

*Vladimir J. (Kaye) Kysilewsky
and the
Ukrainian Bureau in London,
1931-1940*

Orest T. Martynowych



Centre for Ukrainian Canadian Studies
University of Manitoba
Series: Occasional Paper No. 3
2010

**Vladimir J. (Kaye) Kysilewsky and the Ukrainian Bureau in London,
1931-40:
The Formative Years of a Canadian Civil Servant***

Orest T. Martynowych

In recent years Vladimir J. (Kaye) Kysilewsky, a historian and a Canadian civil servant who worked in the Departments of National War Services (1941-45), Secretary of State (1945-50), and Citizenship and Immigration (1950-62), has caught the attention of scholars writing about postwar immigration to Canada. A left-leaning feminist historian has described Kysilewsky as a “committed Cold Warrior” and an “active leader within the nationalist, anti-Communist Ukrainian-Canadian community” who worked with anti-Communist ethnic editors and leaders to manipulate and undermine the ethnic left in Canada.¹ In sharp contrast, a political geographer sympathetic to the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), has referred to Kysilewsky as a “tool of the [Canadian] state” who did all in his power to stymie politically active, anti-Soviet nationalists within the Ukrainian-Canadian community.² While each of these apparently contradictory assessments contains some truth – Kysilewsky was hostile to apologists of Soviet Communism and very suspicious of extremists within the Ukrainian Nationalist camp – they tell us nothing about the genesis of his views. This paper attempts to provide an insight into Kysilewsky's postwar civil service career by examining the evolution of his attitude to Soviet Communism and Ukrainian Nationalism during the 1930s when he served as director of the Ukrainian Bureau in London.

Kysilewsky's background

Vladimir J. Kysilewsky was born in 1896 in Kolomyia, a small and picturesque town on the southeastern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains, in Austrian Galicia. His father, Julian Kysilewsky, a lawyer employed by the Austrian civil service, was active in the popular Ukrainian Prosvita (Enlightenment) society. His mother, Olena Simenovich, was a teacher, a journalist, a founding member of the Western Ukrainian women's

* Paper presented at the 19th Biennial Conference of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association, Winnipeg MB, Canada, 28 September 2007. Footnotes and references have been reduced to a minimum. The major primary source for the paper is Kysilewsky's voluminous correspondence and, in particular, his detailed unpublished Ukrainian-language “London Diaries” in the V.J. Kaye Papers (MG 31 D 69, vol. 1, files 36-41, vol. 2, files 6-11) at Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa.

¹ Franca Iacovetta, *Gatekeepers: Reshaping Immigrant Lives in Cold War Canada* (Toronto, 2006), 12, 51-82 *passim*.

² Lubomyr Luciuk, *Searching for Place: Ukrainian Displaced Persons, Canada and the Migration of Memory* (Toronto, 2000), 271-2 and 169-70, 195-6, 223-9, 242-54 *passim*.

movement, and, during the interwar years, a prominent leader of the moderate Ukrainian National Democratic Alliance (UNDO) and one of the very few Ukrainians elected to the Polish Senate.

Both parents were the offspring of Ukrainian Greek Catholic (or Uniate) clerical families, which had traditionally supplied Western Ukrainians with their political and intellectual elite. Like many members of the Ukrainian Catholic clergy prior to 1900, Kysilewsky's clerical ancestors were descendents of the old impoverished Ukrainian (Ruthenian) nobility, who had never been enserfed and who cherished traditions of status, learning and leadership. Having served the Church for generations, they constituted a semi-hereditary caste whose way of life resembled that of the petty gentry. Although politically conservative, many Ukrainian Catholic priests and their families combined respect for established authority, and a high regard for law and order, with a genuine desire to ameliorate the social and cultural life of their less privileged countrymen through education and legal and parliamentary methods of struggle.

In 1914 Vladimir Kysilewsky graduated from the German classical gymnasium in the city of Chernivtsi, in nearby Bukovyna, where, unlike most educated Ukrainians, he had an opportunity to study English for three years. During the First World War he served with the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen, a Ukrainian division in the Austrian army, and then joined the Ukrainian Galician Army (UHA), which fought against the Poles and the Red Army during the struggle for Ukrainian independence in 1918-20. In 1919, his knowledge of English allowed Kysilewsky to serve as the UHA liaison officer at the British military mission in Odessa. After the war, Kysilewsky spent some time in Paris and then studied history at the University of Vienna where, in 1924, he was awarded a doctorate for a thesis on "The Ukrainian *szlachta* (gentry) during the Seventeenth Century."

