

Ukrainia

STEPHEN SHUMEYKO

UKRAINIAN
NATIONAL
MOVEMENT



Filed in data...
New York

Published by the United Ukrainian Organizations
of the United States

1939

.DK
508.5
.556

Stacks
74
1000000000
1000000000

EXTENT AND SIGNIFICANCE OF UKRAINIAN ETHNOGRAPHIC TERRITORIES

At the very outset of this brief survey of the true Ukrainian situation, some idea must be had of the extent of Ukrainian ethnographic territories, and of the general significance of their location. "For as Geography without History seemeth a carkasse without motion, so History without Geography wandreth as a Vagrant without a certaine habitation," wrote John Smith in his General Historie of Virginia. And this is especially true in the case of Ukraine.

Ukraine is a vast solid national territory lying in the southeastern corner of Europe, on the threshold of Asia. It embraces: (1) the southern part of the European Union of Soviet Socialist Republics bordering upon the Black and Azov seas; (2) the southeastern portion of Poland, including East Galicia, western section of Volhynia and Polisyia, also Kholm and Pidlashe; (3) east central portion of Rumania, including Bukovina and Bessarabia; and (4) the southeastern corner of Czecho-Slovakia. All in all, it is a territory about 3½ times the size of Great Britain.

This border position of Ukraine, on the threshold of Asia, has been in the past particularly disadvantageous to her, principally because of two reasons. First, for close to one thousand years it had been the means of access for the wild Asiatic hordes which, lured by the invitingly rich and civilized lands in Southern and Western Europe, had to first fight their way through Ukraine in order to reach their goal. As a result of this continual warfare, Ukraine became so weakened that she fell prey to the imperialism of her neighbors, Russia and Poland. Secondly, this border position has been disadvantageous because of its distance to the cultural centers of Western Europe. Only during the existence of the Byzantine Empire, particularly during the 11th century, was this position of considerable benefit, for during that time an uninterrupted stream of culture flowed into Ukraine, making her one of the most cultured countries of that period.

Geographical influences, however, vary with the passage of time. Gradually, man has learned to master nature. He has learned to exploit it more successfully and in more diverse ways. And so with Ukraine. Embracing the entire northern coast of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov, Ukraine holds fine possibilities of overseas commerce. Furthermore, the proximity of Asia is no longer dangerous, but, on the contrary, very advantageous, for Ukraine is situated on the shortest land route from Central Europe to Central Asia and India, and commands a good portion of this route. And finally, the steppe, which in the olden times was a place of con-

stant danger, is today one of the best grain producing regions in the entire world, besides containing vast mineral wealth and considerable possibilities for industrial expansion.

Nevertheless, all these natural advantages that Ukraine possesses today, are not for her to enjoy. They are being exploited by foreign powers, under whose rule the Ukrainians found themselves following the collapse of their short-lived post-war republic. To regain them, to make their native land once more free and independent, is the goal of the Ukrainian national movement.

KINGDOM OF KIEV

This movement, it must be borne in mind, is not any recent manifestation. The present-day elements, factors and events that constitute it, are but the latest episode in its saga.

The roots of this movement lie in the ancient Kingdom of Kiev, which originally was also known as Ruś, but from the 12th century became better known as Ukraine—meaning borderland, the easternmost outpost of Europe. This kingdom is considered as the true foundation of the modern Ukrainian nation, notwithstanding Russian propaganda to the contrary. During the 10th century it expanded rapidly, subjugating the mixed tribes of the forest-clad lands to the north, from whom are descended the modern Russians; shattering the invading Asiatic hordes that were attracted to it, as several centuries earlier the Teutons had been

to Rome; strengthening the extensive commercial and cultural relations with the neighboring powerful Byzantine Empire; and seeking to establish similar relations with the distant West.

At the turn of that century, during the reign of Volodimir the Great (980-1015), the kingdom attained its greatest power, extending from the Carpathians to the Caucasus, from the Black Sea to the Volga, and thence westward to somewheres near the delta of the Neva; with Kiev rapidly attaining its apex as one of the wealthiest and most cultured cities in Europe, communicating with the West on equal terms in art, literature, and commerce. During his reign, too, Christianity was officially introduced into the country.

This golden age of ancient Ukraine, however, was not fated to last long after the death of Volodimir's able successor, Yaroslav the Wise. Internal dissension, intervention and attacks from the North by the newly-arisen Moscovite Principality, and the unceasing invasions of the Mongoloid hordes, culminating in the capture and destruction of Kiev in 1240 — these three destructive forces ushered in the decline of the first independent Ukrainian state and brought it to an untimely end in 1350, when its remaining vestiges were incorporated into the Polish state.

The fact that the ancient state of Kiev, as well as its civilization — writes Dr. Stephen Rudnitsky,* an authority on the subject — was

* Author of "Ukraine." 369 pp. 1918. Rand McNally. N. Y. City.

produced by ancient Ukrainians, is evident, not only from the fact that most ancient literary monuments of Kiev already show specifically Ukrainian peculiarities of language; a still more important piece of evidence is the constitution of the Kingdom of Kiev, which originated through the amalgamation of the newly organized royal power with the original republican constitution of the Ukrainians, and which provided that all the power of government rest in the hands of the general assembly of all freemen.

With the fall of Kiev, the scene of organized Ukrainian national life shifted to Western Ukraine, to the provinces of Galicia and Volhynia, which under the vigorous reign of Prince Roman had united (1200); and now Halich (from which the term Galicia is derived) became the new capital of Ukraine.

Western Ukraine, however, was also beset with troubles, mainly in form of Polish and Hungarian efforts to annex it. It managed, however, to keep its independence intact, especially under the rule of Danilo, his son Lev, who extended his sway over Carpathian Ukraine (now an autonomous region of Czecho-Slovakia), and the latter's son Yuriy, under whose able rule Western Ukraine attained the peak of its power and development up to that time.

The independence of Western Ukraine lasted not more than a century after the collapse of Eastern Ukraine. In 1350 Poland managed to conquer most of Galicia and Volhynia.

Meanwhile, large sections of the Tartar-de-

vastated Eastern Ukraine had been gradually absorbed by Lithuania, which, further removed from the Tartar danger, had been slowly rising to power, in spite of the attacks of Teuton princes from the Baltic. This absorption was quite peaceful, and encountered very little opposition among the war-ridden and strife-torn Ukrainians, especially since Lithuania ruled justly, leaving undisturbed the old order nor introducing any new one instead, adopting the old Ukrainian laws, and even making the Ukrainian language as her official tongue.

This system of beneficent rule by Lithuania over the Ukrainians, however, underwent radical changes when in 1370 Lithuania united with Poland, with the latter emerging out of the deal as the dominant power. Poland was now able to extend her sway beyond Galicia, into Eastern Ukraine as well, and now the lot of the Ukrainians become very bad indeed, for Poland treated them as a conquered race. Every Ukrainian was made to feel the iron hand of the aristocratic Polish state.

