

THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY



LOWER INSERT: UKRAINIAN TERRITORY IN EUROPE UPPER INSERT: DISMEMBERMENT OF UKRAINE AFTER THE WORLD WAR

VOL. II—NUMBER 4

SUMMER, 1946

\$1.00 A COPY

TWO UKRAINES FACING THE UNITED NATIONS	<i>Editorial</i>
UKRAINE AND THE WORLD CRISIS	<i>Clarence A. Manning</i>
SKOVORODA, THE SEEKER OF THE GENUINE MAN	<i>Constantin H. Andrusyshen</i>
INDEPENDENT UKRAINE: FICTION OR REALITY	<i>Walter Dushnyck</i>
A UKRAINIAN PLAN FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF EUROPE	
ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO	<i>Nicholas D. Czubytyj</i>
APPEASEMENT OF THE USSR AND THE RIGHTS OF SMALL NATIONS	<i>Floyd A. Cane</i>
JOHN DEWEY'S LIFE-WORK VIEWED BY A FOREIGN OBSERVER	<i>Volodymyr Bezushko</i>
RUSSIA AND THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REVOLUTION 1917	<i>Walter Dushnyck</i>

Printed in U. S. A.

THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

Subscription: Yearly \$4.00; Single Copy \$1.00

Managing Office: THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY
11 E. 7th Street, New York 3, N. Y.

Checks Payable to: UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

Editorial Address: PROF. NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ
P. O. Box 656, Mahwah, New Jersey
Tel. CRagmere 8-3767-M

Edited by EDITORIAL BOARD
Editor-in-chief, NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ
Associate Editor, STEPHEN SHUMEYKO
Published by UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA
with the support of contributions of Americans of Ukrainian descent

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Two Ukraines Facing the United Nations	305
<i>Editorial</i>	
Ukraine and the World Crisis	310
<i>Prof. Clarence A. Manning</i>	
Skovoroda, the Seeker of the Genuine Man	317
<i>Prof. Constantine H. Andrusyshen</i>	
Independent Ukraine: Fiction or Reality	331
<i>Walter Dushnyck</i>	
A Ukrainian Plan for the Organization of Europe	
One Hundred Years Ago	339
<i>Nicholas D. Czubytyj</i>	
Appeasement of the USSR and the Rights of Small Nations . . .	348
<i>Prof. Floyd A. Cane</i>	
John Dewey's Life-Work Viewed by a Foreign Observer	359
<i>Volodymyr Bezushko</i>	
Russia and the Ukrainian National Revolution 1917	363
<i>Walter Dushnyck</i>	
Committee for the Aid of Refugee Ukrainian Scholars	376
BOOK REVIEWS	
The War and Ukrainian Democracy, by N. Hryhoriiv	379
<i>Nicholas D. Czubytyj</i>	
Martyrdom in Ukraine, by Walter Dushnyck	380
<i>Roman Olesnicki</i>	
Ukraine—between Poland and Russia, by Nicholas D. Czubytyj	381
<i>Michael J. Nagurney</i>	
Peace Atlas of Europe, by Samuel Van Valkenburg	382
<i>Nicholas D. Czubytyj</i>	
Poland's Rights to Justice, by Andrew J. Krzesinsky	384
<i>Walter Dushnyck</i>	
Animal Farm, by George Orwell	385
<i>Roman Olesnicki</i>	
Ucrainica in American and British Periodicals	388

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

CLARENCE A. MANNING, PH.D., Professor at Columbia University, Department of East European Languages. Specialist in Russian and Ukrainian Literatures. Author of "Ukrainian Literature" and others. Translator from Ukrainian.

CONSTANTINE H. ANDRUSYSHEN, PH.D., Professor of Slav Languages at the Saskatchewan University, Canada.

WALTER DUSHNYCK, born in the Western Ukraine, is a graduate of the Universities of Louvain and of Columbia, and has done extensive work in the history of Eastern and Central Europe. Mr. Duchnyck served with the U.S. Armed Forces in Saipan, the Philippines, Okinawa and Japan. The last five months of his service he spent as interpreter on General MacArthur's Staff.

NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ, Historian, former Professor of Greek Catholic Theological Academy in Lviv, Western Ukraine, Author of several historical works, Editor of "The Ukrainian Quarterly," Contributor to American journals.

FLOYD A. CANE, PH.D., Professor of History at San Francisco State College.

VOLODYMYR BEZUSHKO, PH.D., former Professor of Philosophy in Western Ukraine, author of *William Shakespeare—a Republican?*, now D.P. in Germany.

TWO UKRAINES FACING THE UNITED NATIONS

Editorial

NOW only has it been revealed how during the Yalta Conference Stalin, discussing the votes in the United Nations, requested that the Soviets be given two additional votes, one for Ukraine and one for White Russia. It was, he added, only fair and just, because these republics are in reality independent states. But when the late President Roosevelt replied that by the same criterion the United States should have forty-eight votes, the master of the Kremlin retorted that both of them, and especially Ukraine, suffered tremendous losses in the war against Germany. He further explained that for "internal reasons" those two republics should have membership in the new international organization.

Thus convinced by Stalin's argument, the late President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill agreed to his demands, and as a result Ukraine and White Russia were admitted to the San Francisco Conference as equal and independent states. To represent Ukraine Stalin sent Dmitri Z. Manuilsky, an old agent of the Comintern. This was the same Manuilsky who in 1918 came to Kiev as an official peace envoy of the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic to seek peace from the Ukrainian National Government. This was the reward of the Ukrainian people for their fight against the German invaders: membership in the United Nations with Dmitri Z. Manuilsky as their representative.

Paradoxically, the admission of Ukraine to the United Nations was cheerfully greeted even by those Ukrainian nationalists who fought and still are fighting the Russian domination of Ukraine. By pushing Ukraine into the United Nations Stalin wanted not only to increase his voting power in this international organization, but also to use the supposedly independent republics of Ukraine and White Russia as his propaganda instruments. Manuilsky's incessant attacks upon Greece, British colonial dependencies in the Middle East and upon the entire British Empire, are now more than ever recognized as Stalin's tactics to weaken and divide the Western powers.

Yet despite all this the Ukrainian nationalists have approved

Ukraine's admission to the United Nations. For the first time the Ukrainian people have been recognized in principle as a nation in the light of international law. Though there is no Ukrainian in the world outside the Communist quislings who would recognize Dmitri Manuilsky as a representative of Ukraine, everyone considers Ukraine's membership in the United Nations as a positive and advantageous fact from the Ukrainian point of view. In the past the Ukrainians have had to fight for recognition as an independent nation; today they want to replace Moscow's emissary Manuilsky with a genuine representative of the Ukrainian people.

We have, therefore, now two Ukraines: one is the real Ukraine, the country of several million Ukrainians, a democratic and peace-loving Ukraine, spiritually a part of the West and its civilization. This Ukraine is being hunted and persecuted by Moscow, its cultural and religious life is being brutally suppressed. It is represented by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, by its imprisoned Ukrainian Catholic Metropolitan and its Bishops, and hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian patriots who are now forced by political reasons to live in numerous DP camps in Western Europe. This Ukraine has no official representative in the United Nations, at the Paris Peace Conference or in any other international organization.

The second Ukraine, is Stalin's Ukraine, represented by Dmitri Manuilsky, an agent of the Comintern and a determined enemy of the Ukrainian people, known as an extreme international troublemaker. It is now high time that this fictitious Ukraine be exposed and a true picture of the situation be presented to those who seek the establishment of a lasting peace.

Purges in Ukraine

The press the world over is reporting lately the vast and all-embracing purges now taking place in Ukraine. The Communist Party of Ukraine, administrative personnel, literary and scientific organizations, collective farms and industry have undergone thorough purges. The Stalin government has decided to purge all phases of Ukrainian life. All Ukrainians, who are attached to their past and history and who understood that Ukraine as a nation is separate from Russia and spiritually connected with Western civilization, have had to be removed from their posts. In this "independent" Ukraine the master of the Kremlin, through his all-powerful NKVD, persecutes thousands of

Ukrainians not because they are guilty of revolutionary acts against the Soviet Union, but they are being liquidated simply because they are Ukrainians and love their way of life which is quite opposed to that of the Russian people.