His family background and his research interests drew the young Kysilewsky into conservative Ukrainian émigré circles in central Europe. Although he became a sympathizer of the Hetmanite movement, led by General Paul Skoropadsky, who had ruled Ukraine with the backing of the German military in 1918, it was not the General who attracted Kysilewsky to the movement. Rather, Kysilewsky, like many Ukrainian conservative intellectuals, was attracted to the Hetmanite movement by its leading ideologist, the brilliant Polish-Ukrainian, Roman Catholic historian and political thinker, Waclaw Lipinski (Viacheslav Lypynsky). Lipinski believed that the Ukrainian national movement suffered from a surplus of "progressive and destructive forces" and a deficit of "restraining and constructive forces," and he called for the reintegration of the educated, politically experienced, economically powerful, but ethnically assimilated (Polonized or Russified) upper classes into the Ukrainian nation.³ When Lipinski broke with the Hetman in 1930 and died shortly thereafter, Kysilewsky lost interest in the Hetmanite movement. Indeed, he would have good reason to become very critical of the Hetman and his entourage during his years in London.

³ On Lipinski see Ivan L. Rudnytsky, "Viacheslav Lypynsky: Statesman, Historian, and Political Thinker" and "Lypynsky's Political Ideas from the Perspective of Our Time" in his *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* (Edmonton, 1987), 437-62.

Kysilewsky immigrated to Canada in 1925. He worked briefly as an agrarian labourer and studied agriculture; served on the Winnipeg-based national executive of the Ukrainian Sporting Sitch Association of Canada, a mass organization established by Skoropadsky's Canadian followers; edited *Ukrainski visti* (The Ukrainian News), an Edmonton weekly; and became a naturalized British subject. In the summer of 1930, following an illness, Kysilewsky moved to Chicago to join his uncle, Dr. Volodymyr Simenovich, a physician who had immigrated to the United States before the Great War and whose unsentimental, common-sense approach to Ukrainian issues would leave a mark on his nephew. For several months, Kysilewsky helped to edit a local Ukrainian newspaper, studied journalism at St. Paul University, and learned to operate a linotype machine. Then, in April 1931, his career took a new turn when Kysilewsky, who was fluent in six European languages and personally acquainted with many prominent Ukrainian politicians and community activists on both sides of the ocean, was appointed director of the newly established Ukrainian Bureau in London.

The Ukrainian Bureau in London

What was the Ukrainian Bureau in London and who was behind it? The Bureau was established and financed by Jacob Makohin, an educated Galician-born Ukrainian, who had immigrated to the United States, enlisted in the Marine Corps, served overseas during the Great War, and married Susan E. Fallon, a wealthy American heiress (probably a distant relative of Oliver Hazard Payne, who had founded Standard Oil with the Rockefellers in the 1870s). In the fall of 1930, while Makohin and his wife were vacationing in Karlovy Vary (Karlsbad), Czechoslovakia, the Polish government responded to the latest round of radical Ukrainian nationalist (OUN) sabotage and terror with the brutal and indiscriminate ‘pacification’ of the Ukrainian population in eastern Galicia. Determined to bring the bloody events in his homeland to public attention, Makohin and his wife resolved to pour some of their substantial financial resources into publicity for the Ukrainian cause.

When the Ukrainian Bureau, which was located in the posh Knightsbridge-Belgravia district, opened its doors in March 1931, London was still considered the most important global capital and the epicenter of power and enlightened opinion. As conceived by Makohin, and put into practice by Kysilewsky, the Bureau had several objectives: 1/ to monitor developments in the Ukrainian lands under Polish, Soviet, Romanian and Czechoslovakian rule and to inform British and English-speaking politicians and opinion-makers about violations of political and human rights; 2/ to keep Western Ukrainian leaders abreast of British and Western policies in regard to East Central Europe; and 3/ to serve as a liaison between Western Ukrainian leaders and sympathetic British politicians, journalists and academics.

