could be lavished on all the authors represented in the bibliography! But such a massive undertaking is obviously a chore for a more definitive bibliography to be compiled sometime in the future.

Finally, if each entry were expanded to include details about graphic design (cover art and illustrations) and press runs (where available), the compilation could serve as the basis for a study of the history of Ukrainian printing in Canada. Similarly, one might also want to note works on specific themes (i.e., immigrant perceptions of the new land, attitudes toward the old country) for the benefit of comparativists and Ukrainian Canadianists. But all these suggestions fall outside the stated scope of the Slavutych bibliography, which is the product of a more modest vision and limited resources.

To his credit, Slavutych is meticulous in his recording of factual information, leaving nothing to chance or guesswork. If he is unsure of something, he indicates as much with a question mark, and if he is utilizing a secondary source he is careful to note, "*Ne bachyv.*" And when he engages in educated speculation, he places the material in square brackets, thus avoiding the pitfalls that plague so much of the work of others who have worked in this field (Marunchak, Mandryka). Whatever its shortcomings, we can be grateful to Yar Slavutych for producing the first reliable reference work on Ukrainian writing in Canada.

Jars Balan
Edmonton

The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture 1750-1850

By David Saunders

Based on original research in the archives of Moscow and Leningrad, this study sheds new light on the role played in Russian cultural development by those Ukrainians who chose to identify themselves with the Russian Empire.

x, 415pp., cloth \$19.95, paper \$14.95.
ISBN 920862-32-2 (cloth), 920862-34-9
(paper).

The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia: 1815-1849

By Jan Kozik

Edited and with an Introduction by
Lawrence D. Orton.

Analyzes the Ukrainian national revival in Galicia in the early nineteenth century, and the revolution of 1848 in eastern Galicia.

xx, 498pp., cloth \$29.95, paper \$19.95.
ISBN 920862-40-3 (cloth), 920862-28-4
(paper).

*The above books may be ordered from
the University of Toronto Press, Distribu-
tion Department, 5201 Dufferin Street,
Downsview, Ontario M3H 5T8.*

PEREIASLAV 1654: A Historiographical Study

By John Basarab

The Treaty of Pereiaslav of 1654 between Ukraine and Russia was a turning point in the history of Ukraine. Yet what actually happened at Pereiaslav remains a contentious issue. Did Ukrainians accept the tsar as their sovereign? Or was it rather a treaty among equals soon to be broken by the Russian side? Dr. Basarab gives the most thorough examination of the interpretations of Pereiaslav to date.

322 pages, cloth \$19.95

Order from:

University of Toronto Press,
5201 Dufferin Street, Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3H 5T8.

Published by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta



UKRAINIAN DUMY

Introduction by N.K. Moyle
Translated by George Tarnawsky
and Patricia Kilina

The *dumy*— lyrical epics based on sixteenth and seventeenth-century historical events and performed by wandering minstrels to a musical accompaniment — are widely regarded as an especially important achievement of Ukrainian oral literature. They are presented in this volume with originals and translations *en face* by the poets George Tarnawsky and Patricia Kilina.

219 pages, paper \$5.95

Order from University of Toronto Press,
5201 Dufferin Street, Downsview, Ontario,
M3H 5T8, Canada.

Published by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies

UKRAINSKA USNA SLOVESNIST

(Ukrainian Oral Literature)



By Filiaret Kolessa

First published in 1938, this work has long been out of print. This edition, augmented with an introduction by Mykola Mushynka, a Ukrainian folklorist from eastern Slovakia, presents a summary of the life and works of Kolessa as an ethnomusicologist and folklorist. The volume is an extensive survey—from the pre-Christian era to the mid-1930s—of Ukrainian folklore. Kolessa's comprehensive treatment of genre makes it a classic in its field.

702 pages, paper \$14.95

Send order to:

University of Toronto Press
5201 Dufferin Street
Downsview, Ontario Canada M3H 5T8

*Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
Research Reports*

- 1 Shirley Zaporzan
Film and the Ukrainians in Canada 1921-1980
1982 xv, 76 pp. \$8.00
- 2 Yury Boshyk and Boris Balan
*Political Refugees and "Displaced Persons,"
1945-1954*
1982 xl, 424 pp. \$25.00
- 3 Alan Rutkowski and Nadia Cyncar
*Ukrainian Serials: A Checklist of Ukrainian Journals,
Periodicals and Newspapers in the University of
Alberta Library*
1983 vi, 62 pp. \$7.00
- 4 W. Roman Petryshyn and Natalia Chomiak
*Political Writings of Post-World War Two Ukrainian
Emigres: Annotated Bibliography and Guide to
Research*
1984 xxvi, 297 pp. \$19.00
- 5 Alan Rutkowski and Nadia Cyncar
*Ukrainica on Microform: A Checklist of Non-serial
Publications in the University of Alberta Library*
1984 91 pp. \$8.00
- 6 John-Paul Himka and Frances A. Swyripa
Sources for Researching Ukrainian Family History
1984 37 pp. \$5.00
- 7 Frances A. Swyripa and Andrij Makuch
*Ukrainian Canadian Content in the Newspaper
Svoboda 1893-1904*
1985 157 pp. \$11.00
- 8 Frances A. Swyripa
*Guide to Ukrainian Canadian Newspapers, Periodicals
and Calendar-Almanacs 1903-1970*
1985 xv, 121 pp. \$11.00

- 9 Bohdan S. Kordan
Ukrainians and the 1981 Canada Census: A Data Handbook
 1985 222 pp. \$14.00
- 10 Bohdan S. Kordan
Ukrainian Community Needs-Assessment Study: Prairie Region
 1985 33 pp. \$5.00
- 11 Frances A. Swyripa
Oral Sources for Researching Ukrainian Canadians: A Survey of Interviews, Lectures and Programmes Recorded to December 1980
 1985 434 pp. \$23.00
- 12 Dennis Sowtis and Myron Momryk
The Olena Kysilewska Collection
 1985 36 pp. \$5.00
- 13 Dennis Sowtis and Myron Momryk
The Kateryna Antonovych Collection
 1985 28 pp. \$5.00
- 14 Mariia Dytyniak
Ukrainski kompozytory: Bio-bibliohrafichniy dovidnyk
 1986 160 pp. \$11.00

Send Orders to:

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
 352 Athabasca Hall
 University of Alberta
 Edmonton, Alberta
 Canada T6G 2E8



**POLITICS AND
SOCIETY IN
SOVIET UKRAINE**

1953-1980

By Borys Lewytzkyj

Perhaps the most authoritative English-language work on the period to date. Encompasses Soviet Ukraine from the death of Stalin to Shcherbytsky's rule as first party secretary. A final chapter on Society examines the economy, religion and the continuing Russification of Ukrainian society by the Soviet regime.
219 pages, cloth \$14.95 paper \$6.95

Order from:
University of Toronto Press,
5201 Dufferin Street, Downsview, Ontario,
Canada M3H 5T8
Published by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies,
University of Alberta

***A catalogue of CIUS
publications may be
obtained from:***

**CANADIAN
INSTITUTE
OF
UKRAINIAN
STUDIES**

352 Athabasca Hall
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada
T6G 2E8
Tel. (403) 432-2972

TO THOSE WISHING TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

All contributions must be submitted in three copies and double-spaced throughout. Footnotes should be placed at the end of the manuscript. The modified Library of Congress system of Cyrillic transliteration should be used (with the exception of linguistic articles).

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 University of Chicago Press *Manual of Style* should be consulted. Authors should send a short academic biography with their submissions. 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.

A TABLE OF TRANSLITERATION (Modified Library of Congress)

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

