

JOURNAL

OF UKRAINIAN GRADUATE STUDIES

Maxim Tarnawsky: An Existential Reading of Pidmohyl'ny's *Misto*

Mykola Bazhan: Six Unknown Poems

Жан-Поль Химка: Український соціалізм у Галичині

Vasyl Lisovy: A Critique of Technocratic Totalitarianism

Alexander Motyl: The Soviet Union through the Eyes of the
New York Times

Reviews

Letters

7
FALL 1979

ЖУРНАЛ
ВИЩИХ УКРАЇНОЗНАВЧИХ СТУДІЙ

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

University of Toronto

MARCO CARYNNYK

VIVIAN OLENDER

NADIA DIAKUN

ROMAN SENKUS, *Managing Editor*

FACULTY ADVISOR: Professor GEORGE S. N. LUCKYJ

EDITORIAL BOARD: J. Marko Bojcun, *York University* • Yury Boshyk, *University of Toronto* • Konstantin Huytan, *University of Manitoba* • Oleh Ihnytzkyj, *Harvard University* • Bohdan Krawchenko, *University of Alberta* • George Liber, *Columbia University* • Andriy Makuch, *University of Alberta* • Bohdan Mytrowytsch, *Université de Paris* • Professor Peter J. Potichnyj, *McMaster University* • Professor Ivan L. Rudnytsky, *University of Alberta* • Professor Orest H. T. Rudzik, *University of Toronto* • Professor Roman Serbyn, *Université du Québec à Montréal* • Myroslav Shkandrij, *University of Calgary* • Professor Danylo H. Struk, *University of Toronto*.

The *Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies* is published semiannually, in the spring and fall, by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. Individual subscriptions are \$5.00 per year, including postage. Cheques and money orders are payable in Canadian or American funds only to Journal of Ukrainian Graduate 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 translated poetry and prose, documents, information, book reviews, and journalistic articles of a problem-oriented, controversial nature. Those wishing to submit manuscripts should observe the guidelines on the inside back cover.

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

Manuscripts, books for review, and all correspondence regarding subscriptions, changes of address, and editorial matters should be sent to: *Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, M5S 1A1.*

© 1979 by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.

Printed by Harmony Printing Limited, Toronto, Canada.

ISSN 0701-1792

ARTICLES

<i>Maxim Tarnawsky: "Nevtomnyi honets v maibutnie": An Existential Reading of Valeriiian Pidmohylny's Misto</i>	3
<i>Mykola Bazhan: Six Unknown Poems, compiled and introduced by Oleh S. Ilnytskyj</i>	20
<i>Жан-Поль Хумка: Український соціалізм у Галичині. (До розколу в Радикальній Партії 1899 р.)</i>	33
<i>Vasyl Lisovy: A Critique of Technocratic Totalitarianism, introduced and translated by M. K. Petryshyn</i>	52
<i>Plea for Lisovy</i>	67
<i>Alexander Motyl: The Soviet Union through the Eyes of the New York Times</i>	69

REVIEWS

<i>Taras Hunczak, ed. The Ukraine, 1917-1921: A Study in Revolution (Steven L. Guthier)</i>	83
<i>Dietrich Neufeld. A Russian Dance of Death: Revolution and Civil War in the Ukraine and</i>	
<i>Michael Palij. The Anarchism of Nestor Makhno, 1918-1921: An Aspect of the Ukrainian Revolution (Michael Malet)</i>	85
<i>František Silnický. Natsionalnaia politika KPSS v period s 1917 po 1922 god and</i>	
<i>Iwan Majstrenko. Natsionalnaia politika KPSS v ee istoricheskoy razvitii (James E. Mace)</i>	90
<i>Oleksander Semenenko. Kharkiv, Kharkiv . . . (Myroslav Shkandrij)</i>	94
<i>Dokiiia Humenna. Mynule plyve v pryideshnie: rozpovid pro Trypillia (Roman Zurba)</i>	98
<i>Eugene W. Fedorenko and Pawlo Malar, eds. Khrestomatiia z ukrainskoi literatury xx storichchia (Romana Bahrij Pikulyk)</i>	101
<i>Ivan Franko. Fox Mykyta. Trans. Bohdan Melnyk (Nadia O. Diakun)</i>	105
<i>Перечитуючи книжку перекладів українських поезій Стенлі Куніца (Остап Тарнавський)</i>	107
LETTERS	113
BOOKS RECEIVED	116

CONTRIBUTORS

JOHN-PAUL HIMKA is visiting assistant professor at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

OLEH S. ILNYTZKYJ is a Ph.D. candidate in Ukrainian literature at Harvard University and is currently teaching courses in Ukrainian language, literature, and culture at the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.

ALEXANDER MOTYL has a Master's degree in International Affairs and a Certificate in East Central Europe from Columbia University. Currently he is involved in preparing Volodymyr Vynnychenko's diary for publication by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. His book, *The Turn to the Right: The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian Nationalism, 1919-1929*, will be published in 1980.

MAXIM TARNAWSKY is a Ph.D. candidate in comparative literature at Harvard University.

M. K. PETRYSHYN has a Master of Social Science degree from the University of Birmingham and is presently studying law at the University of Alberta.

“NEVTOMNYI HONETS V MAIBUTNIE”: AN EXISTENTIAL READING OF VALERIIAN PIDMOHYLNY'S *MISTO*

When Valeriian Pidmohylny's *Misto* first appeared in 1928, the existential novel had not yet disturbed the vocabulary of literary criticism, and there is certainly nothing unusual in the fact that critical opinion did not connect Pidmohylny with his existential predecessors and contemporaries. What is surprising, however, is the almost complete failure of contemporary critics and reviewers to make any sense of the novel. Pidmohylny's *Misto* is a complex work that does not lend itself to simple analysis, but it is not so chaotic as to defy intelligent interpretation. Such an interpretation, however, requires a sensitive treatment of the novel on its own terms.

The early reviews of Pidmohylny's novel must be understood in the context of a particular literary and political climate. The late 1920s and early 1930s were a period of turbulent change in Soviet Ukraine. The relative political freedom of the twenties was gradually being replaced with the repression of the Stalin era. Although the political situation did not reach a crisis until 1933, the atmosphere of the late twenties anticipated the future course of events. Thus, while the reviewers expressed various (usually positive) opinions of Pidmohylny's technical skill as a writer, they invariably condemned the novel on ideological grounds. These condemnations ranged from mild chastisement for the author's inability to portray actual social problems¹ to sharp attacks on the subjectivism and individualism of the novel (“De masy?, kult heroia!”),² as well as virulent personal attacks on Pidmohylny and critics who refused to attack him.³ Nonetheless, *Misto* was published in Ukraine (Kharkiv: Knyhospilka, 1928). On a previous occasion Pidmohylny had turned to west-European publishers after being refused publication by Soviet authorities.⁴

¹ Mykhailo Mohyliansky, “Ni mista, ni sela . . . (Z pryvodu romanu Pidmohylnoho: ‘Misto’),” *Chervonyi shliakh*, 1929, no. 5-6, pp. 273-5.

² L. Pidhainy, review of *Misto*, *Literaturna hazeta*, 13 June 1928.

³ H. Tkachenko, M. Saiko, and D. Kosaryk-Kovalenko—Brygada, review of Petro Kolesnyk, “Valeriian Pidmohylny,” *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia*, 1932, no. 4, pp. 82-5.

⁴ Cf. afterword by H. Kostiuk in V. Pidmohylny, *Misto* (New York, 1954), pp. 284-5.

Furthermore, after one year a second, albeit again small, edition of the novel was allowed to be published.⁵ Details such as these indicate that the political climate still tolerated dissent. In this connection it is worth noting that émigré critics generally ignore the political undercurrent of Pidmohyl'ny's novel. Iurii Sherekh, in particular, argues with characteristic polemicizing condescension: Комісії в СРСР засудили *Місто* й вилучили, разом з автором, з життя, хоча в творі не було нічого протирадянського й політики взагалі — просто він мав занадто широке дихання.⁶

It is certainly true that Pidmohyl'ny's intellectual range is far too broad to fit comfortably into Soviet orthodoxy, but it is, at best, very misleading to say that there is nothing political or anti-Soviet in the novel. Pidmohyl'ny is not only attacking Soviet reality at every other step but also subtly questioning the principles of dialectical materialism. In essence, as we shall see, he rejects any possibility of a cognitive understanding of the physical environment. Generally, then, we must admit that the ideological reservations of Soviet critics were not unfounded. The relevance of their criteria to literary criticism, however, is an entirely different matter.

The questionable relevance of evaluative criteria is not limited to the ideological level. Many of the reviewers, unable to perceive any distinct recurrent theme, focussed on the title of the novel as an indicator of its primary subject. Perhaps the first to do so was Feliks Iakubovsky who, while roundly admitting his own confusion, simply stated that the theme of the novel was embodied in its title.⁷ This idea was repeated by Pidhainy, Motuzka, and Nikovsky in various contexts,⁸ so that by mid-1929 Mohyliansky is facing considerable opposition when he argues that the novel portrays "ni mista, ni sela."⁹ The debate, however, did not end there. In 1955 Sherekh is still repeating Mohyliansky's argument while berating the "committees of pharisees in the émigré community," by which euphemism Sherekh means Hry-

⁵ The first, 1928 edition was published in 4,000 copies; the second, 1929 edition came out in 5,000 copies.

⁶ Iurii Sherekh, "Liudyna i liudy (*Misto* Valeriiiana Pidmohyl'noho)," in *Ne dlia ditei* (Munich, 1964), pp. 83-4.

⁷ F[eliks] Iakubovsky, review of *Misto*, *Komunist*, 20 May 1928.

⁸ Pidhainy, *op. cit.*; M. Motuzka, "Selo i misto v tvorchosti V. Pidmohyl'noho," *Krytyka*, 1928, no. 6, pp. 35-50; Andrii Nikovsky, "Pro 'Misto' V. Pidmohyl'noho," *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia*, 1928, no. 10, pp. 104-14.

⁹ Mohyliansky, *op. cit.*

horii Kostiuk, whose thematic interpretation merely reverses the focus of the Soviet critics: "zavoiuvannia mista selom."¹⁰

While relevant evaluative criteria and an appropriate thematic interpretation have eluded most critics of Pidmohyl'ny's *Misto*, their insights have occasionally identified those troublesome areas that are, in fact, at the heart of the novel's thematic structure. These insights most often focus on the character of the hero. Iakubovsky, for example, is disturbed by the implausibility of Stepan's unearned success.

Не тільки законам художнього твору, а навіть життєвій правді суперечить оцей абсолютно рівний, бездоганно-простий шлях головного героя роману Степана Радченка до вершин, насамперед матеріальної забезпеченості, а почасти й літературної слави. Звідкіля вихоплено цей спеціально антисюжетний тип, що не здивав на своєму шляху ні однісінької перешкоди, який мав і жінок, і достатки, і цікаву роботу. Сам герой поводитьсь в усіх ситуаціях надто безвольно і пасивно: сумлінно робить він то в вищій школі, чи на посаді, чи в літературі те, що кладе перед ним життя, побачивши нове, легко відкидає геть, без жалю й згадки попереднє...; вередує всім, а життя, немов упокорена тварина, слуга йому й тягне довгий килим усяких нудних пригод і середніх успіхів.¹¹

Mohyliansky is also troubled by the unconvincing details in the novel.

Ціле плетиво *Міста* спиймаємо, як художньо неперекональне.... Знаємо, напр., що романічні перемоги в дійсному житті одержуються часом і легше за перемоги Степана Радченка над балериною Рітою. Але читаємо, як він з першого абцугу „шалено потиснув своєю ногою сусідчину”... й спокійна репліка Рітина: „обережніш, панчохо забрудните” художньо не переконує, ляпас переконав би краще.... Неперекональні, художньо неперекональні для нас й інші романічні успіхи Степанові, неперекональна і його літературна кар’єра. Тут вже легко, не обмежуючись враженнями суб’єктивного сприймання, заперечувати, посилаючись на всім відомі факти, що примушують не вірити феєричності Степанових успіхів в місті.... (Поважаючи читача, не наводимо прикладів).¹²

¹⁰ Sherekh, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

¹¹ Iakubovsky, *op. cit.*

¹² Mohyliansky, *op. cit.*, pp. 274-5.

Furthermore, these two were not the only critics who made such observations. Indeed, to a certain extent every reader will be struck by Stepan's sudden and, for the most part, unsought success. Nonetheless the reaction of the critics is jejune. It is ludicrous to accuse the author of implausibility when that is obviously the effect he was trying to produce. The question then is: what significance does this implausibility have? The answer is by no means easy to discover, but we may once again turn to the critics for a hidden suggestion. In his review of Pidmohyl'ny's last work, *Nevelychka drama*, Sherekh compares it to Sartre's *Huis Clos* (*No Exit*) and describes it as a pre-existentialist novel.¹³ Sherekh also says that the earlier *Misto* is a far different work that belongs in the tradition of Balzac and Maupassant, but this difference is, perhaps, best ignored along with Sherekh's inscrutable distinction between pre-existential and existential works.¹⁴ Perhaps *Misto* can also be interpreted from an existential perspective. Certainly those qualities of the novel that the critics have described as implausible and unconvincing can be related to the larger existential concept of absurdity.

Strictly speaking, "the absurd" is a concept associated with only a limited range of the existential tradition, specifically with Camus. In a somewhat broader context, however, the notion of absurdity has played a central role in the existential tradition, from Kierkegaard (and Pascal) and Dostoevsky to Sartre and beyond. Indeed, absurdity is probably the most commonly recognized feature of existential thought. It is also commonly misunderstood as a peculiar quality of the physical universe. Actually, absurdity is a conflict between two opposing elements. Man seeks meaning and order from his environment; the world does not offer these consolations. Absurdity is this conflict, not just its second element.¹⁵ To use Camus's significant image, it is the "divorce between man and his life, the actor and his setting."¹⁶ Thus, we may safely equate absurdity with defeated expectation. With an eye

¹³ Iurii Sherekh, "Bilok i ioho zaburennia," *Ukrainska literaturna hazeta* (Munich), September 1957; translated with some changes by George and Moira Luckyj as "A Disturbance in the Protein," in V. Pidmohyl'ny, *A Little Touch of Drama* (Littleton, Colo., 1972), pp. 9-16.

¹⁴ In fact, Sherekh calls it an "epigonic" work. Even more curious is the double standard he advocates in the same paragraph.

¹⁵ For this and other insights, I am indebted to Prof. Walter Sokel's lectures on the Existential Tradition at Harvard University, spring 1979.

¹⁶ Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays*, trans. Justin Obrien (New York, 1955), p. 5.

toward anticipated objections, it is readily conceded that this equation involves a simplification, but this simplification retains the essential disharmony between subject and object yet conveniently avoids the widespread confusion between existential absurdity and logical absurdity.

Defeated expectation is one of the central recurrent motifs in Pidmohylny's *Misto*. Indeed, the first paragraph of the novel presents such a situation.

Здавалось, далі пливати нема куди. Спереду Дніпро мов спинився в несподіваній затоці, оточений праворуч, ліворуч і просто зеленожовтими передосінніми берегами. Але пароплав раптом звернув, і довга, спокійна смуга річки протяглася далі до ледве помітних пагорків на обрії.¹⁷

This is, admittedly, a very mild form of absurdity. There is nothing inherently illogical about a hidden bend in the river. But existential absurdity does not necessarily entail irrationality. Objective reality may be perfectly orderly, but, in existential terms, when it is divorced from man's perception of it the result is absurdity. In the well-known description of a tramcar ride in Sartre's *Nausea*, for example, Roquentin's view through the window is chaotic and disformed, but the effect is perfectly logical and easily explained.

Bluish objects pass the windows. In jerks all stiff and brittle; people, walls; a house offers me its black heart through open windows; and the windows pale, all that is black becomes blue, blue this great yellow brick house advancing uncertainly, trembling, suddenly stopping and taking a nose dive The yellow house starts up again, it leaps against the windows, it is so close you can only see part of it, it is obscured.¹⁸

Stepan Radchenko experiences many similar disorientations. Indeed, the novel as a whole is merely a sequence of disorientations, a series of discoveries that force the hero to redefine his perception of the world. Stepan arrives in the city an aggressive young man, brimming with enthusiastic expectations. One by one these preconceptions collide with reality and dissipate, bringing the hero that much closer to an unprejudiced perception of the

¹⁷ Valeriian Pidmohylny, *Misto* (New York, 1954), p. 11. Henceforth page references to quotations from this novel will appear in the body of the article in parentheses immediately after the quotation.

¹⁸ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Nausea*, trans. Lloyd Alexander (New York, 1964), pp. 124-5.

world. No sooner has he stepped off the boat than a sudden bitterness engulfs him.

Все навкруги було дивне й чуже. Він бачив тир, де стріляли з духових рушниць, ятки з мороженим, пивом та квасом, перекупок з булками, насінням, хлопчаків з ірисками, дівчат з кошиками абрикос і морелів. Проз нього пропливали сотні облич, веселих, серйозних і заклопотаних, деś голосила обікрадена жінка, кричали граючись пацани. Так звичайно тут єсть, так було, коли його нога ступала ще м'якою курявою села, так буде й надалі. І всьому цьому він був чужий. (p. 16)

This bitterness, which is objectified in the tobacco-soaked spittle he swallows, is but a preview of the complete alienation Stepan will eventually feel. Even before he reaches the house where he will live, Stepan feels a second surge of fear and alienation as he reads over the unfamiliar titles in the window of a bookstore. His reception at the home of Luka Hnidy serves as an appropriate conclusion to his first day in the city.

It should be noted, however, that the city is not the only cause of absurdity. Stepan has brought some with him. His pants have only one pocket, owing to the niggardly instincts of a village tailor (p. 18). Although this humorous detail is not in itself very significant, the manner in which it is disclosed offers an important clue to the structure of the novel. Since the peculiarities of his wardrobe are not new to Stepan, it is the narrator himself who must provide this information. But the narrator does not merely describe Stepan's pants, he goes on to comment about the logic of economy. Nature, he says, could learn from the tailor and give some people only one eye and ear instead of the customary two. In our context, this apparently gratuitous remark serves two functions. On one level it enters into Stepan's world to point out yet another absurd detail. More important, however, is the second level, on which the narrator distinguishes between two perspectives, his own and Stepan's. Although the narrator in *Misto* is not a defined character, not even in the Gogolian sense, he does nevertheless present a more or less consistent viewpoint. His frequent, facetious, and cynical but enlightened remarks characterize him as a comic version of the Sisyphean hero; he is aware of the absurd and unwilling to transcend it. In the novel this perspective surfaces in his numerous marginal or parenthetical remarks and in unexpectedly pointed similes. He describes Stepan's affair with Musinka as an "unconcerned and therefore real life" (*bez dumnoho otzhe spravzhno-*

ho zhyttia, pp. 91-2). Winter was delayed, he remarks, due to circumstances beyond the control of science (p. 107). He even mentions the “curve of human development” (p. 85), a particularly curious remark in light of his usual disparagement of science and learning. In the long run, however, the narrator serves a mechanical rather than personal function. His usually humorous comments prevent the tempting alignment of the reader with Stepan. They enforce a critical evaluation of the hero, pointing to the existential “weakness” of his character.

Stepan's life in the city, as we have noted, is a series of absurd disorientations. The first half of the novel in particular is focussed on the process of alienation. Stepan's enthusiasm for education is quickly overpowered by the plodding bureaucracy and intellectual mediocrity of the university. Uncertain about his financial security, he sets out to find himself a job. After his experience in the employment office, he understands that he is only one of many seeking work and that opportunities are few; nevertheless he continues his search with the confident expectation that justice can still be squeezed out of a random fate. He soon learns otherwise. Stepan discovers the absurd everywhere he goes. The *soirée littéraire* turns out to be a circus, or, to use the narrator's metaphor, a Quixotic battle with immortal windmills (p. 58 ff.). In the course of his education Stepan discovers that he does not even know his native language properly. The narrator's description of the examination at the lecturers' bureau (pp. 110-1), however, subtly challenges the idea that the language can be “known” in any sense beyond mere fluency. In the course of his wanderings Stepan even confronts physical absurdity. Pidmohylny comes very close to a radical Sartrean absurdity in his description of the room in which Stepan meets Andrii Venedovych, a high-school Latin teacher and a “true city dweller.”

Кімната його являла дивний збіг найрізноманітніших речей, що ніби рушивши з різних покоїв, зсунулись сюди від жаху й тут закам'яніли. А як їм абсолютно бракувало місця, то стояли вони чудною юрбою по-під стінами й просто серед хати. Широке двохспальне ліжко визирало краєм з-під куцої ширми, впираючись головами в шафу на книжки, де замість колишнього скла сумно темнів брунатний картон. Поруч шафи, одбираючи їй змогу вільно відчинятись, стояв великий горорізьблений буфет, прихилившись верхушкою до стіни, що без неї він втрапив би рівновагу. Далі під вікном праворуч тулилась повна нот етажерка, хоч піяно в хаті не було. Косяком

до вікна, трохи заслоняючи його своїм краєм, пишалась струнка дзеркальна шафа на одержу — єдина річ, що зберегла свою незайманість і чистоту. Симетрично до грандіозного ліжка навпроти височів потертий турецький диван, а на його широкій спинці, що кінчалась угорі довгастою деревляною площинкою, самотньо підносив до стелі свій рупор грамофон, оточений з боків рівними купками платівок. (pp. 33-4)

The second half of the novel also has its share of disorienting absurdity. Stepan moves into his new apartment with great expectations, but they are soon dashed. When he becomes editor of the literary journal, his first ambition is to bring order to the chaotic offices of the publication. After a few initial successes, he surrenders to the unvanquishable disorder. In a passage intended to recall Pascal's wager, Stepan spends an exorbitant sum on a charitable lottery without any success. Zoska, on the other hand, wins on her first try. Pidmohylny returns to this idea later when Stepan finds the forgotten Musinka, now an addicted gambler, in a lotto (bingo) parlor. Most of Stepan's relationship with Zoska is characteristically absurd. She herself is the epitome of defeated expectations (she wants a boat ride in the middle of the street!), and her eventual suicide is precisely that solution to the problem of absurdity that Camus argues against in his essay. The most significant instance of defeated expectations appears in the climactic moments of the story, which serve as a thematic miniature of the novel as a whole. Unsettled in some measure by Zoska's suicide but mostly by his growing realization of the essential meaninglessness of city life, Stepan finally gives up his ambitious dreams and decides to revert back to the unspoiled simplicity of the village. He will search out Nadiika, his immutable emblem of village purity, and run away from the city with her. But the real Nadiia, as he discovers, is not the woman he has conjured in his dreams. In an instant he realizes that Nadiia is a complete stranger to him, he does not even know her patronymic, and that the road into the past is closed forever. He leaves her apartment, pays the waiting cab driver, and walks down the street a completed hero of the absurd. He needs but one more encounter to move from Camus to Sartre, from the absurd to the existential, from resignation to choice.

At this point we must make a brief digression concerning the structure of an existential novel. Pidmohylny's *Misto*, like many other existential novels, is a *Bildungsroman*. By way of example, we may also mention Sartre's *Nausea*, Musil's *Young*

Toerless, Rilke's *The Notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigge*, and Ellison's *The Invisible Man*. The essential point is that these novels represent only a specific variety of the *Bildungsroman*. The existential novel is not a clearly defined genre, and it would be easy to force various kinds of works into this category. Furthermore, the criteria used to evaluate existential themes offer a necessary but insufficient test for inclusion in this category. Absurdity or defeated expectation is a very common feature of the *Bildungsroman*. The process of learning that constitutes the structural core of this genre often depends on an initial disorientation of the hero's perspective, followed by a new and enlightened redefinition. In Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, for example, the hero's growing alienation from various segments of Irish society is balanced by a deeper understanding of man's relationship with nature and a bitter but ennobling realization of the role of the artist in society. The existential *Bildungsroman*, on the other hand, pursues the absurd to its logical outcome, without recourse to extrinsic or universal values.

Pidmohyl'ny's treatment of the absurd is closely related to yet another characteristically existential concern. Human consciousness, as we have noted, seeks meaning in the world. Since such meaning cannot be found, the frightened consciousness often chooses to adopt a perspective that will at least partially satisfy this need. Such a solution will always have two characteristics: it will not actually explain or organize experience, since that is impossible, and it cannot be fully believed because it is adopted in fear and does not actually correspond to man's perception of the world. It is, in other words, inauthentic. In his major existential treatise, *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre defines this solution as "bad faith."¹⁹ As an illustration, he describes a waiter in a café. The waiter's movements are too quick and too precise. He is too solicitous of the customers' needs. He acts, in other words, as he imagines a waiter in a café should act. He is looking at himself through the eyes of the customers.

Although Sartre's waiter serves as an adequate illustration of this concept, the best examples of bad faith are to be found in Russian literature. The Russian bourgeoisie of the second half of the nineteenth century was, apparently, the epitome of bad faith. Even Gogol seems to have understood this, but it is with Dostoevsky and Tolstoy that the idea finds full and coherent expression.

¹⁹ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, trans. Hazel Barnes (New York, 1956), pp. 47-70.

The latter's *Death of Ivan Ilich* is, of course, the best known treatment of this subject in the entire canon of existential literature. In this context it is not surprising that bad faith also appears in Ukrainian prose, albeit on a secondary level. Among others, Ivan Nechui-Levytsky, Ivan Franko, Les Martovych, and Ostap Vyshnia presented this idea in one form or another. Pidmohylny's understanding of inauthenticity, however, is far more sophisticated than that of any of his Ukrainian predecessors.

Stepan Radchenko is a master of the *comme il faut*. His decisions are generally shaped by social fashion and convention. (The major exception is sex, but that will be discussed separately.) Stepan has come to the city to get an education that will prepare him for further, more productive work in the villages. He is overjoyed at the opportunity to expound his noble sentiments at the university's entrance examination. But, as Pidmohylny's contemporaries would immediately recognize, these sentiments are actually popular political slogans. Stepan can even find them in the newspaper he reads while waiting for an interview. His self-appointed halo receives a conspicuous dent when a friend turns this social improvement program into a sexual pun ("Tak i u vas zmychka?," p. 46). Stepan's sincerity is also evident in the ease with which he abandons these plans. Despite such setbacks, however, Stepan is intent on reforming his life in a city mould. On the morning of his first day in the city, he adopts an exercise program out of a sense of social propriety rather than personal hygiene.

Йому конче захотілось розпочати день нормально, поміському, так ніби він уже зовсім у нових обставинах освоївся. Важливо ж відразу поставити себе в норму, бо норма й розпорядок — перша запораука досягнень! (p. 22)

When the landlady discovers him and offers him a glass of milk, he feels compelled to refuse even though he would gladly drink it. After all, he is not a country boy anymore. Similarly, when he visits Levko he lies about his living arrangements in order to avoid any embarrassment.

Perhaps the most telling example of Stepan's bad faith is his unusual concern for his clothes. Stepan is rather vain. In the course of his exercise, for example, he "lovingly feels his biceps" (p. 22). But Stepan's attention to his wardrobe goes beyond simple vanity. He clearly believes that a man is what he appears to be. While still a relatively poor student, he stops to examine the display in the window of a clothing store.

Йому вільно було уявляти себе неподільним власником цих скарбів, що зробили б його кращим за того світового артиста, талановитішим за скрипаля й спритнішим за циркового акробата; ... І хлопець усвідомлював ту мить чудесну вагу одєжі, що давно перестала вже бути способом прикривати тіло, прибравши ширшого й благороднішого завдання — прикрашати та поліпшувати його. Він, може створив би щось геніяльне, коли б одягти його ту мить в англійську сорочку з комірцем, куці вузькі штани й гостроносі черевики, але не створив нічого, бо й на час не кидала його гірка думка, що нічого за склом йому не належить і належати не може. (р. 76)

These ideas are not mere fantasy. When Stepan gets a job as a language teacher, he does indeed "transform himself in the name of the progress of Ukrainization" (p. 113). In Stepan's mind the transformation is not merely external. Similarly, when he finally decides to move into his own apartment, he burns his old clothes to signal his change in stature.

In this connection it is useful to recall Sartre's essay, *The Transcendence of the Ego*.²⁰ The chief argument of this work is the denial in both the spatial and the temporal dimensions of the possibility that consciousness can *be*. There is no permanent ego uniting consciousness at one moment with the "same" consciousness at another time. The clearest example of this occurs in Sartre's *No Exit*, where each of the characters believes that he or she is defined by a particular quality. Garcin believes he *is* a coward, Inez believes she *is* a lesbian, Estelle believes she *is* an infanticide. While these may be accurate descriptions of their past actions, Sartre would argue they do not constitute any part of the character's essential being. These three characters, like the waiter in the café, assume that they *are* what they merely choose to act.

Pidmohylny's hero clearly labours under the same delusion. Stepan's preoccupation with what he is rather than who he is also extends to others. He identifies people as students, bureaucrats, poets, or country folk. Nadiia in particular is defined as a village girl, to the extent that Stepan is shocked to discover otherwise. But the most pronounced examples of this kind of reification occur in connection with Stepan's career as a writer. The initial impulse that stimulates Stepan to try his hand at writing

²⁰ Jean-Paul Sartre, *The Transcendence of the Ego*, trans. Forrest Williams and Robert Kirkpatrick (New York, 1957).

is a classic example of bad faith. At the *soirée littéraire* he focusses his attention on the writers themselves.

Він думав про самих письменників, про те, що вони виходять перед інших і інші їх слухають. Вони висунулись із юрби, посіли власні місця, і всі знають їх на прізвище. Вони пишуть книжки, ці книжки друкують, продають, беруть до бібліотек, і на книжці того Вигорського, що він тут побачив, його власною рукою поставлено печатку в далекому Сельбуді. І от сам її автор. Він заздрих їм, і не ховав від себе цього, бо теж хотів висунутись і бути обраним. Сміх і оплески, що були нагородою тим щасливцям, мало його не ображали, і кожен новий з них, з'являючись коло катедри, ставив йому болюче питання, чому це не він. Бо він хотів бути кожним із них, однаково — прозаїком чи поетом. (p. 59)

For Stepan, the motivation for writing is external rather than internal. The screenplay he writes is also the result of external influence. After seeing dozens of movies with Zoska and spending two days studying the relevant handbooks, he feels capable of writing a film script as well as anyone else. Even more typical of Stepan's self-objectification are his anguished complaints on those frequent occasions when his literary well runs dry. He continues writing out of a sense of obligation. When he shows Zoska his newly published collection of stories, she reacts with characteristic wonder.

— Оце ти написав? — сказала вона. — Люди такі коміки! Все вони щось накручують, накручують...

— Так покинути? — спитав він.

— Ні, вже пиши, коли почав.

Він і сам це чудово розумів. Треба писати, коли почав! Ця книжка обернула йому письменство в обов'язок, у вимогу, в слово честі, що він мусів додержати. (p. 184)

Stepan cannot ignore "toho nezaperechnoho faktu, shcho vin stav pismennykom" (p. 129). Indeed, he feels "condemned to this punishment, to expiate his thoughtless whim—his blind, unexpected whim to write a short story" (p. 204). Like the characters in Sartre's play, he feels condemned because he does not believe that he is free.