To help Kysilewsky adjust to life in London, and to introduce him to influential and powerful people, Makohin engaged Colonel Cecil L’Estrange Malone to serve as special consultant to the Ukrainian Bureau. A patrician “better endowed with lineage

than land,” Malone had a colourful and controversial past.⁴ During the War he had been a pioneer naval aviator, received the OBE, and was elected to Parliament as a Coalition Liberal candidate. However, after visiting Soviet Russia in 1919, Malone joined the Communist Party of Great Britain, became the first Communist in Parliament, and spent six months in prison after making seditious speeches. By 1931 his ‘Bolshevik’ past was long forgotten and Malone was completing a term as the Labour MP for Northampton. To bring the Ukrainian issue to public attention Malone helped Kysilewsky meet influential people and establish personal relations with politicians, journalists, academics and foreign office staff. In particular, he took steps to have Kysilewsky admitted as a member of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA; a.k.a. Chatham House), an independent research institute established in 1920 for the purpose of studying international affairs and preventing future wars. Governed by a council of thirty members drawn from Britain’s political and academic establishment, the RIIA sponsored lectures by British and foreign politicians, journalists and policy makers; organized study groups; encouraged research; and sponsored several periodicals, including the quarterly *International Affairs*, which published selected RIIA lectures. Its lectures, receptions and banquets provided Kysilewsky with an excellent opportunity to meet influential British and foreign journalists, academics, foreign office employees and diplomats. To establish even closer ties with academics who had played a significant role in influencing British policy in Eastern Europe, Kysilewsky also enrolled at the University of London’s School of Slavonic Studies.

A month before Kysilewsky took up his duties at the Bureau, Malone had managed to persuade more than 60 British parliamentarians to sign a petition urging the League of Nations to investigate the violation of Ukrainian minority rights in Poland. In the months and years that followed, Malone and Kysilewsky would rely on a number of sympathetic British parliamentarians, journalists and academics for advice and for assistance in drawing public attention to issues of pressing concern to Ukrainians. Parliamentarians who worked with the Bureau included a handful of Lords (Noel-Buxton, Dickinson, Parmoor, Cecil) and Commons (Rhys J. Davies, James Barr, Rennie Smith, Josiah C. Wedgewood, Geoffrey Mander, Oliver Stillingfleet Locker-Lampson), primarily but not exclusively Labourites, who were strongly committed to pacifism and had an interest in national minority issues. The Bureau’s most prominent parliamentary ally, Lord Noel-Buxton, the grandson of a leading 19th century British abolitionist and prison reformer, had served as minister of agriculture in Ramsay MacDonald’s Labour administration and presided over the Save the Children Fund. Journalists and writers who used the Bureau’s reference library (books, periodicals, clippings and documents), and tackled Ukrainian issues in their books and articles included the feminist, pacifist and social reformer Mary Sheepshanks; Malcolm Muggeridge and Gareth Jones, who would publish the first damning eyewitness accounts of the Soviet Ukrainian famine in 1933; Hugh Hessel-Tiltman, a political correspondent and author who wrote *Peasant Europe*, a book funded by Jacob Makohin and researched, in part, by Kysilewsky; Lancelot Lawton, who had worked as a foreign correspondent for *The Times* and written several books on Soviet Russia; the young Catholic Hugo Yardley; and Charles Milnes Gaskell, who completed an impressive manuscript on Ukraine shortly before the war. The

⁴ David Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (New Haven and London, 1990), 543.

Bureau's most prominent and consistent academic sympathizers included the noted jurist Sir Walter Napier, an expert on national minorities and stateless persons, and R.W. Seton-Watson, the Masaryk Professor of Central European History at the School of Slavonic Studies, whose writings and influence had contributed significantly to the emergence of an independent Czechoslovakia in 1918. On occasion Kysilewsky also consulted with Sir Bernard Pares, C.A. Macartney, W.J. Rose and even Lewis Namier, who had spent his childhood in eastern Galicia and worked as a foreign office expert on eastern Europe during the Great War. On the eve of the Second World War the Bureau's most active British sympathizer was James Erasmus Tracy Philipps, a colonial administrator, anthropologist and political correspondent, with extensive personal and family connections in high places.