It is not an easy task to be admitted to the Communist Party in Ukraine. All those who have been previously admitted, have had to be politically "pure" and without a shadow of suspicion. And yet the revelation made by Nikita Khrushchev, Secretary of the Communist Party in Ukraine and its Premier, about the "mass replacement of the Party's personnel" in Ukraine, must astonish even those who were or still are apologists for Soviet politics.

Khrushchev revealed that in the course of the last year and a half, he has had to dismiss two-thirds of the heads of the regional Soviets. In some districts, such as Sumy (Eastern Ukraine) 91%, in Nikolaev and Rivno districts 83% of all personnel had to be removed. Over 38% of all regional secretaries of the Communist Party have also been replaced. Furthermore, Premier Khrushchev asserted that the Communist Party of Ukraine, of which he is general secretary, failed to "organize widespread criticism of hostile bourgeois Ukrainian nationalism" and as a result "there have been ideological mistakes and distortions." Khrushchev declared that new schools will be organized which will train the Ukrainian youth in the "principles of Bolshevik theory." It must be added that since 1920 the Soviets have been trying to "train" the Ukrainians in "Bolshevik theory"—periodical purges do not help. It is evident that Moscow's intention is to eliminate all Ukrainians from key positions and replace them with imported Russians such as Khrushchev and Manuilsky or well-trained Ukrainian communist quislings.

Ukrainian History and Literature Under Fire

Premier Khrushchev's sensational declaration about the Ukrainian nationalists in the Communist Party and administrative personnel, reported by *Pravda*, has caused consternation in the Kremlin. The Politburo issued orders to seek the causes of this "crime." It was stated that the danger comes from Ukrainian literature, historical studies and the theatre. Moscow gave orders to the Union of Ukrainian Writers in Kiev to call its members together for the purpose of self-criticism. At such a meeting, held at the end of August, 1946, several writers, poets, editors and critics were censured and criticized for spreading theories connected with Ukrainian nationalism. All publications of the Ukrain-

ian Academy of Sciences, especially those referring to Ukrainian literature and history, were denounced and accused of Ukrainian nationalism. Anyone who knows the martyrdom of this Ukrainian scientific institution which underwent several such purges under the presidency of a Russified Ukrainian, the late Alexander Bogomolets, can readily imagine what there remained to be purged.*

But yet there were some things to be purged. During the war the Academy published *The History of the Ukrainian People* and *The History of Ukrainian Literature*. Both books, written under the dictation of the Politburo, cannot satisfy the Ukrainians because they omit Ukrainian historical events unfavorable from a Russian point of view. Despite this, the first book was criticized because it "propagated Ukrainian nationalist ideas, alien to Soviet ideology." The other book was condemned because it "had separated literary history from the class struggle and had said that nationalism was a decisive factor in the development of literature."

It should be added that in the case of the history the entire period dealing with Mazepa's struggle against Peter the Great was omitted. Apparently this was not enough for the Moscow rulers; they would like to see Mazepa denounced as a "traitor" to the Ukrainian people in books on Ukrainian history as he is presented in all Russian histories.

Several other writers and critics were accused of over-emphasizing the influence of Western European literature on that of Ukraine. Almost every Ukrainian writer, it was charged, insisted that Ukrainian literature and culture are opposed to Russian literature and culture.

Thus it is evident that in Manuilsky's so-called independent Ukraine, the Ukrainians cannot even praise or admire their own culture, literature as well as the past of their country.

In Western Ukraine the well-known Ukrainian historians and professors of Lviv University, Dr. Ivan Krepiakevich and Dr. Myron Korduba, were condemned by a "court" composed of their colleagues for their non-Marxian approach to Ukrainian history. It is no wonder, therefore, that thousands of learned people from Western Ukraine refuse to return to their country and prefer to remain as DP's in Western Europe.

* "Silver Jubilee of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences," N. Czubytyj. *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. I. p. 236.

Unrest in Ukraine

These official revelations about the unrest in Ukraine are only part of a much larger picture. It is reported that several resistance groups, which are part of a well-organized underground known as the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, operate in various localities of Ukraine. This unrest is not due primarily to the current dissatisfaction with the Soviet way of life, but to the desire of the Ukrainians to free themselves from the foreign yoke. Hanson W. Baldwin characterizes this Ukrainian underground in the *New York Times* as follows:

The Ukrainians are restless with the same Ukrainian nationalist or separatist movement that has kept that area active for generations.

With the liquidation of the Catholic Church in Western Ukraine and the forceful imposition of the Russian Orthodoxy, the Soviet government is trying to destroy all vestiges of Ukrainian independent thought and ideals.

This is the real Ukraine which still is not represented at the Paris Peace Conference or in the United Nations. Dmitri Manuilsky does not represent Ukraine or the Ukrainian people. His language is not that of the Ukrainian people. Instead he speaks and acts for his boss Stalin in Moscow.

At the end of October the General Assembly of the United Nations will meet here for its plenary session. It would be only just if some member of the United Nations would raise the question of Manuilsky's legal right to be the official representative of the Ukrainian people.



UKRAINE AND THE WORLD CRISIS

By CLARENCE A. MANNING

WORLD WAR II ended both in Europe and in Asia over a year ago. Millions of men in the United States and elsewhere have been returned to their families and to civil life. Yet there has scarcely been taken the first step to establish that real, lasting and just peace for which the democratic peoples of the world endured the horrors and the devastation of war. Day after day the newspapers are filled with endless debates and the sharp clashes between the democratic powers and the Soviet Union which arise at every point of international relations.

The first rumbles of this storm were heard over two years ago. When the Red Army crossed into the territory of Ukraine and of the Baltic states, the Ukrainian and the Lithuanian foreign language press in this country began to print small and often indefinite articles about the new terror that was being organized in their homelands. The great English-language newspapers of the United States and Great Britain passed these reports over in silence. Popular sentiment was only too ready to believe that they were without foundation in fact or were printed merely to create ill-will among the United Nations. A little later, when the armies penetrated on to German soil, they found the great masses of displaced persons who refused to go back to their native countries, because they realized from personal experience that life under the Soviet dictatorship was unendurable, and who preferred to suffer any hardship or privation rather than return to the Soviet hell. Yet again there was still an unwillingness to face the facts as they were becoming all too evident. It was the day when it was popular to believe that the organization of the United Nations would solve all the problems and when it was felt that any emphasis upon provisions for the maintenance of elementary human rights would only create confusion and imperil the success of that great and beneficent organization that promised so much to a war-weary world.

The democratic powers and their peoples were still impressed with the unity shown by the Soviet Union during the war according to its own stories and propaganda. They were inclined to dismiss as war criminals or fascists those individuals who had deserted from the Red Army and refused to credit them with honor and sincerity. It was only

gradually that the true picture of conditions began to be revealed and even to-day there are many intelligent persons who see something almost fantastic in the details that have been revealed of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Army which struggled for the independence of the nation against both the Nazis and the Communists.

The London conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Big Three in the autumn of 1945 was the first step in the opening of the eyes of the average man to the grim travesty of justice and humanity that was taking place behind the iron curtain set up by the Soviet government in both Europe and Asia. For the first time people began to speak more or less openly about those outrages that had been mentioned only in the foreign language press.—It was only then that the horrible condition of the displaced persons began in a small way to be understood by the broad masses of the population.

Yet step by step the picture broadened, and even the problem of the displaced persons came to form, but one small detail of the grim spectre that was hanging over humanity. Week by week and month by month the broad gulf that separated the democratic powers and the totalitarian Soviet Union has become more painfully manifest, although even now there are still far too many people who do not want to gaze into the abyss that is opening before the civilized world. There are still far too many people who are willing for one reason or another to shut their eyes to conditions as they are and are seeking for some form of appeasement which will preserve the fiction that mankind as a whole is agreed as never before.

At Paris and at the meetings of the United Nations in the United States the struggle is assuming a sharper and sharper form and the attacks of Mr. Manuilsky, the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, against Greece at the very moment when the Soviet satellites of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania are themselves endeavoring to stir up disorder by sending armed bands across the Greek frontier and by encouraging the Greek Communists with arms and supplies are rapidly creating a situation which can no longer be concealed by the platitudes of diplomacy, and by mystification. Sooner or later the conviction will be implanted in the minds of free men everywhere that it will be necessary to secure democratic liberties for all peoples of the world, no matter what the cost, if there is to be a world worth preserving.