All of these examples (and there are many more in the novel) of Stepan's bad faith do not, however, establish the importance of this idea in the thematic structure of Pidmohylny's *Misto*. Bad

faith is not a uniquely existential concept, and its function in the novel could be merely comic. But Pidmohylny has carefully woven this idea into the essential framework of the novel. In fact, to the extent that the hero of this *Bildungsroman* learns a definable lesson, that lesson is good faith or, more accurately, absolute freedom.

The most significant manifestation of Stepan's reification of people is not to be found in his relationships with other individuals or even in his perception of himself, but rather in his presentation of fictional characters. The difference in this regard between his earliest story and the novel he is about to write when we leave him is a measure of Stepan's growth and development both as a writer and as a man. In choosing a subject for his fictional premiere, Stepan first turns his attention toward himself. But this self-examination yields alternately emptiness and excess (p. 60). Thus, when he finally writes the story it turns out to be about an object, specifically, a very symbolic razor. Although Pidmohylny does not offer a detailed description of Stepan's other stories, he does indicate that they too take things for their heroes and offer a dehumanized image of people (pp. 135-6). The screenplay Stepan writes is also characterized by a mechanistic view of humanity. Stepan sees his characters as types rather than individuals. The outline he prepares accurately summarizes his approach to writing.

(Степан) . . . накреслив план кіно-драми з часів громадянської війни на шість частин з прологом, де було все, як годиться: соціальне протиставлення — раз, кохання між героєм-робітником та жінкою з протилежного табору — два, чарівна дівчина-пролетарка, що того робітника від наглої смерті рятує й перебирає на себе його чуття — три, постріли й дим — чотири, перемога чесноти — п'ять, не згадуючи вже про дрібніші факти, що нічим не поступалися попереднім. Були в драмі й комічні елементи, наприклад тухлій-куркуль, якому в сценарії страшенно не щастило і який своїми невдачами дуже насмішив автора. Тиждень попрацювавши, хлопець уклав у цю немудру схему весь свій хист, зробивши її трагічною, і так заплутав дію, що вона стала цікавою. (p. 149)

Stepan himself is not unaware, or at least he becomes aware, of the mechanical quality of his fictional characters. Shortly after he breaks his engagement with Zoska, he begins to worry about the flaws in his writing.

Окремі хиби турбували його, чималі огріхи в побудові й страшенна прикрість від змісту. Про що, властиво, він писав? Ніде, протягом сотні сторінок не здибав він людини — того, що мучиться й прагне, що божевільні пориви зароджує в болі, того, що нидіє і буяє, плазує і підноситься на верховини. Він не знайшов у тих сторінках сумного карлика з велетенським розумом, дрібного звіря, що тягне на щуплих раменах вічний тягар свідомості; не знайшов чарівної дитини, що так мило плаче й сміється серед барвистих цяцюк існування, жорстокого войовника, що вмів вбивати й умирати за свої мрії, суворого поборника за далекі дні, невтомного гінця в майбутнє. І ця відсутність вразила його. Навіщо ж ці твори, коли людське серце в них не б'ється? Мертвими видались йому тепер ці оповідання, де людина зникла під тиском річей та ідей, від неї створених і для неї призначених!

(p. 245)

Furthermore, Stepan has always felt an inclination to explore the subtleties of the human psyche. His first story, as we have noted, took the razor as its subject only because Stepan could not fathom the complexities of his own being. Gradually, however, his attachment to literature changes from "playing a game with fame" to "expressing his soul" (pp. 184-5). Moreover, his personal experience has taught him a new appreciation for the individual. While still unaware of these changes, he visits the office of the journal that published his story in order to collect his honorarium. Caught in a lie about his non-existent work in progress, he is forced to invent a subject for his work. "I am writing," he says, "about . . . people" (p. 157). This seemingly simple remark has produced a great deal of confusion among the various critics who have attempted to interpret the novel. In its initial context its function is chiefly humorous. It also serves to underscore Stepan's thwarted inclinations. But as the story unfolds, this single word, "people," slowly acquires its privileged position at the thematic centre of the novel. It is also, very appropriately, the last word in the text: "Todi v tyshi liampy nad stolom, pysav svoiu povist pro liudei" (p. 281). Some of the difficulty in interpreting the novel is a result of the imperfective aspect of the verb in this sentence. It is not altogether clear whether Stepan will succeed. This new self-confidence may be only temporary. But this, after all, is not the point. What matters is that Stepan has learned to see people as individuals. Like Antoine Roquentin, the hero of Sartre's *Nausea*, Stepan has changed the subject of his writing. Roquentin gives up

investigative history in order to write a novel because he no longer believes that he can reveal the true meaning of historical events. Stepan, too, has learned to distinguish between essence and existence. Despairing of ever achieving the former, he chooses the latter. He will no longer explain the past with symbolic objects. He will write about people, about existence.

People, then, are the thematic focus of Pidmohylny's novel. More specifically, he is interested in the particulars that characterize the human condition. This may still seem an unmanageably broad range, but Pidmohylny specifies his exact concern in the two, often overlooked epigraphs to the novel.

Шість прикмет має людина: трьома подібна вона на тварину, а трьома на янгола: як тварина — людина їсть і п'є; як тварина — вони множиться і як тварина — викидає; як янгол — вона має розум, як янгол — ходить просто і як янгол — священною мовою розмовляє.

Талмуд. Трактат Авот.

Як можна бути вільним, Евкрите, коли маєш тіло?

А. Франс. Таїс. (р. 9)

Clearly, Pidmohylny is concerned with the existential conflict between being and consciousness.

All of the characters in Pidmohylny's *Misto* are, to a greater or lesser extent, characterized by an internal conflict between spirit and matter or, to use simpler terms, between mind and body. This condition is most clearly represented by Stepan. For most of the novel his basic motivation is intellectual. His desire for an education, his concern for social problems, and his dedication to literature offer clear evidence of the preponderance of the angelic qualities of his nature. But the animal in Stepan does not rest dormant. It surfaces in seemingly involuntary outbursts of sexual energy. But they are only apparently involuntary. In fact, it is only Stepan's quasi-rape of Nadiia that clearly reflects this quality. On the whole, Stepan's sexual drive is very overt and anything but subconscious. This is significant in light of the suggestion that Pidmohylny's characters exemplify a basic Freudian psychology. This idea was advanced by Andrii Muzychka in a surprisingly intelligent and erudite, but completely misguided, essay entitled "Tvorchy metoda Valeriiana Pidmohylnoho" in 1930.²¹ In this

²¹ A[ndrii] Muzychka, "Tvorchy metoda Valeriiana Pidmohylnoho," *Chervonyi shliakh*, 1930, no. 10, pp. 107-21 and no. 11-2, pp. 126-37.

essay Muzychka argues that Stepan is a perfect model of Freudian psychology (consciously created), whose behavior manifests a displaced Oedipal complex and repressed libidinal drives. Muzychka could hardly be further from the mark. While there is no direct evidence of Pidmohylny's attitude toward Freudian psychology, the psychological dimensions of his characters point toward the same kind of objections to Freud that Sartre expresses in *Being and Nothingness*. Although Sartre is willing to adopt a great deal of Freudian psychoanalytic method and theory, he strongly objects to the dismemberment of consciousness into three separate functions governed by a censor and terrorized by a repressed subconscious.²² Sartre argues for a unified consciousness in which conflicting drives can coexist without repression, as in the case of bad faith. It is this kind of psychological scheme that Pidmohylny's characters seem to embody.

The history of Stepan's sexual liaisons is a lesson in the conflict between mind and body. This history is divided into five chapters, respectively titled "Nadiika," "Musinka," "Zoska," "The Whore," and "Rita." In each chapter Pidmohylny offers a variant of the same story: sex and love are not the same thing and they must not be confused. "Nadiika" presents the simplest case. Two young people fall in love, but as soon as they confuse love and sex their relationship falls apart. In the next chapter the two partners represent opposite extremes. For Musinka, Pidmohylny's most Freudian character, Stepan embodies the fulfillment of a romantic fantasy. Stepan's interest is exclusively sexual. This paradoxical situation survives only as long as the partners lead dual lives, one at night and a different one during the day. When their affair is exposed to sunlight it immediately crumbles. With Zoska the pattern of increasingly abstract expectations on the part of the female partner is continued. Zoska's love for Stepan exists entirely in a fantastic imaginary world. Stepan must actually teach her the details of physical love. His own feelings in this relationship are, at first, somewhat uncertain. In a moment of passionate confusion, he decides to marry Zoska but soon realizes he was only in it for the sex. With her fantasy world suddenly exploded, Zoska can only commit suicide. Stepan's encounter with the whore is obviously indebted to Dostoevsky's *Notes from the Underground* and presents a similar idea. Unlike the earlier chapters, in this one it is Stepan who cannot distinguish between love and sex. But he is quick to learn his lesson: "the woman is sale-

²² Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, pp. 50-4.

able, the person is not" (p. 264). The final chapter, "Rita," is rather ambiguous and incompletely developed. In comparison with the other chapters, however, it does present one major innovation. Both partners show an open interest in sex, and neither seems to confuse it with love. Stepan is even happy to learn that Rita's stay in Kiev is temporary, since this will prevent any profound emotional attachment.

Yet another area where Pidmohyl'ny underscores the conflict between being and consciousness is in Stepan's friendship with the poet, Vyhorsky. The two men are drawn together by their common profession and interests, but in many ways they are opposites, or rather mirror images, of each other. Vyhorsky, like Stepan, is characterized by the basic existential duality. Indeed, Vyhorsky is not even his real name but the pseudonym of Lansky. In explaining his reasons for writing under an assumed identity, Vyhorsky tells Stepan that he considered it too great a responsibility to sign his real name. It would mean an obligation to live and think the way one writes (p. 115). Vyhorsky certainly does nothing of the sort. As a lyric poet and philosopher of art, Vyhorsky believes in pure abstraction. He even develops a scheme for the relative gradation of the arts according to the abstractness of the medium (p. 214). This attitude spills over into his daily life in the form of constant quasi-philosophical discussions. He pursues these academic conversations so avidly that Stepan (and the reader, too) is often in danger of losing the thread of his argument. But the actual substance of Vyhorsky's philosophy is pure epicureanism. Happiness is a myth, but not so an empty stomach. Between his poetry and his travels, the bulk of Vyhorsky's attention is focussed on food and drink, usually at Stepan's expense. Thus, as an alter ego, Vyhorsky represents a kind of bad faith that is complementary to Stepan's. The numerous conversations between these two friends serve as an important catalyst in Stepan's development. The final result is, to a certain extent, a fusion of both perspectives.

This fusion, then, is the essential thematic statement of Pidmohyl'ny's novel. The conflict between spirit and body, which is merely an instance of the conflict between human expectations and physical reality, must, in the final analysis, remain unresolved. Absurdity is the unavoidable by-product of human existence. Man's only hope for realizing his full potential is to discard the illusory cloak of self-deception and accept reality for what it is. This is the course that Stepan and Pidmohyl'ny choose when they throw open the window and let out an enchanted kiss into the dark abyss of the city.

MYKOLA BAZHAN: SIX UNKNOWN POEMS

It is safe to assume that in October of this year, when the Kiev literary establishment commemorates Mykola Bazhan's seventy-fifth birthday and looks back at his remarkable fifty-seven years as a literary and cultural figure, there will be certain moments in Bazhan's life that the official panegyrists will try to avoid at all cost. Much will be said of Bazhan's achievements (and rightly so), but little will be said of the humiliation and compromises that were part and parcel of his illustrious career. (Bazhan's odes to Stalin can serve as a small reminder of this fact.) No one will probably wish to recall that Bazhan rose to the august heights of Soviet cultural life only after a dangerous and nearly fatal brush with the official guardians of Soviet literary "purity," and that he barely escaped sharing the tragic fate of many of his contemporaries and friends.¹

It is also a virtual certainty that no one will mention that Bazhan's rank and achievements never made him immune to censorship and distortion.² This unpleasantness has shadowed Bazhan throughout his career, but it is especially telling in discussions that touch on his formative years as a poet. Although some conscientious work has been done in this area,³ Bazhan's literary profile of the 1920s is still far from complete. Valuable material (both poetic and critical) remains uncollected and undocumented. The few available bibliographies of his work fail to do justice to his output of the 1920s. As a result, Bazhan's tremendous range (both formal and ideological) of this period is inadequately recognized.

Bazhan began his literary career in 1922-23 as an enthusiastic Futurist and maintained these ties until 1927, although not without certain conflicts. His literary production during this time, however, is so diverse and eclectic that it resists simple categorization. On the one hand, Bazhan wrote trans-sense poetry and made extensive use of free verse. On the other, he also wrote in octaves and used the ballad and sonnet forms. He produced simple

¹ For an example of how Bazhan was unsubtly "encouraged" to change by the critics of his day, see A. Selivanovsky, "Kudy priamuie M. Bazhan," *Krytyka*, 1931, no. 4, pp. 39-47; A. Senchenko, *Zavdannia spilky radian-skykh pysmennykiv Ukrainy* (Kiev, 1935), pp. 25-7.

² For details, see Oleh S. Ilnytskyj, "Mykola Bazhan: His Poetry and His Critics," *Recenzija*, 5, no. 2 (Spring-Summer 1975), pp. 1-26.

³ Iu. Surovtsev, *Poeziia Mikoly Bazhana* (Moscow, 1970); N. V. Kostenko, *Poetyka Mykoly Bazhana (1923-1940 rr.)* (Kiev, 1971).

and direct agit-prop verse as well as dense, baroque, philosophical narratives. In looking back at Bazhan's early career one notes that almost every literary current of the day has found at least a faint echo in his poetry. This is worth stressing in light of contemporary Soviet criticism, which plays down the paradoxes and ambiguities of this period.

Below, the reader will find six early poems, which can serve as graphic illustrations of Bazhan's poetic scope.⁴ These poems are being reprinted for the first time since the 1920s. (A few have been incompletely and infrequently cited in Soviet critical studies.) Although these are not poems on which Bazhan would stake his reputation, they are interesting and significant, especially to the historian of literature, because they throw important light on Bazhan's development. The first five poems are clearly in the Futurist vein, in form as well as ideology. (Agitational and topical verse was a trademark of Futurism.) "Kryzhmo komuny" is especially interesting from the lexical point of view. It heralds the "anti-aesthetic" and "imaginist" tendencies of Bazhan's later poems and clearly links this phenomenon to his Futurist roots. "Osinnia put" is obviously a radical departure from the other poems. This is Bazhan's "canonical" and "pessimistic" side. In the late twenties and early thirties this poem, together with others in the collection *Rizblena tin*, was used to accuse Bazhan of being out of step with Soviet reality. For similar reasons it continues to be censored to this very day.

⁴ "Rura-marsh." First and only publication in *Bilshovyk* (Kiev), 17 May 1923. The poem was signed with Bazhan's pseudonym "Panfuturyst."

"Kryzhmo komuny." First and only publication in *Bilshovyk*, 26 July 1923. The poem was signed "Nik Bazhan."

"Mene zelenykh nih." First published in *Chervonyi shliakh*, 1924, no. 1-2, p. 51. In her book (see n. 3), N. Kostenko cites the poem on p. 24 with a few minor alternations in the text. The version reprinted here is the original one.

"Z 'Povisty pro mistera Iuza i trampa Dzheka'." This is an excerpt from a larger work, which appeared in *Holfstrom*, zbirnyk I, Litsektor AsKK (Kharkiv, 1925), pp. 88-105. This excerpt is reprinted from *Zhurnal dlia vsikh*, 1925, no. 1, p. 21. The full title of the work is "Povist pro mistera Iuza, miuzikhol, pro tavernu i trampa Dzheka."

"Osinnia put." This is the original version, reprinted from *Vsesvit*, 1925, no. 18, p. 8. The poem was last published in the collection *Rizblena tin* (Kharkiv, 1927), pp. 3-8.

"Tsyryk." Written in 1924 but published only in *Nova generatsiia*, 1927, no. 3, pp. 23-6.

The poems below that first appeared in *Bilshovyk* were transcribed from a very poor microfilm copy of that newspaper. I have made every effort to remain true to the original, but certain lines were virtually illegible and demanded some extrapolation on my part. It may be, therefore, that certain words or punctuation marks may not entirely reflect the original.

Oleh S. Ilnytskyj
Harvard University

Панфутурист

РУРА-МАРШ

Селянин, червоноармієць і пролетар
Радянської землі!
Чи зустрінете ви цей удар
Знову напруженим: плі?
Так.
Гарматами по бруку
Серця рев.
— Ради — не Рур
Пуанкаре
Назад ні кроку!
Кріс в руку.
Стій.
Б'є барабан тривогу.
Б'є барабан бій.
В ногу, арміє, в ногу.
Чи зойків злякаємося чийх?
За нашого одного —
тисячу їх
З робітничих рук
не видерти кермо.
— Ради — не Рур
Керзон.
В наших не бравнінг
— в наших руках молот
але силою з вами рівні,
але нас не збороли.
Наша відповідь: мавзери в добу
Порох тримать сухим.
Ради — не Рур
Слухайте, глухі.

Нас не злякають ноти
 Керзонів, Пуанкаре,
 Червона Армія й Флота
 в Карре!
 Перед мільйоном червоних рук
 фашизму язви замусолені.
 Ради — не Рур
 Муссоліні.
 Ми в чеканню,
 Хоч прагнемо помсти ми
 Бо постріл в Лозанні
 Буде першим за фашистами.
 Ми на поготові
 В бій, тортури.
 Всі в одному слові.
 Геть капіталізму мур.
 Ради — не Рур
 Нас не руш,
 Хоч в руках не меч — рало.
 Ради — не Рур
 Генерал Фош.

Нік Бажан

КРИЖМО КОМУНИ

Гей, спалахнуть гори і розлогий степ,
 Коли за океаном грудьми, м'язами мільйонних орд,
 Проскоче грім, гартований грім, мов криця тверда,
 І на бурому руні бурунний вирубає наш герб.
 Ой, затріпоче не одна хмара крилата
 Коли срібне пір'ячко веселить на пожарищу
 Яке зграями злбних змій по небу рине
 В божий пуп встромляючись розпеченим колом.
 Серед блювот і крові й іржі,
 Серед степів посинілого трупа,
 Коли тріпоче серце сонця на ножі
 А серце людське в небо гупа.
 довго червоноармієць землю м'яв і товк
 щоб заплодити черево струмами-
 бурунами і он вже випливають пе-
 люшки червоним шовком для дитини,
 що спить комуною.

**
*

Мене зелених ніг,
тіл тюль люля хміль.
О, хто зазирає ввечері на зорі
в хвиль сльотну толь?

Маг гамм втом —
гілля хили чоло.
Лягай, гаї лагун
на килим, легінь лон.

О коло, локон лих
у голих ніг і мхів твоїх.
Не келих хилить літо то —
а плахту,
не конопель стон —
жах туг —
тінь туг.
Коло плеса оплетене тло
навкруг.
Плахта там.

З „ПОВІСТИ ПРО МІСТЕРА ЮЗА І ТРАМПА ДЖЕКА”

Епізод перший Джек на панелі

Над будинками вітер
шматки стлав хмар.
Акацій колючі віти
стукали й дзвонили в ліхтар.
Під хлюпотінням
дощових смуг,
слизькою тінню
виблискував брук.

Шелестів тротуаром Джеків крок.
Джек був голодний і Джек весь змок.

Під вітру трепіт,
тупіт краплин,
сховавшись в кепі,
панелью плив.
Від дому до дому крався він,
ховався в імлі та тулився до стін.

Захлиналися вітром легені,
Вітер тулився до лон.
Нахабно брязчали в кишені
відмички й Вессон.

Епізод другий
Юз читав газету

Містер Юз
шарпнув нервово сивий вус.
Сховавши руки в глиб кишень,
ще раз проглянув бюлетень.

Нафіксатуаривши корпусом проділ
своїх чемних і коректних шпальт,
таке доводив
„Нью-Йорк Геральд”:
— 10/2. Чікаго. Знову
торговельне представництво СРР
з бавовняним трестом склало умову
на купівлю бавовни тепер

. . . Відомий банкір, містер Тублін
зазначив у інтерв'ю:
на Союз Радянських Республік
пора звернути увагу свою . . .
Тут
майнув часопис в дальній кут,
і глибше в крісло вгруз
сенатор Юз.

Повзли в чоло думки сумні,
і Юз не знав чи лють, чи жаль це.
Чорнильну кляксу на сукні
розвозив неухважним пальцем.

Епізод третій
Полісмени Нью-Йорку не сплять.

В ринвах дощ дзюрчав і булькав.
Спухав водою неба сивий тент.
Мерехтів червоною крапкою люльки
на розі самотній полісмен.

Стояв і думав про губи Ліззі,
про Джіма таверну та білий ель.
Раптом здригнувся. Погляда врізав
у туман, що лягав на панель.
Суворо нахмутив лоба,
ще пильніше вдивився в тьму:

— Який-то ніччю блукає „гобо”,
що потрібно вночі йому?

Розірвавши думок теплий локон,
хитнув полісмен чолом,
лизнув каміння обережним кроком
і рушив за Джеком слідом.

Микола Бажан

ОСІННЯ ПУТЬ

Октави.

В.Л.

I.

Осіньна путь і мряка пелехата.
Рипить по-над шляхом, старий понурий дуб,
І листя дня, зів'яле та латате,
Прослалось стріхами обідраних халуп;
І край села ми сіли зачекати
На, вітром звалений, трухнявий граба слуп.
І скрізь нудьга, і бачу тугу ту-ж
В порожніх ямах зшерхнутих калюж.

II.

В полях туманних бився у тривозі
Холодний день, і жаль, хоч в душу стрель,
На серце впав, й пішли ми по дорозі
Серед пустельних і сумних земель.
І торохтів далеко дядько десь на возі,
Й спухав туманом лан забутих конопель.
І вітровіння скрізь, і вітровіння те-ж
Між пальцями похудлими оцих знайомих меж.

III.

Звідкіль прийшли такі вітри старечі,
До нас вони прийшли відкіль?
І гасить темний і холодний вечір
Радости останню гаріль,
Й на мрій моїх похилі, журні плечі
Ляга важкий і стозапеклий біль.
І розкриває крила, й поринає в льот
Суворий вітер гніву і скорбот.

IV.

І в криках вітру чув далеку сурму бою,
То крок бойців хвилює далечінь,
Бо дика вітру квиль проносить наді мною
Недавніх літ ще не забуту тінь.
Не вгамувать стисканнями спокою
Душі стривожених тремтінь,
Коли згадаю я, і бачу я, що ось
Струміння диму з вітром заплелось.

V.

Це — дим боїв, і дим жорсткий пожарищ,
Коли степи гули прибоюми атак,
Коли напружено у ребра серцем вдариш,
І вгвинтиш у набій людський свій переляк,
Націлишся і враз на ямах чорних згарищ
Ось ворог ще один, скипівши кров'ю, зкляк.
А ти ідеш, і серця зламок твоїй
Набито захватом, як порохом — набій.

VI.

А ось тепер лиш вітер коливає
У серці порослі уже достиглих туг,
Та в далеч стелється і тягнеться без краю
Доріг розімкнений ланцюг.
А я іду, іду й не помічаю,
Що тьма й туман росте навкруг,
Що на полях припишклих достига
Холодна осінь і нудьга.

VII.

Холодна осінь править танок.
Іду й шукаю на шляху
Слід днів, коли підводивсь ранок
У ревах смерті і в жаху,
Гарматний слід, і слід тачанок,
Що царину вкривав глуху.
Шукаю, але згинув слід
Минулих і недавніх літ.

VIII.

І не брелять шляхи, і в далеч вже промчали
Баских коней зухвалі табуни,
А я відстав й на мене не чекали,
Тепер-же спробуй: здогони,
І накажи, щоб не мовчали
Закляті в мовчанці лани.
Ні, то пройшло, і мариш, як ідеш,
Про час загаслих вже пожеж.

IX.

Та знаю: літ сліда не стерти,
Минулих літ, проведених в бою;
Величніх літ боїв і смерти
З сердець не стерти колю,
І на лиці людей тепер твій
Слід радісно й побожно пізнаю,
А слід цей — рана або шрам.
Або покорчене тремтіння, що пробігає по губах.

X.

Вдивляюся в таке тремтіння,
Зів'ялих губ чіткий, тривожний змаг
І бачу, загравне цвітіння
В глибоко вкопаних очах.
В чола похилене склепіння
Той трепіт б'ється, наче птах.
О, ні! Не кожному дано
Носити днів святих клейно.

XI.

Ляга туман. Ревуть далекі луни,
Суворі луни хмурих піль.
Не знаю я, нудьга звідкіль насуне,
Така нудьга іде звідкіль,
Але на прапорі розгорнутім комуни,
Немає слів зневіри і знесиль.
Ляга туман, й вогні цвітуть,
Вогні далекі. Дальня путь.

М. Бажан

ЦИРК

СКОК ЕКСЦЕНТРИКИ СКОК

перекувирк

все таки

геть трико

НОГИ ВИЩЕ ГОЛОВИ

всякі секи тюкань

Карком втру.

виклиКаю тільки гру

ТІЛЬки трюк.

з смерковим какаду

в трик - трак

прийду

без брюк

а так

ЦЕ ГРА

ЦЕ ТРЮК

не тік аттак.

вибрик

карабкається вибрик
по линві на дах сердець.
теліпається душ колібрі
далеко десь.

ВИБРИК

тільки вибрик
тільки ляльки ки - ки - мор
пікантна весна, мов сир брі
і диктові жмихи з блох.

підтюпцем

гоп - са - са
серце
лицаря
дзенькоти ляпаса
скоками
шпіцами
гикати, окати

**ЦЕ ШКІЦ?
ТАК.**

в пики голих фей
блощицею брика матюк
розкручений очкур галіфе
сальто-мортале.

ТРЮК

картатим скакуном захрюкаю
на скупливі шпальти.

ТІЛЬКИ ТРЮК
ТІЛЬКИ САЛЬТО

гикавка

капкою

кука

в фейверк

смерк.

крапка

як дика мука

далі

СМЕРТЬ

ГІП.

ляк

мук

душ

стек

цвях

в сміх

пик

джаз

зойк

спраг

кульш

ніч

блідь

блим

зик

ГІП.

с т о р ч

канкан душ
випнутих душ кікапу
смерч
сій сміх
на лошачий скуйовджений круп.

сонця
цяцьки цькуй
в гору втік хвіст

Я

ЦИБАТИЙ ЦВІРКУН
СОНЯЧНОЇ КУВИРКНОЇ ГРИ
зойк

стій пропелер
махаон дум
ОЙ

пне крізь пельку
лякливий какаду
душу шкереберть
серце нічирк.

це

цирк

там

СМЕРТЬ.

УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ СОЦІАЛІЗМ У ГАЛИЧИНІ

(до розколу в Радикальній Партії 1899 р.)

У другій половині XIX ст. Галичина була одною з найбідніших, економічно найвідсталіших частин Австрійської імперії. Сільське господарство, хоч відстале в порівнянні з іншими частинами імперії, всетаки сповнювало провідну роль в галицькому економічному житті. В сільському господарстві переважали поміщицькі і дрібні господарства; середняцькі на томість мали менше значення. На початку XX ст. поміщицькі господарства понад 100 га. становили тільки 0.62% господарств, але займали 40.3% всієї сільсько-господарської площі краю (включно з лісами).¹

Після скасування панщини в 1848 р. селянські господарства щораз більше роздрібнювалися, так що в 1902 році 80% всіх господарств у Галичині мали менше 5 га. землі. Багато селян було цілком безземельні. Безземельні та малоземельні селяни працювали як сільськогосподарські робітники або емігрували з Галичини.

Лише добувна промисловість, зокрема нафтова, що на початку XX ст. була майже цілком власністю іноземного капіталу, могла користати з праці місцевого експропрійованого селянства. Крім добувної, особливо нафтової, не було в Галичині іншої значної промисловости. Щоправда, існували ще харчовий (горілчаний і мукомельний) промисел та лісопромисловість, але внаслідок іноземної конкуренції вони були слабо розвинуті. Більшість галичан, які працювали в промислі, були ремісниками в малих підприємствах: пекарі, слюсарі, кравці, шевці тощо. У другій половині XIX ст. ці галицькі ремісники страшенно зубожіли внаслідок іноземної фабричної конкуренції. Тільки обмежене число галичан працювало в індустрії — у 1900 р. лише 9.0% всього галицького населення, а з галицьких українців тільки 1.2%.

Українців (греко-католиків) у Галичині було 2,312,000, тобто 42.7% усього населення краю в 1869 р., а 3,104,000, тобто 42.4% усього населення в 1900 р. Переважна більшість галицьких українців, 95.0% у 1900 р., займалася сільським

¹ С. М. Злупко, Ідейна боротьба навколо аграрно-селянського питання в Галичині (кінець XIX — початок XX століть) (Львів, 1960), стор. 9.

господарством. У XIX ст. українські селяни становили радше сирий етнічний матеріал, ніж нарід з окремою національною свідомістю. Носіями українського національного руху в Галичині були духовенство і світська інтелігенція (адвокати, урядовці, учителі, лікарі), що в 1900 р. становили тільки 0.5% українського населення Галичини.²

У 50-их і 60-их роках минулого століття український рух очолювало духовенство. Воно підкреслювало релігійний елемент у народному житті, особливо відрубність і цінність східнього обряду. По дальшій еволюції деякі греко-католицькі священики стали схилятися до православ'я. Клерикальна партія нічого не зробила, щоб національно або соціально освідомити селянські маси. Її члени навіть цуралися народних звичаїв і мови, пишучи мішаниною церковно-слов'янської, російської, української та інших мов. На початку своєї діяльності клерикальна або т. зв. „святоюрська” партія відзначалася відданістю австрійському цісареві. Однак коли в порозумінні з цісарем і німецькими правлячими колами у Відні польська шляхта взяла в свої руки цілу адміністрацію Галичини (1867 року), частина клерикальної партії пройшла еволюцію, закладену вже в ранішій її ідеології, в сторону явного москвофільства.

Далеко поступовішими від москвофілів були українофіли або народовці, які сягали до традицій Маркіяна Шашкевича з 1830-их рр., але які справді почали свою діяльність у 60-их рр. Народовецька партія, більше ніж москвофільська, притягала до себе світську інтелігенцію, хоч в її рядах також були священики. Народовці писали живою народною мовою; в політиці вступали в спілку з польською демократією проти німецького централізму; провадили освітню діяльність серед селян через організацію „Просвіти”. Народовці відіграли важливу роллю у дозріванні українського суспільно-політичного світогляду. Коли святоюрці підкреслювали релігійний елемент, то народовці — національний. Незабаром постала політична течія, яка звертала увагу і на соціальний елемент.