With a circle of British friends and contacts, the Ukrainian Bureau did not confine its activities to issuing press releases and publishing an irregular *Bulletin*. It took advantage of its British friends to raise the Ukrainian issue at every possible opportunity. Bureau staff members, who, at various times included Malone's Oxford-educated wife Leah, and the journalists Lawton and Yardley, wrote letters to major British dailies challenging information disseminated by Polish and Soviet spokesmen and news services. With input from Kysilewsky, Seton-Watson invited several Ukrainian speakers to participate in the RIIA's lecture series and approached Ukrainian scholars for contributions to the *Slavonic Review*. Noel-Buxton and Napier published articles on the Ukrainian minority in Poland in the *Contemporary Review* and in *International Affairs*. In 1932 Noel-Buxton addressed the upper house on the Ukrainian issue in Poland, insisting that it was a British concern because Ukrainians were the third largest ethnic group in Canada. Simultaneously, 74 prominent British parliamentarians, academics and public figures signed a petition to the League of Nations, drafted by Malone and Kysilewsky, calling for an autonomous regime in eastern Galicia. Malone and Kysilewsky also prepared dossiers and memoranda on Ukrainian issues and helped British parliamentarians draft questions that were raised in the Lords and Commons. A Conservative MP first raised the Ukrainian famine issue in the Commons in the spring of 1932; it was subsequently raised in the Lords in 1934. Outside parliament the Duchess of Atholl urged the British government to tie Soviet admission into the League of Nations to the cessation of grain exports from the Soviet Union. The Ukrainian issue was also raised in the Commons in 1934, when Poland repudiated its commitment to safeguard national minority rights, and on a number of occasions in 1938-9, when MPs who worked with the Bureau asked the government to comment on the campaign against Ukrainian schools in Romania; the dissolution of the Ukrainian Women's Union and the confiscation and destruction of Orthodox Church property in Poland; and the Hungarian annexation of Carpatho-Ukraine. Kysilewsky and Malone, in turn, followed up these exchanges in Parliament with visits to the Foreign Office. They met with Laurence Collier, head of the Northern Department, which was responsible for Eastern Europe, Gladwyn Jebb, secretary to Sir Alexander Cadogan, and William Strang, Chief of the Central European Department, for whom Kysilewsky prepared a lengthy memo. Immediately after the spring and autumn crises of 1938 and the British guarantee to Poland in spring 1939, Philipps, armed with briefs prepared by Kysilewsky and vetted by Seton-Watson, had

lengthy conversations about the Ukrainian issue with his mentor, Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax.

Seton-Watson also initiated one of the Bureau's more ambitious projects. In the fall of 1934, after the Polish-German rapprochement and the Polish government's repudiation of its commitment to the national minorities, Seton-Watson advised the Bureau to seize the opportunity by establishing an Anglo-Ukrainian Committee (AUC). Composed of the Bureau's prominent British friends and a few new recruits, the AUC sponsored several public lectures; published a pamphlet on the importance of the Ukrainian question; reached out to Britain's Jewish community; and talked about establishing a Chair of Ukrainian Studies at the School of Slavonic Studies. Ultimately, however, internal divisions rendered the AUC ineffective and it had expired by 1937. While members like the right-wing journalist Lancelot Lawton urged the AUC to call for Ukrainian independence, most members, including Seton-Watson, believed Ukrainian independence was only attainable within the context of foreign intervention and war, a scenario that they were not prepared to endorse. Divisions within the AUC concerning British policy toward Germany and the Soviet Union may have also doomed the committee. Although all AUC members deplored the violence and repression unleashed by the Nazi regime, several, most notably the pacifists Lord Noel-Buxton, Lord Dickinson and Prof. G.P. Gooch, editor of the *Contemporary Review*, believed German aggression was the result of the unjust Versailles settlement and maintained that only Anglo-German cooperation and mutual disarmament could undermine and defeat Nazism. Other AUC members, including Seton-Watson, who opposed all manifestations of appeasement, rejected this view.

Communism and Nationalism

How did Kysilewsky's attitude to Soviet Communism and Ukrainian Nationalism evolve during his nine-year sojourn in London?

Kysilewsky's attitude to Communism and the Soviet Union was negative long before he moved to London. He was, after all, a man who took pride in his noble ancestry, participated in the armed struggle for Ukrainian independence against the Red Army, and subscribed to a fundamentally conservative worldview. The years he spent in London, which coincided with the artificial famine in Soviet Ukraine, the wholesale extermination of Soviet Ukrainian artists and intellectuals, and the purge of all dissident elements throughout the Soviet Union, only reinforced his opposition and convinced him that Soviet Communism was not only the primary enemy of the Ukrainian people but that it also had a corrosive effect on Western societies and values.