And yet, this Polish-dominated coalition rule over most of Ukraine was far too weak to protect it against the unceasing attacks of the wild Asiatics. These invasions devastated and depopulated Ukraine tremendously. During the 15th and 16th centuries, almost all of Eastern Ukraine to the left of the Dnieper turned into a wilderness as a result, while its southern sections became a sparsely settled borderland. And so, beset by the Tartar-Turkish onslaughts on the one side, and by Poland on the other,

Ukraine seemer to totter on the verge of extinction as a nation.

It is about this time, middle of the 15th century, that there appeared the Kozaks—those famous warriors who eventually resurrected Ukraine.

The Kozaks were originally composed only of those bolder spirits who, unable to live under Polish feudal rule, had penetrated into the dangerous borderlands and there lived a hazardous life amidst the plenty that bountiful Nature provided for them. Gradually, as their numbers increased, they began to band together. Of necessity, these bands took on a semi-military character, which became more pronounced with their growth. Their first military organization, however, did not take place until about the middle of the 16th century, when they built themselves a fortified encampment on an island in the lower Dnieper, below the rapids, which became the famous Zaporozhian Sitch. From here the Kozaks sallied forth on their warring expeditions, by land and sea, raiding Tartar and Turkish coastwise and even inland towns and cities, destroying many of them, freeing thousands of captives, and gradually undermining the power and prestige of the powerful Turkish Empire, before whom all Europe was trembling then.

Such were the beginnings of the Kozaks. Originally groups of frontiersmen banding for protection, they developed into one of the finest military forces the world has ever seen,

one whose exploits attracted respectful attention throughout both the Occident and the Orient.

With the passage of time, the character of the Kozak military organization evolved from an independent body existing and fighting for its own sake, into an integral part of the Ukrainian nation herself, fighting for the rights and freedom not only of itself but of all Ukrainian people and not only against the Turks and Tartars, but against Polish misrule as well.

THE UKRAINIAN KOZAK STATE

And so—in 1648 the Ukrainian Kozaks, aided by the entire Ukrainian people, from the Dnieper to the San, under the leadership of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnitsky, the Cromwell of Eastern Europe, rose in rebellion against Poland, shattered all the Polish armies at Zhovti Vodi, Korsun, Pilyava, and Zboriw, leaving entire Poland at their mercy, or, as that romanticizer of the Poles and vilifier of the Ukrainians, the Polish writer Sienkiewicz, wrote in his “With Fire and Sword,”—“Poland lay in blood and dust at the feet of the Kozaks.” Had not Khmelnitsky been lenient with the Poles at this point of his greatest power, all of Poland would have capitulated before him and the entire course of Eastern Europe would have been changed. As it was, he desisted from invading Poland, and thus gave her a chance to recover.

And thus—after three hundred years of bondage, Ukraine regained independence.

Ukraine was now faced with the tremendous task of establishing an internal order that would repair the ravages of countless wars and invasions; exterminate the remnants of the parasitic Polish social-political order; supplant it with one benefiting the Ukrainians themselves; and set up a system of government comprehensive and able enough to direct the destinies of the newly-freed Ukrainian nation.

In order to gain the needed calm and time necessary to achieve such internal organization, and at the same time protect the country from the threatening ring of enemies, Khmelnitsky entered into an alliance with Moscow. This alliance (Treaty of Pereyaslav—1654), provided for the complete independence of Ukraine, as well as her Kozak organization, with the Moscovite Tsar exercising a nominal protectorate. It was a treaty between two sovereign powers, pledging mutual aid in the event of an emergency, a treaty that marked the downfall of Poland and the emergence of the great Russian state.

From the very outset it became clear that Moscow had not the least intention of keeping its part of the bargain. Its main purpose of making the treaty was to extend its sway over Ukraine and at the same time curb Poland. Khmelnitsky, shrewd statesman that he was, quickly detected this and immediately began to plan the abrogation of the treaty. At this critical point in Ukrainian history, however, when his leadership and sagacity were most needed by Ukraine, Bohdan Khmelnitsky died.

To quote Salvandy's description of him:—"Able both as statesman and warrior, accorded a kingly estate by all the great powers, Bohdan continued until the end of his career to lead the life of a peasant or common soldier. In the same room that he shared with his wife and children, he received embassies from the greatest crowned heads of Europe. The sudden apopleptic stroke which carried off the veteran chief of the Kozaks removed a factor which has been compared with that of Oliver Cromwell in the West. Yet today Bohdan Khmel'nitsky's name is all but forgotten in history."

Bereft of a strong hand at its helm, the newly-released Ukrainian ship of state began to flounder on the jagged rocks of Moscow's machinations to wreck it. At times it seemed as if the Ukrainians would be able to cast off Moscow's oppressive hand. But internal strife among the Kozak chiefs themselves nullified any gains made.

In 1667, Moscow, tiring of its thirteen years of war with Poland and finding the whole of Ukraine too difficult to handle alone, concluded with Poland the Treaty of Andrusiw, whereby Ukraine was partitioned. The "Right Bank" (west of the Dnieper) fell to Poland, and soon this section lost its Ukrainian form of government and its Kozak organization; although, in 1672, Hetman Doroshenko nearly succeeded in freeing it completely but failed because of armed intervention of Moscow. The "Left Bank," including Kiev on the right side of the Dnieper, remained under Moscow.

Despite the severest repressions, Ukrainian opposition to Moscovite rule did not abate. There were constant uprisings. But only one came very close to success. It was led by Ivan Mazepa. It collapsed when largely due to Mazepa's failure to marshall all of the Kozak forces on the side of the Swedish Charles XII, the decisive Battle of Poltava was lost to Peter I. This battle buried all Ukrainian hopes then, and Mazepa had to flee to Turkey with his Swedish ally, while Peter (called the Great) put down the Ukrainian uprising with the most frightful atrocities. And thus disappeared another great Ukrainian Hetman. Well does Cresson in his "History of the Cossacks" describe him:—"to have held for an instant the balance of power in the momentous struggle which fixed the supremacy of Russia among the 'Powers of the North'; to lose by a narrowest chance a great place in history; to be remembered only as a hero of a romantic poem [Byron's], the central figure of a popular opera [Tschaikowsky's],—such has been the strange fate of the Cossack Hetman Mazepa."

After Poltava there were several other abortive Kozak rebellions, until finally in 1775 the last stronghold of Ukrainian liberties, the Zaporozhian Sitch, fell into the hands of an overwhelming Russian force and was completely destroyed.