В російській Україні, де українофільський рух мав зовсім світський характер, уже в 70-их роках існувала політична течія, що під впливом російського народництва займалася суспільними питаннями. Серед цієї „народницько-демократич-

² Про соціальний склад галицького населення, див.: Józef Buzek, *Stosunki zawodowe i socyalne ludności w Galicyi według wyznania i narodowości, na podstawie spisu ludności z 31. grudnia 1900 r.*, Wiadomości statystyczne o stosunkach krajowych, tom 20, z. 2 (Львів, 1905).

ної" течії видатною постаттю був Михайло Драгоманов, який приділяв багато уваги також галицьким українцям.³

Драгоманов працював над „європеїзацією" галицької інтелігенції. Він виступав проти безупинних орфографічних сварок у галицькій пресі і за з'єднання обох галицьких партій на нових, більш відповідних селянським інтересам засадах. Він погоджувався з народовцями щодо вживання української мови, але одночасно підкреслював позитивне значення російської мови й літератури. Драгоманов уважав, що за допомогою російських письменників і критиків, таких як Гоголь, Тургенєв, Чернишевський і Белінський, галицькі українці могли б знайомитися з реалізмом, раціоналізмом та іншими надбаннями сучасної західноєвропейської культури. В чисто політичних концепціях Драгоманов був анархістом-федералістом, виступаючи проти всякої централізації. Він відстоював натомість „вільну спілку спілок", боровся, з одного боку, за демократичні права в Російській імперії, а з другого — проти російського централізму, царського як і революційного, а також послідовно виступав проти відбудовування історичної Польщі, яка включала б і українські землі. Драгоманов бачив кращу майбутність для Східної Європи в братерській федерації її народів.

До ідей Драгоманова прихильно ставилися більш поступові діячі народовецького руху, як, наприклад, статистик Володимир Навроцький, але справжніми послідовниками Драгоманова стала академічна молодь. Першими українськими соціялістами в Австрійській імперії були студенти університетів, на яких головний вплив справив Драгоманов. Наприклад, після зустрічі з Драгомановим і ідейно близьким до нього Сергієм Подолинським у 1871 р., член українського академічного товариства „Січ" у Відні, Остап Терлецький, представив кілька доповідей на драгоманівські теми, в яких він говорив про дарвінізм і секту штундистів в Україні; Терлецький виступив у пресі з критикою діяльності існуючих українських партій⁴ і опублікував перші українські соціялістичні брошури („Парова машина" і „Про бідність" Подо-

³ Про Драгоманова, див.: М. Грушевський, 3 починів українського соціялістичного руху. Мих. Драгоманов і женеvський соціялістичний гурток (Відень, 1922); також: Ivan L. Rudnytsky, ed., *Mykhaylo Drahomanov: A Symposium and Selected Writings*, Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., vol. 2 (New York, 1952).

⁴ Остап Терлецький, "Галицько-руський нарід і галицько-руські народовці", *Правда*, чч. 17-18 (1874).

линського, 1875 р.; „Правда” В. Варзаря, 1875 р.; „Правдиве слово хлібороба” Фелікса Волховського, 1876 р.).

Агітація Драгоманова мала також визначний вплив на членів москвофільського товариства „Академический Кружок” при Львівському університеті. Завдяки трьом листам (1875-1876), надрукованим у журналі „Друг”, органі „Кружка”, Драгоманов здобув собі прихильників серед членів редакції, зокрема в особах Михайла Павлика й Івана Франка.⁵ Внаслідок цього характер журналу цілком змінився. Статті почали друкуватися тепер живою народною мовою, а не т. зв. „язичієм”, тобто псевдо-російською мовою. Справжню російську літературу натомість поміщувано в оригіналі. В літературно-критичній частині журналу появились статті, переважно написані Франком, у яких автор з позицій реалізму гостро критикував народовецьких письменників. Студенти, зв'язані з журналом „Друг”, були ініціаторами з'єднання обох академічних товариств у Львові, москвофільського й народовецького, і вимагали, щоб старше покоління українців у Галичині взяло їх за приклад. Члени редакції „Друга” почали читати Чернишевського, Ляссалья й Маркса і старалися поширити драгоманівські ідеї серед молоді.⁶

Діяльність студентів занепокоїла галицьку владу, яка боялася соціалістичної агітації. В січні 1877 р., Павлика заарештовано і після двох з половиною місяців слідчого арешту його засуджено на вісім днів ув'язнення нібито за приналежність до міжнародного тайного товариства соціалістів. Потім, у червні тогож року арештовано цілу редакцію з Павликом і Франком на чолі. Також арештовано, між іншими, Анну Павлик (сестру Михайла), Терлецького і польського соціаліста Еразма Кобилянського. Судовий процес проти них, який відбувся в січні 1878 р., мав вирішальне значення.⁷

Як Франко пізніше сам писав у листі до Драгоманова, перед арештом він „був соціалістом по симпатії, як мужик, але далекий був від розуміння, що таке соціалізм науковий”.⁸ Зате по процесі Павлик і Франко свідомо і відверто виступали

⁵ М. П. Драгоманов, „Три листи до редакції 'Друга',” Літературно-публіцистичні праці у двох томах (Київ, 1970), стор. 397-427.

⁶ О. І. Дей, Українська революційно-демократична журналістика (Київ, 1959), стор. 17-193.

⁷ В. І. Калинович, Політичні процеси Івана Франка та його товаришів (Львів, 1967), стор. 13-96. Emil Haecker, *Historja socjalizmu w Galicji i na Śląsku Cieszyńskim* (Kraków, 1933), st. 144-50.

⁸ Листування І. Франка і М. Драгоманова (Київ, 1928), стор. 325.

як соціялісти. Ув'язнення й процес чимало сприяли їх радикалізації. Під час і після процесу обидві українські партії в Галичині — народовці (за винятком Навроцького) і москвофіли — відреклися від них, а це сприяло тісній співпраці Франка і Павлика з польським робітничим і соціалістичним рухом у Львові. Обвинувачені поляк і українці заявили про свою солідарність під час процесу і між ними виникли близькі особисті стосунки відразу після звільнення Франка й Павлика з в'язниці. Процес викликав теж живіше зацікавлення соціалізмом серед галицької молоді. Наталя Кобринська, що пізніше стала активною в радикальному і соціалістичному жіночому русі, визнала, що „процес наших молодих соціалістів сильно мною потряс; я майже не могла вірити, що й у нас такі питання порушаються, що і у нас суть люди, не раді з оточуючих обставин”.⁹

Перед своїм примусовим виїздом з Галичини (1878 р.) польський соціаліст Болеслав Лімановський скликав збори для заснування соціалістичного агітаційного комітету у Львові. Серед присутніх були Франко, Павлик і спольонізований українець, друкарський складач Йосиф Данилюк. Зібрані запропонували Франкові написати популярну брошуру про соціалізм. Брошура, написана польською мовою в формі катехизму з питаннями та відповідями, була підбудована марксистською теорією і тому значно відрізнялася від ранішньої галицької соціалістичної літератури.¹⁰

Цей агітаційний комітет виступав одночасно як редакція польської соціалістичної газети „Праця” („Praca”), головним редактором і видавцем якої був Данилюк. З огляду на відсутність зорганізованої соціалістичної партії з власним керівним комітетом (до заснування Галицької Партії Соціал-Демократичної — ГПСД — в 1892 р.), редакція „Праці” відгравала ролю керівного комітету для галицького соціалістичного руху.

Павлик і Франко вступили до редакції „Праці” в 1878 р. Майже кожна теоретична й програмова стаття, що появилася в „Праці” в 1878-81 рр., була написана Франком. Численні його статті надавали газеті, і тим самим ідеології соціалістичного руху в Галичині, виразно марксистського забарвлення.¹¹

⁹ Наталя Кобринська, „Автобіографія”, *Вибрані твори* (Київ, 1958), стор. 376.

¹⁰ Іван Франко, „Про соціалізм”, *Твори* (Київ, 1950-56), т. 19, стор. 7-17.

¹¹ Г. Д. Вервес, *Іван Франко і питання українсько-польських літературно-громадських взаємин в 70-90-их роках XIX ст.* (Київ, 1957), стор. 35-71.

Кульмінаційним пунктом співпраці Франка з польськими соціалістами можна вважати його співавторство програми галицьких соціалістів ("Program socjalistów galicyjskich"), що появилася друком у 1881 р.¹² У ній марксистська теорія наукового соціалізму поєднана з анархо-федералістичними поглядами Драгоманова. У програмі ставились конкретні вимоги (загальне право голосування, скасування посередніх податків і встановлення прогресивного прибуткового податку, повна свобода слова і друку тощо), як також теоретичне обговорення соціалізму і його місця в галицькому суспільстві.

Програма визнавала, як у ній самій зазначено, єдину теорію соціалізму підбудовану позитивною наукою, себто теорію Маркса. Вона дала при цьому короткий виклад марксистської теорії, де говорилося про класову боротьбу, додаткову вартість, суперечності капіталістичного способу виробництва, історичну місію пролетаріату і т. д.

Галицькі теоретики соціалізму вже добачали капіталістичні відносини в своєму краю, особливо в сільському господарстві (концентрація земельної власності в руках великого капіталу, зростаюча експлуатація сільського пролетаріату і т. ін.). Вони вказували також на зростання банків, залізничної сітки й нафтової індустрії, як докази поступу капіталізму в Галичині. Зубожіння галицької ремісничої промисловости автори програми пояснювали як наслідок розвитку капіталізму. Перед галицькими ремісниками виростали сильні іноземні конкуренти, які з огляду на краще zorganizовану фабричну продукцію могли свої товари продавати дешевше, ніж товари місцевих ремісників.

Визнаючи відносно відсталість галицького промислового капіталізму, вони цитували слова Маркса з його передмови до першого німецького видання „Капіталу”: „Більш розвинутий край показує менше розвинутому образ його майбутности”. Проте автори програми думали, що в Галичині сільський, а не фабричний пролетаріат повинен відіграти провідну роль в соціалістичній революції, якщо зростання промисловости не посуватиметься вперед швидше, ніж поступова експропріяція селянських земель.

Слабкість галицького соціалістичного руху автори програми бачили не так у промисловій відсталості, як у складній національній структурі краю. Кожна національність, на їх

¹² Передрук в *Polskie programy socjalistyczne 1878-1918*, zebr. Feliks Tych (Warszawa, 1975), st. 97-120.

думку, повинна складати окрему соціалістичну групу, щоб працювати якнайуспішніше у своєму власному середовищі. Ці окремі групи — українська, польська і жидівська — мали з'єднатися в федерацію для спільної діяльності. Таку федерацію становили „польські і українські соціалісти Східньої Галичини”, тобто автори програми. Кожна окрема група зберігала повне право сполучитися з іншими соціалістами тієї ж національності поза межами Галичини. Програма засуджувала всяке поневолення одного народу іншим і зокрема поневолення українців і поляків і бажала натомість, „щоб польський і український народи знову здобули собі самостійне національне життя (*samoistny byt narodowy*)”. Однак вимагаючи незалежного національного розвитку, галицькі соціалісти не мали на думці державної самостійности, бо передбачали зникнення держави як такої. Зате вони відстоювали якнайширшу автономію громад, повітів і країн у вільній федерації. Отже, щодо національного питання і питання державности, програма відстоювала ідеї Драгоманова.

Франко і Павлик не тільки співпрацювали в польському соціалістичному русі, але й старалися ширити соціалістичні думки серед українців. Велике значення у політично-культурному житті австрійської України мали їх видання 1878-1882 рр.: „Громадський друг”, „Дзвін”, „Молот”, „Дрібна бібліотека” і „Сьвіт”. У них Франко опублікував чимало важливих статей про положення трудових кляс у Галичині („Промислові робітники в Східній Галичині”) і про ігнорування їх інтересів інтелігенцією („Критичні письма о галицькій інтелігенції” і „Чи вертатися нам назад до народа?”). Дійсно революційною була художня література в їхній пресі — „Воа Constrictor”, „Борислав сміється” і „Каменярі” Франка, „Пропавший чоловік” і „Ребенцукова Тетяна” Павлика.

Видання Франка й Павлика часто конфіскувались, а за оповідання „Ребенцукова Тетяна” Павлика засуджено на шість місяців в'язниці. Втікаючи від покарання, Павлик переїхав з Галичини до Женеви, де в 1879-82 рр. співпрацював з Драгомановим і Подолинським. Тут разом з Драгомановим він полемізував з польськими соціалістами, зокрема з Лімановським. Українські соціалісти виступали проти ідеї відбудування Польщі такою, якою вона була в 1772 р.¹³ Павлик і Драгоманов також полемізували з львівською газетою „Пра-

¹³ М. Т[achenko = Pavlyk], „Klein-Russland,” *Jahrbuch fuer Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, 1879, S. 305-11.

ця” і вимагали, щоб газета приділяла більше уваги як польським, так і українським селянам.¹⁴

З кінцем 1870-их рр. датуються перші спроби радикальної агітації серед українських селян у Галичині. Цією діяльністю керували передусім Павлики — Михайло і його сестри Анна й Параскевія. Вони продовжували цю агітаційну роботу протягом 1880-их рр.¹⁵ Агітаційну діяльність серед селян у 1880-их рр. провадив також Франко, особливо в селах Добровіляни й Воля Якубова, де він посередньо мав вплив на малолітнього тоді Семена Вітика — майбутнього діяча української радикальної й соціал-демократичної партій.¹⁶

Тим часом у Львові тодішній уряд утруднював соціалістам легальну діяльність. Внаслідок цього виникли в 1882-1884 рр. таємні соціалістичні гуртки серед інтелігенції й робітників. У цих гуртках були поляки й українці. Українськими провідниками гуртків були студент Казимир Тиховський і шевський челядник Михайло Драбик. Таємні гуртки були зв'язані з редакцією „Праці” і видали революційну листівку польською мовою.¹⁷ І в інших містах таємні гуртки гімназійної молоді часто мали соціалістичний характер. Так, наприклад, у тернопільській гімназії коло 1887 р. існувало таємне товариство, в якому Євген Левицький і Микола Ганкевич репрезентували соціалістичну течію. Тернопільський гурток мав близькі стосунки з львівським студентом В'ячеславом Будзиновським, що тоді (в 1886-1887 рр.) був співредактором „Праці”.¹⁸

В 1883 р. Павлик знову вступив до редакції „Праці”, а Драгоманов післав гроші на її підтримку. Однак у результаті гострої полеміки щодо національного питання з польськими соціалістами в Женеві, Павлик був змушений залишити редакцію. Перед відходом, Павлик мав намір видавати двотижневик українською мовою, як додаток до „Праці”.¹⁹

¹⁴ М. Павлик, „Україна австрійська”, Громада, рік 5 (1881), ч. 1, стор. 115-9.

¹⁵ Друкований лист Михайла Павлика до людей (Женева, 1880).

¹⁶ Іван Франко у спогадах сучасників, Книга друга, ред. О. І. Дей (Львів, 1972), стор. 43-54.

¹⁷ М. М. Волянчук, „Перші нелегальні робітничі гуртки у Львові”, Львівський філіал Центрального музею В. І. Леніна. Наукові записки, вип. 1 (1959), стор. 19-47.

¹⁸ „Emil Haecker — spuścizna,” Centralne Archiwum Komitetu Centralnego PZPR (Warszawa), 289/II — poz. 2, st. 11.

¹⁹ Elżbieta Hornowa, *Ukraiński oboz postępowy i jego współpraca z polską lewicą społeczną w Galicji 1876-1895* (Wrocław, 1968), st. 61-2.

Співпраця українців у польському робітничому і соціалістичному русі продовжувалася і в наступних роках. Будзинівський був у редакції „Праці”, а в 1888 р. Павлик мав стати редактором нової соціалістичної газети “Robotnik Galicyjski”, яка однак ніколи не появилася. Коли в 1888 р. відбувся трижневий страйк трьохсот львівських пекарів, українські соціалісти — Будзинівський, Драбик і Ганкевич — співпрацювали з польськими соціалістами в агітації серед пекарських робітників.

Однак уже в 1883-84 рр. виникли виразні різниці між українськими й польськими соціалістами в Галичині щодо ролі агітації серед сільського населення. Українці, зокрема Павлик, хотіли приділяти більше уваги селянам. Навіть Франко, що раніше був більш зв'язаний з робітничим рухом у Львові й Дрогобичі, в 1880-их рр. змінив свої позиції й займався майже виключно селянським рухом. Від 1886 р. до 1897 р., він співпрацював з Болеславом Вислоухом у польському „людовім”, тобто селянському русі. В 1889 р. Франко й Вислоух навіть мали (накінець незреалізований) плян заснувати аграрну партію п. н. “Związek Ludowy Polsko-Ruski dla Galicji”. Павлик також співпрацював з Вислоухом, а крім цього в 1888-1889 рр. редагував поступовий народовецький журнал для селян „Батьківщина”. Однак через радикальні суспільні погляди Павлика мусіло дійти до розриву з народовцями і до його відставки. Невдачею скінчилася також раніша спроба Франка співпрацювати з народовцями в 1882-1884 рр., коли він багато писав для народовецьких органів „Діло” і „Зоря” та брав активну участь у їх селянських вічах.

Не тільки Павлик і Франко при кінці 1880-их рр. виявляли активне зацікавлення агітацією серед селян. Під впливом Драгоманова також інші діячі з-поміж світської інтелігенції намагалися освідомити сільське населення. Такі діячі як Северин Данилович, Іляріон Гарасимович, Кирило Трильовський і Теофіль Окуневський скликали віча, виступали з відчитами в сільських читальнях і намагалися видавати часопис для селян.²⁰

Радикальні українські студенти у Львові займалися тоді більше робітничим, ніж селянським рухом. Вони критикували драгомановські ідеї з марксистських позицій. Крім згаданих уже Будзинівського й Ганкевича, активністю відзначалися Станислав Козловський і Володимир Охримович. Львівські

²⁰ М. Павлик, ред., Переписка Михайла Драгоманова з д-ром Теофілем Окуневським (Львів, 1905).

радикальні студенти заснували в 1888 р. журнал „Товариш”. До редакції вони запросили Франка та Павлика, що довело до суперечки про редакційні справи між цими двома та „молодшими” і це спричинило припинення дальших випусків „Товариша” (вийшло лише його перше число).²¹ Власне це започаткувало ту незгоду між „молодшими” і „старшими”, що панувала в українському соціалістичному русі до розламу в радикальній партії в 1899 р.

Руську-Українську Радикальну Партію засновано на з'їзді у Львові 4-5. X. 1890 р.²² Між присутніми були Франко, Павлик, Терлецький, Данилович, Гарасимович, Трильовський, Окуневський, Будзинівський, Охримович, Левицький, Ганкевич і Роман Ярославич. Драгоманов, що перебував тоді в Болгарії, дав новій партії моральну й матеріальну підтримку. До його смерті в 1895 р., більшість радикалів уважала Драгоманова ідейним керівником партії. Органом радикальної партії став двотижневик „Народ”, що виходив у Львові від січня 1890 р. Ідеологічна різниця між „молодшими” і „старшими” виявилася вже на першому з'їзді, при обговорюванні проєкту програми. В результаті цього була створена компромісна програма, яка складалася з двох частин: максимальної та мінімальної.²³

Максимальна програма, опрацьована головно студентами Левицьким, Ганкевичем і Охримовичем, була спрямована на „переміну способу продукції згідно зі здобутками наукового соціалізму” і вимагала „колективного устрою праці і колективної власності средств продукційних”. Також включалися тут драгомановські постулати раціоналізму, реалізму і автономії громад, повітів і країв.

Мінімальна програма відображала погляди Франка, Павлика й Даниловича і фактично позбавляла „науковий соціалізм” у максимальній програмі реального значення. В економічних справах мінімальна програма пропонувала ряд реформ, спрямованих на гальмування процесу швидкої пролетаризації сільського населення. Вимагалось тут знесення ґрунтового податку і введення прогресивного прибуткового податку, сплачування якого не порушувало б мінімуму матеріального забезпечення, необхідного для прожитку насе-

²¹ О. І. Дей, „Журнал ‘Товариш’,” Дослідження творчості Івана Франка, вип. 2 (Київ, 1959), стор. 103-32.

²² John-Paul Himka, „Polish and Ukrainian Socialism: Austria, 1867-1890” (Ph.D. diss., the University of Michigan, 1977), pp. 496-502.

²³ Програма РУРП появилася в *Народі*, 1890, ч. 20.

лення. Автори програми виступали проти заведення неподільності селянських ґрунтів, бо вважали, що це сприятиме витворенню маси рільничого пролетаріату. Ці думки мінімальна програма черпала зі статті „Земельна власність у Галичині”, написаної Франком для журналу Вислоуха „Przegląd Społeczny” в 1887 р.²⁴

Франкові студії аграрного питання були вихідним пунктом і для інших реформ, пропонованих у мінімальній програмі, а саме: „реформ зміряючих до витворення постійної громадської організації народної продукції”. Метою цих реформ було набування панських господарств сільськими громадами і взагалі укріплення, поширення громадської власності. І так, програма вимагала безумовної заборони ділення громадської власності, зреформування спадкового закону на користь громад, викупу панських господарств громадами і правного полегшення цього останнього.

Програма домагалася теж реформи державних фінансів, загального голосування як для чоловіків, так і для жінок, знесення постійного війська, безплатної початкової й вищої освіти і якнайширшої автономії для Галичини. У національних справах, радикальна партія прямувала до „піднесення почуття національної самосвідомості і солідарності в масах усього русько-українського народу, через літературу, збори, з'їзди, товариства, демонстрації, відчити, печать і т. д.”.

Спочатку частина „молодших”, очолювана Будзиновським, не погодилася на офіційну програму радикальної партії. Будзиновський відстоював свої власні думки на першому партійному з'їзді і відразу після нього виступив з окремою неофіційною програмою, яку деякі радикали, напр. Охримович, прийняли за свою. Програма Будзиновського вимагала, щоб суспільство, зорганізоване в сильну, централізовану національну державу, було єдиним власником засобів виробництва. Будзиновський вважав народовецьку інституцію „Народна Торговля” зерном майбутньої націоналізованої промисловости і пропонував різні конкретні заходи, щоб її зміцнити. Він вимагав, щоб держава сприяла розвитку промисловости, а це привело б до збільшення попиту внутрішнього ринку на рільничі продукти.

Якщо в офіційній програмі вимагалася якнайширшої автономії для цілої Галичини, то неофіційна програма прагнула поділу Галичини на західню (польську) і східню (укра-

²⁴ Передрук в Творах, т. 19, стор. 278-304.

їнську) частини та з'єднання останньої з українською Буковиною в одну самостійну, централізовану українську державу, „оскільки се дасться досягнути на дорозі правній, без порушення цілості Австрії”. Тому програма Будзиновського вимагала поділу Австрії на національні адміністративні території з найповнішою автономією, тобто вилучення їх з-під правління австрійського парламенту і центрального уряду. Вона теж пропонувала створити з австрійської України самостійну митну територію, а також митну унію з Росією (для економічного об'єднання з Великою Україною).²⁵

„Старші” радикали критикували програму Будзиновського за те, що вона була базована не на потребах селянства і взагалі трудових класів, але „на фікції державности, а посередньо на інтересах тих верств, котрі в першій лінії з неї би користали, коли тим часом доля робочого люду в такій самостійній державі могла би навіть погіршитися”.²⁶ Франко піддав Будзиновського гострій критиці за перекурення марксистської теорії і його загальне неучтво.²⁷

Офіційну програму радикальної партії критикували й польські соціал-демократи. Вони висловлювали незадоволення з самого названня партії „радикальною”, замість „соціалістичною”. Непослідовність радикалів польські соціал-демократи добачували в тому, що хоч радикали висловилися за науковий соціалізм, то все ж таки вони стояли не на класовому становищі пролетаріату, а на класовому становищі дрібних власників, селянства. Соціал-демократи спротивилися постулатові викупу панських ґрунтів, бо викуп, як їм здавалося, не згідний з суспільним розвитком, дає селянам землю і таким чином замикає їм можливість переходу до робітничих рядів. Вони вважали, що радикалам скоріше чи пізніше доведеться об'єднатися з робітниками, що прийде необхідність їх з'єднання з соціал-демократичною партією.²⁸ Соціал-

²⁵ С. В. [Вячеслав] Будзиновський, *Культурная нужда австрийской Руси*, 2 частина (Львів, 1891). В. Будзиновський і Іван Гриневецький, „Матеріали до ревізії програми Русько-української радикальної партії”, *Народ*, 1891, стор. 155-9.

²⁶ Іван Франко і Михайло Павлик [Редакція], „Руське державне право і народна справа”, *Народ*, 1891, ч. 1, стор. 8-9.

²⁷ Іван Франко, „Ще про нашу культурну нужду”, *Народ*, 1891, ч. 23, стор. 309-12.

²⁸ „*Ruska partya chłopska*”, *Robotnik*, 1890, no. 17, st. 3-4. „*Nowa partja*”, *Praca*, 1890, no. 19, st. 2. b+i, „*Eine radikale ruthenisch-ukrainische Partei*”, *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, 1890, no. 45, S. 7.

демократична критика радикальної програми здобула собі симпатію серед молодших радикалів.

Отже, як бачимо, члени радикальної партії в 1890-их роках сильно різнилися між собою щодо ідеологічних переконань. Павлик, Франко і Данилович хотіли, щоб партія зберегла свою окремішність, щоб вона відрізнялася від соціал-демократичної партії і зосереджувала свою діяльність на селянстві. Молодші діячі бунтувалися проти старших радикалів, висловлювалися проти ідеології Драгоманова в дусі марксизму. Однак поміж цими молодшими виникли щораз помітніше дві протилежні течії. Будзиновський і Охримович згодом відійшли від захоплення марксизмом і натомість розпочали чисто національну, часом націоналістичну й антипольську діяльність. Зате Ганкевич і прибулий до Львова в 1892 р. Вітик продовжували відстоювати ближчі зв'язки з польською соціал-демократичною партією.

Незважаючи на ці основні різниці і на гарячу дискусію перед другим з'їздом радикальної партії в 1891 р., справу ревізії програми вдалося зняти з денного порядку на цьому з'їзді. Напевно успішна опозиція до народовців і їхньої „ нової ери ” шляхетсько-українського порозуміння та гарячкова політична діяльність серед селян (скликування масових селянських віч, виборчі кампанії тощо) допомогла молодій партії зберегти свою суцільність. До того ж, молодшу опозицію в радикальній партії послабило перенесення, на початку 1890-х років, політичного й видавничого центру партії зі столиці Львова до провінційної Коломиї. З бігом часу, однак, радикалам стало щораз трудніше зберігати свою єдність.²⁹

В 1895 р., особливо після смерти Драгоманова, який умів зберігати партійну єдність, старші радикали почасти були змушені допустити молодших до голосу. Ще навіть перед смертю Драгоманова, але в тому ж році, молодшим, а саме Будзиновському, було передано редагування двох радикальних органів — „Радикал” і „Громадський голос”. Центр партії перенесено назад до Львова. На партійному з'їзді 29. XII. 1895 р. програму партії піддано ревізії так, що тепер вона вимагала створення окремої української політичної території з українських частин Галичини і Буковини з якнайбільшою

²⁹ Про розходження в РУРП в 1890-их роках, див.: В. Левинський, *Нарис розвитку українського робітничого руху в Галичині* (Київ, 1914), стор. 41-54. Jan Badeni, *Radykali ruscy* (Kraków, 1896).

автономією.³⁰ В тому ж році один із молодших діячів, Юліян Бачинський, пішов далі і видав свою брошуру „Україна irredenta”, у якій відверто і з марксистською аргументацією висловився за незалежність України.

Група радикалів близьких до польських соціал-демократів (до неї належали м. ін. Ганкевич, Ярославич, Вітик і Бачинський) посилила свою діяльність у другій половині 1890-х років. Вони хотіли, щоб радикальна партія прийняла назву „соціал-демократична” та з'єдналася з ГПСД. Завдяки їхній внутрішньо-партійній агітації представники радикальної партії, Ярославич і Вітик, були присутні на з'їзді австрійської соціал-демократії в 1897 р., на якому від імені радикальної партії подали заяву, що їхня партія, затримуючи повну свою самостійність, бажає ввійти в якнайближчу спілку з соціальною демократією. Інші фракції в партії протиставлялися впливові соціал-демократії, вважаючи ГПСД за патріотичну, навіть шовіністичну польську партію, ворожу українським інтересам.

Більшість у партії згодилася на потребу вести агітацію серед українських робітників.³¹ Соціал-демократична фракція підняла цю акцію згідно зі своїми марксистськими переконаннями, щоб вплинути на клясову свідомість українського пролетаріату. Інші вважали агітацію серед робітників необхідною для того, щоб рятувати українських робітників від польонізації і вплинути на їхню національну свідомість. Старші вважали агітацію серед робітників за запобіжний засіб проти залишення партії деякими молодшими, які перейшли б до рядів польських соціал-демократів. У вересні 1896 р. радикали скликали таємні збори українських робітників у Львові, на яких було вирішено заснувати українську соціал-демократичну партію (УСДП) і видавати окрему українську робітничу газету. УСДП видала 17. IX. 1896 року відозву „Поклик до робітників русинів” українською мовою, але польським шрифтом. Цю відозву, що підкреслювала національний

³⁰ С. Данилович, Пояснене програми Русько-української радикальної партії (Львів, 1897).

³¹ Вже в 1891 р. Павлик написав у листі до Драгоманова: “справді, нема іншого виходу, як освідомлювати своїх робітників. Я власне думаю закласти... у Львові тов[ариство] руських робітників, де буду їх сам вчити руського письма й т. і., рад би також видавати по-руськи лат[инськими] буквами соц[іялістичне] письмечко, котре певне піде”. М. Павлик, упор., Переписка Михайла Драгоманова з Михайлом Павликом. (1876-1895). (Чернівці, 1910-12), т. 6, стор. 216.

момент, підписали Франко, Павлик, Ганкевич, Левицький і робітники-ремісники Михайло Бориславський, Іван Глинчак, Михайло Котиліак і Юрій Сидорак.

Орган нової організації, „Робітник”, почав виходити під редакцією Ганкевича в січні 1897 р. Журнал, на відміну від відозви, підкреслював радше класові, ніж національні інтереси робітників. Тільки шість чисел „Робітника” побачило світ; через брак грошей УСДП змушений був припинити його видання.³² Між радикалами й членами УСДП виник спір за виборчу кампанію 1897 р., і це позбавило УСДП підтримки радикальної партії. УСДП розв'язалася і частина її членів (м. ін. Ганкевич) вступила до ГПСД.

На з'їзді радикальної партії у вересні 1897 р.³³ Ганкевич рахувався вже як гість, представник ГПСД. ГПСД мала тоді надію, що з'їзд ухвалить резолюцію, яка з'єднає радикальну партію з ГПСД. Однак радикали ухвалили резолюцію, що, стоячи на ґрунті наукового соціалізму, вони хочуть тільки співпрацювати з соціал-демократичною партією в межах своєї програми, зберігаючи в той сам час цілковиту самостійність. З'їзд дав радикальним послам до парламенту вільну руку щодо приналежності до політичних клубів, незважаючи на внесок Вітика, щоб радикальні посли з'єдналися виключно зі соціал-демократичним клубом.