It must be a matter of regret to every Ukrainian and to every sympathizer with the Ukrainian cause that the fair name of the country is being so stained by the foreign conquerors and their few Ukrainian

allies. It is painfully evident even by the Soviet announcements that the Ukrainian government which was forced into the United Nations as the price of Soviet participation does not in any degree represent the people but that it is the ardent Ukrainian patriots who are struggling against Soviet domination despite overwhelming odds who speak the voice of Ukraine and manifest its true spirit. Just at the moment when the official delegates of the country are echoing the voice of Moscow and opposing every effort to bring Europe back into the paths of peace, the Kremlin dares to announce new purges of a surprising part of the Soviet administration of Ukraine. Soviet bureaucrats and Communist writers in Ukraine are being denounced in unsparing language as touched by the curse of Ukrainian nationalism at the very time when Soviet propagandists are proclaiming to the entire world that the entire population of the Soviet Union is united heart and soul behind the regime of Joseph Stalin. The contrast between the loud declarations of unity and the repeated assertions that a large proportion of the members of the Soviet regime in Ukraine are definitely disloyal to the Soviet Union serves better than any possible argument to make clear the dissatisfaction of the Ukrainian people as a whole with the iron regime under which they are compelled to live their miserable lives. It throws into high relief the steady flow of information on the deportations, the forced labor, and the general outrages against human rights and dignity that characterize the Soviet system and present in a grim light the efforts of Soviet propagandists to send abroad delegations of writers and artists to appeal to the Ukrainians abroad in the hope of converting them to Communism.

It supports furthermore the many reports of religious persecution that have come out especially of Western and Carpatho-Ukraine that the Soviet government with the aid of a subservient Patriarch has wiped out the Ukrainian Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite and by forceful and uncanonical measures annihilated an institution that for nearly three and a half centuries has numbered among its members many of the most sincere and eminent sons and daughters of Ukraine. By measures that would shock the most barbaric ages of human history, the Soviet Union is endeavoring to sweep away religion and to destroy the last vestiges of the integrity of the human spirit.

It is a hopeful sign for humanity and its future that Ukraine despite its frightful losses by famine and by war and the oppression that it has undergone during the last quarter of a century still finds the spiritual and physical strength to protest by word and by action against its oppressors. Once more it has become clear that man cannot be com-

pelled to bow his head even by the most intolerable acts of cruelty and that we can count on human dignity to rise again whenever there is the slightest relaxation of the external pressure.

Yet that is not enough. The world to-day cannot pass by and dismiss the sufferings of any one land as negligible and unimportant. It is becoming more and more clear with every successive day that the hope of peace and prosperity is one for the entire planet to enjoy. What might have been passed over as of no account a few years ago, now must be clearly recognized as a factor of the greatest importance. The future well-being of Ukraine depends upon the well-being of the world, but the well-being of the world depends likewise upon the well-being of Ukraine and of all the countries of Europe and Asia which are suffering under the same oppressive rule.

That was recognized as the reason for the organization of the United Nations. It has been the teaching of Christianity, the vision of men of good will and intelligence throughout the ages since man first became conscious of the difference between good and evil. To-day in the twentieth century, there can be no turning back, unless all for which man has lived and progressed is to be wiped out and a new era of unmitigated violence open for the world.

It may have seemed even a year ago easy enough for a world organization to be established without any reference to the human rights and liberties that it was intended to safeguard. There are still people who are so attracted by the vision that they are little concerned with the reality that must be behind it, but month by month their number is diminishing, and unless the new United Nations organization can take cognizance of this fact, it cannot look to the future with confidence and hope.

With every succeeding clash between the Soviet Union and the free peoples of the world, the fundamental differences are coming more clearly to be recognized and charted. What perhaps first appeared as a mere clash between two economic systems is now being revealed as a clash between two conflicting views of life which threatens to ruin and to destroy all those finer sides of civilization that man has evolved and that were accepted almost without question but a few short years ago. There are still attempts made to gloss over this fundamental struggle on the ground that it is merely a clash between various systems of imperialism but the efforts to do this are becoming more and more transparent and artificial, and their falsity is becoming evident to the man on the street who would be only too glad, if they were true, and

if diplomacy and mutual understanding could take the place of conflict.

It is becoming increasingly clear that by one means or another there must be added to the Charter of the United Nations an article guaranteeing human rights to all the people of the globe. Those safeguards which the Christian world has developed by centuries of trial and error, by bloodshed and by suffering, must be recognized as an inalienable part of the heritage of the human race and the world, if it wishes peace, must be prepared to support them for all nations. It is idle and worse than useless to believe that a line can be drawn across the continent of Europe or of Asia, so that on one side there can be preserved all that men have always cherished and on the other there can be no limit to the arbitrary control of a few men backed by secret police and organized violence.

The economic and Social Council and later the General Assembly and the Security Council will be forced to face this situation, and the sooner that public sentiment can be aroused to demand it, the better. It will be little use to avoid action on the ground that insistence upon it will jeopardize the success of the new organization and shatter the hopes of humanity. Such a plea will be increasingly seen as a council of despair and an incitement to new acts of aggression, on the part of the Soviet Union as it extends its influence and its methods throughout neighboring countries and more and more disgusts and antagonizes those people who are really trying to improve conditions in the world.

At the time of the meeting in San Francisco a year ago much of this seemed academic. Even those who felt most strongly suspicious of the Soviet Union could not believe that events would justify their most pessimistic thoughts. At all the conferences between President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Stalin, no voice of public opinion was raised to protest and to condemn the ambiguities of the statements which obviously failed to clear up the fundamental questions of human rights. The great mass of the people in the United States and Great Britain accepted the entrance of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic as an independent state. They were perhaps surprised at the willingness of the Soviet government to give special rights to two of the Soviet Republics that formed the Union but they were not prepared to see the utter subordination not only of the delegates of Ukraine and White Russia but of the representatives of the other Slavonic states which were allowed to pass within the iron curtain and be dominated by a small Communist party directed from Moscow.

As a result there has been brought about a sharp division in every

international gathering and a growing feeling of pessimism as to the possibility of achieving even a minimum of good results, for it is extremely unlikely now that any of the Communist-dominated countries will be willing to allow to introduce into the world organization any provisions or even any statement of human aspirations that may conflict with their iron regime. At the same time there can be no satisfactory peace until that is brought about. The consequence is a tragic impasse which is casting deeper and deeper shadows over the whole of mankind, and which threatens in the atomic age the destruction of everything that mankind has struggled through the centuries to gain.

No one has yet suggested even the first step in breaking this deadlock which is assuming a more and more critical form as its seriousness is being recognized by increasing numbers of people. A war-weary world finds it hard to believe that so soon after the ending of the great holocaust of World War II, any group of men or any nation would be so utterly unresponsive to the aspirations of humanity. It is that disbelief that is to-day the great weapon of the Soviet Union and its Communist-dominated satellites and it is the same weapon that Moscow used so effectively twenty five years ago for the subjugation of free Ukraine.

One thing is clear,—the necessity of a continuous and unwearying effort to bring home to the peoples of the world the real nature of the problem that confronts them. It may seem a slow and almost useless work. It may seem as if the little that can be done is nothing in comparison with the great task of arousing humanity to the dangers of their position. It may seem that nothing can be done to save the lives of the millions of Ukrainians and of other peoples who are being crushed out by the Soviet machine. There is no reason for despair. Man is still going to maintain his faith and his confidence in those ideals which he has long cherished and sooner or later the world is going to awake to the fact that it is necessary to form a united front in order to achieve these ideals.

The real standard of measurement is not the success or failure as judged by the passing moment but the change which has come over the thoughts of men during a longer period. Nothing can be more inspiring than the contrast between the war years and the present, between the time when only insignificant articles in the foreign language press spoke of Soviet brutality and the present time when the fundamental clash between the two systems of life is so openly displayed that even the most unintelligent people cannot fail to be aware of it. The difference between the two periods, a matter of scarcely more than two years in

time, shows us what progress has already been made in presenting the situation to the intelligent thought of the world. It gives abundant ground for optimism, even though that optimism must be saddened by the thought that even during these years more millions of human beings have been driven from their homes to face a rapid or a slow death to advance the interests of the Red dictator.