And so ended the remnants of Ukrainian independence, that had flowered so promisingly a century and a quarter before, ended at a time when across the seas in a new land thirteen

young colonies were embarking upon a hazardous course that was to lead to the foundation of the great United States of America which a century and some odd years later was to begin to provide a haven of refuge, freedom and opportunity to thousands upon thousands of the oppressed descendants of these Kozaks who had fought so valiantly for that great ideal dear to all peoples — Freedom.

Having destroyed Ukrainian political independence, Moscow definitely embarked upon a course designed to make her a great European power. One of her first acts in this direction was the abandonment of the term "Moscovy," by which she had been clearly known and called up to that time, in favor of the term "Russia." This first happened when after the defeat of Mazeppa, Peter I accepted the peculiar title of "Emperor and Tsar of all the Russias," thereby proclaiming himself to be the successor of the rulers of the Ukrainian Kingdom of Kiev, originally known as Ruś. It is highly significant that Peter I did not designate his newly-founded empire as "Ruś," for the simple reason that he knew quite well that it would be impossible to convince his people (the Moscovites) as well as the outside world that Muscovy is Ruś, for to everybody Ruś was situated to the south of Moscovy and was identical with Ukraine. But an entirely new name — Russia (Rosiya) — was quite another matter, and so "Russia" was promulgated.

This act on the part of Peter I began to have its repercussions upon the Ukrainians, who

to keep their identity clear of that of the Russians began to use more often the term "Ukraina" as the name of their native country. "Ukraina" first appeared in the old chronicles of Kiev of the 12th century, as a designation for the borderland of the inhabited Ruś. With the gradual advance of Kozak conquest towards the south and the colonization of the steppes, this term expanded concurrently. Gradually it came into use as a synonym of the old name Ruś and eventually displaced it entirely. Hetman Khmelnitsky himself used both terms alternately, and all the maps of that period (French, Dutch, German, Italian) simultaneously and alternatively used "Ruś" for "Ukraina," in clear distinction from "Moscovitia" or "Moscovia."* When, therefore, Moscovy conquered Ruś Ukraina and adopted her present name of Russia, the term Ukraina began to be used almost exclusively by the Ukrainians, and today it is the only name that all Ukrainians throughout the world recognize.

On this point it is well worthwhile to deviate and quote the conclusion reached by Prince

* "In the British Museum and the Bibliotheque Nationale at Paris there may be seen a series of maps showing Europe during the 14, 15, 16, and 17th centuries. On these maps Muscovy and Ukraina are shown as different countries. These differentiations disappeared at the time of Catherine II. The Russian Imperial Government began to call Muscovy, 'Great Russia,' and Ukraina 'Little Russia.'" —"The New Map of Europe and the Ukraine," by A. Margolin, **New York Times Current History**, May, 1922.

D. S. Mirsky in his history "Russia"*: — "The thesis of Great Russian historians has always been that the Eastern Slavs formed a pre-established unity from the beginning of time. The thesis of Ukrainian historians is that the Eastern Slavs had two centers of gravity — one in the north and one in the south, and that the southern group was originally not much more closely related to the northern than it was to other groups in the Balkans or in Central Europe. The sum of evidence seems to be increasingly favourable to a view that is closer to the Ukrainian than to the Great Russian thesis."

Having subducd and adopted Ukraine's original name, Russia began an intensive action marked by heavy-handed oppression to eradicate the various differences that existed between the Russians and the Ukrainians as members of two distinct nationalities. This was in line, of course, with her centralizing and leveling process to create a great Russian empire, peopled by one homogeneous ethnic and lingual "Russian" people. And so we find Catherine II (called the "Great" or the "Liberal") writing in her secret instructions to the Procurator General Prince A. M. Viazemsky that it was necessary to uproot in Ukraine the "immoral idea that they [the Ukrainians] are a nation completely different from ours" and to fight "against their false and improper republican ideas."

* Century Co., N. Y. C. 1931.

UKRAINE — A SCHOOL FOR RUSSIA

And so, at every step the Ukrainians felt the heavy-handed Russian oppression, aiming at their complete denationalization and ruin. As a result, some of them, especially the higher classes who found advancement closed to them, turned Russian, to the great benefit of Russia. "Ukraine," wrote Prof. A. Bruekner, the Polish scholar, in his work on the Europeanization of Russia, "was equivalent of a school for Russia," especially after the Treaty of Pereyaslav when many Ukrainian students of the western theology, medicine and science migrated to Moscovy, and helped to Europeanize it.*

* Outstanding among them were such as Epyphany Slavynetzky, who translated Western European geographies, works on anatomy and medicine; Meletiy Smotritsky, Archbishop of Polotsk and a man of wide cosmopolitanism, whose grammar, published in Kiev in 1619, was reprinted in Moscow in 1648; Innocent Gizel, whose history ("Synopsis"), published in Ukraine in the middle of the 17th century, influenced Russian historians more than any other text up to the 18th century and was used in their schools until the 19th century, being reprinted in Moscow in 1863; and then later Metropolitan Dimitri Rostovsky, Stephen Yavorsky, and Theodore Prokopovich, the closest advisors of Peter I. Furthermore, at the convention of lawmakers called together in 1767 by Catherine II, the most important delegates were Ukrainians. It was the Ukrainians who taught the Moscovites the linear method of musical notation, as well as the art of printing. Nearly all of the bishops were Ukrainians, as well as the seminary students and

Meanwhile, conditions in that part of Ukraine which had been ceded to Poland at Andrusiw were not much better, for Poland also strove to destroy the Ukrainians as a nationality. From the very outset, however, she encountered very stubborn resistance, especially in form of guerilla warfare of roving bands of embattled peasants, the "Haydamaki."* In 1768, they nearly drove the Poles out of Ukraine, only to fail at the crucial point because of the military intervention of Russia. The revolt was crushed with shocking cruelty. One thing it did accomplish, however, was the weakening of Poland, paving the way towards her dismemberment by her erstwhile ally Russia together with Prussia and Austria (in 1772, 1793, and 1795).

Nevertheless, the end of Ukraine as a nation seemed imminent then. All of the finer

teachers. Everywhere the Ukrainian influence was felt. "Ukrainian literary men," wrote the Russian Pypin, "composed works of which no one dreamt in Moscow...they were works of grammar, dictionaries, catechisms, histories, church teachings, and general polemical church literature which was equal to the literature aimed against the Orthodox Church by the Jesuits. Gogol, creator of Russian prose, was Ukrainian. In music, Tschaikowsky, Bortnyansky, and Vedel, generally known as Russians, were really Ukrainians. In painting, Losenko, Levitsky, Borovikovsky, Zaryanko, Repin, and Sudkovsky, were all natives of Ukraine.

* An epic poem "Haydamaki," by Ukraine's greatest poet, Taras Shevchenko, was recently translated into English by Prof C. A. Manning of Columbia University.

things of Ukrainian life and spirit, created and nurtured throughout the centuries by valiant effort, bloodshed and sacrifices, lay strewn in the dust at Russia's and Poland's feet. The Ukrainian upper classes had become either Russianized or Polonized. Only within the peasantry, most abused and downtrodden that it was, did the flame of Ukrainian national consciousness continue to flicker.