Усі розходження в середині партії стали дуже виразними під час з'їзду. Вітик вимагав виключення Окуневського з партії, бо той висловився на з'їзді проти соціалізму. Будзиновський виступив в обороні Окуневського. У своїй промові, адресованій селянським делегатам присутнім на з'їзді, він стверджував, що соціалісти хочуть спролетаризувати селянство. Вітик виступив проти Франкової програми викупу панських ґрунтів. Франко критикував внесені пропозиції Вітика, щоб партія висловила також за незалежність України, а не тільки за поділ Галичини. Будзиновський вважав аграрний страйк зброєю проти поляків, тоді як Яцько Остапчук пропонував організувати аграрні страйки спільно з польськими соціал-демократами. Дозріли, отже, ідеологічні розходження і назрів ґрунт до розламу.

Під кінець 1890-их рр. Охримович і Левицький самі відійшли від партії. Окуневський і Будзиновський були виклю-

³² Рецензія на „Робітника” появилася в польській соціалістичній газеті *Przedświt*, 1897, no. 7, st. 22-3.

³³ Wł. Studnicki, „Zjazd radykałów ruskich we Lwowie,” *Od socjalizmu do nacjonalizmu* (Львів, 1904), st. 114-22.

чені на з'їзді 1898 р. На тому ж з'їзді Остапчук і Ярославич внесли пропозицію, щоб радикальна партія перетворилася в соціал-демократичну парцію в назві, організації й програмі. 5. V. 1899 р., після приватної конференції Франка з провідником австрійської соціал-демократії Віктором Адлером у Відні, управа партії обговорила питання і більшістю лише одного голосу ухвалила зберегти партію такою, якою вона була досі. Це викликало велике незадоволення в партії, так що 21. V. 1899 р. скликано конференцію „мужів довір'я” радикальної партії. Конференція ще раз ухвалила зберігати надалі окремішність радикальної партії від соціал-демократичної. На конференції семеро голосувало проти реорганізації партії (між ними: Франко, Павлик, Данилович, Трильовський), шестеро було за з'єднання з соціал-демократією (між ними: Ярославич і брати Степан і Михайло Новаківський). Соціал-демократи в радикальній партії заявили про свій намір виступити з неї. Так, 16. VI. 1899 р. загальна ексекютива австрійської соціальної демократії прийняла до відома, що утворилася українська соціал-демократична партія. Тимчасова управа партії складалася з колишніх радикалів і з українців, що раніше були в ГПСД: Ганкевич, Вітик, Новаківський, Ярославич і Бачинський. УСДП була представлена на Бернському з'їзді австрійської соціал-демократії в 1899 р. і була визнана як частина загальної австрійської партії.³⁴

Після розриву з соціал-демократами, радикальна партія й далі вважала себе соціалістичною. Однак у 1904 р. партія усунула зі своєї програми слово „науковий” перед словом „соціалізм”.³⁵

У тому ж 1899 р. націоналістична фракція „молодших”, і разом з ними Франко, також виступила з РУРП. У червні 1899 р. появилось перше число журналу „Будучність”, що був ідейним органом нової націонал-демократичної течії. Редагували його колишні радикали Євген Левицький і Володимир Охримович разом з малярем Іваном Трушем. „Будучність” критикувала існуючі течії в українському політичному житті, включно з народовецькою й радикальною, і особливо гостро виступала проти драгомановської спадщини.³⁶ У про-

³⁴ Naprzód, 1899, no. 22-3. Громадський голос, 1899, чч. 2-3, стор. 14-5.

³⁵ Злупко, Ідейна боротьба, стор. 70.

³⁶ „Драгоманов... ніколи не розумів питання національного”, бо був захоплений „всеросійщиною”. Рух, що він почав, „був прямо шкідливий для національного виховання суспільности”. „Передне слово”, Будучність, 1899, ч. 1, стор. 5.

грамовій статті редакція „Будучности” заявила: „Розуміючи, що суспільність наша мусить поволі вийти в стадію ідейної консолідації та перейти процес перетворювання з етнографічної маси в народ в політичній значінню, ми хочемо процес той прискіпити і йому пособити, хочемо в тій нашій розбитій масі виробити спільний ідеал політично-національний”.³⁷ Пізніше „Будучність” ясніше писала про потребу скасування всіх існуючих українських партій та створення з найкращих їх елементів нової національної партії.³⁸ Така, власне, концепція лягла в основу Української Народно-Демократичної Партії (УНДП).

УНДП була зорганізована на довірочних зборах у Львові 26. XII. 1899 р. Програма нової партії (особливо первісна її редакція) багато запозичила з радикальної програми, і не диво, бо справжні творці нової партії були колишні радикали — Євг. Левицький, Охримович і Франко (разом з наддніпрянцем Михайлом Грушевським). Всі вони вступили до „тіснішого комітету” (управи) УНДП. До „ширшого комітету” належав і Будзиновський. Крім колишніх радикалів, партія складалася зі старих народовців (їх було дев'ять в тіснішому комітеті).³⁹

Перехід таких осіб, як Левицький, Охримович і Будзиновський до УНДП, ані не схвилював, ані занадто не засмутив правовірних радикалів, очолюваних Павликом. Але перехід Франка до національних демократів був сильним ударом для радикалів. Коли на дев'ятому з'їзді РУРП (17-18. XII. 1899 р.) Франко заявив свій намір виступити з партії, селянин-радикал Павло Думка висловився проти цього „в найбільшій роздражненню”: „Ми мали наших інтелігентних товаришів за півбогів, а тут переконуємося, що ті півбоги сваряться межі собою — нехай би те робили не перед людьми. Таким способом ми тратимо до інтелігенції довір'я Я думаю, що д-р Франко повинен тримати з нами, бо коли ще д-р Франко та Павлик не будуть з нами, то ми вже не маємо нікого з інтелігенції”.⁴⁰ Також Павлика глибоко зранив розрив з Фран-

³⁷ Там же, стор. 6.

³⁸ Див.: „Політичні амфібії”, *Громадський голос*, 1899, ч. 21, стор. 175-6.

³⁹ „Новинки. Нова руська партія”, *Громадський голос*, 1899, ч. 23, стор. 192-4; 1900, ч. 1, стор. 5-7. Народовці в тіснішому комітеті були: Юліан Романчук, Олександр Борковський, Василь Нагірний, Євген Озаркевич, о. Олександр Стефанович, о. Олександр Темницький, Кость Левицький і Дем'ян Савчак.

⁴⁰ „Дев'ятий з'їзд Русько-укр. радикальної партії. 17-ого і 18-ого грудня 1899 року”, *Громадський голос*, 1900, ч. 3-4, стор. 27.

ком. Натякаючи на Франкому поему „Похорон”, Павлик написав у відкритому листі до Франка, що селяни „тепер ховають Мирона [тобто Франка] — недавнього свого товариша і проводиря. І це роблять не в сні [як у поемі „Похорон”], а на яву. Хіба ти не чуєш їх стогнів-ридань за тобою? Коли ні, то ти справді вснув, твердо вснув, зачарований твоїм лихим генієм”.⁴¹

Франко відійшов від радикальної партії із-за особистих і принципових причин. Тому що принципи його вияснення мало відомі, тут їх цитуємо вповні. На дев'ятому з'їзді РУРП Франко сказав: „Головна хиба в тім, що нарід наш темний, самі хлопи не вміють провадити руху, — треба інтелігенції, рух мусить опертися на багатших хлопах, що мають вільні руки, а не на бідних. Ми є не тільки хлопи, але й русини; ми мусимо вести не тільки хлопську, але і руську політику . . . ”⁴² Він виклав свої думки обширніше у відповіді на відкритий лист Павлика.

[На дев'ятому з'їзді РУРП] я виступив проти тої думки декого з інтелігентних радикалів, що селянство мусить само організуватися, само робити політику, — виступив проти неї . . . бо по моїй думці **тепер** іще наше селянство не є настільки освічене, настільки освідомлене, щоб могло зробити це само без інтелігентної помочі, поради, без проводу . . . Інші інтелігенти чули себе ніяково в радикальній партії, через те, що приступаючи до неї вони, так сказати, виступали з руської суспільности, ставали осторінь від національних змагань, нераз навіть від усяких товариських зносин. Нам з Вами, старий Товаришу [Павлик], було це байдуже, але іншим ні . . . Чи ж не початком сектарства найгіршого рода є те, що на останнім з'їзді радикальним задля пустої покищо доктрини про страйки (бо для її здійснення треба величезної організаційної праці) кинено іскру незгоди між дрібку маєтніших і менше маєтніших селян, між нинішніх і завтрішніх жебраків? . . .⁴³ Я не знаю, може Вам дуже еретичною і нерадикальною видається думка, що у нас може бути покривдженим не тільки робітник, не тільки хлоп, не тільки ремісник, але також піп, урядник, учитель, купець, і навіть жандарм. І що в інтересі національним може

⁴¹ Анна і Михайло Павлик, “Все про те-ж”, *Громадський голос*, 1900, ч. 2, стор. 10.

⁴² “Дев'ятий з'їзд”, *Громадський голос*, 1900, ч. 3-4, стор. 27.

⁴³ Як глибоко Франко тут помилився видно з надзвичайного успіху аграрних страйків 1902 і 1906 рр. Див. м. ін.: Ivan Franko, “Bauernstrikes in Ostgalizien,” *Beitrag zur Geschichte und Kultur der Ukraine* (Berlin, 1963), S. 411-22.

лежати боротьба против усякої кривди. І що національний розвій може лежати в тім, щоб ми з посеред своєї нації витворювали всі ті стани і верстви, що відповідають певним функціям народного життя і не потребували дізнавати кривди ще й від того, що ті функції серед нашого народного тіла будуть сповняти люди чужих народностей нам на шкоду. . . . Я чую себе насамперед русином, а потім радикалом.⁴⁴

Незважаючи на деякі слушні зауваги Франка, не можна заперечити, що тут він оцінює національне вище від соціального, і що це було відходом від ідеалів його молодости, відступом від соціалізму.

Все таки Франко не довго залишився в національно-демократичній партії. Він вийшов з неї вже в 1900 р.,⁴⁵ а в 1904 році думав вернутися до РУРП. Франко виступив з УНДП, між іншим, тому, що ця партія „не зробила нічого для організування селянської маси та ведення її до свідомого політичного життя”.⁴⁶

Отже, від 1900 р., українці Галичини мали три головні політичні партії (не рахуючи москвофільського табору, що занепадав). УНДП, найсильніша з них, старалася обороняти інтереси всіх українців, незважаючи на класову приналежність. Зате РУРП і УСДП орієнтувалися на окремі класи — селянство і пролетаріят. Всі ці три партії, включно з УНДП, були в тій чи іншій мірі дітьми соціалістичного руху. Соціалізм в австрійській Галичині — як соціалізм усюди — мав завдання визволити трудящих. Однак цього, як знаємо, галицький соціалізм не досягнув. Натомість рух цей чимало спричинився до політичного оживлення й розвитку українців — як нації і як визискуваного народу.

⁴⁴ “Голос небіжчика”, Громадський голос, 1900, ч. 3-4, стор. 22-3.

⁴⁵ “Новинки. Д-р Іван Франко”, Громадський голос, 1900, ч. 14-5, стор. 128.

⁴⁶ Іван Франко, “Деж властиво безголов’є?”, Руслан, 1904, ч. 259, стор. 2.

A CRITIQUE OF TECHNOCRATIC TOTALITARIANISM

The Soviet philosopher, Vasyl Lisovy, is known in the West primarily for his activity as a Ukrainian dissident. When the wave of arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals took place in 1972, he refused to remain silent and with Ievhen Proniuk co-authored an "Open Letter to the CPSU," in which he protested against the arrests and outlined in detail the problems gripping Soviet society, particularly in Ukraine.¹ As a result, Lisovy was arrested on 5 July 1972 and has since served a seven-year sentence in Soviet labour camps and prisons. On 5 July 1979 he is expected to have begun a three-year term of internal exile. At the time of his arrest, Vasyl Lisovy was thirty-five years old (he was born in 1937) and had a promising scholarly career ahead of him as a Candidate of Philosophy, a research associate of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, a lecturer at the T. H. Shevchenko State University in Kiev, and a member of the Communist Party.

*The following essay, originally published in Ukrainian in 1971 in *Filosofska dumka*, the official publication of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSSR,² provides an insight into Lisovy's theoretical and social concerns.³ In it Lisovy addresses himself to one of the key questions of our time, raised originally by Max Weber and discussed more recently in the West by such social theorists as Herbert Marcuse and Juergen Habermas—the failed promise of Reason, which had been held out by the Enlightenment as the solution to the inability of the mythological and traditional world views to orient humanity toward emancipation and humanism. Instead, rationalism has become the means of ordering and dominating society. Rather than fulfilling its original function of providing a critique of society, it has become part of its control and legitimating mechanisms. Lisovy*

¹ The English translation of this letter is available in pamphlet form from the publishers of the Information Bulletin on Democratic Movements in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, P.O. Box 835, SUB 11, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, T6G 2E0.

² The original title of the article was "Krytyka stsiientystskykh konceptsii naukovo-tekhnichnoho prohresu" (A Critique of Scientific Conceptions of Scientific and Technical Progress). It appeared in *Filosofska dumka*, 1971, no. 3, pp. 63-71.

³ A partial list of Lisovy's other published works can be found in *Three Philosophers—Political Prisoners in the Soviet Union*, trans. and ed. Taras Zakydalsky (Baltimore: Smoloskyp, 1976).



explores the development of Reason and science, and their role in maintaining technocratic totalitarianism.

Although this article was written as a critique of Western society, Lisovy's statement that "barrack" communism resembles technocratic totalitarianism, in that both exhibit the characteristic of the rationalistic regimentation of social life, suggests that the article should also be understood as a veiled criticism of Soviet society. Rather than analysing the roots of this development and examining its historical alternatives, Lisovy looks at the problems that arise when scientific and technical progress is seen as the ultimate goal, and the only means, of social life. Lisovy is especially concerned with the repression of the independent development of moral, spiritual, and aesthetic values. He maintains that the full, independent development of such values is a precondition for humanism.

The range of concerns shown in this article makes this philosopher's imprisonment all the more tragic. Not only has his society been deprived of an individual of personal fortitude and civic courage, but his incarceration deprives us all of a profound thinker who, had he been allowed to develop his ideas freely, would have undoubtedly made a great contribution to the examination of the role that science plays in the political domination, as well as the material and technical processes, of modern industrial societies.

МКР

Scientific and technical progress expands the sphere of knowledge and provides humans with the material means to make possible the realization of humanity's ideals. But despite what bourgeois ideologists are inclined to believe, this progress alone is not a sufficient determinant of social development. *How* this new potential will be used is not automatically resolved in the course of scientific and technical development.

Bourgeois scientific and technocratic doctrines maintain that the subordination of all human goals to scientific and technical progress does away with the possibility of choice. Technology is declared the ultimate value; consequently, all aspects of human activity are evaluated exclusively by the role they play in scientific and technical progress. Scientism, as a hypertrophied rationalism, declares Reason and its recursively derived formulas to be the only principle of ordering social life. The bourgeois technocrat regards setting formally validated standards of conduct and then manipulating people to meet these standards as perfectly justified. Apologists of technocracy maintain that the "rationalization" of human life in this way is dictated by scientific and technical progress and that attempting to counteract it is futile.

While criticising the contemplative rationalism of previous western-European philosophical traditions, the founders of Marxism cautioned against scientific optimism, that is, regarding cognition as the only and sufficient factor of human emancipation and "humanization." They repeatedly emphasized that science alone does not provide the criteria for utilizing its own achievements.

The achievements of science and technology equally may be used for the sake of humanity and its liberation, or against it. In the era of imperialism, ruling social groups, armed with technocratic ideas, direct the conquests of science against humanity. In his speech delivered on the anniversary of the *People's Paper*, Marx said:

There is one great fact, characteristic of this our nineteenth century, a fact which no party dares deny. On the one hand, there have started into life industrial and scientific forces which no epoch of former human history had ever suspected. On the other hand, there exist symptoms of decay, far surpassing the horrors recorded of the latter times of the Roman empire. In our days everything seems pregnant with its contrary. Machinery, gifted with the wonderful power of shortening and fructifying human labour, we behold starving and over-working it. They new-fangled sources of wealth, by some strange weird spell, are turned into sources of want. The

victories of art seem bought by the loss of character.¹ *At the same pace that mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own infamy.* [Lisovy's emphasis.] Even the pure light of science seems unable to shine but on the dark background of ignorance. All our invention and progress seem to result in endowing material forces with intellectual life, and in stultifying human life into a material force.²

Another of the negative attitudes of Marxist philosophy to contemplative rationalism is expressed in the famous eleventh thesis on Feuerbach.³

Classical rationalism played a central role in the development of philosophy and science. It emerged as a way of restricting the realm of faith, for the benefit of reason. The maxim, to be guided by Reason and its principle of "universal doubt," freed the individual, the thinker, from the rigid restrictions of religious canons. But philosophers of the most diverse schools began treating Reason as an absolute. In their banalized form these efforts progressively became superstitions of everyday thinking and led to very negative results. They led to the "rationalistic" destruction of moral values, that by-product of the process of "death of the gods," completely unforeseen by the proponents of classical rationalism. Because they generally regarded science as a panacea, the proponents of classical rationalism did not realize that making Reason absolute would result in the destruction of spiritual values and the triumph of the principle "everything is permissible." At first glance, the stipulation that actions be governed by Reason appeared to put definite restrictions on people. For if one considered freedom as "recognized necessity," then "necessity" itself became the limit of the "permissible." It seemed as if this stipulation would have prevented ethical nihilism. In fact, this restriction proved illusory. It was incapable of serving as an obstacle to the negation of moral values and the assertion of a blatant individualism. For necessity to become a real restriction, the authority of an "omniscient being"

¹ In Lisovy's article and in the Russian editions of Marx this sentence reads: "The victories of technology are bought at the cost of moral degradation." (trans.)

² Karl Marx, "Speech at the Anniversary of the *People's Paper*," *Survey from Exile: Political Writings* (Harmondsworth and London, 1973), pp. 299-300.

³ Marx's eleventh thesis reads: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it." (trans.)

who would definitively know the content of the "one" universal necessity had to be posited. It was worth casting the existence of this being into doubt, however; for assuming that cognition is infinite and that different people attain the essence of things in different ways, then every person automatically becomes autonomous in the interpretation of what is necessity. It became evident that what was necessary in the view of one class or social stratum was not regarded so by other classes or strata. In fact, class interest played a fundamental role in defining "necessity." Theoretical arguments were used simply to legitimate this interest.

The stipulation that all actions be validated brought only ephemeral satisfaction, because the very concept and methods of proof do not remain constant. Moreover, should a person want to account "completely" and "definitively" for his actions beforehand, thereby foreseeing all their consequences, a person would never dare act. Contemplative rationalism never turned to practice as a criterion of truth. The formula "freedom is recognition of necessity," while expanding the frontiers of Reason, did not provide a safeguard against moral nihilism. When Engels said "freedom does not consist in the dream of independence from natural laws, but in the knowledge of these laws, and in the possibility this gives of systematically making them work *towards definite ends*,"⁴ he assumed that human beings choose these ends and that options grow in proportion to the level of knowledge attained. Neither Marx nor Engels considered freedom as an end in itself. They never asserted that freedom alone provides human beings with a fully developed spiritual life, nor that it prevents moral nihilism. Releasing a human being from being concerned about a piece of bread is not sufficient to guarantee his spiritual well-being. For this, society must make additional efforts. Precisely this was beyond the comprehension of contemplative rationalism, which viewed scientific knowledge as the goal, rather than a means, of humanism.

Some modern thinkers have attempted to avoid the moral nihilism resulting from scientism by delimiting the realms of reason and faith. The most distinguished attempt was made by Kant. Although positing determinism as a principle of science, he considered it incorrect to extend the applicability of this principle to the moral realm. In Kant's view, human actions in the moral realm should not be considered causally determined. The human being

⁴ Frederick Engels, *Anti-Duehring: Herr Eugen Duehring's Revolution in Science* (Moscow, 1969), p. 136. The emphasis is Lisovy's.

as a "thing in itself," in contrast to a human being as a phenomenon, possesses free will. The only law applicable here is the dictates of the conscience, the principle of the categorical imperative. A somewhat simplified schema of the idealistic delimitation of the realms of reason and faith is the following. Nature, including the human being as a natural creature, is a realm dominated by necessity, whereas the "mind" has a free will, which distinguishes it from mere things. Thus, the "mind" breaks away from the chain of causal determination and has the ability to "choose freely." In order to limit this "free choice," the necessity of God is postulated, belief in whom is voluntary and simultaneously involves responsibility. The human being answers to God for his actions. Belief in God, although limiting "freedom of choice," does not destroy free will. This manner of restricting Reason for the benefit of faith was justified as the need to counteract moral nihilism.

The constraint that was imposed by the dictate that the individual be guided by God's commandments did not preclude the corollary that "everything is permissible," since it soon became evident that people had different interpretations of religious doctrine and therefore of God. Interpretations grew in direct proportion to the degree that rationalism penetrated the religious realm. Under certain social preconditions, this resulted in the emergence of heresies and eventually in the formulation of the individualistic version of Christianity—Protestantism.

Even during the period of considerably "rationalized" faith, however, the Christian still came into direct contact with myth, which, because its particular features allowed scope for the imagination, created the illusion of the integrality of being.⁵ The myth's obvious drawing power opened possibilities for its use in the imaginary mediating of social contradictions and in attaining an illusory spiritual unity among individuals. Although the church frequently took to the sword and united by force instead of seeking an irrational basis for catholicity (persecuting in particular those who dared understand God in their own way), religious myths, without doubt, can serve as a great unifying force. Otherwise religion could not have fulfilled its role as "opium of the masses" and could not have been used as a means of "reconciling" classes.

⁵ It is not our purpose here to examine the complexities involved in the use of the term "myth". Cf. S. Averintsev, "Analiticheskaia psikhologiya K. G. Iunga i zakonomernosti tvorcheskoi fantazii," *Voprosy literatury*, 1970, no. 3; *Kratkaia literaturnaia entsiklopediia* (vol. 4, 1967), s.v. "mify."

Was it possible to formulate a new world view exclusively on the basis of a rationalistic critique and elimination of religion, without attempting to counterpose to religion a higher and fuller spiritual life? Was the belief in Reason and the cult of the intellect capable of filling the spiritual vacuum created by the "death of the gods"? It soon became evident that it was not. The cult of necessity, regardless of the content of this necessity, could not compete with a mythological perception of the world. Scientific formulas did not provide the scope for the imagination that was intrinsic to myths. Consequently, the "religion of rationalism," as a type of idolatry, is the most impoverished of existing religions.

It is not so much the "staleness" of the scientific cult that is disturbing, as the inherent threat of it subverting or completely destroying spiritual values. Rationalism designates cognition to be the goal of activity, and the mastery of the reified world to be the goal of cognition. This mastery manifests itself in the freedom to unconstrainedly manipulate known objects. Being is regarded simply as passive material that must be mastered for the satisfaction of human needs. Although the satisfaction of material needs is a precondition of genuine humanism, maintaining that the attitude of human beings to the world is exclusively one of master to servant neglects other important aspects of this attitude—the moral and the aesthetic among others. This latter view is attributable to extreme rationalism, which is inferior in many ways even to the patriarchal-mythological way of thinking. The patriarchal world view accepted Being as something one had to coexist with on certain terms: humans were to consider themselves neighbours, and not masters, of being. In this world view, such objects as bread, salt, and water have an intrinsic value. They are the constants of "something," consequently have an existence independent of ours, and therefore should receive "respect" for what they are. This is the origin of the ritual attached to the use of these objects. The rationalistic approach, in contrast, denies the intrinsic value of Being in general, including that of human beings. Moreover, this approach considers the human psyche simply as an object of cognition—an object to be controlled and manipulated. It regards the sovereignty of the human being as a superstition and affirms the conviction that humanity exists exclusively as a means of satisfying "my" needs.

If naïvete is inherent in the mythological-patriarchal world view, then technical rationalism is the spiritual foundation of bourgeois cynicism. Bourgeois politics, being arbitrary and devoid of all moral limitations, finds its ideological justification when everything is evaluated exclusively by whether it conforms to the

needs of particular people and social groups, and when the role of science is reduced to the production of the means of such conformity. This kind of ideology serves the ruling class even better than religion.

Pre-monopoly capitalism was characterized by the progressive destruction of both the patriarchal way of thinking and the traditional religious world view. But the ideals of bourgeois individualism, which were determined in particular by the features of the economy at that time, continued to nourish the ideology.

With the transformation of pre-monopoly capitalism into imperialism, it became evident, since "the gods had died," that the integration of people within the framework of bourgeois society on a religious basis had become impossible. Furthermore, by that time atheist criticism had exposed the activity of the church sufficiently to discredit it profoundly.

Moreover, even bourgeois individualism was increasingly exhausting itself and was no longer able to offer any positive ideal in theory or in real life. After all, it was a version of "the divinization of humans," in which a positive principle of humanism—the assertion of the intrinsic value of the individual—had become the sole principle. No supra-individual value, to which human beings should orient to prevent absolutizing any single, given moment of their existence, was acknowledged. Individualism, which in its time had provided the impetus for the development of culture and philosophy, now created the most banal versions of anarchism and, for that matter, hopeless pessimism. The conservative attempt (Vladimir Soloviev, Nikolai Berdiaev) to rescue religion, by somehow rejuvenating it and undertaking the reformation of the church, remained a localized phenomenon and never had a mass impact.

Given these conditions, it seemed that the ruling strata were no longer left with an appealing myth, with an illusion capable of assuming the role of an ideology that could at least soften class contradictions and avoid the revolutionary renewal of social relations. There seemed to be only one solution for the bourgeoisie—keeping people in submission exclusively by the use of force. But brute force devoid of ideology could hardly serve as a reliable tool; it would be impossible to stop the revolutionary movement by terrorizing people with brutality. Therefore, "pure" force remains a secondary attribute of technocratic totalitarianism. The consumption cult and consumer psychology have replaced religious myth in its function of allowing the exploiting class to forego the use of naked force. Technocratic totalitarianism refrains from using brutal forms of coercion (although all bourgeois govern-

ments are resorting increasingly to them) because of the transformation of "rocks into loaves of bread." It rejects the warning "not by bread alone" and scientifically develops methods of temptation, so a person is not satisfied simply with his "daily bread" but instead is drawn into a constant pursuit of things. While creating the possibility for the satisfaction of material needs, technology, in fact, creates a situation where the demand for new things is increasing constantly.

In ancient societies human beings took natural objects—water, salt, grain or plant fibre—and adapted them to their needs, shaping them into a traditional form. The tradition corresponded to the low level of technology. Humans could provide only the mere necessities of life, because even this demanded considerable effort. One result of the modern scientific-technological revolution is the mass production of goods over and above basic necessities, at least for a significant number of people. Since expenditure for production increases and the demand for goods fluctuates, industrial corporations artificially create a market by moulding an appropriate consumer psychology in the process. The American economist, John K. Galbraith, in assessing the success of advertising in shaping this psychology, writes:

The consequence [of advertising] is that while goods become ever more abundant they do not seem any less important. On the contrary it requires an act of will to imagine that anything else is so important. Morally, we agree that the supply of goods is not a measure of human achievement; in fact, we take for granted that it will be so regarded.⁶

This system exacts from people the maximum possible output in the production of consumer goods, an adherence to fashion, and the purchase of new items. The refusal to buy what is advertised threatens the very existence of the industrial system. The function of advertising includes the "conditioning of attitudes necessary for the operation and prestige of the industrial system."

Thus, in bourgeois society human beings, their interests, and ideals are subordinated to a product of human activity—the industrial system. The existence of the human being is subordinated to the existence of things. This trivial version of alienation is a vulgar form of idolatry. Above the authority of the social moral value, which could continuously direct human beings towards fostering

⁶ John K. Galbraith, *The New Industrial State* (Boston, 1967), p. 209.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 210.

humanness in themselves, is placed the authority of the thing. The production of goods is regarded as the only goal worthy of human aspirations. By taking into account the biological and psychic particularities of human beings and by manipulating their needs, scientific methods make it possible to transform humans into satisfied, "happy" entities. In return, human beings are divested of the freedom to go beyond the framework set out for them, to go beyond the algorithm ruling their lives. To put it another way, human beings pay for "happiness" by relinquishing the freedom to influence the functioning of the system in which they exist.

In non-Marxist philosophy, the threat of technocratic totalitarianism was clearly perceived by Dostoevsky. In the legend of the Grand Inquisitor (*The Brothers Karamazov*), the Inquisitor reproaches Christ for not having turned "rocks into leaves of bread" because Christ believed that "man will not live by bread alone." Christ also refused to take up the sword of Caesar, yearning instead for a person to love him of his own accord. The Inquisitor believes that people, having wrestled with the freedom granted them, would ultimately renounce it. Then he, the Inquisitor, would come and take the burden of freedom and thus responsibility upon himself. He would turn "rocks into leaves of bread," that is, with the aid of technology he would provide maximum comfort, and most people would be made "happy." Those not consenting to be made "happy" would have reliable prisons built for them. Although prisons are sin, they are sin in the name of "the happiness of the majority," and the Inquisitor will accept it as his responsibility. He and the others with him will take the punishment upon themselves—if only to save the majority from suffering. This is how the "crystal palace" will be constructed, a place where people, though deprived of freedom, will be "happy."

Some Western theorists, representatives of the New Left, call a society integrated in this way "contained" or "one-dimensional," since there are no forces within this system capable of changing it. In their view, the system is closed, and only by an existential revolt that would create a gap in this containment could one go beyond its limits.⁸

In so far as existence cannot be expressed in scientific formulas, it cannot be the object of calculation and manipulation.

⁸ Cf. Iu. Davydov, "Kritika 'novykh levyykh'," *Voprosy literatury*, 1970, no. 2, pp. 68-9.

The recognition of this aspect of existence is in essence a challenge to rationalism. The student revolts of 1968 were an example of a "fissure" that could not be explained within the framework of the theory of "containment" in technocratic society. But the New Left only threw a challenge to this society; in the process it did not avoid some essentially philistine illusions and openly inquisitorial inclinations.

It is noteworthy that on our level of analysis the vulgar theory of "barrack communism" and technocratic totalitarianism converge. The rationalistic regimentation of social life is made absolute in both cases. Proponents of such control frequently put forward what in their view is the most substantive argument: control is the most reliable safeguard of "order." This idea is profoundly mistaken. In analysing the historical situation in France in the mid-nineteenth century, Marx pointed out how various reactionary forces blatantly speculated in the slogan of "order."