More than any other experience, the Bureau's efforts to bring the famine to public attention and elicit an effective response left Kysilewsky feeling utterly helpless. The Soviet regime's ability to brush aside the death of millions and to discredit eyewitness reports was a bitter pill to swallow. By consistently denying that there was famine in Ukraine, the North Caucasus and the Lower Volga (not to mention that famine had been engineered by the central authorities), Stalin and his cronies effectively stymied the

efforts of the United British Appeal (an organization created by representatives of Noel-Buxton's Save the Children Fund), the Federation of Jewish Organizations, the Quakers, and the Ukrainian Bureau, to provide relief for famine victims. From the outset, the UBA's efforts to send money to TORGSIN, the Soviet hard currency shops that delivered food to specific individuals upon receipt of payment, struck Kysilewsky and the Ukrainian Bureau as naive and ineffective. Ultimately, the Bureau opted to work more closely with Dr Ewald Ammende of the Viennese-based inter-confessional International Relief Committee. Ammende urged propaganda and concerted political pressure on the Soviet government until it admitted relief missions into the country or alleviated conditions itself. In particular, he urged the British government to make Soviet entry into the League of Nations conditional on the admission of foreign monitors and relief missions into the USSR.

This tactic also proved ineffective in the face of the Soviet regime's ability to manipulate information. The famine was never mentioned in the Soviet media, which insisted that famine reports were the work of fascists, anti-Soviet émigrés, and capitalists eager to hoodwink their own workers. Foreign correspondents were denied access to Ukraine and the North Caucasus during the spring and summer of 1933 when the famine was at its worst. When they were finally given access, self-serving Western journalists like Walter Duranty and Louis Fischer, who endorsed the official Soviet line, were given priority. They trivialized famine reports and libeled journalists like Kysilewsky's friend Gareth Jones, who wrote about the terrible toll that the famine was taking in the *Manchester Guardian* and delivered the first public lecture on the topic in March 1933 at an RIIA meeting chaired by Malone. Prominent Western visitors, who received brief guided tours of model collective farms and city quarters that had been swept clean of beggars and corpses, also ridiculed the notion that there was famine in Ukraine or any other part of the Soviet Union. As a result, the British Foreign Office, which knew all about the famine, felt little pressure to respond, at a time when it, and public opinion in general, were both preoccupied with the Nazi seizure of power in Germany. There is no doubt that the success of Soviet propaganda and the regime's ability to silence its critics, including Gareth Jones, who died under mysterious circumstances near the Soviet-Manchurian frontier in 1935, left an indelible mark on Kysilewsky and strengthened his resolve to combat Soviet apologists and propagandists during the Cold War Years.⁵

Kysilewsky's attitude to Ukrainian nationalism was a much more complicated matter. Throughout the 1930s the Bureau enjoyed the support of moderate, liberal and democratic groups like the Ukrainian National Democratic Alliance (UNDO) in Poland, the Ukrainian National Party in Romania, the Ukrainian Radical Democratic Party in Paris and the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League (USRL) in Canada. Members of these organizations provided the Bureau with information about Ukrainian life in their countries while Kysilewsky reciprocated by arranging meetings with the Bureau's British friends, providing letters of introduction, organizing receptions and even taking Western

⁵ See, for example, two articles by Marco Carynnyk, "Making the News Fit to Print: Walter Duranty, the *New York Times* and the Ukrainian Famine of 1933" and "Blind Eye to Murder: Britain, the United States and the Ukrainian Famine of 1933" both in Roman Serbyn and Bohdan Krawchenko, eds., *Famine in Ukraine 1932-1933* (Edmonton, 1986), 67-95.

Ukrainian and Ukrainian-Canadian parliamentarians, churchmen and community activists who visited London on guided tours of the city. The Bureau's relations with radical and authoritarian émigré groups, on the other hand, were more problematic. The sordid political intrigues, belligerent rhetoric, violent tactics and pro-Nazi sympathies of the Hetmanites and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), Kysilewsky believed, were counterproductive. They only helped to create and sustain the stereotype of Ukrainians as a deeply divided, politically immature people who were unprepared for statehood, that was quite prevalent in British Foreign Office circles.