And it was indeed most fortunate for Ukraine that the blind racial instinct caused the peasantry to cling to her. For upon them rose the modern Ukrainian revival, that despite its many discouraging reverses has been steadily growing in power and intensity to this very day.

THE MODERN UKRAINIAN REVIVAL

From this layer nearest the soil, the Ukrainian national revival gradually began to spread upwards, gaining in clearness and force as it took fresh hold upon those intellectual and other higher classes that had previously been deserting it. Finding all progress along political lines blocked, this revival turned to folklore, literature, and science for its expression. Yet so tightly was it bound with the national movement of the Ukrainian people, that throughout its entire course, and up to very recent times, we find the same persons figuring prominently in both.

Of them can be cited Ivan Kotlyarevsky (1769-1838), father of the modern Ukrainian literature; Mikola Kostomariw (1817-55) first ideologist of the Ukrainian national revival and a historian; Taras Shevchenko (1814-61), Ukraine's great poet, patriot, and martyr, "the outstanding incarnation of the national genius of the Ukrainian people... a man who sums up all the past of his nation and stands out like a guide to the future"; Markian Shashkevich (1811-44) whose writings in the living tongue of the people brought about a national reawakening in Western Ukraine under Austria (today under Poland), and who advocated closer cooperation between the sundered parts of Ukraine; Marko Vovchok (Maria Vilinsky Markovich, 1834-1907) the Harriet Beecher Stowe of Ukraine, whose unforgettable stories exposing the terrible lot of the downtrodden peasantry were translated into Russian by Tuugeniev; Michael Drahomaniw (1841-95), the energetic and prolific writer, teacher and publicist, who is generally credited with providing the program for the national revival during the latter part of the 19th century; Lesya Ukrainka (Lesya Kosach, 1871-1913), that remarkable woman whose beautiful poetry and prose and a life lived in the constant shadow of death are especially inspirational and thought-provoking; Ivan Franko (1856-1916), a worthy successor to Shevchenko, a man of amazing fecundity, a poet whose works, differing greatly in character from those of Shevchenko, rank among the finest in world literature, a scholar of high degree, and a great spiritual leader among his

people; and, finally, Michael Hrushevsky (1866-1934), one of the best historians Eastern Europe has produced, whose works, mentioned favorably in the Index of the American Historical Society, prove that the Ukrainian drama beginning with the Kingdom of Kiev is not but an episode in the greater drama of the Russian race, that the Ukrainians are a separate race — also, a man of great scholarly, literary, organizing, and political achievements, a holder of various foreign honors, and the President of the short-lived post-war Ukrainian National Republic.

These then were some of the many individuals who, laboring in all fields of endeavor, launched the Ukrainian movement for independence on its way, a movement that at first lagged behind the literary and scientific movement, then gradually overhauled and ran alongside it, and finally outstripped it to become the irresistible force that it is today.

Yet it must not be supposed that at any time this movement was able to advance unimpeded even a little, for such was not the case. In fact, it can correctly be stated that no national movement in world history has been subjected to such rigorous opposition as has been the Ukrainian.

In Russia, for example, although as a result of the disastrous Crimean War the Government somewhat relaxed its relentless pressure upon the Ukrainians, yet it was only for a short while; for preceded by a declaration in 1863 by the Russian Minister of Interior that

there was no Ukrainian language and never would be, an ukaz was issued banning the use of this language in any form whatsoever. Little wonder then, that when in 1887 a Kiev philologist submitted a manuscript of a Ukrainian grammar, the Russian censor forbade its publication because "it would be impossible to print a grammar doomed to extinction."

That it did not become extinct, however, was considerably due to the comparative freedom found in Austrian Ukraine, where the Government, in pursuance of its time-worn policy of keeping the Hapsburg Empire intact by playing off one nationality against another, permitted the Ukrainians certain liberties as a device to insure their loyalty, especially at such times as in 1848, when the clamor of the Poles for their independence grew very loud. These concessions, insignificant though they were in comparison to those granted the Poles, who were far more influential in government circles, nevertheless made Galicia a haven for Ukrainian writers and patriots from Russian Ukraine, and Lwiw the center of Ukrainian culture and agitation. It is no wonder, then, that Milukoff, prominent Russian historian and liberal, attacked Russia's oppressive tactics over Ukraine, and bitterly complained that—"not among us but in Austria (Galicia) there has been built up a center of culture which with every year is winning more influence upon the national life of our Ukraine."

Thus despite its ban in Russian Ukraine, the Ukrainian language was able to develop

more or less unhindered in Austrian Ukraine, to the point where it become absurd even for Russia to deny its existence. In 1905, the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Petrograd itself issued an official confirmation of the fact that the Ukrainian language is independent of Russian, and at the same time denounced the myth of the "Pan-Russian" language, of which the Ukrainian had been declared a dialect.

Turning our attention back to Austrian Ukraine, we find that despite the more liberal atmosphere prevailing there, conditions had to be endured there which were not very much better than those in Russian Ukraine. These conditions became especially acute when in 1873 the Poles, taking advantage of the corrupt conditions in the Austrian Government, concluded a secret agreement with it, whereby in return for their promise of absolute loyalty to the Hapsburg dynasty they were given a free hand in Galicia. As a result, a fresh wave of oppression swept over the Ukrainians. The peasants were the chief sufferers, on account of the Polish landlords, who owned more than 45% of the land, and of whom the Nobel prize winner, Bjoernstjerne Bjoernson, wrote that, "in their understanding, liberty means nothing but license for themselves to do what they please. Everywhere the Ukrainians were discriminated against and abused."

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Ukrainian emigration to America and elsewhere, which had begun rather slowly in the final quarter of the 19th century, took on the aspect

of a general exodus in some parts of Austrian Ukraine, beginning with the turn of the 20th century and lasting up to the World War.

THE WORLD WAR

Such was the fate of Ukraine at the outbreak of the World War; rent asunder by Russia and Austria, her people enslaved, her natural wealth and resources exploited, and her very existence denied by them. And yet, despite the centuries of such martyrdom, Ukraine was steadily advancing in her national development. It remained only to be seen whether she was strong enough to strike out for liberties, or whether the time was not yet ripe for such a move.

The opening stages of the War offered the Ukrainians not the slightest opportunity in this direction. Russian mobilization was immediately followed by a harsh suppression of everything that pertained to Ukrainian life, not only in Russian but also in Austrian Ukraine, which the Russians had invaded; and thousands of Ukrainian patriots were exiled into the depths of Russia and Siberia. And those Ukrainians who had hoped for better treatment at the hands of Austria-Hungary, were quickly disillusioned, for that Government paid but scant attention to their hopes and aspirations and their loyalty to it. But the most tragic feature of the entire situation was that since Russia and Austria were on opposite sides, Ukrainian had to fight against Ukrainian; not for his motherland, but

for those powers that were oppressing her. Nevertheless, the Ukrainians did not despair, but bided their time for the arrival of that moment when they would be able to strike for their national liberty.

THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC

That moment finally came; first with the collapse of Russia in 1917, and secondly with the collapse of Austria-Hungary in 1918.

The first was ushered in by the Russian Revolution. Quickly the Ukrainian Central Rada (Council), representing various parties and groups in Ukraine, arose under the leadership of Prof. Hrushevsky. Negotiations followed with the Russian Provisional Government. The latter flatly refused Ukrainian demands for autonomy, being fearful of losing Ukraine, which was indispensable to Russia not only as a granary but also as the foundation of her industrial and commercial development.* Finally, however, it had to capitulate, grudgingly, to be sure, and only after the Rada proclaimed Ukrainian autonomy. Great happiness reigned throughout Ukraine, for after centuries of bondage the people were once more free. When the Bolsheviks came into power, Ukraine declared herself free, leaving the door open, however, to negotiations leading towards the creation of a Russian federative state, with Ukraine as an

Besides grain Ukraine furnished pre-war Russia with most of the coal and iron, nearly all of the oil, all of the salt, 80% of beet, 70% of tobacco, and 33% of the livestock.

autonomous part of it. Immediately, France and England recognized Ukraine. The Bolsheviki recognized her also, but it soon became apparent that this recognition was only a subterfuge, as it was quickly followed by their invasion of Ukraine when the Central Rada refused to acknowledge the supreme authority of the Soviet. As a result, Ukraine issued her Declaration of Independence (Fourth Universale) on January 22, 1918. The following day, at Brest Litovsk, the Central Powers recognized the independence of the newly-arisen Ukrainian National Republic, and several weeks later concluded with her a treaty of peace.*

The young republic was immediately set upon by the Bolsheviki. In this crisis the only effective remedy would have been a strong central government and a powerful army. But

* Commenting on this treaty, the "Independent" (March 2, 1918. Incorporated with "Harper's Weekly") said:—Tyranny dethrones tyranny, and Satan casts out Satan. It seems that malevolent monarchies may do more for the liberation of an oppressed people than benevolent republics have done. The fable is reversed and the wind [Germany] accomplished what the Sun [Allies] could not." The writer would have been more correct had he written "...what the sun **would not.**" The Ukrainians looked toward the Allies for aid and encouragement in their fight for freedom, but in vain; consequently they had to turn for help to the Central Powers. Further on the writer of this article comments that "...it is unfortunate that in this crisis the People's Republic [Ukraine] is receiving recognition and aid from the Central Powers while the Allies, pledged to champion the oppressed nationalities, must stand aloof and averse."

both were lacking, largely due to the socialist theories which were rampant among the majority of the Central Rada membership and which opposed centralization and strong armed forces. Soon the Bolsheviks captured Kiev, Ukraine had to seek foreign aid. An ally was found in Germany, with whose aid the Bolsheviks were driven out of the country. Germany, however, began to exploit Ukraine in the most outrageous fashion, and an ever-widening breach appeared between the Rada and the German military command. As a result, the Germans overthrew the Rada as the government of Ukraine, and with the aid of some Ukrainian landed interests set up in its stead a puppet government, headed, by General Skoropadsky. Soon after Skoropadsky was overthrown by the Directory, representing a coalition of Ukrainian parties, with Volodimir Vinichenko and Semen Petlura at its head. Once more the Ukrainian National Republic set out to preserve its independence.

In the meanwhile, great events were taking place in Western Ukraine. For, when the military and political might of Austro-Hungary began to totter and disintegrate, when the various subject nationalities of it began to cast off the shackles of oppression—the Western Ukrainians realized that their long-awaited moment had at last arrived, that they must strike for their liberties.

On October 18th, 1918 delegates from all Ukrainian territories under Austria-Hungary elected a Ukrainian National Rada, which was

to act as the constituent assembly of Western Ukraine. This assembly established an independent Western Ukrainian Republic.

In the early morning hours of November 1st, 1918, young volunteers and Ukrainian soldiers from the Austrian army seized Lviw in the name of the new republic. This was followed by seizure of city after city, and in a few days the Ukrainian blue and yellow banner waved throughout most of Galicia and other provinces of Western Ukraine.

The young republic was immediately attacked by the newly-resurrected Poland. Under the guise of using them against the Bolsheviks, the Poles received supplies and military equipment from the Allies, who at that time were well-nigh panic-stricken at the thought that the Bolsheviks might overrun all of Europe. The Ukrainian forces, on the other hand, although of sufficient manpower, were underfed, badly clothed, poorly equipped and ill-trained. That they fought unceasingly against terrible odds, is a tribute to them and their cause.

On January 22nd, 1919, amidst great rejoicing, representatives of two Ukrainian republics met in the historic St. Sophia Square in Kiev, and there proclaimed the federation of the sundered parts of Ukraine into one Ukrainian National Republic, with the supreme power vested in the Directory headed by Petlura. It was indeed an inspiring moment. For what could be more striking and characteristic of this courageous people than this act, when

—surrounded on all sides by the Bolsheviks, the Poles, and the royalist Russian forces, all intent upon destroying the newly arisen Ukrainian state—they made the supreme gesture of their conviction in the sanctity of their cause by uniting Eastern Ukraine with Western Ukraine.

The year 1919 was one of the darkest in Ukrainian history, relieved only by the shining courage of the Ukrainian soldiery in their terrific struggle to preserve their newly-won national freedom. Entire Ukraine was the center of events which defied precedent and beggared description, a battle-ground of merciless war, a war characterized by bloody raids, affrays and massacres, involving tens of thousands of men, a war of horrible persecutions wreaked upon the Ukrainian people by one enemy or the other.

From all sides a ring of predatory enemies converged upon the republic. In the southwest Rumania was attacking the province of Bukovina, which had previously declared its union with the Western Ukrainian Republic. In the west, Poland was steadily advancing deeper into Ukrainian territory, thanks to Allied aid. From the east and south came the royalist Russian forces under Denikin and later Wrangel, also aided by the Allies. And from the north descended the Bolsheviks with their reign of terror.

No nation in modern history was ever made the object of such a many-sided and overwhelming attack. And although the Ukrainians, united under Petlura, fought valiantly, and were at times victorious, yet it was humanly impos-

sible to stave off final defeat for them and their cause, especially when more than one-third of their armed forces fell before the spread of the typhus disease,* which raged unchecked mainly because of the lack of medical supplies which the Allied blockade, ostensibly aimed at the Bolsheviki, refused to permit to enter into Ukraine.