During the June days all other classes and parties joined together to form the *party of Order*, in opposition to the proletarian class, the *party of Anarchy*, of socialism and communism. They "saved" society from the "enemies of society". . . . Society was saved as often as the circle of its rulers contracted, as often as a more exclusive interest was upheld as against the wider interest. Every demand for the simplest bourgeois financial reform, every demand of the most ordinary liberalism, the most formal republicanism, or the most commonplace democracy, was simultaneously punished as an "attack on society" and denounced as "socialism." And, finally, the high priests of the cult of "religion and order" are themselves kicked off their Delphic stools, hauled from their beds at the dead of night, put in prison vans, and thrown into jail or sent into exile. Their temple is levelled to the ground, their mouths are sealed, their pens smashed, and their law torn to pieces in the name of religion, property, family, and order.⁹

It is well known that a society in which the creative self-activity of people is destroyed in the name of bureaucratic regimentation, in the name of restriction for the sake of restriction, inevitably degenerates into a mechanical corporation. Moreover, that type

⁹ Karl Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," *Surveys from Exile*, pp. 155-6.

of society is not safeguarded against chaos. On the contrary, the threat of chaos and its very ramifications grow in unprecedented proportions because, where everyone's activity is restricted by a brutal algorithm, everyone is automatically relieved of responsibility. This type of society is like a train, in which every passenger is assigned to a compartment-cage and has no right to peer out to ascertain the train's direction. Meanwhile, the conductors watch carefully, not so much where the train is speeding, but that no passengers look out. Thus it is all the more unexpected and catastrophic when the train crashes. This type of society has control without feedback. And the technocrats, who sink into the illusion that they are omniscient and universal experts, are no more a protection against societal chaos than are "pure" politicians.

A bourgeois society that has evolved into technocratic totalitarianism is far from realizing humanistic ideals. It cannot be denied that scientific and technical progress, even within the framework of bourgeois society, is important for the proliferation of material values. But if the achievements of technology are used to disguise existing misery (if only for relatively narrow strata of the population), if "mass consumption" is combined with such a deformation of moral values that wealth becomes an unprecedented evil, then this has nothing in common with humanism. Technocratic totalitarian society is a society that uses science to "correct" economics, morality and art so that they pose no threat to the system. This society cultivates half-truths, humans without values, and a fragmented person in a mechanical world.

Traditional philosophical rationalism did not foresee many of the negative consequences of making scientific and technical progress absolute. It frequently sank into scientistic optimism, that is, it was not sufficiently aware that cognition alone provides no "directives" for the use of its results. With the conquests of science, human beings can achieve tremendous mastery over nature and themselves. What is more important, however, is what human beings will create out of themselves when they do become omnipotent, what they will use their freedom for. It is at this point that we enter the realm of choosing values. The generating and choosing of values are processes that differ from scientific research. In this realm, the human acts as a being that makes choices according to his conscience. Conscience cannot be set by scientific formulas. One need only reduce conscience to an aggregate of definitions and a human becomes replaceable in all essential parameters of his existence. As a very imperfect imitation of mechanical activity, human life then loses all meaning.

When the economy and technology become ends in themselves, the unique individual is regarded simply as an obstacle to be eliminated. Indeed, it is "convenient" for technology to have physically standardized human beings, for then it is very easy to automate the production of consumer products. It is "convenient" for human beings to be spiritually uniform, for then the interaction between the human psyche and the automaton can be expressed as a limited number of states. If scientific and technical progress is made absolute and nothing is done to counteract the deadly effects of the stereotypical nature of the industrial world, a stereotypical nature that ineluctably arises in bourgeois society; if passive conformity is all that is required of human beings—then this type of idolatry is the worst, and possibly the most dangerous, that has ever existed. The consequence is moral degradation. The tedium of uniformity leads to mass obsession with artificial means of relieving the monotony of life—drug addition, alcoholism, and sex. For this reason the preservation and development of spiritually consummate individuals, of a diversity of individual, ethical, and other forms of originality, is not a problem devised by poets but a very necessary alternative to the spiritual degeneration of society. Ignoring this problem will have harmful consequences not only for the spiritual, but also for the material, life of society.

Technocratic totalitarianism, a variety of neofascism, provides no means for overcoming the incommunicability of human beings in the modern bourgeois world. It transforms bourgeois society into a corporation of mechanically united individuals—cogs in a soulless bureaucratic machine. It offers a technological ersatz for spirituality, transforming all areas of spiritual life (art, science, religion) into props of this machine. Consequently, these areas themselves become void of real content and appeal. The bureaucratic octopus deadens everything its tentacles touch, leaving only an empty shell with its soul sucked out.

The socialist order alone first reveals the real potential for using the conquests of science and technology to benefit human beings. Socialism regards the creation of the material and technological base of communism as the main precondition, the necessary base for the construction of a communist society. But constructing a communist society also requires both the mastery of all spiritual values (moral, artistic, and so on) mankind has produced in the course of its history, and their proliferation. Speaking at the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Georgian S.S.R. and the Communist Party of Georgia, L. I. Brezhnev said:

We all understand the great significance of the economic and defence potential of our country. The moral and political state of society and the spiritual and moral dimension of the people are, however, no less significant. In fact, the strength of our defence, the international position of our state, and the economic potential of our country depend on this in many ways. But for us communists the principled, moral growth of each person has, in addition, a very great independent value; after all, the complete and harmonious development of human individuality is our ultimate goal.¹⁰

Marxist-Leninist philosophy does not make scientific and technical progress absolute. Comprehending the relative but nevertheless significant autonomy of moral, artistic and other values, it regards their formation as a very important independent task, which is not automatically resolved by scientific and technical progress. That is why surmounting the individualism that results from capitalism cannot be realized automatically simply by displacing humans from the process of material production. *The cultivation of spiritual values—conscience, civic courage, responsibility, and so on—is a special realm for the application of human energy.* The cult of the economy and technology, as the prism through which spiritual values are assessed, is a bourgeois view. Marxist philosophy overcomes the absolutization of technical and economic progress. It shows that science and technology alone are incapable of harmoniously integrating people into a society. Scientific formulas are only the means (and far from sufficient ones) for ordering the realm of necessity, that is, the realm where the human harmonizes his existence (as a biological and psychic phenomenon) within society, and society within nature. Human beings cannot disregard the laws of nature or refuse to consume and produce; human beings, therefore, must accept the inevitable consequences. But if heeding the results of knowledge forces human beings to adapt to the conditions of their life, it also gives them a certain scope for freedom. The essential human faculties are manifested precisely in the realm where human beings are released from the compulsion of necessity, that is, in the realm of freedom and creativity. The organic unity of human beings in an association of free citizens is achieved only when humans associate with one another as free agents, and when their unity is not thrust upon them from the outside by the dictates of necessity or a particular social group. The realm of necessity is only a pre-

¹⁰ *Radianska Ukraina*, 15 May 1971.

condition of this unity. It is its obligatory, but far from sufficient, precondition, because necessity alone does not constitute the content of such unity. *As social beings, people are able to meet and associate with one another. This meeting can be transformed only by the existence of spiritual values, without which people lose their human essence.*

Marxist-Leninist philosophy has overcome the limitations of the scientific, hypostatized, rationalistic world view and has indicated the conditions under which science and technology can truly become the factors of humanism.

Translated by
M. K. Petryshyn*
University of Alberta

* I am grateful to J. P. Himka, I. Lysiak-Rudnytsky, and A. Hornjatkevyč for commenting on the translation and suggesting revisions. The remaining errors are mine.

PLEA FOR LISOVY

To the Editors:

The following letter may be of interest to your readers:

Mr. L. I. Brezhnev
General Secretary of the CPSU
Central Committee
Chairman of the Supreme Soviet's Presidium
The Kremlin, Moscow, USSR

Your Excellency:

We are writing to you on behalf of the Ukrainian philosopher Vasyl Lisovy, who has been in prison in the USSR since 1972. Over one year ago a letter, signed by forty-five members of the sub-faculty of Philosophy, Oxford University, was sent to you asking that you initiate a "review by way of judicial supervision" into the case of Mr. Lisovy. We received no reply to this letter. In March of this year many of the same philosophers signed a petition to the Soviet Ambassador to Great Britain, Nikolai M. Lunkov, asking for Mr. Lisovy's release. Again, we received no response.

Mr. Lisovy's seven-year sentence to a strict regime labor camp ends this summer, and he is scheduled to be sent into internal exile 6 July. His term of exile will end 6 July 1982. At this point in Mr. Lisovy's sentence we ask you once again to reconsider the case.

Mr. Lisovy, born in 1937, was a member of the Communist Party, a candidate of the Institute of Philosophy at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and a lecturer at the Kiev State T. H. Shevchenko University. He had been disturbed by recent arrests of the intelligentsia in the Ukraine, which he considered illegal. For this reason he and a colleague, Yevhen Pronyuk, drafted an open letter to members of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Though the letter could in no way be considered subversive or dangerous, both Mr. Lisovy and Mr. Pronyuk were arrested and imprisoned for writing it.

In spite of Soviet pre-trial regulations, which require that a prisoner must be brought to trial within nine months of his arrest, Mr. Lisovy was not tried until December 1973. Though his trial was, in effect, conducted in secret, we have reason to believe that he was charged under Article 62 of the Ukrainian penal code, which deals with Anti-Soviet Agitation and Propaganda. He was sentenced to seven years in a strict regime labor camp followed by three years of internal exile.

Upon his arrest, Mr. Lisovy was deprived of his academic posts. Whilst in prison, he has spent at least two and half years of his sentence under special conditions such as solitary confinement. He is known to have been suffering from chronic hepatitis, severe eczema, and festering and bleeding leg wounds. His wife, Vera Lisova, lost her post as a teacher of philology at Kiev University, and has most recently been working in a factory. For some time she was unemployed. Their two children have been ill. Pressure has been put on Mrs. Lisovy to make her husband recant his views, but with no success.

As we pointed out in our first letter to you, Mr. Lisovy's case could be reconsidered through a process known as "review by way of judicial supervision," which allows for a reappraisal of a prisoner's case on the following two counts:

(1) A lack of correspondence between the court's findings set forth in judgement and the factual circumstances of the case. (There is no reason to think that Mr. Lisovy intended to undermine the Soviet government. Furthermore, he has a consistently good record as a citizen, Party member, and academic.)

(2) A lack of correspondence between the punishment assigned by the court and the gravity of the crime or the personality of the convicted person. (The harshness of the sentence passed on Mr. Lisovy seems out of all proportion to his action.)

While we recognize the rights of all countries to run their own affairs, we feel it our duty to protest against such treatment of a fellow teacher of philosophy. We appeal to you to take note of our plea and would welcome any comment you might have to make on Mr. Lisovy's case.

Anthony Quinton, President, Trinity College, Oxford, *Charles Taylor*, Chichele Professor of Political Theory, All Souls College, *Peter Strawson*, Waynflete Professor of Metaphysical Philosophy, Magdalen College, *Iris Murdoch*, *Stuart Hampshire*.

This letter appeared in the New York Review of Books of August 16, 1979. It has been reprinted intact except for the change in the surname from the Russian Lisovsky to the Ukrainian Lisovy.

Alexander Motyl

THE SOVIET UNION THROUGH THE EYES OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

Moscow correspondents for the *New York Times* are an illustrious lot. They are said to understand the Byzantine workings of the mysterious Russian mind and are considered knowledgeable authorities on a distant and exotic world. They write articles quoting unpronounceable sources. They may even write books about their experiences. But most important, they report what they see, and what they see is surely what is.

But are they also providing an accurate picture of the Soviet Union? Are they capable of covering that vast and complex country? Do they write their articles in such a manner as to overcome the many limitations on reporting from Moscow? And if they do not, why not? And if the final product is misleading, are they alone to be held responsible?

The last question is crucial. For although the individual correspondent plays a very important role in determining news content, the process by which news reaches the pages of the *Times* involves the interaction of three broadly defined groups—the journalists, the management (here considered equivalent to editors, owners, gatekeepers, and all other persons who exert influence from the inside), and the audience (readers, advertisers, competitors, and all who exert influence from the outside)—and results in a certain undeniable harmonization of interests, which leads to the newspaper's having a "profile," a character that is unmistakably its own. By the very act of being involved with the same newspaper, journalists, management, and audience assert their fundamental identity of interests and outlooks. The Moscow correspondent, therefore, is as much a representative of his editors and readers as he is an independent actor with complete freedom of judgement.

How, then, does news on the Soviet Union get to appear in the *Times*? Is this process in any way related to the content of the news? More precisely, how does the *Times* report on Soviet dissidents, a favorite topic, and on Soviet nationalities, a not-so-favorite topic intimately related to and indispensable to understanding dissent?

Hedrick Smith, Christopher Wren, David Shipler, and Craig Whitney have been the most recent Moscow correspondents for the *Times*. The newspaper's choice of these four reporters was

clearly dictated by the conviction that good reporters are good under any circumstances. Smith's previous experience included Vietnam, the Middle East, and Washington. Wren was promoted to Moscow after serving as senior editor at *Look* and *Newsweek*. Shipler got to the Soviet capital by way of Saigon and the *Times's* metropolitan staff. Whitney's rise was at least geographically more logical: Washington, New York, Saigon, Bonn, and finally Moscow. Clearly, none of the four could claim familiarity with the Soviet Union at the time of their assignment.

Although good reporters may indeed remain good reporters anywhere in their home country, it is not hard to see that this need not be so abroad. Two obstacles immediately come to mind. First, does the correspondent speak the foreign language sufficiently well to catch all its nuances? (To argue by analogy: would the *Times's* metropolitan desk be likely to hire a reporter with an imperfect knowledge of English?) And second, does he know the history, culture, politics, and social patterns of the given country as well as a foreigner may be expected to know them? Surely the correspondent's reporting will suffer if he is lacking in either language or knowledge.

With regard to language, Moscow correspondents generally learn Russian in a year of intensive studying before being shipped out to the USSR. That they can make themselves understood is clear, but can they really *speak* the language? A recent Soviet Jewish émigré, Lev Navrozov, provides a likely answer: "The most obvious key to the knowledge of any foreign country is its language. Everyone has experienced or observed the fact that it is extremely difficult for a foreigner to speak and understand a new language as well as a six-year-old speaks and understands it. By the time that six-year-old has developed into a reasonably developed and versatile person, it is the rare foreigner indeed who can match his mastery of the nuances of his native tongue. By this I mean not just that an expert on a country must know the language of that country, but that such an expert must be as gifted, reverent, subtle, sophisticated, and eager to learn from natives as a student striving after perfect and authentic mastery of a foreign language. Too many Westerners have been too slow in grasping this."¹ Even Harrison Salisbury, according to Navrozov, "still manages to mangle the commonest Russian words he uses occasionally in his books."²

¹ Lev Navrozov, "What the CIA Knows About Russia," *Commentary*, September 1978, pp. 52-3.

² *Ibid.*, p. 53.

That good knowledge of a foreign country is a prerequisite to good reporting seems trivially true. Nevertheless, foreign correspondents are routinely assigned to regions about which they are insufficiently informed. To answer this charge by replying that prior knowledge is not necessary because a reporter's primary job is to report what he sees misses the point: what the reporter thinks he knows largely determines what he sees. Very simply, it is a question of posing the right questions. Hedrick Smith, for example, admitted: "At almost every turn, the improbability of the down-to-earth realities of Russian life constantly forced me to correct my own preconceptions. The painstaking dissections of Western Kremlinologists, for example, had exposed the fiction of the Communist Monolith but did not quite prepare me to hear a dissident's wife disclose that she was a Party member or to spend an evening listening to a Party *apparatchik* tell me cynical jokes about Lenin and Brezhnev."³

Smith's comment is revealing for two reasons. It shows that his acquaintance with the "painstaking discussions of Western Kremlinologists" was not as good as he had imagined and that he had probably had no contacts with any of the very numerous recent Soviet émigrés before leaving for Moscow. Had Smith been stronger on either of the two counts, he would almost certainly not have been so surprised at dissidents being Party members and functionaries telling anti-Soviet jokes.

But given the correspondent as he is, how will living and working conditions in Moscow affect and perhaps even determine the kind of reporting that he will do?

The first and most obvious limitations are geographical. Moscow, as is too often forgotten in the West, is but one city in a country of 245 million inhabitants, 102 nationalities, 15 theoretically sovereign republics, and of 8.6 million square miles. The very size and diversity of the USSR make it virtually impossible to do justice to the country. Moreover, Moscow's population is primarily Russian, while the non-Russians, who constitute just over half of the USSR's population, live on the periphery of the country. The correspondent, as a result, is largely screened—save for his occasional trips to the outlying regions—from at least half of the Soviet Union's potential newsmakers.

The second set of restrictions on the Moscow correspondent are societal. Very simply, the closed nature of contemporary Soviet society discourages observation and investigation, the two essen-

³ Hedrick Smith, *The Russians* (New York, 1976), p. 7.

tials of a journalist's work. Press, radio, television, and publishing are all state-controlled and therefore reveal to the journalist only that which the Party and state want him to know. In addition, a particularly impenetrable and all-pervasive bureaucracy intent on preserving its secrets deprives the reporter of the possibility of observing the government machinery from the inside. Officials, who virtually all are state employees, require government approval to grant interviews. Knowing that their remarks will be reported up the hierarchy, they are "chary of candor with the foreign press."⁴ As David Shipler succinctly noted, foreign correspondents "are toasted by officials and vilified by the Soviet press, escorted graciously around factories and denied interviews, entertained at receptions and deprived of facts."⁵

Of perhaps even greater importance is the difficulty of speaking to the "man on the street." What Hedrick Smith calls "the self-censorship of most Russians that inhibits them from speaking candidly with outsiders about their society," and which he attributes to a "national mania for dressing up reality at all costs"⁶ (David Shipler sees this as stemming from a "Russian tradition of aversion to foreign observation"⁷—which is to say that Russians are not candid because they were never candid), may indeed spring from some mysterious and convenient national "inferiority complex." More likely, it is a conditioned reflex of the fear of being seen associating with Western journalists whom Soviet propaganda regularly portrays as "agents of foreign powers" intent on subverting the Soviet order. That the roots of this "self-censorship" sooner lie here than in "Russian tradition" is also suggested by the very genuine and understandable popular fear of the Soviet security police, the KGB.

The third set of restrictions are, loosely speaking, legal. The correspondent cannot choose his own place of residence and instead must live and work in a heavily guarded compound for foreigners, where natives are rarely willing to tread. Prior to the signing of the Helsinki accord in 1975, correspondents were also restricted from travelling more than twenty-five miles from Moscow and had to go through laborious procedures to obtain the Foreign Ministry's permission to visit the "non-restricted" parts

⁴ David K. Shipler, "Russia Views Foreigners with Envy and Fear," *The New York Times*, 23 July 1978.

⁵ David K. Shipler, "Reporters Find Hospitality in Soviet but Little News," *The New York Times*, 11 June 1976.

⁶ Smith, p. 15.

⁷ Shipler, "Russia Views Foreigners . . ."

of the country. After Helsinki, the 25-mile limit was lifted, 24-to-48-hour notification was decreed sufficient for travel to the non-restricted regions, and journalists were given multiple entry and exit visas. However, the benefits of these moves appear to have been minimal, particularly with respect to travel to non-restricted areas. As Shipler has reported, "30 percent of the territory is closed," while "85 percent is inaccessible"⁸—the result of a simple bureaucratic trick of refusing the correspondent hotel space in those open areas where his presence is undesired.

The last, and perhaps most important, limitation on a correspondent is the KGB. Its presence in all facets of Soviet life facilitates a control of the society and its members that interferes at every step with the Western correspondent's search for news. At the same time, the KGB follows the reporter, taps his telephone, searches his apartment and belongings, monitors his work, and occasionally harasses him physically to keep him in line. Hedrick Smith's belief that these "harassments in fact represent less of a problem than . . . the self-censorship of most Russians" reveals a profound underestimation of the KGB's power to control the correspondent's environment and a surprising unfamiliarity with the realities of Soviet life.⁹

The combined effect of these limitations—those of the journalist together with those imposed upon the journalist by the Soviet Union—is to isolate him almost completely from his surroundings, thereby depriving him of access to virtually all but official sources of information.

Whom, then, can a correspondent go to for other than official information? It is the dissidents. Having consciously chosen a course that goes against the established Soviet order, dissidents perceive correspondents not as threats to their existence but as helpers in their cause. The result of this perception is a symbiotic relationship between correspondent and dissident. The correspondent needs the dissident to write his story; the dissident needs the correspondent to tell his story. In this respect, the Soviet government is itself to a large degree responsible for the "dissident-laden" news in the Western press by driving the dissidents and correspondents together. The solution to this problem—opening up the society—is of course no alternative for the Soviet regime.

How does this relationship between correspondent and dissident manifest itself? The dissident's usefulness to the correspon-

⁸ David K. Shipler, "Travel Curbs in Soviet and U.S. Not Improved by Detente," *New York Times*, 3 February 1977.

⁹ Smith, p. 15.

dent is clear: the latter taps him for information on dissident activities and on events that receive little or no coverage in the Soviet media, as well as for an alternate or supplementary viewpoint on officially covered news items.

The example of Nobel Prize-winner Andrei Sakharov vividly illustrates the dependence of Western journalists on dissidents. As is clear from reading the *Times*, Sakharov provides its correspondents with an exceedingly large amount of their news on dissent. In fact, his comments appear in almost every article on the Soviet Union. Moreover, Sakharov himself is a "star" whose every word and action is assigned a significance far out of proportion to its actual importance. The *Times*, for example, once ran a UPI article covering the fact that Sakharov's phone had been disconnected—an insignificant event that would probably not have been mentioned had the dissident in question not been who he is.¹⁰

Correspondents are equally indispensable to the dissidents. The Soviet activists use the journalists as "transmission belts"¹¹ to the West. They supply the correspondents with underground writings, provide them with news of the latest political repressions, and encourage them to publicize their plight in the West. Dissidents, however, do not do this out of a concern for the American press. Rather, their intention is to provide their Western sympathizers with information that will advance their cause and will be broadcast back into the USSR. The second point is particularly important, because foreign broadcasts give the dissidents the local publicity that the official Soviet media deny them. Considering the large amount of Soviet propaganda devoted to counteracting the influence of foreign radio stations—a sure sign that many Soviet citizens listen to these broadcasts—it is understandable why the dissidents place such great weight on communicating with the outside world. This roundabout communications route is actually the shortest and most effective way of reaching their audience at home.

In a very real sense, therefore, dissidents manipulate Western correspondents. Moreover, a fair share of what dissidents do as dissidents is probably intended as much for the Western media as for the Soviet regime. In this respect, Soviet dissidents create

¹⁰ UPI, "Telephone of Sakharov Disconnected in Soviet," *The New York Times*, 14 March 1978.

¹¹ Gayle Durham Hollander, "Political Communication and Dissent in the Soviet Union," in *Dissent in the USSR. Politics, Ideology, and People*, ed. Rudolf L. Tokes (Baltimore, 1975), p. 259.

"media events." On the other hand, Western coverage of dissident activity probably encourages such activity. This is not to say that Soviet dissidents are the creation of the Western press. Clearly, however, the knowledge that a sit-in or rally will be covered if the appropriate newsmen is notified beforehand may encourage the holding of such actions for the specific purpose of getting such coverage.

Many of the protests by Jewish activists should be seen in this light. In contrast to most other dissidents, Jews have adopted a surprising vocal and Western form of dissent. They take to the streets, they demonstrate, they make themselves very visible. Anatolii Shcharansky's open and extensive contacts with Western correspondents, for example, reveal the degree to which Jewish dissidents understand the value of the Western press and utilize it to their own ends. Just as telling was the 1973 *Times* photograph of five Jews holding protest signs before an official building in Moscow. Given the rapidity with which demonstrations of any kind are broken up by the KGB, the correspondent who took the photograph must have known exactly when and where the protest was going to take place. Incidentally, it is not surprising that in almost all cases open protests, whether by Jewish or other dissidents, occur only in Moscow. A Georgian dissident in Tbilisi, for example, realizes well that news of his action is unlikely to reach the Western correspondent, whose attention is fixed on the capital.¹²

An even more blatant example of a "media event" occurred on March 20, 1972, when Hedrick Smith and Robert Kaiser of the *Washington Post* were invited to interview Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, who had just won the Nobel Prize. According to Smith, "he handed us each a fat copy of written material from the writing table, headed 'Interview with The New York Times and the Washington Post'. And there it was, the whole thing, questions and answers—all prepared by Solzhenitsyn. I was stunned. What an irony, I thought. This is the way it is done at Pravda" The Russian writer, concluded Smith, had taken it "for granted that the Western press was his vehicle. If he had to be his own defense attorney, he assumed that the West would provide him partisan witnesses and a partisan jury."¹³

The combined effect of the various restrictions on the Moscow correspondent is to isolate him in the Russian capital and to limit his professional contacts to the Russian and Jewish dissidents

¹² *The New York Times*, 7 May 1973.

¹³ Smith, p. 421.

living in Moscow. How, then, might one expect these restrictions, together with the correspondent's own limited knowledge of the Soviet Union, to affect his coverage of Soviet dissidents and nationalities?

It is not unreasonable to presume that the correspondent will tend to confuse the Soviet Union with Russia, that he will present the dissident movement as consisting almost entirely of a regionally limited group of Russians and Jews, and that he will often provide superficial accounts that leave much to be desired in the way of background.

It will be best to consider these propositions separately.

1. That the Soviet Union is equivalent to Russia.

As the British researcher Colin Seymour-Ure points out, "the primary effects of the frequency of communications about a subject are to define the matters that audiences think about, even if they do not determine audience attitudes towards them, let alone their behaviour."¹⁴ If one accepts Seymour-Ure's statement as accurate, then it follows that reporting about the Soviet Union from a primarily Russian perspective will tend to identify the Soviet Union with Russia in the reader's mind. The point, of course, is that the Soviet Union is *not* Russia, as a quick look at any map will reveal. In fact, confusing the USSR with Russia is tantamount to saying that the United States is Texas. Certainly, Texas is an important part of the USA, but it is very far from being the entire country.

The problem, however, goes deeper in that the *Times's* correspondents insist on using the terms Russian and Soviet interchangeably. (Once again, the analogy with Texas reveals the absurdity of this insistence: would a *Times* correspondent ever refer to Jimmy Carter as the President of Texas?) Hedrick Smith made a very telling comment in this respect in the foreword to *The Russians*: "This book is intended for general readers and I hope that specialists will forgive a few conventions that I have adopted to make it easier for ordinary readers. I have used 'Russia' and 'Soviet Union' almost interchangeably though technically speaking, Russia, or the Russian Republic, is only one of the 15 Republics that make up the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."¹⁵ Curiously, Smith considers this terminology to be important only to specialists, as if to imply that journalists should not be interested in "getting

¹⁴ Colin Seymour-Ure, *The Political Impact of the Mass Media* (London, 1974), p. 37.

¹⁵ Smith, p. x.

their facts straight" and that language can be easily divorced from meaning, and rationalizes its use by pointing to the ignorance of his readers—an ignorance for which he and his fellow correspondents are probably partly responsible.

2. That dissidents are Russians and Jews.

According to computations based on the *New York Times Index*, the number of articles originating in Moscow from 1972 to 1977 and dealing with dissidents was 390 for the Russians, 336 for the Jews, 30 for the Ukrainians, 35 for the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians, and 33 for the Georgians and Armenians.¹⁶ Whether these figures are totally accurate is unimportant. Just as unimportant is the fact that some of these articles were provided by AP, UPI, or Reuters. What is important is the extreme imbalances they reveal in the *Times's* coverage of the dissident movement. According to the *Times's* picture, Russian and Jewish dissidents far outweigh all the other nationalities. But is this really true in terms of numbers and significance?

Dissident estimates that more than half of all Soviet political prisoners are Ukrainians and Balts should dispel any doubts that the dissident movement is a multinational phenomenon, whose significance lies precisely in the fact that it is multinational and not restricted to Moscow. Of course, the question of significance has a second side to it, that is: significant for whom? Clearly, the *New York Times* perceives Russians and Jews as being the most significant, the most newsworthy, dissidents.¹⁷

Two Norwegian media researchers, Johan Galtung and Mari Holmboe Ruge, provide criteria for newsworthiness that are very helpful at this point. According to these criteria, coverage of Soviet Jews is perfectly logical because Jewish dissent is "frequent" in relation to the "frequency of the news medium," it has a high "threshold" of "amplitude" (often taking the form of demonstrations and sit-ins), it is "unambiguous" ("Let my people go!"), it is "meaningful" and "culturally proximate" to a large portion of the *Times's* readership, it is "expected" in that the popular image of the USSR is that of a virulently anti-Semitic state, and it is "unexpected" insofar as large-scale dissent is unusual for the Soviet Union. Coverage of Jewish dissent is also likely in that it deals with "elite nations" (in contrast, say, to Lithuanians or

¹⁶ "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," *The New York Times Index*, 1972-7.

¹⁷ Michael Browne, ed., *Ferment in the Ukraine*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1973), p. 19.

Armenians) and with "elite persons" (for example, such well-known Jewish dissidents as Shcharansky, Levich, and Rubin), is easily presented in "personal terms," and has the advantage of being "negative" in its exposure of repression in the Soviet Union. The same criteria clearly apply to Russian dissidents, although to a somewhat lesser degree with regard to "meaningfulness" and "proximity." Here, however, the coverage of "elite persons," such as Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov, comes much more into play.¹⁸

Hardly any of these criteria, on the other hand, apply to any significant degree to the other nationalities and their dissidents. From the *Times's* vantage point, Ukrainian dissent, for example, is neither "frequent," nor "ample," nor "unambiguous," nor "meaningful" to most New Yorkers or, indeed, to most Americans. Neither are the Ukrainians an "elite nation," nor are any of their dissidents "elite people." Not surprisingly, the Ukrainians, Balts, Armenians, and Georgians, who together constitute the majority of all dissenters, receive very little coverage. The 1978 trials of the Jewish dissident Anatolii Shcharansky and of the Russian dissident Iurii Orlov on the one hand, and of the Ukrainian dissident Lev Lukianenko on the other, offer convincing proof of this tendency. Although all three dissidents are more or less equally "important" to the Soviet dissident movement, Shcharansky and Orlov received almost daily coverage, while Lukianenko was mentioned only once in a short notice buried on page 11 in the metropolitan news section.¹⁹

3. That the reporting will be superficial.

Although the *Times* occasionally prints very good pieces on the Soviet Union, it is nevertheless true that the general level of many of its articles is not very high. Two of the best examples of bad reporting are attributable to Craig Whitney. Both deal with peripheral Soviet republics—Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia—about which Whitney was clearly very uninformed. (A series by Christopher Wren written in the spring of 1977 while on a trip through the non-Russian republics also stands out.)

The first article, posted in "Kiev, USSR" (Houston, USA?), deals with the question of anti-Semitism in Ukraine. Whitney begins by stating that "a monument finally stands over Babi Yar,"

¹⁸ John Galtung and Mari Holmboe Ruge, "The Structure of Foreign News," in *Media Sociology*, ed. Jeremy Tunstall (Urbana, Ill., 1970), pp. 259-97.