No one can predict to-day the actual course of events but there will certainly be a growing conviction on the part of the free people of the world that those rights in which they believe must be extended within and without the iron curtain. There will be a growing conviction that the charter of human rights must be inserted in some way into the United Nations charter. The only danger will be a sense of despair, a loss of the vision of peace and an acquiescence in the present unhealthy situation. Yet that is not so likely to happen as it did in 1919. There has been a clearer demonstration of the real meaning of Communism and of the Soviet Union. There is a clearer realization of the true significance and value to humanity of such countries as Ukraine and if the friends and supporters of the cause of liberty will only continue their work, the time will surely come when the last excuses for dictatorship will be exposed for their true value and when it will be possible to counteract the expanding menace.

It may well be in accordance with the old proverb that it is darkest just before dawn. The extension of the Soviet iron curtain across the central part of Europe and the continuously irritating policies of the Soviet Union and its satellites will have an effect far greater than they did when their field of operations was limited to territories that the world was half inclined in its ignorance to regard as Russian. The very emphasis that the Soviet Union is laying on its fight against Ukrainian nationalism will help an aroused world to realize that Ukraine is not a product of Soviet policy but a true nation that has been suppressed by a foreign conqueror and that it has never voluntarily submitted. Then when the hour comes, in whatever form it takes, we can be very sure that the world will be ready to restore to Ukraine and the other peoples coerced into the Soviet Union those rights and liberties that have so long and faithfully been cherished and revered by them. Ukraine has suffered long and much but the growing crisis in world affairs and the growing realization of the real meaning of Communism and of the Soviet Union is rendering it possible for the Ukrainians to present their cause to a more sympathetic public than they have ever known and with greater chances of success.

SKOVORODA, THE SEEKER OF THE GENUINE MAN

By PROF. CONSTANTINE H. ANDRUSYSHEN, M.A., PH.D.,
University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Sask., Canada

OF ALL the men of thought whom European civilization has produced Hrihori Savich Skovoroda (1722-1794) is one of the most curious and interesting figures. His originality lies not so much in the type of philosophy which he professed as in the manner in which he sought to apply it to life, and so out of sheer imponderables to produce the miracle of *quasi* palpable truth, beauty and goodness. The philosophy he pursued can, both in broad outlines and meticulous detail, be recognized in the pre-Socratic, Platonic, Patristic, and Mystic (German) philosophies of the preceding ages. These Skovoroda incorporated in his vast system. And yet, eclectic though he is, he cannot be termed a mere imitator of his forerunners, because the essence of his thought is a thing quite distinct. His was the labor of a bee which gathers nectar here and there, but in the end produces a substance particularly its own.

Skovoroda was born in Ukraine into an ordinary peasant family of Kozak stock. His entire boyhood was spent in direct contact with Nature and this developed in him religious, imaginative and musical tendencies. At the age of six or seven he was taught to read the Psalter and liturgical books by the local sexton. Most of his education, however, he acquired by himself, through extensive reading. His progress was so marked and rapid that his father decided to send him to the Kiev Academy.

The education meted out by the Ukrainian Academy in the eighteenth century was thoroughly scholastic. The system was stagnant, and consisted mainly of learning by rote the outmoded rules and principles of logic, dialectics, poetics, and grammar. In no wise did it conform to life and its needs. All manner of independent thought was frowned upon and discouraged. The budding eighteen-year-old philosopher certainly disliked this senile pedagogy, and might have rebelled against it openly if the Academy had not possessed a fairly good library from which he was able to draw enough to broaden his mind independently.

His studies were interrupted by an invitation from Empress Elizabeth Petrovna to join her circle of court singers. In St. Petersburg

he remained for two years, after which, upon being released at his own request, he reentered the Academy. All efforts on the part of his superiors to induce him to enter the priesthood were in vain. It is reported that he even simulated simple-mindedness and resorted to stuttering in order to escape their appeals. After about seven years in the Academy Skovoroda left it, well-versed in the Scriptures, Patristic writings, and ancient literatures and philosophies.

Skovoroda's wish to go abroad was fulfilled when he was asked to become a member of the retinue accompanying Major General Vishensky whose mission was to purchase foreign wines for the Imperial Court. The philosopher was taken with the view to his becoming a precentor in the Orthodox church recently established in Budapest. His wanderings across northern Italy, Austria, Hungary and Poland were somewhat fruitless. Western thought did not appeal to him. He discovered that there was nothing in the countries visited that he had not already learned and experienced in his own: the same injustice, worship of self, poverty humiliated, wealth exalted, ignorance taking precedence over wisdom, innocence persecuted, immorality condoned and even encouraged. On foot, with a knapsack over his shoulder, he returned to his native village of Chornukhi in the Poltava region. There he might have remained to gain his livelihood by tilling the soil, but his inner urge ("Minerva" he called it) advised otherwise.

Although he had not quite completed the required course at the Academy, he was invited to teach poetics at the seminary of Pereyaslav. There, almost immediately he came into conflict with the presiding archbishop who opposed his innovations in the poetic theory of the day. Skovoroda championed the accentual system of versification, which was that of Lomonosov, and tended to disregard the conservative syllabic system which he considered detrimental to the melodious effect of the language he spoke. A rupture between him and the prelate followed. And again he found himself cut off from all resources, with no other possession but that which was in his knapsack. *Omnia mea mecum porto*, he would often say.

In 1754 he was engaged to tutor the son of a wealthy landowner Stefan Tamara. Treated with disdain by this haughty family, Skovoroda left it after about a year of service. That same year he was in Moscow at the Troytsko-Sergiyevskaya Lavra (Monastery). Its abbot appreciated the visitor's talents, but the philosopher felt too great a yearning for his "aunt" Ukraine, as he called his native land, and returned. As soon as he heard of this, Tamara, repenting his former

conduct, had him virtually kidnapped and brought to the estate to continue in his previous capacity. Conditions being now more tolerable, the tutor consented to stay. For the next four years he took full advantage of his relative leisure in order to compose his philosophic poems. This he did mostly out in the open, to the hum of the bees which, in addition to the tones of his own flute, was to him the pleasantest sound in nature; while the finest sight was the sunrise, which he would often go out to meet.

Contemplating the universe, the philosopher waxed ecstatic. He beheld everything around him with the eye of a pantheist. In each living thing, in the tiniest blade of grass he saw the "shadow of the living soul"; in each ray of light—the echo of God revelling in His creation. "Glory to thee, O morning world," he would exclaim, "glory to thee, O vernal power that fillest my veins, flowers, trees and all things." On such occasions he would produce his flute, which he always carried with him, and pour out his feeling through it, blending its tones with the hues and sounds of Nature. Of a peasant he would now and then inquire: "Where do you think God is?" The reply would be invariably naive: "In heaven . . . maybe in my heart." These allocutions Skovoroda would supplement thus: "Not only there . . . God is in everything, completely and indivisibly." This is how Skovoroda expressed his first experience of all-pervading divinity: "My first feeling was of a somewhat scattered nature, it was a sense of freedom and uplifting, a hope of something about to happen. When this spiritual state flooded my inner being and my will was possessed by longing, I felt within me a movement that gave me ineffable strength. A sweet fluid filled my soul, and all my interior seemed aflame. In my veins I felt a fiery circuit. I did not walk, but ran, insensible of my feet and hands, as if I were being carried away by an impetus, as if I had become a fiery vapor that moves in the expanses of the surrounding sphere. The entire world vanished from my sight, and only the feeling of love, peace and eternity enlivened my being. Tears in streams flowed from my eyes and overflowed in a kind of sweet harmony that filled my entire constitution. I hearkened introspectively and felt what seemed a filial trust of love. From that time on I devoted myself to ardent obedience to the spirit of God."

He was a vegetarian and satisfied himself with food consisting mainly of fruit, vegetables and milk. He ate once a day, after sunset. A four-hour sleep was enough to refresh him. Yet in spite of this severe regime he remained sturdy and active to the very end. His life was not

conventional, but neither was it ascetic. He was known to take an occasional drink. His personal needs being extremely limited, he was always happy and content. Kindness, generosity, regard for all manner of good people, both poor and rich, characterized him and endeared him to all with whom he came in contact. His numerous friends, scattered throughout Ukraine, willingly and eagerly offered him food and shelter, vying with each other for that privilege.