* Concerning this, Henry Alsberg of the "Nation" (Nov. 1, 1919) had this to say in his article on the "Situation in Ukraine": "But worse of all is that every third person in the Kamenietz has had typhus. In the other cities the situation is the same. In the army it is worse. At Vapniak I was with Petlura at a review of a frontier garrison where out of a thousand troops at least two hundred had had typhus. Against the epidemic Petlura's government is quite powerless to make headway. The Ukrainians are condemned to death by the fact that the Entente is backing Denikin. In an interview I had with Petlura, he begged that if only for humanity's sake the Red Cross would send over a mission to fight typhus. Let me add here that right across the river in Rumania are all the medical supplies necessary, as well as plenty of food with which to feed the dying Ukrainian children. The head of the American Red Cross in Czernowitz, and also the head in Bucharest, had a first impulse to send supplies here. But two American Red Cross delegates have since come from Paris, who say that they will have to go first to the Ukraine to investigate conditions. One of them told me that the Entente had decided to back Denikin, and would do nothing for the Ukrainians in Petlura's territory. In short, far from having any mission to relieve the terrible suffering, they had been sent merely to report on how near Petlura was to breaking down."

It may be peculiar to some that the Allies which had pledged themselves to the highly-touted Wilsonian principle of "self-determination" should have taken such a hostile attitude towards the Ukrainian struggle for freedom and thereby helped to defeat it. In this connection, it must be understood that from the very start the French policy was pro-Polish. France was for Poland "grande et forte, tres forte," for such a Poland might become "a new France to the east of Germany," doubling the power of France in the west. For that reason, France strongly supported Poland in her invasion of Ukrainian territories. In this she was backed by America and Italy. The British alone reacted unfavorably to this policy, predicting that the extension of Poland's boundaries at the expense of another nationality would prove in the future to be a continual source of trouble for Poland and the countries supporting her. How true was this prediction! Herbert Adams Gibbons, American journalist and writer, explained this hostility of the Allies towards Ukraine and their support of Polish and royalist Russian armies in the following manner: "An independent Ukraine however, does not seem to fit in with the interests of the victors in the World War, as these interests are conceived by statesmen . . . **The misfortunes of the Ukrainians have come from the fact that the independent existence of their nation was an obstacle to the political aims of all the rival forces contending for supremacy, and at the same time proved to be an irresistible magnet to the occult powers behind armies.**

which lust for oil and coal and monopolies of food stuffs and raw materials.” *

PRESENT STATUS

And so — on December 9, 1919, by virtue of the Minorities Treaty signed at Paris, the Allies handed over the Ukrainian provinces of Bukovina and Bessarabia over to **Rumania**, a territory of 22,000 square kilometers, containing a compact mass of close to 1,250,000 Ukrainians. Despite her promises to safeguard the racial, religious and linguistic rights of the Ukrainians, Rumania has been guilty of the notorious “Balkan methods” of governing them, which consists of cruel persecutions and abuses, directed towards the destruction of the Ukrainians within her borders as a separate nationality. One of the results of this policy — in the words of “Dilo,” leading Ukrainian daily, published in Lviw—is that today “the Ukrainians under Rumania have not a single elementary, secondary, or technical school, and private schools are not allowed. The same applies to reading-halls, and cooperative societies. No Ukrainians are allowed in the Civil Service, and Rumanian enterprises import Rumanian labor rather than employ local Ukrainians.”

* “Ukraine and the Balance of Power”—
“**Century**” magazine, July, 1921.

On September 10, 1919, by the Treaty of St. Germain, the newly-created Republic of **Czechoslovakia** absorbed 15,000 square kilometers of Ukrainian territory then known as Podkarpatska Ruś and today as Carpatho-Ukraine, containing about 655,000 Ukrainians, as "an autonomous unit within the Czechoslovak Republic." Despite this guarantee, Czechoslovakia under Masaryk and Benes failed to grant the region any autonomy, but was guilty of trying to denationalize its inhabitants.

With the rise of the new Czecho-Slovakia in October, 1938, however, and the retirement of most of those who had guided its destinies up to that time, the status of Carpatho-Ukraine changed considerably. On October 11, it received Home Rule. On October 26, a Cabinet composed entirely of Ukrainians was appointed by Prague to govern it, headed by Monsignor Augustin Voloshyn, the new premier. On November 2, however, by the so-called Vienna arbitration award of Germany and Italy, the most fertile portion of Carpatho-Ukraine (with its capital Uzhorod and cities of Mukachiw and Koshytsi) was allocated to Hungary.

The allocation was a result of Hungary's ambition to absorb all of Carpatho-Ukraine. In this ambition she was supported by Poland, not so much because such an annexation would have given the two countries a common frontier, strategically beneficial to both, but because it would have removed from existence the autonomous Carpatho-Ukraine, which Poland fears

will become the base of operations for the national unification and independence of the 45,000,000 Ukrainian nation, including the portion under her own misrule.

On November 19th, Carpatho-Ukraine formally received its new Constitution, providing for its autonomy.

Today, Carpatho-Ukraine is in the process of rapid development. Its population is animated by the belief — as Robert Best, United Press staff correspondent wrote on December 17th from Hust, new capital of the region — “that the hour for birth of greater Ukrainia is rapidly approaching. Two developments today in Ruthenia (or Carpatho-Ukraine) tended to encourage their attitude. They were a decision at Prague that Ukrainian instead of Russian will henceforth be the official language in Ruthenia and that a new legislature of 30 members, selected solely from the government party, will be elected early next spring.”

On March 15th, 1923 the Conference of Ambassadors at Paris recognized the occupation of Galicia by **Poland** and approved the Riga treaty whereby Poland and the Soviets divided up between themselves the other parts of Western Ukraine. This decision was based upon two provisions, whereby Poland recognized that “the ethnographical conditions necessitate an autonomous regime” for this region, and guaranteed to respect the pledges she had made at the signing of the Treaty of Versailles on June

28, 1919, of preserving the national rights of the Ukrainian people within her borders. This meant that Poland received not only Eastern Galicia but Northwestern Ukraine as well, including Kholm, Pidlashe, Polisy, and Volhynia, an area of 137,000 square kilometers (35% of her entire area), inhabited by a Ukrainian population upwards of 7,000,000.