¹⁹ Reuters, "Dissident in the Ukraine Is Given 10 Years' Camp and 5-Year Exile," *The New York Times*, 21 July 1978.

a ravine where thousands of Jews were executed by the Nazis in 1941. That no monument was built for thirty years is "mute testimony to the anti-Semitism that was a powerful force in the Ukraine for centuries before the Nazis came." However, this "prejudice was not driven out with the Nazis, according to Ukrainian Jews," one of whom is Vladimir Kislik, a scientist who has not been allowed to emigrate—something the correspondent strongly implies is attributable to Ukrainian anti-Semitism. Then, in order to prove his point, the *Times's* journalist asks an ostensibly Ukrainian "student" about Ukrainian anti-Semitism. She "narrows her eyes and says: 'This city is 80 percent Jewish if you want to know the truth'." Whitney ends by quoting Izrael Klejner, a recent Jewish émigré from Ukraine, as saying, "such expressions as 'we can arrange another Babi Yar for you' every Jew in the Ukraine has heard a dozen of times."²⁰

Whitney's article makes one thing very clear: although there may or may not be anti-Semitism in Ukraine, Whitney is persuaded that there is. Not only is the tone of the entire article nastily "anti-Ukrainian" with its persistent references to the Nazis, but it does not even succeed in showing that anti-Semitism exists. That a monument was belatedly erected at Babi Yar, Whitney surely must know, was certainly not the decision of the Ukrainians, nor of the Communist Party of Ukraine, but of the Kremlin. That Kislik was not able to emigrate no more testifies to the existence of anti-Semitism than the emigration of thousands of others testifies to the non-existence of anti-Semitism. But worst of all is Whitney's tendentious and journalistically unethical presentation of what he meant to be seen as the Ukrainian side. To offer the asinine comment of a student, whose nationality need by no means have been Ukrainian, as typical for the whole population is tantamount to claiming that a Ku Klux Klanner is a typical American. Perhaps even more unethical was the *Times's* decision not to print Mr. Klejner's letter in which he claimed to have been quoted out of context.²¹ In any case, both Whitney and his employer revealed a tendentiousness, one-sidedness, and lack of ethics that are unusual for a newspaper with a professed commitment to "objectivity." To repeat Hedrick Smith, "this is the way it is done at Pravda."

²⁰ Craig R. Whitney, "Jews in the Ukraine Charge that the Age-Old Anti-Semitism Persists," *The New York Times*, 1 December 1977.

²¹ Izrael Klejner, "Declaration of the Society for the Study of the Problems of Ukrainian Jewry in Israel," *Ukrainian Weekly* (Jersey City, N.J.), 19 March 1978.

An equally one-sided piece about Georgia and Armenia ("Tbilisi, USSR") appeared several months later. The reason Whitney travelled to the distant Caucasus was a huge street riot "to protest against a new Constitution because it made no mention of Georgian as the official language of Georgia." The correspondent's lead sentence, however, immediately betrays the bias he will maintain throughout the article: "People in Soviet Georgia and Armenia have two loyalties—to the Soviet Union and to the Georgian and Armenian nations." Apparently unaware that the recent riots, which also occurred for similar reasons in Armenia, are hardly proof of loyalty to the USSR, Whitney sets out to prove his point with quotations from a university professor, the editors of the Russian-language (sic!) Georgian and Armenian Communist Party (sic!) papers, and a newspaper staff member. It should be readily apparent that none of these people is likely to give a negative opinion of the Soviet Union and, instead, will probably parrot the official line that the nationalities are loyal to and happy with the Soviet regime. Again, this may indeed be true. Whitney, however, simply takes the word of these *apparatchiks* for granted. Moreover, as in the Ukrainian case, he presents only one side of the argument. Why did he not offer the views of a Georgian dissident on the question of Soviet-Georgian relations? Instead, the only time Whitney quotes non-official sources is on Armenian attitudes towards Turks, implying in the process that the Armenians perceive the Turks and not the Kremlin as their enemy. Armenian nationalism, concludes Whitney, "has taken an inward emotional turn, not in reaction against domination from Moscow but against the memory of oppression from Turkey." Whitney is clearly unaware of the many Armenian political prisoners in the USSR whose nationalism was very much in reaction to "domination from Moscow" and which, in fact, resulted in their imprisonment. As in the Ukrainian case, Whitney and the *Times* have contented themselves with giving one, and what they obviously believe to be the only, side of the story.²²

Of course, the management and the audience are also responsible for the quality of the *Times's* coverage of the Soviet Union. That articles of a certain kind and of a certain bent are consistently printed over a long period of time shows that both groups are in general agreement with the "profile" they convey. This "profile," moreover, reveals the plane on which the interests

²² Craig R. Whitney, "Georgian and Armenian Pride Lead to Conflicts With Moscow," *The New York Times*, 26 June 1978.

and worldviews of the journalists, the management, and the audience converge.

Bernard Roshco's comment is very instructive in this regard: "Most of the snap judgements that result in publication or rejection of specific news stories are based upon a social frame of reference derived from the social structure within which the press functions."²³ Press values, and particularly those of so established an American institution as the *New York Times*, reflect the values of the society in general and of the immediate social environment in particular. The *Times*, therefore, will adopt such values and present such views as are consonant with those of American and New York City society. An identification of the Soviet Union with Russia, a superficial understanding of complex questions of ethnicity and nationality, and a concern for Israel and the Jewish question are all basic to the current American worldview. It is not surprising, therefore, that the *Times* shares these perceptions. A comment by Hedrick Smith provides a classic illustration of this sleight-of-hand attitude towards more than half of the Soviet population: "...except for the religious and ethnic minorities, dissent in the Soviet Union is something for the urban upper middle class."²⁴ It is obvious that for Smith, the *Times*, and most Americans, Soviet religious and national dissent is simply not very interesting.

All of this fits in rather neatly with the criteria of newsworthiness outlined by Galtung and Ruge. Viewed from this perspective, these criteria, or "news norms," are simply another way of expressing the commonality of beliefs and socio-political attitudes among journalists, editors, and readers. That journalists claim to know intuitively what makes a good story is not surprising, because they see the news in terms of American values and biases that are also very much their own. The journalist's biases are taken for granted, however, and decked with the cloak of "objectivity" because these biases (or ideological slant) are indeed "objective" within the context of the journalist's social environment. Distortions in coverage of the USSR, therefore, are distortions only for scholars and the dissidents and nationalities concerned. For the American reading public, which expects this kind of news, the distortions are examples of good, "objective" reporting. An attempt to balance and deepen the coverage might in fact

²³ Bernard Roshco, *Newsmaking* (Chicago, 1975), p. 113.

²⁴ Hedrick Smith, "The Dissidents Cast a Long Shadow," *The New York Times*, 20 February 1977.

be criticized as being unobjective and as evidence of the reporter's "taking sides."

The result is a terrible dilemma and irony for the *New York Times* and for American journalism. Their commitment to "objective" reporting is reduced to reproducing current social values, with the result that the final journalistic product suffers from being very much "subjective." True, there is a large number of very real restrictions that greatly reduce the Moscow correspondent's maneuverability and adversely affect even sincere attempts at "objectivity." Likewise, it may make perfect business sense to print articles that meet the criteria of newsworthiness of Galtung and Ruge. However, none of this changes the fact that the end product—the *Times's* overall coverage of prominent aspects of the Soviet Union—is misleading, and that the *New York Times*, which should know better, is apparently satisfied with this sad state of affairs.

REVIEWS

THE UKRAINE, 1917-1921: A STUDY IN REVOLUTION. Edited by Taras Hunczak. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1977. viii, 424 pp.

This volume of fourteen essays with an introduction by Richard Pipes is built around papers presented at a conference held at the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in New York in May 1968 honoring the fiftieth anniversary of the Ukrainian Revolution. By supplementing these conference papers with individual chapters by other prominent scholars of the Ukrainian Revolution, the editor has prepared a work of sufficient scope to serve as a basic reference on the political history of the national movement in eastern Ukraine between 1917 and 1921. The volume begins with four essays broadly outlining developments during the period of the Central Rada (Wolodymyr Stojko and Ihor Kamenetsky), the Hetman State (Taras Hunczak), and the Directory (Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak). The remainder of the selections are devoted to more specific aspects of the Ukrainian Revolution. There are two excellent chapters by Yaroslav Bilinsky and John Reshetar on the communist suppression of Ukrainian independence and divisions in the ranks of local Bolsheviks over Ukraine's status in the party and state. Jurij Borys reviews the positions of Ukrainian, Russian, Jewish and Polish political parties on Ukrainian self-determination.* Ivan L. Rudnytsky discusses the evolution of the federalist and separatist viewpoints within the Ukrainian national movement and the triumph of the latter concept in the Fourth Universal. The movement for Ukrainization of the Orthodox Church during the Central Rada period is examined by Bohdan R. Bociurkiw. Arthur Adams analyses agrarian upheaval in Ukraine between 1918 and 1920 in the only chapter in this book devoted primarily to the social history of the Revolution. Frank Sysyn considers the late conversion of Nestor Makhno to Ukrainianism, but not to support for Ukrainian statehood, in the context of the peasant leader's anarchism. The volume concludes with three essays on the diplomatic history of the Ukrainian national movement during the revolutionary era. Oleh S. Fedyshyn focusses on relations between the Central Powers and the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine prior to the Brest-Litovsk peace. George A. Brinkley considers French

* This essay (p. 137) mistakenly identifies the partner of the Ukrainian SRs in the election to the All-Russian Constituent Assembly as the Social Democratic Union (Spilka). It was in fact the Ukrainian Peasants' Union (Selianska Spilka), an important conduit of Ukrainian SR influence and nationalist propaganda to the village in 1917.

policy, and Constantine Warwariv examines American policy toward Ukraine during the Revolution and Civil War.

While the quality of the individual essays is generally high, this volume as a whole introduces little new to the study of the Ukrainian Revolution either thematically, interpretatively or methodologically. The selections are heavily weighted towards discussions of party centres, the domestic and foreign politics of the national governments, and the Bolshevik takeover. It is precisely on these aspects of the Revolution that many excellent studies have already been produced in English. The reader who wishes to refresh his memory on the major political events of the years 1917-21 will be well served by this collection. Inasmuch as this volume originated as individually prepared essays, it necessarily lacks continuity between chapters or comprehensiveness on any one topic. Therefore, the serious newcomer to Ukrainian revolutionary history will need first to turn to the standard studies by Reshetar (*The Ukrainian Revolution*), Adams (*Bolsheviks in the Ukraine*), and Borys (*The Russian Communist Party and the Sovietization of the Ukraine*). Having consulted these works, the newcomer to the field will have covered much of the factual and interpretative content of the volume under review. The contributions of Bohdan R. Bociurkiw and Frank Sysyn should be noted for providing careful analyses of problems not extensively treated in the aforementioned standards.

With the exception of Arthur Adam's essay, "The Great Ukrainian Jacquerie," the social dynamics of the period are treated only peripherally in this volume. Adams includes an argument in favor of devoting more attention to the rural social history of the Ukrainian Revolution, and in the process delivers a critique of the existing literature which largely can be extended to this volume.

The roles of the political parties have often been so overemphasized as to give the impression that *all* the important forces at work in the Ukraine were concentrated in party centers and in the governments they established. Such overemphasis implies, erroneously, that one may gain complete understanding of the events of 1918-1920 by focusing on the activities of the political parties. Emphasis on a single influential factor to the exclusion of all others frequently weakens the analysis of complex historical processes, for, all too often, major historical events are determined variously—by the character of the actors, by economic, social, political, and cultural influences, or by a sometimes indecipherable procession of accidents or confluence of social forces. (Adams, p. 249)

The coincidence of the Ukrainian national revolution with a sweeping social revolution merits at least equal emphasis with Ukrainian-Entente relations. This volume, however, largely ignores attitudes and social pro-

cesses in the Ukrainian village in 1917 or the interaction of peasants and the nationalist intelligentsia. Also largely ignored is the impact on the course of the Revolution of such factors as the socio-economic background of national tensions in Ukraine; the relationship of the Ukrainian urban-industrial proletariat to the national movement; Ukraine's division into distinct socio-economic regions; and alien control over the region's economic and industrial resources.

It is perhaps unfair to set objectives for a work that neither the contributors nor the editor intended to meet. Nevertheless, the value of this book as a basic source on the Ukrainian Revolution would have been enhanced by rounding it out with chapters on the less well-known but equally important social, economic and geographic forces at work in Ukraine between 1917 and 1921. As it stands, *The Ukraine, 1917-1921* is a welcome supplement to the existing literature on political developments during the Ukrainian Revolution.

Steven L. Guthier
University of Michigan

DIETRICH NEUFELD, *A RUSSIAN DANCE OF DEATH: REVOLUTION AND CIVIL WAR IN THE UKRAINE*. Translated and edited by Al Reimer. Winnipeg: Hyperion Press, for the Mennonite Literary Society and the University of Winnipeg, 1977. xiii, 142 pp.

MICHAEL PALIJ, *THE ANARCHISM OF NESTOR MAKHNO, 1918-1921: AN ASPECT OF THE UKRAINIAN REVOLUTION*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1976. xii, 428 pp.

These two books are not directly comparable: one is a scholarly work, written many years after the events it describes; the other is part diary, part narrative, written at and shortly after the time of the events it describes.

The Mennonite Society and the University of Winnipeg are to be congratulated on making available an English translation of Neufeld's book. Of course, it has its faults, and to these we shall return, but it would be churlish in the extreme not to acknowledge and welcome the appearance of a reasonably objective eye-witness account of events where truth is habitually at the service of propaganda. This review will concentrate on the harrowing events in the Mennonite colonies of Kichkas and Zagradowka in the winter of 1919-20, rather than the less unusual story of the author's escape from the Soviet Union, which occupies the last third of the book.

Given the chaotic and abruptly shifting conditions in Ukraine during the Civil War, it is remarkable both that the author managed to write

the book, especially the first part—a diary, and that he managed to bring the manuscript with him to the West. Both the maps and the illustrations, the former from other Mennonite sources, the latter woodcuts by Neufeld, add to the understanding and interest of the work.

It must be emphasized, especially in view of the reservations entered below, that the picture painted by Neufeld is indeed a horrifying one. In many ways it is also perceptive: the author saw the hollow nature of Denikin's rule in Ukraine without the benefit of hindsight. He brings to our attention a people, the German Mennonites, descendants of colonists at the end of the eighteenth century, and a geographical area, central Ukraine, widely ignored in most of the literature, in all languages, on the Civil War in favour of the Moscow-Petrograd axis and the victorious Bolsheviks. Perhaps the most harrowing description in the book is that of the typhus epidemic of that terrible winter, the author being among its non-fatal victims.

In view of this perceptiveness, it is the more surprising that the author has one serious blind spot, which he shared with almost all his fellow-colonists. He could not understand "why the Russian peasant is not kindly disposed towards our Mennonite settlers" (p. 9). He partly answers this later when, suggesting that the Mennonites treated their labourers—Ukrainians, not Russians—better than the Russian landlords, he points out that the relationship was still that of "capitalist master and inferior servant" (p. 78). Unfortunately, this is only a momentary glimpse of the resentment the Ukrainian peasants felt towards their colonist neighbours. The latter had been privileged from the beginning, exempt from both serfdom and military service, and given cash to help start them off. Emancipation affected this but little: the increased prosperity of the colonists only further excited the envy of their Ukrainian neighbours. During the revolution and Civil War, they used their newly realized strength to try to settle this account. In both the major massacres mentioned by Neufeld, at Zagradovka and Eichenfeld (Kichkas), the local peasantry played the leading part, rather than Makhnovist troops.

By 1914 the Mennonites, who were pacifists, were no longer exempt from conscription, but were able to perform non-combatant duties in the forestry or medical services, in which they served loyally and well. But they could hardly welcome the chauvinist anti-German measures passed by the Tsarist government during the war. It is not surprising, therefore, that they welcomed the invading German and Austrian forces in the spring of 1918. This added to the resentment felt by their Ukrainian neighbours, and this in turn was compounded by the formation of Self-Defence units in the autumn of that year. These units were encouraged by the departing Germans, who could see better than the Mennonites what lay in store for the colonists when the occupying forces left. The formation of these units was diametrically opposed to their pacifism, and

we should be very slow to condemn their creation, an agonizing ethical choice. As Neufeld points out, what seemed to some of the young lads to be an exciting adventure proved to be both practically disastrous—the Mennonites were vastly outnumbered by their resentful and well-armed enemies, especially by the peasants—and theologically and ethically divisive. The peasants were not slow, either, to point to the contrast between refusing to fight for the Tsar and country, and readiness to fight for their own homes. Some of the young colonists even volunteered to fight for the Whites, and more were compelled to do so. How easy it was for Bolsheviks or Makhnovists to describe the Mennonites—all their colonies had self-defence forces, for varying periods—as being enemies of the people, kulaks, and the like.

The reason for the prominence of Nestor Makhno in the Civil War is geographical and economic: all sides in the war wanted Ukraine for its industry, communications (especially railroads), and agriculture. Makhno's home area between the Donbas and the river Dnieper was a key one. One of the Mennonite colonies was at Molochnaia, on the Sea of Azov, south of the Makhnovist area. The second, at Khortytsia, opposite the town of Oleksandrivsk, was the former home of the Zaporozhian Sich Cossacks and was the best river crossing for many miles either way; it was therefore of vital strategic importance. Zagradoivka, about 100 miles to the south-west of Khortytsia, and a daughter-colony of Molochnaia, was near the direct line of Makhno's travels, in retreat and advance, in the summer and autumn of 1919. Ukraine suffered more than most of the rest of the Empire, as armies and bands marched backwards and forwards across it.

In these circumstances the plundering of Kichkas and Zagradoivka, and, to a much lesser extent, Molochnaia, is regrettable but was hardly unexpected. At Kichkas, it is clear, much of the looting was done by Makhnovist troops on their way back from their victory over White forces at Perehonivka in September 1919 to their home area of Huliai Pole, Makhno's own hometown. Much must also have been done by the local peasants: if they could murder, they must plunder first and perhaps afterwards. Further, Makhnovist troops behaved in the towns much better than the picture drawn at Kichkas; in view of the peasant-insurgents' attitude towards towns, one would expect little to be left. This is to some extent, but not entirely, a matter of comparison with the Whites, nationalists, the bands, and the Bolsheviks.

There are no reliable estimates for the casualties of the Civil War, still less for a breakdown of numbers dying from natural and unnatural causes, but *Izvestiia* (3 September 1920) gives figures for both types of typhus for the period of July 1918 to June 1920—a total of 4½ million of the Empire, excluding seven Ukrainian provinces; of these, two-thirds occurred in the second year, including the period we are concerned with.

By contrast, the casualties of the Mennonites' colonies, between 700 and 800, seem small but were avoidable. Of these deaths, two-thirds occurred at the Old Colony (Khortytisia) and Zagradoivka, about sixty at Molochnaia. At the Old Colony, which had a swollen population of 5000 at the end of 1919, a third of the colonist villages were destroyed: taking the violent deaths there as 250, this would represent five percent of the residents; of these 250, one-third were murdered by local peasants in the massacre at Eichenfeld on 8 November. At Zagradoivka from 12 to 14 December (these are new-style dates: for some reason, the translator has kept the original old-style dates), eighty-four persons were murdered; the motive was either punishment for helping the Whites, or desire to take over all the Mennonite land. The executioners were either Makhnovist troops or local peasants; most likely they were the latter disguised or proclaiming themselves as the former, whose headquarters at the time were being transferred to Nykopol following the abandonment of Katerynoslav on 9 December. Reimer suggests (p. 27, no. 21) that the murders were the work of "Makhnovite and other local terrorist bands." It would seem that the latter were mostly, if not exclusively, responsible. Few massacres elsewhere can be ascribed to the Makhnovists, many to the local bands and *otamany*, such as Hryhoriiv and Anhel.

**
**
*

Michael Palij's book is the first full-scale study of Nestor Makhno to be published in English. While in a number of respects this is an opportunity missed, the author and the University of Washington Press deserve our thanks for writing and funding this work. With one exception, Makhno has had an appalling press from writers of Ukrainian nationalist sympathies, understandably so. Palij's sympathies are plainly in this direction, but he does not let this wildly distort his judgment of his central character. This is not to say that his judgment is unaffected. In one respect, in his discussion of Makhno's national consciousness and that of his wife, Halyna, and also in a short chapter on the socio-economic background of the Makhnovist region, his sympathies are an aid to understanding. Elsewhere, this is not so. One of the best features of the book is the excellent annotated bibliography. Its one fault, especially for the non-specialist reader, to whom, in the reviewer's opinion, it is vitally important that historians of Ukraine, Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian alike, reach out, is one prevalent in much of the book—an overemphasis on the political history of the nationalist movement during the period 1917-21.

This tone is set from the start of the book, and Makhno, although he should be, from the title, the predominant figure in the work, is in fact fitted into the context of the Ukrainian *nationalist* revolution rather than simply the Ukrainian revolution indicated in the book's subtitle. This may seem a fine point, and could perhaps better be rephrased as the ques-

tion: is this book about Makhno, or why the Ukrainian nationalists failed in 1917-21? There would seem to be a tension in the author between the historian of Makhno and the nationalist wishing to understand why Petliura and Vynnychenko failed.

This preoccupation with the history of the nationalists, when not part of the Makhno story, unbalances the book. Makhno himself has no significant mention in the first fifth of the book—fifty pages. The political history of the Directory at the end of 1918 and its fortunes in 1919 occupy twenty-five pages, while relations between Makhno and the Directory are allotted but five. There is not enough on Makhno in the main chapters on Hryhoriiv and on the Whites. Three pages is a meagre ration for Makhno's life after 1921, and the first half of the conclusion is not about Makhno at all. This unbalance shows naturally enough in the index: Skoropadsky has nearly half of the entries accorded to the peasants; the Central Rada has more than Volin and Arshinov, two of Makhno's chief aides, put together.

The history of Ukraine is certainly more than usually complicated during the revolution and civil war. While oversimplification is to be avoided, a chronological approach, into which are fitted various relevant discussions, such as organization, strategy, and nationalism, makes the story more, rather than less, difficult to follow. For example, Makhno and the Bolsheviks appear together in chapters 8, 14, 16, 18, and 19, while Makhno's organization and tactics appear in chapter 11, and Skoropadsky and the Directory in chapter 12.

There is no discussion of anti-Semitism in the book. In view of the many such accusations against Makhno, this is both surprising and to be regretted, all the more so as similar and much more serious allegations have been made against the nationalists and their leaders: we only need to recall here the background to the assassination of Petliura in exile in 1926. Nor is there any chapter devoted to the aims, aspirations, and feelings of the peasants, and, more especially, why they supported Makhno for so long and so consistently. It can be recalled that this was also a blind spot for Neufeld.

Although "anarchism" appears in the title, it merits but a short chapter, which covers the anarchism of Makhno himself, of the peasants, and of the Ukrainian anarchist confederation, Nabat. The Whites and Reds merit much less attention than the nationalists, although the latter played a far less significant part in Makhno's activities. The comparison with the leader of the Tambov revolt, Antonov, is not made, and but little space is devoted to the local chieftains, or *batky*, and their similarities and differences from Makhno. More could be said about the Makhnovists in the towns, about finance, supply, medical services, the insurgent press. The omission of French documents is understandable, of British less so.

The confusion is encapsulated on page 252. After correctly pointing out that Makhno fought the enemies of Ukraine, that he was not a traitor, Palij then criticizes him for non-co-operation with the nationalist armed forces and for having no positive goals! Yet Makhno made his position on this quite clear in the "Project-Declaration" issued in Oleksandrivsk in the autumn of 1919: "In speaking of the independence of Ukraine, we do not mean national independence, a Petliura sort of autonomy, but the social and labouring independence of the workers and peasants." That puts Petliura into Makhno's context: Makhno is the square peg, the Ukrainian People's Republic is the round hole.

Michael Malet

FRANTIŠEK SILNICKÝ, *NATSIONALNAIA POLITIKA KPSS V PERIOD S 1917 PO 1922 GOD.* Munich: Suchasnist, 1978, 314 pp.

Iwan Majstrenko, *NATSIONALNAIA POLITIKA KPSS V EE ISTORICHESKOM RAZVITII.* Munich: Suchasnist, 1978, 223 pp.

The fact that Suchasnist has issued two Russian-language studies on the history of Soviet nationality policy can only be welcomed. Both works under review have their flaws, but Silnický's rigorous scholarship and analysis far outweigh any minor shortcomings. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of Majstrenko's more ambitious effort, which seems to be a pastiche of material gathered in conjunction with his earlier works.

Silnický is a Moscow-trained Party historian who edited Czechoslovakia's official journal on Party history, *Príspevky k dejinám KSČ*, before emigrating to the West in 1968. His earlier access to Soviet archives has enabled him to quote a number of extremely valuable documents hitherto unknown to Western scholars. These documents relate to Bolshevik policy toward the Borotbisty, Stalin's plan of "autonomization" of the national republics, and the Georgian controversy.

Silnický argues that the period 1917-21 has been virtually ignored in favour of the controversies surrounding the formation of the USSR in 1922-23, while practically all the controversies of the later period originated in the preceding one. For those who are familiar with Richard Pipes's classic study of the formation of the USSR, the period beginning in 1917 is far less *terra incognita* than Silnický implies, but his access to information unavailable to Pipes allows him to shed much new light on the critical period from the collapse of the Russian Empire to the formal establishment of the Soviet Union. For example, we learn that Stalin's "autonomization" plan was actually the brainchild of the Ukrainian communist D. Z. Manuisky, who suggested it in a hitherto unknown letter to Stalin in 1921.

Silnický believes that the establishment of the USSR actually did little beyond giving legal sanction to a situation that already existed. After all, the national republics were tied to the RSFSR by a system of bilateral treaties that established a military and economic union of all Soviet republics in 1920. It may well be that formalizing what had hitherto been an informal, but nevertheless real, centralization worked to the advantage of the national republics by defining the limits of central authority and providing institutional channels through which national prerogatives could be defended. Mykola Skrypnyk, for example, was an eloquent and effective defender of Soviet Ukraine's rights during the 1920s, especially in the Chamber of Nationalities.

Silnický lays the groundwork for his study by examining the development of Bolshevik theory concerning the nationality question, beginning with the 1903 Russian Social Democratic program, which recognized the right of national self-determination in the sense of regional self-government in non-Russian areas of the Russian Empire. In tracing pre-revolutionary controversies, Silnický shows an unfortunate tendency to rely on Lenin's works to learn what Lenin's opponents had to say. The author's treatment of the polemics between Lenin and the Ukrainian Social Democrat, Lev Iurkevych-Rybalka, would undoubtedly have benefited had he read the latter's *Russian Social Democracy and the Nationality Question*. Such an omission is rather puzzling, since Suchasnist has published Iurkevych's pamphlet in a version which contains both a Ukrainian translation and the Russian original.

Silnický should also have examined the statements of those Bolsheviks who disagreed with Lenin's stand on the nationality question. Some invaluable documents of this type were published in 1930 as an appendix to a collection of articles sponsored by the Institute of Red Professors. The volume in question is entitled *Sketches on the History of the October Revolution* and was edited by M. N. Pokrovsky. Consideration of the Luxemburgist case as presented by Nikolai Bukharin, Iurii Piatakov, and Evgeniia Bosh would have perhaps convinced the author that the question was one of principle versus pragmatism: while Lenin saw national grievances as a force to be reckoned with and even used to advance the revolutionary cause, the Luxemburgists were intent upon exposing what they saw as the essential falseness of all national aspirations. Since national oppression was an inevitable consequence of capitalism in its imperialist stage, the so-called national nihilists reasoned, national oppression could not be ended without the overthrow of capitalism. Once capitalism was overthrown, their argument continued, all oppression would end. Thus, they concluded, national aspirations were essentially utopian under capitalism and would be rendered superfluous by the advent of socialism. They thus saw any attempt to cater to national aspirations as opportunistic.

Silnický is at his best when tracing the zigzags of Bolshevik nationality policy during the Civil War, when the exigencies of survival compelled the Bolsheviks to force theoretical niceties to the background. His attempt to survey the various national movements is inevitably sketchy and would have benefited had he consulted the excellent collection of documents compiled by S. M. Dimanshtein and published in 1930 by the Communist Academy. Nevertheless, it is difficult to dispute his conclusion that the Bolsheviks were caught unawares by the importance that the national movements assumed in the aftermath of the empire's collapse and that the Bolsheviks were forced to adapt in order to survive.

One such adaptation, Silnický points out, was Lenin's acceptance of federalism, an idea that went against the grain of everything Lenin had earlier upheld. Silnický adds that, although Lenin saw recognition of the right to self-determination as necessary to convince non-Russians that the Bolsheviks were different from their predecessors, this right was respected only in the case of Finland, and then only because the Bolsheviks were too weak to do otherwise. Despite their recognition of the right to self-determination in the abstract, the Bolsheviks always saw separatism as a vestige of bourgeois aspirations. Stalin's unearthing of Lenin's discarded formula, "the right of self-determination of the toilers of a given nation," meant that the Bolsheviks reserved to themselves the right to prevent separation whenever they were able. It would have done no more than to make official the policy which the Bolsheviks were unofficially pursuing. Yet, Lenin would not permit such a step because he recognized that the nationality question was organically bound up with Bolshevik hopes of extending their revolution beyond the boundaries of the former empire. After all, what Hungarian or German would freely consent to being ruled from Moscow? Autonomy, as Lenin put it, was an expedient but transitional stage to complete union.

Lenin opted for the creation of formally independent Soviet republics ruled through a centralized Party apparatus, usually with a vague declaration proclaiming "federal ties" to the RSFSR. In fact, the Red Army was normally closely followed by Russian Soviet officials who were little concerned with the fact that they were operating in what was formally recognized as a foreign country. Ultimately, Lenin came to realize that the national republics had to be transformed into a surrogate for real independence, but this happened after the Twelfth Party Congress in 1923 rather than prior to the establishment of the USSR. Silnický may well be correct in maintaining that the Bolsheviks never overcame Russian chauvinism in their own ranks. Nevertheless, they tried. Silnický argues that the Soviet surrogate for independence failed because communism was limited to the territories of the old empire, and as a consequence the Russians more than balanced all other nationalities combined. Whether this is so involves too many imponderables and would lead us into the

woods of counterfactual history. Was collectivization of agriculture inevitable? Would the non-Russian national revivals have been cut short had collectivization not served as a catalyst? If not, would the political situation in Ukraine today be all that different from that which prevails in much of Eastern Europe? Who can say?

At times Silnický is less than rigorous with his sources. For example, he cites a probably apochryphal letter from Lenin which appears in no edition of Lenin's works but is quoted in the 1933 edition of N. N. Popov's *Outline History of the Communist Party (bolshevik) of Ukraine*. The letter denounces the Ukrainian Borotbisty in harsher terms than elsewhere and does not appear in the more reliable 1928 edition of Popov's book. Were the letter genuine, it would in all likelihood have appeared in the late 1930s in the third edition of Lenin's works. After all, denouncing the Borotbisty was no less fashionable in the late 1930s than it had been a few years earlier. In fact, it was during the late thirties that those Borotbisty who remained in the Party were purged. The most likely explanation is that the letter in question was the product of Popov's overly fertile imagination. Such things do happen.