When the Ukrainian Bureau opened its doors in London, Hetman Skoropadsky already had a representative in the city. That representative was Vladimir Korostovets (Wladimir de Korostowetz), a veteran of the Imperial Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Initially, Korostovets raised funds for the Hetman and publicized his cause in Britain through the *Whitehall Gazette*, a glossy, conservative, right-wing monthly edited by Maundy Gregory until the latter was exposed as an influence peddler and extortionist, jailed and pensioned off to France by powerful British clients.⁶ Always in need of money to support a wife in Berlin, a mistress in Paris, and a penchant for fast cars and women of easy virtue, Korostovets continued to solicit funds for the Hetmanite cause by promising wealthy Britons economic preferences and lucrative investment opportunities in Ukraine once the Bolsheviks were deposed and a Hetmanite State established. A second Hetmanite periodical called *The Investigator* collapsed in 1934 after its manager sued the Hetman and Korostovets for wrongful dismissal and fraud. To undermine the credibility of the Ukrainian Bureau, which he perceived as a rival, and to deflect attention from his own failures, Korostovets circulated rumours that the Bureau was financed by Soviet agents.

Needless to say, Hetmanite activity worried the Ukrainian Bureau's British friends. Seton-Watson warned Kysilewsky that Korostovets was clouding British perceptions of the Ukrainian issue by identifying it with Skoropadsky's cause. He also believed that Korostovets was alienating potential British support from the Anglo-Ukrainian Committee and discrediting the Ukrainian cause by identifying it with disreputable characters and by taking money from wealthy Britons under false pretences. Laurence Collier, a Foreign Office expert on Eastern Europe, who dismissed rumours that the Ukrainian Bureau was financed by the Soviets, told Malone that Ukrainian émigrés hated one another with such passion that they routinely denounced their rivals as "Bolshevik agents." Collier concluded that Hetmanite propaganda was pure bluff and the movement was little more than a German intrigue without any popular support.

Kysilewsky's attitude toward the OUN was more ambivalent. Like the Bureau's moderate Western Ukrainian and Canadian allies, Kysilewsky found OUN tactics – sabotage, armed expropriations, terrorism and political assassinations – morally reprehensible and politically counter-productive. While visiting Lviv in January 1933, Kysilewsky heard UNDO leader Vasyl Mudry condemn the OUN as "Irish gunmen" who were intimidating and terrorizing the Ukrainian public. Mudry revealed that he was obliged to carry a revolver because the radical Nationalists had threatened to assassinate

⁶ Cannadine, 316, 323.

him in retaliation for editorials criticizing the recent rash of armed expropriations that had culminated in gun fights, the murder of a Polish postal worker, and the execution of two young OUN activists. During the same visit, Ukrainian Greek Catholic archbishop Andrei Sheptytsky, who had already issued several pastoral letters condemning political terrorism, told Kysilewsky that he was very troubled by the OUN's efforts to exploit the idealism of young Ukrainians. A year later, when the OUN assassinated Bronislaw Pieracki, the Polish minister of internal affairs, and then gunned down Ivan Babii, the highly regarded director of a Ukrainian gymnasium (high school), who had obstructed terrorist efforts to recruit his students, Sheptytsky characterized OUN leaders as neo-pagans, who made an idol of the nation by elevating it above God, and as madmen who were leading Ukrainian youth into "the dead end of crime."⁷

The Bureau's British friends also believed that OUN tactics brought little credit to the Ukrainian cause. Seton-Watson refused to have any contacts whatsoever with terrorist organizations like the OUN. At the Foreign Office, Collier informed Malone in 1933 that the assassination of Soviet diplomats by the OUN would only discourage British officials from raising the Ukrainian famine issue with Soviet representatives. And in 1935, Malone let it be known that OUN Leader Colonel Yevhen Konovalts, who was looking abroad for new allies, should postpone a planned British visit because the recent widely publicized trial of Ukrainian Nationalists implicated in the Pieracki assassination had left a bad impression in British Foreign Office and government circles.