From the very outset of her occupation of Western Ukraine, Poland has been guilty of not only breaking all these pledges she made guaranteeing Ukrainian rights but also of the grossest abuses of their elementary human rights, all in an effort to Polonize the Ukrainians. Many of these abuses have reached incredible lengths. Ukrainian national, cultural, and economic progress is retarded at every step.*

* "From 1920 to 1934 the number of Ukrainian schools has been reduced from 3,600 to 120; 2,974 schools have been made bilingual but only a few unimportant subjects are taught in Ukrainian. Not a single Ukrainian technical school exists; and out of the 28,855,420 zlotys allocated in the 1934—35 budget for universities and colleges, only 63,490 zlotys were assigned for two Ukrainian chairs in Warsaw University. Rigorous restrictions are placed upon the entry of Ukrainian students to the higher schools and universities. In 1931—32, out of 49,770 university students, there were only 2,192 Ukrainians. The students in Warsaw Engineering College then were divided as follows:—Poles, 3,692; Jews, 468; Ukrainians 6."—Lancelot Lawton, London's "Fortnightly Review," April, 1934.

Furthermore, those Ukrainians who do manage to graduate from the higher schools, find all sorts

Several times Poland's mistreatment of the Ukrainians became so harsh as to become the object of complaints before international tribunals, especially when she resorted to a reign of terror. It is no wonder, therefore, that the London "New Statesman and Nation" (Aug. 29, 1931) stressed that:—"Among the abuses in post-war Europe the worst are the cumulative violations of the 'Minorities Treaty' by the Polish State... In Poland they have acquired a primary international importance... by reason of their barbarism and abundance." This was written at the time when the civilized world recoiled in horror at the "pacification" by Polish constabulary and troops of the Ukrainians, concerning which the "Manchester Guardian" (England) wrote then that:—"This so-called pacification has been carried out with ferocity which can only be compared to the previous atrocities carried out in the early nineteenth century by the Bashi-Bazouks in the old Turkish territories." Thus, then, has Poland carried out her pledges

of obstacles and discriminations placed in their way of entering professions, and "find no outlet for their abilities in the state administration of Poland as long as they do not renounce their Ukrainian ideals."—"Political Quarterly," England, Oct.-Dec., 1932.

Then too, to drive hostile Polish wedges into the compact Ukrainian settlements, the Polish government resorts to artificial settlements of Ukrainian territories with Polish colonists, selling them their plots at greatly preferential rates. Various manifestations held by the Ukrainians, including memorial exercises for the Ukrainian war dead are often banned or dispersed by Polish police.

to respect Ukrainian rights. And to add an ironic touch to it all, on September 13, 1934, Premier Beck solemnly notified the League of Nations that Poland would no longer be bound by the Minorities Treaty. As if she ever had! Sir John Simon, the British delegate, sternly rebuked Beck for this repudiation by his country of her solemn pledges. "Rarely if ever," wrote the "Manchester Guardian" then, "has the representative of any country at Geneva received so stern a rebuke."

Since that repudiation Poland has pursued her policy of oppression with even greater force. Early in 1938, she dissolved the Society of Ukrainian Women, including its 72 branches and a membership well over 50,000, and suppressed its two periodicals, "Zhinka" and "Ukrainka." The attack was then launched against the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, and many priests were sent to prison for conducting services or registering births in Ukrainian. Next to feel the brunt of the attack was the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. More than 200 of its churches in the Volhynia and Polisia districts were destroyed or converted into Polish institutions. Shocking though these acts of the Polish Government are, yet they pale before the terroristic "pacification" that is being wreaked on the defenseless Ukrainian population now. According to Donald Day, foreign correspondent of the Chicago Tribune Press (in a dispatch written from Riga, Latvia, dated October 18, 1938) "twenty thousand Polish police are assisting the army" in this "pacification" . . . "Using lists compiled by their spies, the Poles are reported

to be beating mercilessly Ukrainians who are active in political and cultural organizations.”

Very aptly has H. G. Wells described Poland in his book on the “Shape of Things To Come”:

“The restoration of Poland—the excessive restoration of Poland—was one of the brightest ambitions of Wilson. Poland was restored. But instead of a fine-spirited and generous people emerging from those hundred and twenty years of subjugation, and justifying the sympathy and hopes of liberalism throughout the world, there appeared a narrowly patriotic government, which presently developed into a vindictive and pitiless dictatorship, and set itself at once to the zestful persecution of the unfortunate ethnic minorities caught in the net of its all too ample boundaries . . . In the treatment of the Ukrainians involved in liberation, Poland equalled any of the atrocities which had been the burden of her song during her years of martyrdom.”

“Let it not be supposed, however, that this mistreatment of the Ukrainians by Poland has broken their spirit,” wrote E. A. Powell, in his book “Thunder Over Europe” (1931), “for not even in the Emerald Isle [Ireland] does one find more formidable fighting qualities or a more passionate national sentiment than in Ukraine.”

Nor has it retarded their national evolution.

“Deserted in the past by rich Ukrainian landowners who became Polish aristocrats,” wrote T. P. Conwell-Evans in the British “Polit-

ical Quarterly" (Oct.-Dec., 1932), "The Ukrainian peasants, aided by their hard-working priests, themselves of peasant stock, developed capacity and talent for responsible action. Their political leaders are nearly all sons or grandsons of peasants, many of them trained in the Universities of Prague and Vienna... A visitor to Poland making a tour of some of the Ukrainian villages will be agreeably surprised at the character of the activities carried on by the peasants, which betrays not only a deep seated national consciousness, but a readiness and ability to work together and a sense of citizenship... So vigorous a resurrection, starting at zero after the devastation of the Great War, is all the more remarkable as the Ukrainians have achieved it by their own unaided efforts, without credits from the state or from the Polish banks... The Ukrainians are too well consolidated to be ignored: they cannot be assimilated, they are too numerous and too determined. Oppression will serve only to drive them into illegal and violent methods of protest. Up to now the vast majority tenaciously cling to constitutional methods... It would be disastrous if they began to swell that band of hot-blooded young men, members of a secret military organization [UWO—predecessor of present-day OUN—Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists] who are impatient of constitutional redress..."

The futility of constitutional means for obtaining any rights from Poland, was well illustrated last December 21, when the Polish Gov-

ernment notified Ukrainian Deputies that it was rejecting their proposal for consideration by Parliament of autonomy for Poland's Ukrainian population.

The realization among Ukrainians that constitutional redress for them is well-nigh impossible has reached the point where they are beginning to regard war as the only salvation for them. Otto D. Tolischus, correspondent of *The New York Times*, noted this fact himself when he wrote (June 11, 1937): "Rich in tradition, history and culture of which the West in its pride knows little but which do not allow them to forget that they were the first of the East Slavic people to attain Statehood back in the ninth and tenth centuries, the Ukrainians again look forward to the re-creation of their own State much as the Poles did before 1914—so much so that they are already pursuing as far as possible the same policy and tactics that brought the Poles success, even to the extent of basing all their hopes on the next war."

"Black must be the injustices suffered by Ukrainians in Poland," a writer in the Catholic "Commonweal" (June 3, 1938) concluded, "since they regard the — maybe — suicidal catastrophe of an international war as a means of possible deliverance."