The problems with Silnický's work are minor in comparison with its worth. One hopes that it will speedily be translated into English.

Iwan Majstrenko's attempt to survey the CPSU's nationality policy from beginning to end is rather more ambitious than successful. Majstrenko has done excellent work on the early history of Soviet Ukraine, and his monograph on Borotbism testifies to his scholarly talent and discipline. In the present work, however, he sets himself a task larger than what he is able to do well:

The present work on the nationality policy of the CPSU differs from other works written on this theme in two ways: first, it traces the nationality policy of Russian Bolshevism through its entire history—from the Bolshevik Party's beginning in 1903 at the Second RSDRP Congress to our own day; secondly, the nationality policy of the CPSU is examined in this work not only according to the theoretical works of its figures, not only according to the decisions and declarations of the Party's leading organs, but also in the practice of how this theory and these decisions and declarations were carried out.

Such a task would require years of rigorous research, and, given the breadth of the subject, the author can hardly be blamed for a few errors committed and corners cut. The trouble is that there are more than a few of them. For a historian, E. H. Carr once wrote, accuracy is less a virtue than a duty. Majstrenko sometimes fails to do his duty to his readers.

One example of such dereliction of duty will suffice. Panas Fedenko's *Ukrainian Movement in the Twentieth Century* (p. 185) quotes Aleksandr Shlikhter, the Bolshevik food commissar in Ukraine in 1919, as writing:

"Every pood of requisitioned grain was soaked (*oblyttyi*) by drops of blood." Majstrenko (p. 66) cites the original article by Shlikhter but without a page number. According to Majstrenko, Shlikhter wrote that "every pood was soaked (*oblit*) in blood." This could well become the most common apochryphal quote in the entire literature of the Ukrainian revolution, for what Shlikhter wrote (*Litopys revoliutsii*, 1928, no. 2, p. 121) was far less dramatic: "Expressed figuratively, it might be said that every pood of requisitioned grain was tinged (*okrashen*) with drops of the blood of the workers." If one quotes a source and footnotes the original, one might at least get it right. Such an error, if taken by itself, might seem rather unimportant. It is not, however, the only such error in Majstrenko's book, only a particularly blatant one.

As for Majstrenko's analysis, there is little that is particularly new or insightful. While Silnický attempts to carefully construct his case that the Bolsheviks repeatedly borrowed from the mental world of the autocracy, Majstrenko contents himself with the repetition of outworn clichés that attribute every facet of Soviet nationality policy to Russian national tradition. There are also strange gaps. One can but wonder whether an attempt to trace Soviet nationality policy to the present can be considered complete if it fails to mention a figure like Petro Shelest.

Still, Majstrenko's work ought not be dismissed for its various shortcomings. A history of Soviet nationality policy has been needed for decades, and Majstrenko has gone where others have feared to tread. Even a flawed history of Soviet nationality policy is better than none at all, if only because it gives the rest of us a place from which to start.

James E. Mace
University of Michigan

OLEKSANDER SEMENENKO, *KHARKIV, KHARKIV* . . . N. p. [New York]: Suchasnist, 1976. 239 pp.

The last decade has seen the publication of several personal accounts of the 1920s in Ukraine. The most interesting and informative to appear in the Soviet Union has been Iurii Smolych's controversial trilogy, which came out between 1968 and 1972;¹ but other Soviet writers, for whom

¹ Iu. Smolych, *Rozpovid pro nespokii* (Kiev, 1968); *Rozpovid pro nespokii tryvaie* (Kiev, 1970); and *Rozpovid pro nespokii nemaie kintsia* (Kiev, 1972). The author has recently published another book, entitled *Moi suchasnyky: literaturno-portretni narysy* (Kiev, 1978), which is, however, much less informative and interesting than the trilogy.

these years were the formative ones in their intellectual development, have also taken advantage of the relative "thaw" of the sixties to write their memoirs—Vasyl Mynko, Petro Panch, and Borys Antonenko-Davydovych among them.² These recollections, written by and, chiefly, about writers, have provided some useful detail on the literary personalities of this period, one that witnessed an unparalleled wave of literary and artistic creativity. The prestigious position enjoyed by the creative writer and his craft at the time can be judged by the number of those desiring to be numbered therein: for the 1922 census, in Kiev alone—informs us Antonenko-Davydovych—ten thousand individuals gave "writer" as their profession. The glaring weakness of these books is their virtual silence on such subjects as the fate of these same literary figures and artists, many of whom suffered political persecution and were "liquidated" in the thirties. They are also marred by a trivialization of literary and political debates, and an unwillingness to delve too deeply into the complexities of the intellectual life of the time.

Emigré accounts of this period, by contrast, have, not surprisingly, focussed more on the politics of the 1930s. Events and personalities are described with a more sardonic eye, whether they be the youthful antics and overweening ambition of the futurists, constructivists, acromantics and other candidates for Parnassus from this period, or the manoeuvrings of the Ukrainian political elite. The overall tone is set by the debacle of an ensuing decade that silenced many of the greatest talents and hopes and took all fancy and spontaneity out of the work of the remainder. The slim and scattered accounts of witnesses of the twenties and early thirties—Iurii Klen's reminiscences of the "neoclassicists," Arkadii Liubchenko's documents of the VAPLITE group, Semen Pidhainy's prison notebook, and a collection of short pieces edited by M. Orest—make up the "classics" of our memoir literature about a decade that was rich in colourful personalities, literary "events," and heated deliberations on culture, art and politics.³

Among the most recent additions to the memoir literature published by émigrés—the appearance of which were, at least in part, stimulated by

² See V. Mynko, *Chervonyi parnas: spovid kolyshnoho pluzhanyna* (Kiev, 1972); P. Panch, *Vidlitaiut zhuravli: etyudy* (Kiev, 1973); and B. Antonenko-Davydovych, *Zdaleka y zblyzka: literaturni syluety y krytychni narysy* (Kiev, 1979).

³ See Iu. Klen, *Spohady pro neoklasykiv* (Munich, 1947); materials from A. Liubchenko's archive were published in G. S. N. Luckyj, ed., *Vaplitianskyi zbirnyk* (Oakville, Ont.: Mosaic Press for the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1977); Liubchenko's "Spohady pro Khvylovoho" appears here, pp. 33-46; S. Pidhainy, *Ukrainska intelihentsiia na Solovkakh: spohady 1933-41* (n. p.: Prometei, 1947).

Soviet publications of the last decade—one ought to mention Anatolii Hak's *Vid Hul'iai-polia do Niu-Iorku* (*From Hul'iai-Pole to New York*),⁴ which recaptures some of the youthful spirit of the twenties, and Hryhorii Kostiuk's *Oknianni roky* (*The Accursed Years*),⁵ which, although presenting some interesting information on the leading personalities of the post-revolutionary decade, deals primarily with the 1937-38 hunger strike in the Vorkuta labour camps. Inevitably, in these émigré accounts the picture of an age of great expectations turns gradually to one of sombre disillusionment, ending finally in a tragic denouement. The problem for the chronicler is that the wisdom of hindsight colours his attempts to recreate the mood of an earlier period.

Oleksander Semenenko's *Kharkiv, Kharkiv...* owes much of its popularity to the fact that the author was able to treat the past with required seriousness and yet preserve an affection for, and truthfulness to, the first impressions of his younger days. Among the list of figures who have taken up the pen in order to record their experiences of this age, the author is unusual in that he was not a writer by profession at the time, but a lawyer and administrator. Although his overall assessment of the post-revolutionary generation follows in the tradition of other émigré accounts, he has the benefit of a unique vantage point.

Less concerned with literary groupings and their discussions, and more with cultural developments generally, Semenenko's perceptions differ somewhat from those of literary figures of the period. He himself was trained as a lawyer and found work after the Revolution in the People's Commissariat of Justice and other government departments. The inner workings of these institutions and the characters of their leading functionaries were observed carefully by him throughout the twenties and thirties, until his arrest and imprisonment in 1937. More conscious of the lack of legal norms during this period, aware of the arbitrary conduct of his superiors, and by character less inclined to hero worship, he paints a highly critical picture of such figures as Mykola Skrypnyk. The scandals surrounding Skrypnyk during his term as Commissar of Justice from 1922 to 1927, notably the Aksarina affair and the murder of Kotovsky, as well as the Commissar's protection of the secret police and the party from the full impact of the law, are described from personal memory. The purely decorative function played by Western Ukrainians such as Eresteniuk and Badan, with whom Skrypnyk surrounded himself, was symbolic of the Ukrainian facade carefully fostered by the Party. Semenenko's chief criticism of the republic's elite is their blindness, through

⁴ A. Hak, *Vid Hul'iai-polia do Niu-Iorku* (New York, 1973).

⁵ H. Kostiuk, *Oknianni roky: vid Lukianivskoi tiurmy do Vorkutskoi trahedii, 1935-1940* (Toronto, 1978).

faint-heartedness or out of opportunism, to the fact that their strength was illusory: real power lay elsewhere. Some of Semenenko's most informative chapters deal with the legal profession he knew so well and its prominents—O. Aleksandrov, I. Siiak, Z. Vysotsky (Z. Stepovy) and M. Skrypnyk. The organization of administrative life, its unwritten code of behaviour, and repeated attempts to Ukrainize itself, provide material for some of the author's most poignant insights.

Vignettes are presented of figures from various walks of life, among them the academic I. Sokoliansky, the actors O. Saksahansky and M. Sadowsky, the poets Ie. Malaniuk and M. Vorony, the religious leaders Oleksander Yareshchenko, Bishop of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, and V. M. Chekhivsky. Separate chapters are devoted to V. Elansky, to Iukhym Medvediv, the first president of the Ukrainian SSR, and to M. V. Levytsky, "the father of the *artel* movement" and a symbol of the old populist, self-sacrificing ethic—all valuable as much for their incidental detail as their characterization. These sketches are woven into a description of public events that recorded their impression on the urban intelligentsia of Kharkiv and Kiev. Given the increasingly anaemic political life, displays of national feeling tended to centre around such events as the ovation that welcomed M. Sadowsky's return to the Kharkiv stage, the greeting that M. Hrushevsky received at Kharkiv University, where he delivered a lecture after making his way back to Ukraine from emigration, Sumtsov's funeral in 1921, and Khvylovy's in 1933. These were mass demonstrations at which the population of Kharkiv acknowledged its intellectual mentors and spiritual leaders; and all are duly recorded by the commentator.

Semenenko's impressionistic account of his age, written, as the title implies, with a heavy dose of nostalgia, renders one other service to the post-revolutionary years. He succeeds frequently in capturing "the spirit of place," that ineffable quality that was Odessa in 1919, or Myrhorod in the twenties, or Kharkiv, or Novo-Arkhanhelsk, or Ielysavethrad, or Honcharivka—in short, of Eastern Ukraine on the boundary between two epochs, with its heroes, symbols and history. The author's style never degenerates into political tub-thumping, but preserves a becoming philosophical detachment, and is enlivened by snatches of dialogue and vivid descriptions of scenes that flicker like old newsreels, preserving something of a rapidly receding past. The combination of nostalgic reminiscences with the evocation of the atmosphere of places has proven irresistibly attractive, and the book has been extremely successful among a large sector of the émigré readership.

"There are places, names, events, which are somehow especially close and dear to us," writes the author. "The hand of our youth has touched them." His book, evocative and well-written, is an illuminating sketch of

the spirit of an age and its capital, Kharkiv, in the 1920s and early 1930s—and is all the more welcome given the paucity of materials on this subject.

Myroslav Shkandrij
University of Calgary

DOKIIA HUMENNA, *MYNULE PLYVE V PRYIDESHNIE: ROZPOVID PRO TRYPIILLIA*. New York: The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., Inc., 1978. 384 pp.

When Ukrainian authors write about Ukrainian history or prehistory, their perspective suffers, more often than not, from excessive zealotry and a reaffirmation of pre-existing, overworked notions. This book is not an exception.

There are unfortunately few books which the lay reader can refer to on the topic of Ukrainian prehistory that do justice to the subject matter (either in English or Ukrainian). The author states in the preface that her aim in writing this book was to interpret the specific language of the archaeological researcher and to render it into an easy, accessible language. In other words, she wanted to mediate between the body of archaeological knowledge and the reader. This has been done successfully by the German writer C. W. Ceram (pseudonym of Kurt W. Marek), whose works can be found in any public library. Ceram displays a great talent for disseminating Western archaeological knowledge, not by actively engaging in field work or scholarly polemics, but by popularizing the subject. Ceram is both conversant with the literature and the professionals in the field.

Dokiia Humenna, as evidenced by her extensive bibliography, is aware of most of the major literature available on the subject of her book—the Trypillian culture, famous for its polychromatic, multicurvilinear designs (4-2 millennium B.C.). Much to the detriment of the book, however, she seems to have failed to consult with the specialists in the field.

The prologue to the book deals with the initial discovery of the Trypillian culture by the Czech avocational archaeologist, V. V. Khvoika, around the turn of this century. Based on disinterested material, Khvoika intuitively formulated his theory of autochthonous development. He hypothesized that there is an unbroken genetic link between the Trypillian culture and the much later Kievan Rus' culture in the Middle Dnieper Region. His hypothesis, however, can only remain as such until enough persuasive evidence can be produced to show whether or not it is acceptable.

A hypothesis, to remain viable, must have scholars actively engaged in the pursuit of its feasibility. This became impossible in Ukraine after

1933, when VUAK—the All-Ukrainian Archaeological Committee in Kiev—was purged of its cadres; purged also were many archaeologists attached to other museums and learning establishments. Humenna, wishing to maintain “Ukrainian” scholarly input, erroneously states on p. 16 that the Kiev Institute of Archaeology carried out five expeditions between 1934 and 1938 to excavate Trypillian sites. The Institute, however, unfortunately was not established until 1938. Ukrainian archaeology during this time had only a geographical connotation, having been bled of its Ukrainian archaeologists. It was now being carried out by archaeologists from Leningrad and Moscow. There were, of course, in the various expeditions a few Ukrainians who were seconded from other purged Ukrainian social-science institutes. Later (around 1938), the expeditions also included semi-rehabilitated Ukrainian archaeologists who had survived the purges. Since Khvoika’s discovery of the original Trypillian site, many more hundreds have been discovered, but due to the political reality in Ukraine his hypothesis remains not in force.

The author, though evidently familiar with the English language and its body of archaeological literature, does not include any recent works from the late 1960s or early 1970s that could be cogent to her topic. She thereby does not place Trypillia in the present-day controversies surrounding European prehistory, thus limiting our understanding of those earlier times.

The major controversy centres on the chronological order of the cultures in the Old World. Near-Eastern cultures are based on well-ordered and well-dated dynastic lineages. The age of organic artifacts from European prehistory, however, is basically determined by carbon-14 measurements. In the early use of radiocarbon dates, scientists believed that ^{14}C isotope was produced at a constant rate; due to some recent discoveries, however, it is now known that the production of ^{14}C isotope fluctuated. Therefore the earlier ^{14}C dates are being corrected by the use of a recalibration factor. The outcome has been that earlier European dates are placed even further back in antiquity. This correction of dates has meant the death knell of the diffusionists’ ideas that culture emanated from the Near East. The new chronology shows that the Balkans developed metallurgy, animal domestication, and pottery—the hallmarks of civilization—either autochthonously or even independently of the Near-Eastern cultures. The large megalithic structures of western Europe were erected long before the pyramids of Egypt. And there is also strong evidence that the Trypillians, far from being on the periphery of civilization (as Humenna contends), played a leading role in one of the world’s greatest technical innovations—wheeled transportation. They had already domesticated the horse (ample, datable skeletal evidence exists for the earliest domestication), and there exists indirect evidence that they had knowledge of the wheel.

Archaeological field methods only uncover the remains of the material culture: no archaeologist has ever uncovered an intact kinship system, religion or language. The author, not understanding the limitations of the archaeological method, overtly extends the interpretive nature of archaeology. The philosophical slant of her interpretation has its origins in the nineteenth-century a-priori concepts of human social development and resultant kinship systems put forth by Lewis Morgan, Marx and Engels; that is, that a given culture's economic level will have a given set of human relationships. For example, Trypillia, being an agricultural neolithic culture, will be matriarchal, whereas the pastoral nomadic Yamna Culture will be patriarchal. Today, even in the Soviet Union, where Morgan's ideas are official doctrine, archaeologists pay perfunctory lip-service to these ideas.

Credulity is strained to the breaking point in the second half of the book when the writer completely side-steps her task as mediator and sets out to explain Trypillia in the context of nineteenth-century Ukrainian ethnographic analogies. The last of Trypillia was interred forty centuries ago—in other words, 160 generations ago (twenty-five years per generation). The gap, or rather the chasm, between Trypillia and the nineteenth century is filled with great unknowns. In spite of this, Humenna asks rhetorically whether we should not date the beginning of Ukrainian history from Kievan Rus' or even from a more distant, and hence more prestigious, culture like Trypillia (p. 191). This is where we come to the whole dilemma of Ukrainian historical studies: even the historical origins of the Ukrainians are under a big question mark, let alone the prehistorical ones. Soviet historiography and some émigré scholars view Ukrainians as a recent historical phenomenon of the fourteenth century, resulting from the breakup of the people of Kievan Rus'. When the problem is taken one step back, the origins of Kievan Rus' itself is neatly divided into several antagonistic schools of historical thought—Normanists, neo-Normanists, anti-Normanists, and so on. Being a product of the proto-historic first millennium A.D., Kievan Rus' should be uppermost in our minds if we want to begin unravelling the boondoggle of the origin of Ukraine and Ukrainians. It is sheer folly to work out our geneological insecurities on something as remote as the fourth millennium B.C.

V. V. Khvoika's basic concept—that there was basic integrity in the material culture from the fourth millennium B.C. until Kievan Rus' in the Middle Dnieper Region—can be seen in the endless generations that tilled the same lands, and nurtured the same cultigens and animals until the introduction of New World species (in the sixteenth century). The great problem in realizing Khvoika's concept lies in the area of ethnogenesis (a Soviet term), that is, nation formation. A quick glance at a group of Ukrainians will assure you of the difficulties in retracing their genetic roots. Trying to reach a consensus on Ukrainian ethno-history,

or any people's prehistory for that matter, requires a multi-disciplinary approach, for which archaeology provides just the foundation.

In total, the book is wide of its mark of trying to inform the reader about Ukraine's early prehistory. The writer, a noted Ukrainian author, would have served the cause of archaeology much better if she had used her vivid imagination to write about Trypillia in a historically fictional way, thus exercising her literary talent to the hilt.

Roman Zurba
University of Toronto

KHRESTOMATIIA Z UKRAINSKOI LITERATURY XX STORICHCHIA. (Readings in Ukrainian Literature of the XX-th Century).¹ Edited by Eugene W. Fedorenko and Pawlo Malar. New York: Educational Council — U.C.C.A., 1978. 432 pp. (in Ukrainian)

It is simply impossible to list all the gross errors that are to be found on the pages of this anthology, which is badly written from every point of view. The editors, whom one presumes are also the authors of the various introductory sections and "The Dictionary of Literary Terms," which is to be found at the end, display total unfamiliarity with the basics of literary criticism and methodology involved in the compilation of an anthology. It is doubtful that the high-school student, to whom this anthology is primarily directed (p. 418), or even the literary specialist, for that matter, will understand the definition cited below, the confusion of which expresses in a nutshell the confusion that pervades the whole anthology.

Наука про літературу, літературознавство послуговується визначеннями — методологія й метода. Методологія творчості є сукупність застосування автором творчих засобів у пов'язанні з ідейною настановою та літературним напрямом його творчості.² Творча метода походить від методології та є спосіб застосування засобів зображення у пов'язанні з літературним стилем. (p. 6)

The editors have utilized, to use their own words, a "conditional" chronological periodization (p. 8), which consists of the following periods: (1) the Period of Revolution and National Liberation of Ukraine at the

¹ The editors have mistranslated the title as "Readings." This collection is not a reader, for there are no glossaries, notes or stress marks. A reader is urgently needed by students of Ukrainian in Canada and the United States, but that is a separate issue.

² The punctuation (a period) has been supplied by the reviewer since it does not exist in the original text.

Beginning of the Century; (2) the Period of the Liquidation by the Regime of the National Rebirth in Ukraine of the Thirties and Forties of the XX century;³ (3) the Prewar Period and the War Years; (4) the Period of the Rebirth in the Sixties and the Resistance to the Reaction in the Seventies of the XX Century; (5) Ukrainian Literature in Western Ukraine between the Two World Wars; and (6) Ukrainian Literature in the Emigration.⁴

The reason why the editors have called this a "conditional" chronological periodization becomes apparent when one takes a closer look at these periods. Why, one wonders, does an anthology of Ukrainian literature of the twentieth century ignore the seventeen years preceding the revolution, especially since Modernism, the dominant literary style of this century, traces its beginnings to the turn of the century? The editors themselves seem confused on this point, for in this section they have included poetry from the pre-revolutionary period, and in the introduction to this section they discuss events of the pre-revolutionary period. On the other hand, the prose and drama sections include selections by Hnat Khotkevych and Volodymyr Vynnychenko, but none of the early twentieth-century Modernist masterpieces by Vasyl Stefanyk, Mykhailo Kotsiubynsky or Lesia Ukrainka, which are so crucial for an understanding of style in twentieth-century Ukrainian literature. The final selection for this period is an essay written by Oleksander Biletsky in 1960! Oles Honchar's *Sobor* (*The Cathedral*, 1968), Ievhen Sverstiuk's *Sobor u ryshtovanni* (*A Cathedral in Scaffolding*, 1970) and Oleksander Dovzhenko's *Poema pro more* (*A Poem about the Sea*, 1955) have all been misplaced in period three. It is period four, the period of the 1960s, however, that contains the biggest surprise, for here there are included the two sub-sections of "Literature of the Participants of Armed Struggle" and "Anonymous Poetry of the Soldiers of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army."

The organization of the material within each of the above periods is very sloppy and characterized by terrible inconsistency. Period 1, for example, consists of a general introduction, which is subdivided into "Historical and Political Background," "Literary Background," "Press and Literature," and, finally, "Periodical Literature." This general introduction is followed by a section entitled "Poetry," which consists of an introduction and selections of poetry, grouped according to author, each introduced by a short biographical sketch of the author. This is followed by a section entitled "Prose and Drama," which consists of an introduction

³ In all other places (p. 88 and p. 426) this section is referred to as "The Period of the Liquidation of the National Liberation and the National Rebirth of Ukraine."

⁴ In the table of contents, both periods five and six are mistakenly labelled as five (pp. 430-1).

and selections of prose, again grouped according to author and preceded by a biography. For some reason, prose and drama have been lumped together and no examples of drama of this period are given. Moreover, no distinction is made between the critical-essay form and the short-story form. Period two does not follow this format. It consists of a general introduction, which is subdivided into an untitled section and sections on poetry, prose, drama and periodical literature. This general introduction is followed by selections of writers' works with no regard to genre groupings. None of the other periods have genre groupings, and period six does not even discuss prose, drama or poetry in its introduction. This inconsistency is apparent everywhere, ranging from major organizational features, such as those outlined above, to minor details such as dates of works and writers, which are listed in some cases but not in others.

The editors inform us on p. 418 that they have included a bibliography at the end of each biographical sketch. Apparently the editors do not understand what a bibliography is, for the works that are cited at the end of each biography are the titles of the works of each of the writers. Occasionally, when works are cited, the source is not fully given, as for example the Lavrynenko quotation, where the page numbers are not indicated (pp. 96-7). In the cases of the actual literary selections, the sources and editions are never listed.

This serious lack of scholarship is evident also in "the Dictionary of Literary Terms." Needless to say, there are no bibliographical sources listed here, even though the editors send us to some mysterious "appropriate Ukrainian and English handbooks, dictionaries, and the like" (p. 418). Although all the definitions can be criticized, I shall cite here only one example—namely, the definition of Existentialism, for it displays the editors' complete unfamiliarity with basic twentieth-century ideas.

Екзистенціалізм — напрям у філософії та естетиці, а також в літературі, поширений став після другої світової війни. Екзистенціалізм визнає, що духовне існування людини — "екзистенція", — непіддатне пізнанню. Звідси в екзистенціалістів виразні прояви песимізму, приречености людини, безпомічности тощо. (p. 410)

A dictionary of literary terms is a separate project altogether. Why, one wonders, have the editors attempted to compile a dictionary of literary terms when they had enough problems with the anthology alone?

The editors inform us that some works are abridged. Sometimes these deletions are simply unnecessary, as, for example, the omission of twenty-six lines in the short story by Vynnychenko (pp. 67-9). In the short story by Khvylovy there is no indication on p. 143 that this is part two. There is also no indication that material has been left out on pp. 130, 182 and 185. Sometimes the editors make up their own titles for excerpts, as on pp. 175, 182 and 185.

As far as the actual selection of works is concerned, there is no balance between outstanding and mediocre writers. The writers Valerii Shevchuk, Ievhen Hutsalo and Emma Andiiievaska are not represented at all. It is too bad that in making their selections the editors did not consider their own words on p. 11.

Загальна тенденція тогочасного літературного процесу виявлялася в прямуванні до звільнення літератури від надмірного соціологізму й ідеологічної проґрамовості, в прямуванні до звільнення літератури від функції бути ілюстрацією до соціології й політики.

This anthology contains also a number of factual errors. One reads, in reference to 1922, "The Russian Communist Party immediately takes control of literature, art and science" (p. 88). This statement distorts the fact that the various arts enjoyed considerable freedom from Party intervention for approximately ten years. No mention is made of Ukrainization. On p. 324, Mykhailo Osadchy's memoir *Bilmo (Cataract)* is called a psychological novel, and on p. 6 Mykhailo Petrenko, Viktor Zabila and Levko Borovykovsky are called poets of the post-Shevchenko era. On p. 367, the editors state that the early Ukrainian settlers of Canada left no significant literary works outside of songs and legends. This is incorrect, for in this period there is a sizeable body of poetry and prose that is of the same literary value as the works of the members of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, which the editors of the anthology include among their selections.

Stylistically this anthology is of inferior quality as well. The editors apparently do not believe in punctuation. Examples of the kind of writing one is faced with on every page of this anthology are the following.

Ще до захоплення влади над Україною російськими комуністами почали свою творчість П. Тичина, М. Рильський, В. Чумак, М. Семенко, у перебігу революційних подій в українську літературу приходять багато молодих талантів, літературне життя відроджується, стає інтенсивним і розмаїтим. (p. 88)

Тематично — проза сучасності, з невеликими появами про недалеке минуле — 1905 рік, війна, переважають у прозі, твори про село, селянські з походження письменники. (p. 93)

There are also grammatical mistakes, such as "Odnache z ikh prykhodom ne bula pereborena v poezii zlyva peresichnosity i shtampu" (p. 261), and typographical errors, such as "vtoryt" instead of "tvoryt" (p. 403) and "pezii" instead of "poezii" (p. 122).

Since this anthology is aimed primarily at the high-school student, the editors should have included extensive notes and explanations of the various difficult passages, names, and so on. Comparisons with the fields of twentieth-century Ukrainian art, cinema and theatre and illustrations

of these would also have been very useful. An example of a good anthology that awakens in students a love for literature and a desire to find out more about it is the French *XX^e Siecle* (*The Twentieth Century*) by Lagarde and Michard.⁵

This reviewer does not recommend the anthology by Fedorenko and Malar to anyone. Ukrainian-speaking students could certainly use a Ukrainian anthology of the quality of the Lagarde and Michard anthologies; until such a work is available, however, students may make use of the various other existing anthologies on twentieth-century Ukrainian literature.⁶

Romana Bahrij Pikulyk
York University

IVAN FRANKO, *FOX MYKYTA*. Translated by Bohdan Melnyk, illustrated by William Kurelek. Montreal: Tundra Books, 1978. 148 pp.

Translation is not limited to word-for-word reproduction of any literary piece from the source language into the target language. It is far more complex than the simple rendering of the Ukrainian *kit* as the English "cat." Semantic variations, slight shades of meaning, diction, and grammatical and syntactical composition must be taken into consideration. The translator's task, therefore, becomes virtually impossible. Although any translation will lack some aspect of the original, it will, if translated carefully, bear resemblance to the source-language text at least in content if not in artistic beauty. The difficulties and pitfalls of translation have been examined, discussed, and debated many times over, and it is not the intention of this reviewer to add hypotheses to existing theory, but rather to draw attention to the delicate matter of translation.

Ukrainian literature is lacking in translation, particularly if compared to other Slavic literatures. Plausible reasons exist for this deficiency—lack of interest in Ukrainian literature, limited demand, lack of resources, and so on. Yet, many of these obstacles can be overcome. Perhaps the most plausible reason is that few translators of Ukrainian literature are fluently bilingual, and fewer are trained to translate.

⁵ A. Lagarde and L. Michard, eds., *XX^e Siecle* (Paris, 1966).

⁶ Some of the best ones are the following: B. Boychuk and B. Rubchak, eds., *Koordynaty*, 2 vols. (New York, 1969); I. Koshelivets, ed., *Panorama nainovishoi literatury v URSR: poeziia, proza, krytyka*, 2d ed. rev. (Munich, 1974); I. Lavrynenko, ed., *Rozstriliane vidrodzhennia: antolohiia 1917-1933; poeziia, proza, drama, esei* (Paris, 1959); and G. S. N. Luckyj, ed., *Modern Ukrainian Short Stories: Parallel Text Edition* (Littleton, Colo., 1973).

Franko's *Lys Mykyta* has never been translated into English. What appears to be a simple children's fable is really a complex weave of philosophical musing, allegory, satire, wit, punning, and human wisdom masquerading as fable. An English translation of *Lys Mykyta* would serve several purposes: to entertain children as a fable, to entertain adults as an Aesopian tale, and to satisfy those who wish to see more Ukrainian classics translated. But Melnyk's prose "English version" fulfills none of the above. Although it may still be suitable for children as a fable, an animal story, a coherent, logically progressing tale with a moral it is not.

The translation, or perhaps one should call it a *retelling* of *Lys Mykyta*, is peppered with errors, weak translation, faulty diction, and translator intrusion.

A first reading will reveal the curious animal names: King Lion Tsar Lev, Queen Lioness Tsarina Lvytsia, Vovk Nesyty Wolf the Hungry. One can only wonder about the redundant names and whether there is some justifiable reason for the doubling, about the substitution of the Russian *Tsarina* for the Ukrainian *Tsarytsia*, and the mistranslated Vovk Nesyty, Wolf the Insatiable. The names become comical in certain instances: Keet Moorlyk (Kit Murlyka), Jack Yats the Rabbit (Zaiets), Badger Babye (Borsuk Babai), Medveed Boormylo (Medvid Burmylo). Perhaps Melnyk's intention was to render the names phonetically, but a substitution of an English name of equal semantic value would have sufficed. The English speaker will be amused by the word "keet": it means Guinea fowl.

Many of the passages are either inaccurate retellings of events or outright invented additions on the translator's part: "This stunning revelation caused Tsarina Lvytsia to lean over and whisper something into Lion Tsar Lev's ear" (p. 15). Oftentimes crucial lines that add a pun or ironic twist are omitted, or changed entirely, such as the final verse of the poem.