Nevertheless, between 1934 and 1938, when the German-Polish non-aggression pact persuaded OUN strategists to rethink their pro-German orientation, Kysilewsky and the Ukrainian Bureau pursued a *modus vivendi* with the radical Nationalists. During this brief interlude, Kysilewsky befriended and tried to moderate the views of Eugene Lachowitch and Stephen Davidovich, two young English-speaking, North American-educated OUN envoys – the latter a Canadian – who were dispatched to London in 1934 and in 1937. He introduced both to Bureau staff, gave them access to the Bureau's reference library, shared information about recent developments in Ukrainian lands, introduced them to British journalists, encouraged them to write articles, helped arrange meetings with Foreign Office staff, and spent hours discussing tactics and criticizing OUN actions "very sharply, but very politely." There can be no doubt that Kysilewsky managed to modify the views of both men. Lachowitch, who arrived vowing to destroy Ukrainian moderates because they were poisoning the mind of the Ukrainian people, left a much more tolerant man who appreciated and respected the views of the OUN's critics. Davidovich, better-educated and more moderate, praised Kysilewsky in his letters to Konovalts and argued that it would be a mistake to identify the Ukrainian Nationalist cause with Berlin and Rome. Even after the OUN ordered him to establish a separate Ukrainian National Information Service in London, Davidovich continued to cooperate with Kysilewsky and confined himself to producing articles, commentaries and opinion pieces on Ukrainian history, culture and current affairs that were palatable to British readers.

⁷ Andrii Krawchuk, *Christian Social Ethics in Ukraine: The Legacy of Andrei Sheptytsky* (Edmonton, Ottawa and Toronto, 1997), 134-47 *passim*.

In 1938 relations between the Ukrainian Bureau and the OUN took a turn for the worse. Makohin and Kysilewsky became increasingly disenchanted with the Nationalists when the OUN endorsed the German annexation of Austria, supported the progressive dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, attempted to take control of the government and the militia in autonomous Carpatho-Ukraine, and openly pinned its hopes for Ukrainian independence on the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis. OUN activity in Carpatho-Ukraine, in particular, created an ever-widening chasm between the Ukrainian Bureau and the Nationalists. Like Seton-Watson, Makohin and Kysilewsky believed that Carpatho-Ukraine had no future as an independent state, that it could only survive as an autonomous province of Czechoslovakia, a state they had always respected for its adherence to democratic principles and its relatively enlightened policy toward national minorities. They were especially concerned by OUN efforts to take control of Carpatho-Ukraine's volunteer militia, by the belligerent editorials published in the Nationalist press, and by Nationalist radio broadcasts from Vienna that extolled German foreign policy and railed incessantly against Czechoslovakia.

When the inevitable happened and Carpatho-Ukraine was annexed by Hungary on the same day that the Germans marched into Prague, Makohin cursed and disavowed the OUN. The Bureau's determination to neutralize OUN influence grew in the summer of 1939 as the Nationalists issued threats and tried to intimidate Ukrainian friends of the Bureau who had opposed OUN policies in Carpatho-Ukraine, and as it became widely known that the Germans were training a Ukrainian volunteer detachment composed primarily of OUN enthusiasts.⁸ The military unit, Makohin and Kysilewsky feared, would not only be used to destabilize the Polish state and then promptly discarded, it would also further compromise the Ukrainian independence struggle in the eyes of Britain and the Western democracies. "Without any reservations, without any diplomatic subtleties," Makohin repeatedly wrote Kysilewsky, "we must strike at the 'nationalist' leadership and the followers of Skoropadsky, or they will lead us into another catastrophe."

During the year leading up to the war the Bureau cautioned the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League, its primary Canadian ally, not to become involved in Nationalist campaigns calling for the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia and Poland, but to confine themselves to appeals for Ukrainian autonomy in both states. Kysilewsky also warned the Bureau's Canadian supporters that the OUN and the supporters of Hetman Skoropadsky had already compromised themselves by endorsing various aspects of Nazi Germany's foreign and domestic policy in their press. Neither the Nationalists nor the Hetmanites, Kysilewsky cautioned his Canadian allies, had the moral right to submit

⁸ This was the secret National Military Detachment, made up of six hundred veterans of the defeated Carpatho-Ukrainian militia and OUN members who had made their way to Germany after Hungary annexed the region in March 1939. Located in Wiener-Neustadt, Austria, the detachment "was to act as an auxiliary to the Wehrmacht in its approaching attack on Poland and to provide an armed nucleus for an uprising which the OUN hoped would lead to independence for the Ukrainians in that country." Though the unit marched toward Galicia in September 1939, it was disbanded when the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany's ally at the time, decided to annex eastern Galicia. John A. Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism*. 3rd ed. (Littleton Colorado, 1990), 28.

demands to the Canadian government concerning the Ukrainian issue because the headquarters of their organizations were located in Nazi Germany.