In his later thirties Skovoroda was given the post of teacher of Poetics at the Kharkiv Collegium. There he met a student, Kovalinsky, who was to be his first biographer and with whom he formed a lifelong friendship. There, too, pressure was brought to bear upon him to enter the holy orders, but the philosopher categorically refused to become a monk, maintaining his unwillingness to "increase the number of hypocrites," and claiming that "genuine monasticism is not within the habit but in an unselfish life, in being satisfied with little, in temperance, in avoiding passions and self-adulation, and in seeking the glory of God and not that of men." Later, when he chose the life of a wanderer, his friends, pained at the sight of his penury, often advised him to become a priest, and so not only grace the church as one of its pillars but also gain well-being for himself and perhaps fame. His reply to them was: "Why do I need all that? . . . Why a home and other things when I am a universal citizen? Does not he who has a pure heart and the chalice of joy possess much wealth?" And he continued in his lowly mode of life, rejoicing in the thought that "God made all that is necessary easy to attain, and all things difficult—unnecessary."

Like Shakespeare, Skovoroda considered life as a stage; but upon it man was destined to play but one, not several parts. That part depends on the condition and inclination of the player. After long and deep consideration of the problem, Skovoroda came to the conclusion that in order to gain the most out of life, one must remain true to his nature and assume only that role for which he is fashioned. In so doing man fulfils God's will, and so makes himself one with His designs. Skovoroda might have creditably filled many capacities, but early in his life he recognized that he was destined to be an ordinary, unpretentious human being. As such he remained throughout his life—humble with the humble, the least among the lowest, but, on the other hand, proud and severely outspoken with the haughty. It is reported that once he accepted a coin from a poor woman who mistook him for a beggar, merely to make her happy in her almsgiving. The Governor of Kharkiv, Yevdokim Scherbinin, who was a very close friend, Skovoroda

treated on level of equality and never addressed him as "Your Excellency." When the Governor, it is reported, brought Empress Catherine II to see the philosopher and asked him to come out to her carriage, Skovoroda said: "I am always ready to be of service to a lady." He did not, however, show her more respect than he would to other women. He allowed himself to be interviewed simply as a matter of conventionality. He derided and berated the vested authorities of the church for their ignorance and hypocrisy. In his opinion, most of them were false shepherds, blind leaders, eager for personal advancement and gain, praying with their lips but not with their hearts. Woe to them! But whatever his railings against the priesthood, it cannot be said that he rebelled against the institution as such, but against its members who, heeding solely their individual comforts, neglected to work for the spiritual betterment of their flock.

Although it was somewhat dangerous, Skovoroda nonetheless made bold to teach that not only the Prophets, Evangelists and the Church Fathers but also the pagan sages and philosophers spoke under the influence of the Holy Ghost. He attacked the general conception prevailing at the Collegium that genuine faith consisted of strict adherence to the ritual, and that the clergy, the rich, and the ruling classes were more pleasing in God's sight than the poor and the serfs who, in the eyes of the former, were considered as just slightly above the dumb animals. On the contrary, Skovoroda insisted that Christianity was revealed only in humility, well-doing and loving one's neighbor, and that honest labor exalted an individual, whether he be a tsar or a serf. This humanitarian activity is one of the glories of Skovoroda's life, and gave him him influence upon the Ukrainian men of letters of the nineteenth century. The emancipation of the serfs in 1861 was in some measure due to him.

In the period when enlightenment was intended only for the select (the clergy, gentry and nobility) it was quite original of Skovoroda to proclaim that education must not be squandered on the "pontiffs of science alone, who devour it and whom it satiates, but should devolve upon the entire people, enter . . . and invest the hearts and souls of all those who seek to attain the truth . . ."—those who have the right to say: "I am a human being, and all that is human is not alien to me."

It is true that Skovoroda never protested against the institution of serfdom; but he continually protested against the debasement of the common people by their lords who scornfully considered them as a

black, inert mass. To this the philosopher replied: "The common people, so it is said, are asleep . . . But every sleep ends in an awakening; and he who slumbers is not carrion, nor is he a dead, petrified body. Having had enough of slumbering, he will one day awaken, and after his full measure of dreaming, will rise and gather strength."

For being the spokesman of that "black" mass, Skovoroda was often derided as one who carries a candle before the blind, or as a bellringer for the deaf. To that the philosopher would reply with composure: "They know their affair, and I know mine, and act as I know best."

Long before anyone in eastern Europe thought seriously of the spiritual well-being of womankind, Skovoroda was the champion of that slighted half of humanity. Once when a clergyman snickered at the teaching of poetics to women, the philosopher was incensed: "And what is wrong with that? The men are educated tolerably enough, but the women, who are mothers, who share men's lives as consorts, remain ignorant. Are they not human beings? Are they not equal (with us) in their human nature? . . . Is that just?"

The effort to elevate the soil-blackened peasant to the status of a human being was begun by Ivan Vishensky (1550-1620) who in this respect may be considered Skovoroda's precursor and counterpart. Addressing the spiritual and worldly leaders of his age and clime, Vishensky exclaims: "How could you call yourselves spiritual, nay, even faithful, if you consider your brother, baptized by faith in the same bath of baptism and born in equality with you of one mother Grace,—how could you consider him inferior to yourselves? how could you bemean him and hold him insignificant? . . . I ask you, scorner of Christ's name, in what manner are you better than the bondman? Are you not in all respects like the serf?—tell me. Are you not the same matter and clay?—inform me. Are you not the same flesh and blood . . . spittle and corruption?—enlighten me. And if you cannot reveal to me that you are all of stone, bone, or gold, but the same dung, flesh and blood as any man, how can you then claim to be better than the serf?"

The campaign of emancipation and enlightenment of the serfs was taken up by Skovoroda and, through his influence, carried on by Kotliarevsky, Shevchenko, Kvitka-Osnovianenko, Marko Vovchok, Hrebinka and others. Without unduly idealizing the peasant, Skovoroda and his disciples in this humanitarian-democratic field made a noble effort to efface the injustice done to those unfortunates and to make them conscious of their human worth.

The greatest influence in the realm of letters Skovoroda exerted upon Ivan Kotliarevsky, both in the latter's travesty of the *Aeneid* and the dramas. *Natalka-Poltavka*, for example, bears the moral that, it is easy to do good, but difficult to do evil—one of Skovoroda's moral tenets. Shevchenko mentions that in his formative years Skovoroda's poems were a source of delight to him. His philosophic poems and fables also had much to do in the literary development of the fabulist Evhen Hrebinka.

Naturally enough, a man of such unorthodox convictions was a thorn in the side of the ecclesiastical body. The more tolerant of the clergy appreciated his unconventional pedagogy and, for fear of losing him, regarded his innovations in silence; but the majority were openly hostile to him. The main point of contention between them and him was his refusal to accept the Bible literally: its spirit was to him all in all. In order to drive him out of their midst, they accused him of all sorts of evils and heresies: of being a Manichean because he ate neither meat nor fish; of transgressing against Christ's command to love one's neighbors because he would often seclude himself for meditation; of being irreligious because he considered money as an evil. These foolish denunciations and petty persecutions Skovoroda suffered with Christian patience.

To fulfil the wish of Empress Catherine II, a course on Good Behavior was established at the Collegium, and Skovoroda was asked to conduct it. The new task so pleased him that he even refused to accept remuneration for his pains. His very first lecture, however, revealed that his originality bordered dangerously on liberalism, a movement equivalent to the radicalism of our day. His book, entitled *The Rudimentary Guide to Good Manners*, caused him to be called to account for "improper" teaching. He was discharged, and once more became a wayfarer.

From that time on, for the next thirty years of his life, he wandered *per pedes apostolorum* from town to town, from community to community, many a time passing the night under the stars, living like the birds of the sky and the lilies of the field. Wherever he went, he was welcomed with open arms by the poor and the rich alike, who were only too eager to minister to his needs. He became a peripatetic philosopher, a "wandering academy," and his auditorium was the entire Ukraine. His fame as a practical philosopher grew and expanded across the breadth of that steppe country, and wherever he moved it seemed as if he carried with him a soothing balm for the aches and misery of

common humanity. It is said that at his approach cruel lords would even be swayed to mitigate their harsh treatment of the serfs.

Skovoroda loved his native land and its people. "My mother Malorossia and my aunt Ukraine," he would often call his country. Without it he could not exist, and when he travelled abroad, nostalgia he invariably suffered from, and he would long to return to the region with whose nature, songs and traditions he was one, whose expanse he had measured with his own feet. However, his was rather a sentiment of strong attachment to the land of his people. Nationality in the modern political sense was to him a hazy idea. But his yearning for his country's freedom was the bud from which modern Ukrainian nationhood evolved. Freedom he held to be of inestimable value, in comparison with which gold is as mud; and the embodiment of freedom he saw in the great *hetman* Bohdan Khmelnitsky whom he called the "father of liberty."