Тут кінчиться наша казка.
Бубликів солодких в'язка
Тим, хто слухав, не шумів...
Може, дехто пригадає,
Що не раз таке буває
І в людей, як у звірів.

appears as

The story ends. As Fox takes leave,
He wipes his eyes upon his sleeve
And says to those who read this tale:
'May you be happy, free of woes!
And as for your relentless foes,
May all their plots against you fail!' (p. 148)

The didactic, moral ending of *Lys Mykyta* is lost. Franko's harmless "Hey, Mykyto! De podivsia? Vylizai!" (Song 2, verse 3) is transformed into "Hey, Mykyta!" Bear shouted menacingly. "Where are you, you good-for-nothing bum? Come out and be quick!" (p. 22). One questions its suitability for children and the impression the English version makes on the reader. There are far too many such changes and inaccuracies to enumerate.

To its credit, *Fox Mykyta* has William Kurelek's illustrations. The whimsy and wit of Franko's *Lys Mykyta* is conveyed through the black and white drawings, and fills the gaps left by the text.

Granted that translating Ukrainian verse into English verse is rather difficult, an accurate prose version would suffice. Unfortunately, this version is not as successful as it could have been. One could overlook the minor weaknesses had the translator captured the witty language of Franko's Aesopian fable through an equally adept language for puns, English, and had he been faithful to the content of his source.

Nadia Odette Diakun
University of Toronto

ПЕРЕЧИТУЮЧИ КНИЖКУ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ПЕРЕКЛАДІВ ПОЕЗІЙ СТЕНЛІ КУНІЦА

Читаю книжку українських перекладів поезій Стенлі Куніца, видану чепурно з репродукціями дереворитів мистця Якова Гніздовського,* і зупинився на вірші "Війна проти дерев". Зацікавило мене не тільки ім'я перекладача, Івана Драча; цей вірш на тему "дерева" звернув мою увагу вже давніше та й задумав був я його перекласти. То ж у мене не тільки оригінал вірша у папці, але вступні нотатки і пояснення. В додатку сторінка у книжці перекладів, на якій поміщений цей вірш, прикрашена відбиткою деревориту Гніздовського, що у "змісті" має назву "стовбур", а в оригіналі звався "старе дерево", того самого деревориту, що його використав цей мистець для проекту обкладинки моєї збірки "Самотнє дерево". То ж і вірш та ілюстрація стали мені близькі, мов рідні, і я з великою увагою почав читати оригінал і переклад, намагаючись вкласти слова оригіналу й перекладу в один поетичний образ, що його відкрив уперше поет і переніс на папір.

Ось вірш Стенлі Куніца:

* Стенлі Кюнїц, Вінок цей, небезпека: вибрані поезії, упорядкував і переклав Богдан Бойчук із Вольфрамом Бургардтом, Іваном Драчем, Вадимом Лесичем і Юрієм Тарнавським (Нью-Йорк: Сучасність, 1977).

THE WAR AGAINST THE TREES

The man who sold his lawn to standard oil
Joked with his neighbors come to watch the show
While the bulldozers, drunk with gasoline,
Tested the virtue of the soil
Under the branchy sky
By overthrowing first the privet-row.

Forsythia-forays and hydrangea-raids
Were but preliminaries to a war
Against the great-grandfathers of the town,
So freshly lopped and maimed.
They struck and struck again,
And with each elm a century went down.

All day the hireling engines charged the trees,
Subverting them by hacking underground
In grub-dominions, where dark summer's mole
Rampages through his halls,
Till a northern seizure shook
Those crowns, forcing the giants to their knees.

I saw the ghosts of children at their games
Racing beyond their childhood in the shade,
And while the green world turned its death-foxed page
And a red wagon wheeled,
I watched them disappear
Into the suburbs of their grievous age.

Ripped from the craters much too big for hearts
The club-roots bared their amputated coils,
Raw gorgons matted blind, whose pocks and scars
Cried Moon! on a corner lot
One witness-moment, caught
In the rear-view mirrors of the passing cars.

Про переклади, чи радше про мистецтво перекладу в нас уже багато писали. Додав і я своє слівце до цієї теми у двох статтях, що були надруковані, одна у "Києві" (1956), а друга у "Порогах" (1957). В загальному згоджуюся, що переклад повинен бути вірний оригіналові, і в той час не понижувати мистецького вислову. Трудність з'являється, коли перекладач натрапляє на ідіоматичні місця. В поезії часом одно слово, навіть і не

ідіоматичної породи, створює цілу картину, цілий світ. Завданням перекладача було б уміти передати цей поетичний світ, що його зафіксував словом поет.

З увагою до цієї вмюлости передати в перекладі світ автора читаю Драчів переклад Куніцового вірша:

ВІЙНА ПРОТИ ДЕРЕВ

Він продав свій газон "Стандарт Ойл",
Він жартує з сусідами, він спостерігає,
Як бульдозер, сп'янілий бензином,
Промачує тугу якість землі,
Як підкрадається під гіллястими небесами
До безтурботного коріння дерева.

Цей напад на куці куці бузків
Був лише сигналом до штурму
Старовинних велетнів зелені.

Бульдозери грубо підрізували,
Шматували, калічили, розривали —
З кожним в'язом століття на землю гупало...

Цілий день машини, вантажені в'язами,
Скидали їх, зарізаних під землею.
Гусениці металеві ходили по ходах крота.
Кріт шалів з переляку у темних своїх палацах.
Велетні на коліна впали. Корони зелені спали.
Тряслися в припадочній, як од скаженого сіверка.

Я бачив перелякані тіні дітей,
Що бавилися в дитинство під тіннями в'язів —
Зелена сторінка життя пилюгою покрилась.
Я бачив, як розвертались червоні фургони,
Як розганяли дитячі привиди в передмістя,
Засмічені димом, засмучені старістю.

Я бачив, як за борти тікало навтьоки коріння,
Хотіло землі товкнутись — доторкалося до гудрону.
Кричи, Місяцю! На цьому кутку землі
Сталось з деревами те, що сталось...
Я в свідки беру відображення їхніх конвульсій
У маленьких люстерках проїжджих байдужих машин.

Перший рядок перекладу передає точну думку оригіналу. Та у Драча слово “чоловік” замінено на “він”. Це було б непогано, якби це “він” не повторювалось двічі у двох наступних реченнях. Так це повторення надає початкові вірша форму якогось стаккато — тоді, коли у Куніца просто подана інформація, що хтось там продав свій городець. Ці повторення “він” звели перекладача, і другий рядок його перекладу вже зовсім не відповідає оригіналові. У Куніца чоловік, продавши свій городець, запрошує сусідів подивитись, як будуть корчувати старі дерева під площу для бензинової станції. У Куніца про це дуже просто: продавши городець чоловік жартома запрошує сусідів “вач те шов”.

Тут приходить думка, що й у нашу мову можна би включити слово “шов”. Воно вже має міжнародне громадянство та й уживають його у різних мовах, навіть у французькій, від якої перебрали ми слово “спектакль”. Далі “бульдозери” замінено одним “бульдозером”. І змінена теж ціла картина. Поет бачить картину війни, бульдозери наступають, мов танки. Перекладач не вклався в задум автора і, замінивши множину на однину, “бульдозери” на “бульдозер”, применшив повагу і трагізм хвилини, ще й підсунувши слово “підкрадається” та й “до безтурботного коріння дерев”, чого зовсім немає в оригіналі. У Куніца мова ударна і проста, як справжній наступ у битві: бульдозери наступають, вони пробують спершу ту основну силу противника, твердь землі, що рівнозначна із твердю характеру, чеснотою, щоб дібратися до її нутра і виважити коріння дерев, перевернувши спершу кущі на першому пляні.

Початок другої секстини в перекладі знову невірний. Звукове враження від слів “форситії” і “форейс”, з повторним “р”, може неперекладене, але можна точно за автором зарисувати картину. Ця точність ще й потрібна для передачі дії. Тут слово “прелімінарії” можна і треба залишити, бо воно і в нашій мові вживається на визначення початкової дії. Не бачу потреби замінювати слово “прелімінарії” словом “сигнал”. Оба однаково чужі, а для визначення дії перше більш відповідне, бо війна вже почалась і “сигнал до штурму” вже запізнений; це йдуть вже “прелімінарії” війни проти “прапрадів міста” — таке чудове визначення дерев у вірші Куніца та зовсім зігнороване у перекладі.

Змінив перекладач і третю секстину. У Куніца кульмінація на “велетнях”, що їх “поставлено на коліна”. Звідкіля у перекладача останній рядок, що розвиває всю силу цієї кульмінаційної точки, ще й із тим “сіверком”, що зовсім не вкладається в картину, задуману поетом?

Непорозуміння і в четвертій секстині. Тут не “тіні”, а привиди дітей, що шукають за своїм дитинством у тіні дерев. Просто людина пригадує, що під гіллястим деревом колись у дитинстві шукала того, чого не знайти. Це непорозуміння можна пояснити незнанням американського побуту. У Куніца картина навіяна дійсністю: міста втрачають свій чар, віддають свою зелень під бетон і будівлі, а мешканці втікають на передмістя, де є зелень,

але там їх чекає самотність, сум і смерть. Драч знає європейське місто, де на передмістях фабрики і заводи, і тому у його перекладі “передмістя засмічені димом” — зовсім незгідне з оригіналом.

Остання секстина перекладу зовсім відбігає від оригіналу. Це в оригіналі пуант — кінець, трагічний кінець війни, смерть дерев. Куніца відтворив це з великою майстерністю, ядерними короткими фразами, вживаючи складні слова. Перший рядок (“вирвані з кратерів” — з наголосом на “р”) у Драча замінено довгим-розповідним: “я бачив як за борти втікало навіть коріння”. Тут не місце на споглядання-бачення — це фінал, закінчується трагедія. Куди ж тепер корінню “втікати”? Війна закінчена, на побоевищі коріння, мов ампутовані ноги вояків, що нагадують потворних горгон. Куніц подав у примітці пояснення до слова “горгони”. То ж і не повинно бути ніякого непорозуміння. Саме у слові “горгони” кульмінаційний пункт трагедії, що є темою вірша. Це ті потвори, що на їх вид людина замінювалась у камінь. У Куніца коротко: “закричав місяць”. Місяць глянув на побоевище і від страшного виду, як від виду горгонів, крикнув (і скам’янів). Вид, що кличе до неба про пімсту. І ще болючіша ця трагедія, бо ніхто її не переживає, ніхто не звертає уваги на трагічну гибель отих пра-прадідів міста — дерев. Картина, що сповняє жахом, мов вид потворних горгон, тільки в один момент краєчком відбилась у малому, бічному дзеркальці автомашин, що саме в той час поспішно переїхали побіч. Не треба пояснювати, що ці автомашини в кінцевому рядку поеми не випадкові. Це задля них відбулась війна з деревами, щоб видерти у дерев землю під газолінову станцію.

А ось і мій переклад, що його я викінчив у висліді зустрічі з книжкою перекладів поезій Куніца:

ВІЙНА ПРОТИ ДЕРЕВ

Сусід, що свій город продав для Стандарт Ойл,
пожартував з сусідами: ходіть на шов!
— коли бульдозери, сп’янілі газоліном,
вже випробовували твердь землі
під небом гілля,
спершу перевернувши ряд кущів.

Та наступ на форситії і рейд на лози
— це лиш прелімінарії війни
проти пра-прадідів старого міста,
що свіжо зрізані і покалічені
валилися на землю раз-у-раз;
і з кожним в’язом падало століття вниз.

Весь день машини били по деревах,
втискали їх — порубаних у ґрунт,
у корчовище, де підпільний кріт
розбурхував проходів чорні стіни,
аж наступ з півночі звалив
оці корони: велетнів поставив на коліна.

Я бачив привиди дітей, що в грі
ганялися поза дитинство в тінь дерев.
Коли зелений світ перегорнув сторінку смерти,
перекотивсь червоний віз,
— я бачив як відходили вони
на передмістя, де прийдеться вмерти.

І вирване із кратерів, що більші за серця,
коріння оголило покручі кривуль:
страшні Горгони сплутались наосліп; на їх вид
аж місяць скрикнув.

Там за закрутом вулиць
одна — ця незабутня мить
лиш схоплена в бічному дзеркалі проїжджих авт.

Остап Тарнавський

LETTERS

31 May 1979

Dear Editor:

Enclosed is a list of Japanese books and articles on Ukraine that have appeared in recent times. In my view, they should be published in the *Journal* by way of information. During my last trip to China I discovered that two important books on Ukraine were translated into Chinese — Ivan Dziuba's *Internationalism or Russification?* and Petro Shelest's *Ukraino nasha Radianska*. Xerox copies of the title pages are enclosed for your information.

Sincerely yours,

Professor Peter J. Potichnyj,
Department of Political Science,
McMaster University

JAPANESE ARTICLES AND BOOKS ON THE HISTORY OF UKRAINE

- AOKI, Setsuya. "‘Minzoku Kakumei’ no Unmei." (The destiny of the "National Revolution.") *Roshia Kakumeiron*, 1977, pp. 260-301. About the Central Rada, Directory, Petliura.
- . "Sengo Ukuraina no Minzoku Mondai 1945-1972." (National problems in Ukraine after World War Two, 1945-1972.) *Tooshi Kenkyū*, vol. 1, 1978, pp. 221-38. About Symonenko and Dziuba.
- KIMURA, Hiroshi. "Ukuraina no Sovietoka (1917-20)." (The Sovietization of Ukraine [1917-20].) *Hogaku Ronsō*, vol. 71, no. 4 (1962): 29-78. A study of the Ukrainian revolution based on J. Borys's book.
- NAKAI, Kazuo. "Machnovshina. Naisenki Ukuraina niokeru Nomin Undo." (The Mahknovshchyna. A peasant movement in Ukraine during the civil war.) *Machno Hanrangunshi*, 1975, pp. 303-26.
- . "Ukuraina Kakumeishi ni yosete." (Some important points for the study of the Ukrainian revolution.) *Roshiashi Kenkyū*, no. 24, 1975, pp. 18-33. A comment on Saito's article.
- . "Ukuraina no Kakumei 1917-1920." (The revolution in Ukraine, 1917-20.) *Rekishigaku Kenkyū*, no. 424, 1975, pp. 1-18. A study focussing especially on the peasants.
- . "Ukuraina Kyōsantō no Seiritsu." (The formation of the Communist Party of Ukraine.) *Rekishi Hyōron*, no. 306, 1975, pp. 48-65. About the Taganrog conference and the first congress, from February 1917 to August 1918.

- . "Ukuraina Kakumei ni okeru Kyosanshugisha. 1-2." (Communists in the Ukrainian revolution.) *Rekishi Hyōron*, no. 327, 1977, pp. 53-62; no. 328, 1977, pp. 61-71. About the Borotbisty, Skrypnyk, and Zatonsky; the national composition of the CPU.
- NISHIUMI, Tarō. "Bessarabia to Ukuraina." (Bessarabia and Ukraine.) *Rekishigaku Kenkyū*, no. 67, 1939, pp. 30-73. From February 1917 to 1919.
- SAITŌ, Haruko. "Ukuraina Rada ni tsuite no jakkano Kōsatsu." (A study of the Ukrainian Central Rada.) *Shiron*, no. 12, 1964, pp. 65-88.
- . "Ukuraina Sovieto Kakumei no Daiichidankai." (The first step of the Soviet revolution in Ukraine.) *Rekishigaku Kenkyū*, no. 409, 1974, pp. 35-45. A study of the Ukrainian revolution in 1917 based on official Soviet views.
- . "Ukurainashi niokeru Minzoku to Kakumei." (Nation and revolution in the history of Ukraine.) *Roshiashi Kenkyu*, no. 25, 1976, pp. 62-72. A response to Nakai's critique.
- SHIMIZU, Takehisa. *Ukuraina Dokuritsu Mondai no Minzokushiteki Kōsatsu*. (A historical study on the independence of Ukraine.) 1941, 95 pp. A general survey of Ukrainian history.
- TŌA-KENKYŪSHO, ed. *Ukuraina Minzoku Kenkyū Zadankai*. (A symposium on Ukrainian studies.) 1940, 88 pp. Attended by thirteen persons, including the former consul-general in Odessa.

15 July 1979

Dear Editor:

Enclosed please find a supplement to Dobczansky's Bibliography for Oles Berdnyk.

Sincerely,

John A. Barnstead,
Department of Russian
Dalhousie University

Addenda to a Bibliography for Oles Berdnyk

Materials from Soviet Ukrainian Newspapers (Based on an examination of *Litopys hazetnykh statei*, 1966-77).

- 1966 (2924) Berdnyk, Oles. "Obrii piznannia: rozdumy fantaŭta."
Selianski visti, 9 January 1966.
- (12717) "Lisova kazka" (Uryvok z povisti pro M. Rerikha).
Zirka, 10 June 1966.

- 1967 (26751) Tahor, Rabindranat. "Hitandzhiali ('Pisenna zhertva')": pereklad z khindi O. Berdnyka i O. Kulemanovoi. *Literaturna Ukraina*, 8 December 1967.
- 1968 (5855) Berdnyk, Oles. "Poklyk neba — snihova baba" (virshi). *Radianske Podillia*, 6 March 1968.
- 1969 (14122) Berdnyk, Oles. "'Polit u nebuvalist.'" (Rozpovid pysmen-nyka pro stvorennia povisti 'Pokryvalo Izidy')." *Druh chytacha*, 1 July 1969.
- 1970 (10059) Kovalenko, Mykhailo. "Fantastyka chy mistyka? (Pro lit. fantastyku O. Berdnyka)." *Literaturna Ukraina*, 19 May 1970.
- 1971 (9410) Berdnyk, Oles. "'UR'. Uryvky z fantast. povisti."
(10270) *Moloda hvardiia*, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28 April 1971.

Numbers in parentheses are index numbers from *Litopys*.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- ANTONENKO-DAVYDOVYCH, Borys. *Iak my hovorymo*. Introduction by Nadia Svitlychna. Toronto and Baltimore: V. Symonenko Smoloskyp Publishers, 1979. xii, 271 pp.
- AVERY, Donald. "*Dangerous Foreigners*": *European Immigrant Workers and Labour Radicalism in Canada 1896-1932*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979. 204 pp.
- IARYCHEVSKY, Sylvestr. *Tvory*. Volume 1. Edited, annotated, and introduced by Mahdalyna Laslo-Kutsiuk. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1977. 301 pp.
- . *Tvory*. Volume 2. Edited by Mahdalyna Laslo-Kutsiuk. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1978. 509 pp.
- IROD, Kornelii. *Peredoden*. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1975. 205 pp.
- KLEINER, Izrail. *Natsionalni problemy ostannoi imperii (Natsionalne pytannia v SRSR ochyma radianskykh dysydentiv)*. Paris: PIUF, 1978. 406 pp.
- KOLASKY, John. *The Shattered Illusion: The History of Ukrainian Pro-Communist Organizations in Canada*. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1979. 200 pp.
- KOTSAR, Mykola. *Nezhasne polum'ia*. Bucharest: Editura Litera, 1978. 44 pp.
- KUTIUK-KOTRZYNSKI, Kiril (Kutsiuk-Kochynsky, Kyrylo). *Vohni Smerkannia—Focurile Înserării*. Bilingual edition. Translated into Romanian by Livia Bacăru. Bucharest: Editura Litera, 1978. 87 pp.
- KUTSIUK-KOCHYNSKY, Kyrylo. *Zapakh neba*. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1977. 46 pp.
- LASLO-KUTSIUK, Mahdalyna. *Pytannia ukrainskoi poetyky*. Bucharest: Faculty of Slavic Languages, Bucharest University, 1974. 209 pp.
- LASLO-KUTSIUK, Mahdalyna. *Ukrainska poeziia xx stolittia: antholohiia*. Bucharest: Faculty of Slavic Languages, Bucharest University, 1976. 360 pp.
- LASLO-KUTSIUK, Mahdalyna. *Ukrainska radianska literatura*. Second revised edition. Bucharest: Faculty of Slavic Languages, Bucharest University, 1976. 362 pp.
- MASYKEVYCH, Orest. *Burekvity*. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1979. 95 pp.
- MELNYCHUK, Oksana. *Osinnie riznotsvittia*. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1979. 133 pp.
- MOROZ, Valentyn. *Moisei i Datan*. Toronto and Baltimore: V. Symonenko Smoloskyp Publishers, 1978. 51 pp.

- Mykhailo Hrushevskiy u 110 rokovyny narodzhennia 1876-1976*. Zapysky NTSh, vol. 197. New York, Paris, Sydney and Toronto, 1978. 236 pp.
- Olenskyi tsvit: zbirka ukrainskoi usnoi opovidalnoi tvorchosti z Rumunii*. Collected, edited, annotated, and introduced by Ivan Reboshapka. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1978. 327 pp.
- PAVLISH, Iurii. *Skhody*. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1979. 119 pp.
- PLYUSHCH, Leonid. *History's Carnival: A Dissident's Autobiography*. With a contribution by Tatyana Plyushch. Edited and translated by Marco Carynnyk. New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979. xvii, 429 pp.
- REBUȘAPCĂ, Ioan (Reboshapka, Ivan). *Curs de Folclor Literar Ucrainean* (in Ukrainian). Bucharest: Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Chair of Slavic Philology, Bucharest University, 1977. 209 pp.
- REBOSHAPKA, Ivan. *Narodzhennia symbolu: aspekty vzaiemodii obriadu ta obriadovoi poezii*. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1975. 251 pp.
- ROMANIUK, Pavlo. *Neporochnik movchannia*. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1978. 113 pp.
- RUDENKO, Mykola. *Prozinnia: poezii, poemy*. Articles by Petro Hryhorenko and Ihor Kachurovsky. Baltimore and Toronto: V. Symonenko Smoloskyp Publishers, 1978. 365 pp.
- Russia, the USSR, and Eastern Europe: A Bibliographic Guide to English Language Publications, 1964-1974*. Compiled by Stephan M. Horak. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1978. 488 pp.
- SIRKA, Josef. *The Development of Ukrainian Literature in Czechoslovakia 1945-1975: A Survey of Social, Cultural and Historical Aspects*. European University Papers, series 16—Slavonic Languages and Literatures, vol. 11. Frankfurt/Main, Bern and Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1978. xi, 198 pp.
- Soiuz Vyzvolennia Ukrainy 1914-1918 Viden*. New York: "Chervona Kalyna" Ukrainian Publications Cooperative, Inc., 1979. 199 pp.
- SVERSTIUK, Ievhen. *Vybrane*. Edited by Ivan Koshelivets. N.p.: Suchasnist, 1979. 275 pp.
- TARNAWSKY, Yuriy. *Os, iak ia vyduzhuu*. Introduction by Vitalij Keis. N.p.: Suchasnist, 1978. 127 pp.
- Ukrainian Political Prisoners in the Soviet Union: A Biographical List*. Compiled by the Ukrainian Central Information Service. Preface by Valentyn Moroz. Toronto: Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine and Studium Research Institute, Inc., 1979. 128 pp.

Journal

Ukrainskyi pravozakhysnyi rukh : dokumenty i materiialy kyivskoi Ukrain-skoi Hromadskoi Hrupy Spriannia Vykonnanniu Helsinskykh Uhod.
Compiled by Osyp Zinkevych. Introduction by Andrew Zwarun.
Toronto and Baltimore: V. Symonenko Smoloskyp Publishers, 1978.
477 pp.

WYNAR, Christine L. *Ukrainian Children's Literature in North America.*
Reprinted from *Phaedrus*, spring 1979, pp. 6-21. Englewood, Colo.:
Ukrainian Research Foundation, Inc., 1979.

ZILYNS'KYI, Ivan. *A Phonetic Description of the Ukrainian Language.*
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1979. ix,
212 pp.

MASTER'S AND DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS

The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies invites applications for four Master's thesis fellowships (\$3,600 each), non-renewable, and three Doctoral thesis fellowships (\$6,500 each), renewable, to be awarded in 1980-81. The awards are intended to aid students to complete theses on Ukrainian or Ukrainian-Canadian topics in the disciplines of education, history, the humanities, law, library sciences, and the social sciences. Fellowships will be awarded only in the thesis year of an academic program and only for thesis work.

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

Closing date for receipt of applications is January 31, 1980. For application forms, write to the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 352 Athabasca Hall, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E8 or phone (403) 432-2972.

UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS

The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies invites applications for ten undergraduate scholarships (\$1,500 each), renewable, to be awarded in 1980-81. The awards are intended for students interested in an undergraduate degree with a major in Ukrainian studies, consisting of a combination of at least five full courses in a three-year Arts program in Ukrainian, East European, Soviet and/or Canadian studies (depending on whether Ukrainians or Ukrainians in Canada is the main concern) and at least eight full courses in a four-year Arts or Education program.

The awards are intended to cover tuition fees and to subsidize the cost of room and board beginning in the first year. Scholarships of \$500 to students residing at home will increase the number of scholarships available.

The scholarships are for an eight-month period of study at any Canadian university. Candidates must be Canadian citizens or landed immigrants at the time of application. Only in exceptional circumstances may an award be held concurrently with other awards.

Closing date for receipt of applications is January 31, 1980. For application forms, write to the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 352 Athabasca Hall, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E8 or phone (403) 432-2972.

Journal

Ukrainian for Undergraduates

By Danylo Husar Struk

Intended for university students with some background in the language, *Ukrainian for Undergraduates* introduces basic morphology and vocabulary through numerous drills, written and oral exercises, and tables. Points of grammar are explained in English, but grammatical terminology is given in both Ukrainian and English.

350 pages cloth \$9.00 paper \$5.00

Ukrainian Dumy

Editio minor

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 here in a college edition with originals and translations *en face* by the poets George Tarnawsky and Patricia Kilina. The complete academic edition of the *dumy* will be published by the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. Published for the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

219 pages cloth \$9.95 paper \$5.95

FORTHCOMING

Modern Ukrainian

By Assya Humesky

Used as a first-year university grammar at Harvard University for several years in manuscript form, *Modern Ukrainian* presents the fundamental morphology and vocabulary of Ukrainian and some notations on syntax and intonation through the use of exercises and dialogues. Notes explain grammar rules, usage, stylistic flavour, regional variants, and so on.

Approx. 400 pages paper \$8.00

These books may be ordered from:

University of Toronto Press

Order Dept.

5201 Dufferin Street

Downsview, Ontario

Canada

M3H 5T8

PUBLICATIONS OF THE CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Lektsii z Istorii Ukrainskoi Literatury, 1798-1870

(Lectures on the History of Ukrainian Literature, 1798-1870)

By Mykola Zerov

Edited by Dorren W. Gorsline and Oksana Solovey

Mykola Zerov, the gifted Ukrainian poet, translator, and critic, may also be considered as a founder of modern Ukrainian literary scholarship. His arrest in 1935 and subsequent death in a Soviet labour camp prevented him from completing the work he had begun with *Nove ukrainske pysmenstvo* (*New Ukrainian Writing*, 1924), but this gap is filled in large measure by the lectures he delivered at Kiev University in 1928. Published from a typescript compiled by Zerov's students and checked by Zerov himself, the lectures deal with the crucial period of nineteenth-century Ukrainian literary history and are a model of scholarly objectivity.

271 pages cloth \$9.95 paper \$3.95

Vaplitianskyi Zbirnyk

(The Vaplite Collection)

Edited by George Luckyj

The writers and artists who grouped together in VAPLITE (1925-1928) spearheaded the cultural revival in Ukraine in the 1920s. Their attempt to develop a high culture, based on Western European models, was cut short by the onset of Stalinism. The group was disbanded under official pressure, and many of its members were subjected to severe repressions. George Luckyj, who is also the author of *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-1934*, has assembled a rich collection of letters, diaries, poetry, and fiction from the archives of VAPLITE. Unavailable elsewhere for the most part, the texts are enhanced by forty-three rare illustrations.

260 pages cloth \$10.95 paper \$4.95

Antolohiia Ukrainskoi Liryky, Chastyna I—Do 1919

(An Anthology of Ukrainian Lyric Poetry, Part I—To 1919)

Edited by Orest Zilynsky

"A favorite scholarly idea of Zilynsky's was that the Ukrainian *Geist* attained its greatest heights in lyrical poetry," wrote *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* in June 1977. This idea has found its full expression in the present anthology, which provides a rich sampling of Ukrainian lyric poetry, from anonymous seventeenth-century songs to twentieth-century Symbolist poetry. The volume contains a long introduction by the editor, whose untimely death in 1976 deprived Ukrainian scholarship of a leading light, a biographical note by Eva Biss-Zilynska, a survey of Zilynsky's scholarly work by Mykola Mushynka, and notes on the authors and sources.

439 pages cloth \$13.95 paper \$6.95

A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language

By George Shevelov

Covering the entire history of Ukrainian in its phonological aspects from the inception of the language in Common Slavic to the present, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language* examines Standard Ukrainian against the background of, and in relation to, its dialects. All phonetic changes are discussed, including accentological ones and those interacting with morphology. Diagrams, charts, and maps supplement the text, and each chapter is followed by an extensive selective bibliography. The book constitutes a part of *The Historical Phonology of the Slavic Languages*, a series edited by Professor Shevelov, who is also the author of such distinguished studies as *The Syntax of Modern Literary Ukrainian* (1963) and *A Prehistory of Slavic* (1964).

Published for the CIUS by Carl Winter Universitaetsverlag.

vi, 809 pages cloth 500Dm paper 460Dm

Available from:

Carl Winter Universitaetsverlag
Postfach 10 61 40
6900 Heidelberg 1
West Germany

Ukrainian Canadians: A Survey of Their Portrayal in English-Language Works

By Frances Swyripa

Frances Swyripa, a research assistant in the CIUS at the University of Alberta, has provided an important guide to the state of Ukrainian-Canadian studies. Her survey highlights the changing place of Ukrainians in Canada by taking a chronological look at government reports, theses, novels, magazine articles, and writings by educators and churchmen to show changes in the image of Ukrainians. The book concludes with a bibliography of sources, biographical sketches, and a note on existing Ukrainian-Canadian bibliographies.

169 pages cloth \$9.95 paper \$3.95

Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment

Edited by Manoly R. Lupul

The conference proceedings in this volume record the discussion of relationships between multiculturalism and separatism—issues crucial to all Canadians. They illustrate that Ukrainians have a large contribution to make in the current national unity debate. The contents also critically examine the implications of multiculturalism, federalism, and separatism for Canada as a whole and for one of Canada's largest ethnocultural groups—the Ukrainians—in all regions of Canada. Proposals put forth illustrate that it is both possible and vital that the development of Canadians of all backgrounds be encouraged and helped to achieve a sense of national unity which encompasses all Canadians.

177 pages paper \$4.95

These books may be ordered from:

*The University of Alberta Press
450 Athabasca Hall
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada
T6G 2E8*

TO THOSE WISHING TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

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

In general, articles should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages, except where especially justified by extensive documentation, tables, or charts. For purposes of style and footnoting, the 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
ґ — 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