Today, the Ukrainian strivings for freedom have reached the stage where, according to a United Press dispatch from Warsaw (December 19, 1938) "Poland's foreign policy at the moment is dominated by the Ukrainian issue . . . Poland, it was admitted, would find it difficult to coun-

teract any secessionist movement among her 7,000,000 Ukrainians — nearly one-fourth of the entire Polish population—if an independent Ukraine were established.”

By the Treaty of Riga concluded between Poland and the Soviets on March 18, 1921, the latter fastened their hold upon 450,000 square kilometers of Ukrainian territory, containing approximately a 35 million Ukrainian population. Two years later this territory was incorporated as an integral part of the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics, the strong national feelings of it preventing the Bolsheviki from robbing it of its national identity.

“From the very first,” wrote the “Cork Examiner” (Ireland, May 7, 1938), “Ukrainians were of all peoples under the Soviet the least amendable, the most strongly individual, the most fiercely nationalist, therefore the most atrociously suppressed.”

Despite the use of terrorism as a weapon of rule, the earlier years under the Soviets were characterized by certain cultural concessions granted the Ukrainians, as a partial offset to the violent political repression and economic exploitation of them. That this cultural sop failed in its purpose was evidenced by the Ukrainian peasantry's opposition to the government's requisition of foodstuffs which forced it to give it up and introduce for awhile the “Nep,” or New Economic Policy, with its security of individual farming and freedom of private trade. With the passage of time and growth of the

Soviets in power, however, even these cultural concessions began to be taken away, and the government policy aimed directly and systematically at the complete political, economical and cultural subjugation and denationalization of the Ukrainian people. Although some Ukrainian cultural institutions were permitted to continue their existence, yet they found themselves emasculated of any real progress because of their being forced to proceed only along channels of Communistic ideology. The same is true of Ukrainian writers in the Soviet Union. Those who rebelled against this policy or showed even the slightest trace of nationalist sentiment, were branded as traitors to the Russian Revolution, summarily tried and executed, or sent to the notorious prison camps in the north. Concerning one such trial, the London "Saturday Review" (January 18, 1930) correctly pointed out that "the real reason for bringing a charge against Jefremov, Czechivsky and the others is the desire to destroy the Ukrainian intelligentsia by getting rid of its chief representatives...Realizing its failure, Bolshevism has taken to its alternative weapons—terrorism and provocation. By this means it seeks to kill the creative efforts of Ukrainian culture and that is the real significance of the present trial"... and, it might be added, of subsequent such trials.

Even these weapons, terrorism and provocation, failed to subdue the Ukrainian resistance, especially to the Soviet economic policy. Such opposition was usually followed by mass reprisals on the part of the authorities, which

included the forcible shifting of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian population from native habitat in order to artificially populate the vacated areas with alien peoples.

In 1932 and 1933 the Bolsheviks by their economic policy, and especially by their enforcement of rural collectivization, brought about an acute state of famine in Ukraine, which took a terrible toll, conservatively estimated by such conscientious observers as William Henry Chamberlin, former Moscow correspondent of the "Christian Science Monitor" (Boston), to be well over 4 million lives. And although (in the words of a resolution submitted in the House of Representatives of the United States) the Soviet Government was fully aware of the famine in Ukraine and although having full and complete control of the entire food supplies within its borders, it nevertheless failed to take relief measures designed to check the famine or alleviate the terrible conditions arising from it, but on the contrary used the famine as a means of reducing the Ukrainian population and destroying the Ukrainian political and cultural rights.

Despite all such mass reprisals and terrorism of the authorities the national spirit in Soviet Ukraine burns as brightly as ever, a fact which Stalin as well as some of his underlings have themselves admitted. At the 17th Congress of the Communist Party, held in January 1934, for example, Stalin declared: "Only very recently in the Ukraine the deviation towards Ukrainian Nationalism did not represent

the major danger but when we ceased to fight against it and enabled it to grow to the extent that it joined up with the interventionists this deviation became the major danger."

Today this spirit is one of the chief worries of the rulers in Kremlin. That is why the purges in Ukraine are especially severe, directed against the "separatists." At the January 1938 session of the Moscow Party leaders, it was revealed that in the last Party purge of 100,000 persons, no less than 40,000 were in Ukraine, that 3,422 persons were ejected from the Party in Kiev alone. Last June a new purge of considerable severity was begun in Ukraine, where, as reported by Harold Denny, Moscow correspondent of "The New York Times," "anti-Soviet sentiment and activity has been intensely stubborn since the first days of the revolutionary," and which "has been the field of a strong nationalist movement from the beginning of the Bolshevik revolution." That is why, to quote M. Butenko, late Soviet Charge d'Affaires at Bucharest, "the Ukraine is entirely administered by men faithful to Stalin sent from Moscow. The slightest sign of Ukrainian nationalism is repressed by ruthless methods so that the region is seething with hatred against the Bolsheviks." Especially drastic are the purges of the Red Army in Ukraine. Out of 18,000 officers of the Kiev and Minsk military districts, more than 50% have been "liquidated." From Tukhachevsky down there have been executions and banishments for separatist activities. The most recent purge, as reported by the Associated Press from Moscow

(Dec. 20, 1938) is in the leadership of the Ukrainian Komsomol (League of Young Communists). The secret Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, which operates in all Ukrainian territories, is especially feared by the Soviet authorities, so much so that its leader, Colonel Eugene Konovaletz, was assassinated in Rotterdam, on May 23, 1938, by a Soviet agent — a fact which the Rotterdam chief of police, Rossbach, himself confirmed.

“That something was fundamentally wrong with the situation in the Ukraine,” declares an editorial in the “New York Herald-Tribune” (December 19, 1938), “has been proved by the fact that during the recent months even Stalin’s most trusted lieutenants have failed him when sent to the Ukraine, and he has had to dispose of those in the Ukraine in more rapid succession than in any other part of the country . . .”

In view of all this, it is no wonder that an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, dated September 23, 1938, reports that in the present crisis arising from Hitler’s push towards the east, Moscow is concentrating its forces in Ukraine, for it knows that the Ukrainians are only waiting for the opportunity when they can strike for their freedom.

“For six hundred years . . .” writes H. Hessel Tiltman in his book on “Peasant Europe,”* “they [Ukrainians] have fought to remain Ukrainian. They have preserved their own distinctive language, their own Church, their own clothes, their

* Jarrolds, London, 1934.

high state of husbandry. And, at the end of that fight for centuries, as at the beginning, they face the world undaunted alike by poverty, persecution, and repression—demanding the right of 43 millions of people having a common stock and a common life to rule themselves. That demand may be resisted for a year, a generation or a hundred generations. But at the end of that time the Ukrainian people will still be asking their freedom. And there will be neither lasting peace nor the reign of justice in Eastern Europe until that right is granted, and the alien troops withdrawn, leaving the Ukraine to control its own destinies and enrich all the peasant lands by its example.”