The first part of his missionary life Skovoroda devoted to the higher stratum of society—the clergy, nobility and gentry. In their own estates and in colleges he taught and exhorted them to mend their negative manner of life. Failing in that effort, he turned to the peasants. In public squares, on crossroads, at village fairs, in hovels, and even in barns he taught the people of the soil the road to spiritual perfection. The perfection of the soul was the common denominator whereby Skovoroda sought to reconcile the masters and the slaves. But even in this arena he did not succeed. The common people accepted the substance of his satiric poems but not his philosophy of the "heart" which, in fact, was too deep for them to plumb. For that reason it was only fitting that he should sum up his mission in this phrase: "The world tried to seize me, but did not." This was his epitaph.

The period of his wandering is not known in detail. Skovoroda was not a man to talk about himself; and Kovalinsky, his Boswell, was in Moscow at that time. For these reasons there is a gap of some twenty years during which hardly anything is known of his activity. Stories, however, were rife; among others, one relates how he escaped matrimony by abandoning his bride just as the marriage ceremony was about to commence. The girl later married someone else, much to the philosopher's relief. The only fact really known is that he never ceased to discuss the problems of life and matters spiritual with all and sundry, intriguing both young and old to exercise their mental faculties. Thus to his very end.

Death held no terror for Skovoroda. In his conception, man is

common humanity. It is said that at his approach cruel lords would even be swayed to mitigate their harsh treatment of the serfs.

Skovoroda loved his native land and its people. "My mother Malorossia and my aunt Ukraine," he would often call his country. Without it he could not exist, and when he travelled abroad, nostalgia he invariably suffered from, and he would long to return to the region with whose nature, songs and traditions he was one, whose expanse he had measured with his own feet. However, his was rather a sentiment of strong attachment to the land of his people. Nationality in the modern political sense was to him a hazy idea. But his yearning for his country's freedom was the bud from which modern Ukrainian nationhood evolved. Freedom he held to be of inestimable value, in comparison with which gold is as mud; and the embodiment of freedom he saw in the great *hetman* Bohdan Khmelnitsky whom he called the "father of liberty."

The first part of his missionary life Skovoroda devoted to the higher stratum of society—the clergy, nobility and gentry. In their own estates and in colleges he taught and exhorted them to mend their negative manner of life. Failing in that effort, he turned to the peasants. In public squares, on crossroads, at village fairs, in hovels, and even in barns he taught the people of the soil the road to spiritual perfection. The perfection of the soul was the common denominator whereby Skovoroda sought to reconcile the masters and the slaves. But even in this arena he did not succeed. The common people accepted the substance of his satiric poems but not his philosophy of the "heart" which, in fact, was too deep for them to plumb. For that reason it was only fitting that he should sum up his mission in this phrase: "The world tried to seize me, but did not." This was his epitaph.

The period of his wandering is not known in detail. Skovoroda was not a man to talk about himself; and Kovalinsky, his Boswell, was in Moscow at that time. For these reasons there is a gap of some twenty years during which hardly anything is known of his activity. Stories, however, were rife; among others, one relates how he escaped matrimony by abandoning his bride just as the marriage ceremony was about to commence. The girl later married someone else, much to the philosopher's relief. The only fact really known is that he never ceased to discuss the problems of life and matters spiritual with all and sundry, intriguing both young and old to exercise their mental faculties. Thus to his very end.

Death held no terror for Skovoroda. In his conception, man is

immortal. His apparent decease is only the loss of his shadow. Life is a dream of the boundless and cogitating thought, and that thought, which is the core of life, is deathless. Man's body, being the shadow of the eternal, loses by death only its secular appurtenances, but immediately gains the attributes of a new sphere of being. Just as a child issues out of the mother's darkful and restricted womb, so does the soul, when the body dies, emerge out of the prison of temporal existence into the freedom of God's never-setting light. And so did Skovoroda go down the pilgrim's path, knowing full well that he is possessed by the life-giving thought, by the spirit as wide as the universe, by the heart which embraces and contains everything but itself is not contained. Life with all its fretting he knew to be the strivings of the thought to reach its end and its coinciding beginning. That is its haven and refuge.

For that reason Skovoroda was not afraid to cast off his mortal husk and its attendant joys and sorrows. Against that supreme change he had armed himself not with reason but with the wisdom which led him peacefully to reconcile himself with the will of the Maker. One is therefore not at all surprised at the scene of his final moments on earth:—It was at Kovalinsky's manor. After a cheery supper, during which Skovoroda entertained his host and fellow-guests, he suddenly rose and disappeared into the night. Some time later Kovalinsky found him digging a grave in a secluded spot. Having requested to be buried in it, the philosopher retired, changed into fresh linen and during the night peacefully breathed his last.

His life welled with altruism. In the words of his later biographer Snegirev, "he lived more for others than for himself, imparted to the people sincere truth, and died without regretting his life as a wanderer, in the course of which he was both a disciple and a master, a singer and a shepherd, but always a sage, striving to rise above his surroundings, to preserve strictly his self-appointed principles, and not to submit to the common thought when it tends to withdraw one from truth and virtue." All his life he reacted against the crass materialism of his day, and by his own example revealed the path to the moral ideal in which truth and wisdom are one.

Skovoroda is often referred to as the "Ukrainian Socrates." No doubt this comparison is valid. Like his Grecian counterpart, the Ukrainian preached self-knowledge for the purpose of the social and moral amelioration of mankind; he likewise used the method of oral inquiry and a similar form of dialectics. In all this, of course, he is inferior to the Greek. In the power of his feeling, however, he is super-

ior, for it must be borne in mind that Skovoroda was a greater idealist than Socrates.

Taking into account the benighted age in which he lived, Skovoroda's knowledge was quite extensive. His first teacher was Nature itself, to which his impressionistic years were abandoned almost totally. His training in the Academy cannot have been systematic; it was, however, rounded out by his own desultory readings. Mainly through his own effort he acquired a thorough mastery of the Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and German languages. Ancient Greek philosophy was only second to the Bible among the subjects of his predilection. He was well acquainted with the pre-Socratic period, Socrates himself, Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, Plutarch; in Roman literature—with Virgil, Cicero, Lucian, Marcus Aurelius, Seneca, Terence. Next in the line of his interest were the Church Fathers. He also paid close attention to the more recent scientific progress as represented by Copernicus and Newton.

The greatest flaw in his literary endeavor is the language which he used. He wrote in a macaronic Slavic, a conglomeration of Russian, Ukrainian and Old Church Slavonic. Besides, his style is ponderous and involved. In his daily intercourse with the people, however, he spoke pure and unadulterated Ukrainian.

It has been claimed that Skovoroda is a "philosopher without a system." In certain respect this is true, for, as S. Yefremov states, "his teachings stand comparison with Socrates, Epicurus, pantheism, dualism, idealism," and many other—isms. What makes him distinct and a philosopher in his own right is his spiritual and ethical hedonism. The happiness of the inner man was his goal. All that is necessary to attain that bliss is to be found within the individual; all that lies without is superfluous and might just as well be disregarded. The pass word that opens the door to genuine happiness is "Know thyself!" For "nothing is more important, more beneficial, more exalted than to discover oneself and to feel in one's ashes the buried spark of blessedness." That is the Socratic core of all his teaching. Self-knowledge is the greatest of virtues and a basic one. It ramifies into all other virtues, the sum of which is happiness, the greatest good. To know oneself is, in reality, to recognize oneself as a part of Divinity.

Skovoroda's philosophy may appear abstract to one who comes in to contact with it for the first time. Nonetheless if it is analyzed even slightly, it becomes apparent that he seeks to effect a harmony between the individual and society. In that, too, lies happiness, for one cannot,

after all, refuse to conform to the prevailing conventionality. Neither can a man become a stylite. It is true that spiritual bliss is preeminent, but while one lives it must be supplemented by that contentment which follows the fulfilment of the tasks exacted by one's physical milieu. In this, as in everything else, Skovoroda was an example for others to follow. He, too, "joined his innate, particular duty with the general obligation." Such was his political morality.