In May 1940 Kysilewsky left London and returned to Canada. By the spring of 1940 there was little reason to remain in Britain. The Bureau's Western Ukrainian sources of information and supporters (UNDO, the Ukrainian Parliamentary Representation) had been outlawed and dispersed by the invading Soviet forces in the fall of 1939. British interest in the Ukrainian question, which had briefly caught the attention of Foreign Office strategists during the Russo-Finnish War, waned at the conclusion of that conflict in March 1940, and was relegated to the back burner as German armies blitzed through Norway, Denmark and the Low Countries in April and May. At this point Kysilewsky decided to return to Canada permanently, to help resolve differences among non-communist Ukrainian-Canadian factions. In Canada, he continued to carry out the Bureau's mandate by working for the formation of a Ukrainian Canadian Committee in which liberals and democrats would participate on an equal footing and exert a moderating influence on the more extreme Nationalist and Hetmanite elements. Ukrainian-Canadian organizations, he maintained, had to repudiate the violent tactics, authoritarian proclivities and pro-German orientation adopted by overseas Ukrainian extremists, and work in unison on behalf of the Allied war effort. Only then would they earn respect and have an opportunity to lobby London and other Western capitals for Ukrainian independence.

Kysilewsky's efforts to bring the famine in Soviet Ukraine, and the violation of Ukrainian minority rights in Poland to public attention, taught him at least two valuable lessons. First, that the Soviet regime's brutality, its insidious propaganda, and its ability to influence and manipulate the news media at home and abroad, made the Soviet Union, and the Communist Parties that were beholden to it, the most dangerous enemies of the Ukrainian people and of Western societies and values in general. Second, that the sordid political intrigues, belligerent rhetoric, violent tactics and pro-Nazi German orientation of the anti-communist Ukrainian émigrés led by the reactionary Hetman Paul Skoropadsky and the terrorist Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, were morally reprehensible, abhorrent to potential allies in the West -- particularly in Britain -- and absolutely counterproductive insofar as the cause of Ukrainian independence was concerned.

Accordingly, during the Cold War years, when he became the Citizenship Branch's chief ethnic liaison officer, Kysilewsky would be engaged in efforts to neutralize and undermine the influence of the "ethnic left," that is to say, the Communist Party of Canada and its various pro-Soviet ethnic mass organizations such as the Ukrainian Labour-Farmer Temple Association (ULFTA) and its successor the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians (AUUC). Based on his experience in London, and on his knowledge of these organizations and their press, Kysilewsky believed that they functioned primarily as instruments of Soviet propaganda, promoting an irrational veneration for the Soviet "workers' fatherland" and its omniscient Communist leaders, and churning out apologias for the crimes of Stalinism. In fact, the

Communists who led the "ethnic left," championed Soviet achievements, real and imaginary, unwaveringly and much more enthusiastically and effectively than they challenged the injustices of Canadian capitalism.

At the same time, just as he had done in London during the 1930s, Kysilewsky attempted to use his position in the civil service to undermine and defuse the legacy of political authoritarianism, intolerance, violence, terror, and obsession with national liberation, brought to Canada by some extremists in the Nationalist camp. To this end, he met and counseled influential Nationalist émigrés, especially ethnic newspaper editors, to promote a greater appreciation of liberal and democratic values, the rule of law, and human rights. Ultimately, totalitarian organizations and ideologies that made idols out of the 'worker's state' or 'the nation' were equally abhorrent to Kysilewsky.

Orest T. Martynowych studied history at the University of Manitoba (BA (Hon), MA) and at the University of Toronto. He is the author of *Ukrainians in Canada: The Formative Years, 1891-1924* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, University of Alberta, 1991). Currently, in 2010, he is a Scholar-in-Residence at the Centre for Ukrainian Canadian Studies, University of Manitoba, researching a project on the urban history of Winnipeg's Ukrainian Canadians.

Photo credits: V.J. Kaye portrait from the Ivan Bobersky Photo Collection, courtesy Ukrainian Cultural and Educational Centre (Oseredok), Winnipeg; London panorama, photo by Orest Martynowych, July 1979.

Copyright © 2007 Orest T. Martynowych. All rights reserved.

No part of this paper may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.