This is the cross-section of Skovoroda's philosophy:—

Life is philosophy, and philosophy is life. The chief reason for human existence, the fountain-head of human actions is the spirit of man, his thoughts and his heart. The aim of philosophy is to give wisdom to the spirit, nobility to the heart, and clarity to the thoughts. These three features go to constitute the happiness of an individual. And happiness is the aim of all positive philosophy.

Since Skovoroda's philosophy is idealistic and its aspect religio-moral, he makes the "heart" the center of all things, for it is the source of human will and emotions, which, in turn, give rise to thought and action.

Following the symbolism of the Bible and ancient writings, Skovoroda couches his own philosophy in figures and images, decking them, as it were, in pristine signs. That is its first characteristic. The second is its antithetic method.

This manner of philosophising Skovoroda borrows from the Sophists, Plato, Plotinus, and Paul the Apostle (cf. "though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich."—Cor. 2, 8:9). The world and all it contains presents itself to Skovoroda in a maze of antitheses. In reality there exist two worlds: one visible the other—invisible. The symbol of life is a tree, the shadow of which represents evanescence. The tree stands firmly, but its shadow is now prolonged and now shortened. So it is with Nature and life: growth, decline, decay. The eternal and the temporal are united with things like the shadow is united with the tree. Matter exists eternally, but its form is changeable. The visible and invisible aspects of the world are quite distinct, and yet there is but one indivisible universe.

By developing this method Skovoroda came to the conclusion that there is "eternity in transiency, life in death, awakening in sleep, light in darkness"; in individual life: "truth in falsehood, joy in weeping, hope in despair"; and in spiritual experience: "sweetness is the reward of bitterness, and bitterness is the mother of sweetness." These opposites

are formed in Nature and merge to compose an absolute whole, as in a circle, where the beginning and the end are one.

Everything that one sees, feels, imagines, including God, is of a double nature. Man is a compound of two parts: one earthly and visible (the creature); the other celestial and invisible (God). The latter is, of course, preeminent, since in nature "that which is invisible is more powerful." The same applies to other natural phenomena, e.g. there are two waters, two airs, two fires, with the material and the divine in each. There is no fusion of the two, and yet they are inseparable, joined irrevocably into a single hypostasis. Matter is not God, nor is God Matter, although He exists within it, without it and above it. To Plato Matter is the "place" where the realization of ideas is brought about; to Skovoroda Matter is the "place" for the vestige of God's imprint.

The world is in perpetual motion which consists of the composite movement of the opposites. All in it disintegrates, and reunites to revive only to disintegrate anew. Thus endlessly. This process Skovoroda compares to a minute fig seed: "Open your eyes and consider . . . its power; you shall see and be convinced that within it is concealed the whole tree with its fruit and seeds . . . numberless millions of fig-tree orchards are contained therein . . . when the old seed decays in the soil, new venture emerges therefrom (to prove) that where there is a relapse there is also a renovation." In other words, where death is, there is likewise a resurrection, with death itself becoming the life-giving force. This analogy, of course, is not original with Skovoroda. He merely paraphrases Philo the Alexandrian, Plotinus and the more recent German mystics who also compared the world to the life of a plant reduced to its seed.

The flesh is the shadow of the inner real man who, in all certainty, is God. Consequently, self-love is the love of God. Narcissus, contemplating his image in the watery mirror, falls in love with himself, hence with God who is in him. The inner man Skovoroda considers to be the "heart," which is the source of thought. "What is the heart if not the soul? What is the soul if not a bottomless abyss of thoughts? What is thought if not the root, the seed of our flesh, blood and other external matter?" And he exclaims: "O heart! . . . how profound art thou! Thou embracest and supportest everything, but nothing contains thee." The "heart" therefore is the compendium of the life of the entire universe.

Even to ethics Skovoroda applies his antithetic method. Passivity is, in reality, ethical activity, and humility its perfection. To conform to the will of God, one must do away with one's own will and accept

God's volition in all things. Man must lose himself in God in order to find himself in the bosom of divine peace and freedom, and become like a ball "to which it is indifferent where it rolls." Only then does man become like unto God. The path to godhead, however, is through the annihilation of his soul, which, in effect, is its purification from earthly passions, desires and cares. These to the soul are what diseases are to the body.

The paradox of "unequal equality" is rationalized in Skovoroda's philosophy in the following manner:—In God's sight all men are equal, but among themselves they are unequal, because they "do not all possess equally the living thought." God fills every part of his creation fully, but only in the measure of the various capacities of things. Speaking figuratively, water can fill the vessels to their very brims, but its quantity depends on how much this or that vessel can contain. So it is with men.

Man is the measure of all things. His heart (which in Skovoroda's philosophy is hardly tinged with sentimentality) is the abysmal abode of God himself, who is Nature in its entirety. Hence man is the microcosm of the macrocosm. From this conception stems Skovoroda's injunction, which is the key-stone of his philosophy:—"Know thyself," "listen to thyself," "look into thyself." There lies the source of all knowledge and wisdom which increase with "rumination." To Skovoroda, as to Philo, a ruminative animal is the symbol of contemplation.

It is only too apparent that the beginning and the end of Skovoroda's cogitation is to seek and find God. And what is God? Nature, Universal Wisdom, the Being of Things, Time, Eternity, Inevitability, Truth, Love. Under these and other guises the philosopher strives to constitute Him in all clarity. And the material for that research is not far to seek, for it is within him, where resides the "genuine man." The problem, therefore, is to understand that "man," to fathom his depths; and the discovery of God will be coincidental. And the result of that discovery? Happiness. Such happiness as consists not of wealth, emoluments, talent, fame, health and the like, but of "peace that passeth all understanding." This happiness is not difficult to gain. It is like sunlight: one has only to open the portal, and it will flood the entire heart.

Skovoroda is not an archaic philosopher altogether. He has a message even for our scientific and materialistic age in which spiritual values are mercilessly sacrificed to the Beezlebug of Utilitarianism. In our times, as he did in his own, he might ask:—Is it fair to the human heart and mind so to debase man as to render him all matter and no

soul? We have "fathomed the sea, measured the earth, air, firmament, disturbed the entrails of the earth in order to extract metals therefrom; we have computed the orbits of the planets, searched out the mountains, rivers, cities (*sic!*) on the moon, found an untold number of unknown worlds: we construct complicated machines, fill abysses, divert and direct water currents, and every day we achieve new accomplishments . . ." And yet! Of what avail are all these achievements in science if they serve only to make confusion more confounded, if they produce in life one chasm after another, each time more profound! Of what avail indeed is the effort if man is thereby reduced to a soul-less creature and the divinity within him is crushed by the coarse ingress of the materialistic demon into the heart of humanity! Only that knowledge which enhances the human worth and improves the quality of life is of importance. Writes Skovoroda: "I do not censure science (on the contrary) I commend the lowliest craft." What deserves reproof is our disregard of the "highest science, to which every age, clime, generation, sex has the door open." That, of course, is the science of the "heart."

In yet one other respect is his message valid in our age:—The present headlong rush for material bliss would appear mad to Skovoroda. All that senseless bustle, he might say, is not conducive to genuine happiness, and the effort spent in attaining physical comforts is too wasteful in comparison with the results, because the appetite increases with the consumption and is never assuaged. To this age, as to his own, Skovoroda would likewise raise the cry—Temperance! and advise that "God made all that is necessary easy to attain, and all things difficult—unnecessary."



INDEPENDENT UKRAINE: FICTION OR REALITY?

By WALTER DUSHNYCK

RECENT events inside and outside the Soviet Union are more than an indication of the new turn in the history of the Soviet state. That all is not well behind the "iron curtain" the world has learned from terse pronouncements from Moscow. After the "liquidation" of the "independent states" of the Checheno-Ingush republic in the Caucasus and that of the Crimean Tartars for their alleged collaboration with the Germans, other events of great importance followed. The industrial purge claimed several thousands of Soviet "specialists" and technicians, many of them now being committed to trial. Out of sight went Maxim Litvinov, who had been in considerable obscurity since 1943. Then the "literary purge" followed, the victims of which were several Soviet poets and writers. Now there are indications that the Soviet Army is the next target. Stalin is particularly concerned about his army, which is reported to be anti-communist and seriously demoralized as a result of its contact with the Western nations.

Events Reported From Ukraine

But it is in Ukraine, that restless perimeter of the Soviet Union's inner defenses against the Western world, that these purges are taking their greatest toll in people, organizations, factories and, indeed, in members of the Communist Party. It is generally assumed that Marshal Zukov's transfer to a post in Odesa last July was due to the growing revolt of the Ukrainian nationalists, who are now said to be claiming more power and independence from Moscow in return for their immense sacrifices in their war against the Germans. According to the Soviet Ukrainian Government in Kiev, these purges have been going on continually for the last year and a half.

On August 23, 1946, Nikita S. Khrushchev, Premier of Ukraine, Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine and member of the Politburo, revealed that a "mass replacement of the Party's personnel is taking place." He declared: "In the course of the last year and a half in

the republic, about half of the leading workers have been replaced." During this period, he added, 64 per cent of all heads of regional executive committees, and 66 per cent of the directors of machine-tractor stations have been replaced. Furthermore, in some districts, such as Sumi district (Eastern Ukraine) 91 per cent of the presidents of executive committees of the regional Soviets have been dismissed, while in the Nikolaev and Rivno districts 83 per cent of all personnel have been replaced.

Premier Khrushchev charged that the Communist Party of Ukraine failed to "organize widespread criticism of the hostile Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist ideology in the press." He complained that "owing to this, there have been ideological mistakes and distortions, attempts to allow rebirth of the bourgeois nationalist concepts of the historian Hrushevsky and his school in some books, magazines and newspapers." The man whom he had in mind was the well-known Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky, first president of the Ukrainian Central *Rada* (1917) and from 1925 to 1930 the most prominent scholar of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev. During the vast anti-Ukrainian drive in 1930, Hrushevsky was arrested along with 45 other Ukrainian savants and exiled to the Caucasus, where he died prematurely in 1934.

Danger in History and Satire

Ukrainian schools, press and literary life were most heavily hit. At a two-day meeting of the Union of Ukrainian Writers in Kiev, held at the end of August, 1946, several writers and editors were criticized and censured for spreading theories connected with Ukrainian nationalism. A study, *The History of the Ukrainian People and Its Culture*, "propagated Ukrainian nationalist ideas, alien to the Soviet ideology," according to the opinion of the Politburo. Another book, *A Survey of the History of Ukrainian Literature*, published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, was condemned because it "had separated literary history from the class struggle and had said nationalism was a decisive factor in the development of literature." Furthermore, it was charged that the book "ignored progressive leaders in Soviet literature, exaggerated the influence of Western European literature and failed to emphasize the ties between Russian and Ukrainian literature." Several writers and poets were denounced for "forgetting fundamental ideological demands of the Party." L. Smilyansky was accused because he "openly opposes the Ukrainian people and culture to the Russian

people and culture"; another writer, A. Kundziuh, was charged with spreading the idea of "patriarchal self-generating origins of Ukraine's people and its culture." A woman writer, V. Tcherednichenko, "idealized the remote past and distorted the life of the Soviet people." L. Kovalenko, I. Pilhuk, G. Lazarevsky and Ostap Vyshnia, all critics, were severely criticized for distorting the actual conditions of Soviet life.

It is interesting to note that Ostap Vyshnia, once outstanding Ukrainian satirist and author of *The Smiles*, was banished to Siberia in 1930. In 1945 he was brought back to Ukraine to combat widespread Ukrainian underground satiric pamphleteering. One of the illegal magazines, *Ukrainsky Peretz (Ukrainian Pepper)* is said to be popular with Soviet Army men. In Kiev *Chervony Peretz (Red Pepper)* was founded in opposition to *Ukrainsky Peretz* and Ostap Vyshnia was put in charge of it; but apparently he did not justify the Communist Party's hopes, inasmuch as the Union of Ukrainian Writers, upon order of the Politburo, charged that *Red Pepper* was "substituting spite and vulgarity for popular humor." The editors of the magazine were further accused of describing the Soviet people as "foolish and spiteful small-town dwellers."

The newspapers *Pravda Ukrainy* and *Radianska Ukraina* were censured for not printing enough articles on the "theory and history of Bolshevism." (*Radianska Ukraina's* editor-in-chief, Luke Palamarchuk, was on a "mission in Canada and the United States." He is said to have come here with other "cultural delegates" to woo over the Ukrainians and Russians to the Stalin-sponsored Pan-Slavic bloc—*The New York Times*, Sept. 9, 1946.)

Stalin's Interpretation of History, 1939

One of the books on Ukrainian history, now condemned as detrimental to Soviet ideology, was published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev in 1941, just a few weeks before Hitler's attack upon the Soviet Union. On page 365, an anonymous author explains the events leading to World War II as follows:

In the fall of 1938, after the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, the bourgeoisie of Great Britain, France and the United States raised a very suspicious clamor about the so-called "Ukrainian problem" in order to poison the atmosphere of Soviet-German relations. The bourgeoisies of those countries wanted to push Germany into war against the Soviet Union.

On page 366 of this *History of the Ukrainian People*, there is another explanation of the Soviet-German pact which precipitated World War II:*

In accordance with its policy of peace, the government of the Soviet Union signed a Soviet-German non-aggression pact on August 23, 1939, in Moscow. *This pact is one of the most important documents in the history of the international relations of our era, because it marked a sudden change in the development of Soviet-German relations and became a "turning point in the history of Europe and not only Europe alone" (Molotov). By signing it Soviet-German hostility, inflamed by war instigators, came to an end.* (Italics added.)

Perhaps, then, "bourgeois Ukrainian nationalism" was not the only reason for the condemnation of the book by the same Politburo which, in 1941, gave the order to interpret the history of 1939 as quoted above. At this time the institute of Marx, Engels and Lenin, an agency of the Politburo, has given it its full approval.

Manuilsky's "Independent" Ukraine

While all these purges and changes are taking place in Ukraine, Ukraines' flamboyant Foreign Minister, Dmitri Z. Manuilsky, is waging his untiring fight at Lake Success against the "Greek menace." Zealous in his role of accuser of British "imperialists," he has failed to realize, however, that the world knows of what is going on in his supposedly "independent" Ukraine.

Though Ukraine has been admitted to the United Nations, it is more than doubtful whether it can carry out any obligations imposed on it as an independent state. It has been disclosed that at Yalta Stalin asked the late President Roosevelt for two additional votes in the United Nations. He is quoted as having asked his American counterpart that for "internal reasons" Ukraine and White Russia should be admitted to the United Nations, since, according to the Soviet constitution, they are independent.

It is worthwhile to analyze the background of the Soviet Ukrainian Republic on the basis of Soviet records and law, for the sake of history and our own interests as well.

During the revolutions of 1917-1918 the Ukrainians proclaimed their democratic republic, which at one time was recognized *de facto*

*) See Review by N. Czubyj "The Ukrainian Quarterly, Vol. I. p. 291.

by France and Great Britain, and *de jure* by the Central Powers. In 1919-1920 the greater part of Ukraine was already conquered by the Red armies, and a fictitious "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic" was installed in Kharkov. According to A. Margolin's *From a Political Diary*, p. 184, the present Ukrainian Foreign Minister, Dmitri Z. Manuilsky, came to Kiev in 1918 as a peace envoy of the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic to negotiate peace with the Ukrainian National Government in Kiev.

Not even a Ukrainian, it is Manuilsky's secret—and the Soviets'—how he effected the transition from being a Russian emissary suing for peace from Ukraine to being Ukrainian Foreign Minister.

On December 30, 1922, the Soviet Union was organized into a federation with Ukraine as a second important "republic-sister." According to the Soviet Stalin constitution of 1936, each Soviet republic maintains its own organization as an independent state. Actually, Ukraine is independent in name only. Article 17 of the Soviet constitution gives the republics the "right to secede" from the Union, but its practical application is hardly possible. It is sheer fantasy to believe that Russia would let Ukraine go free when Ukrainian resources and riches are the basis of Russian's imperialistic growth.

All the branches of the government of Ukraine, according to the Soviet constitution, belong not to the Ukrainian Commissariats (now Ministries) but to All-Union or Russian Ministries. Ukraine has its own ministries, such as public instruction, local industry, communal agriculture and social legislation; but even these are limited and their actions are subject to further limitations by Moscow.

At the head of the Soviet judicial system in Ukraine is a chief procurator appointed by the central Soviet Government in Moscow. The regional and district judges are appointed by the Ukrainian Soviet Government, but confirmed or rejected by Moscow.

It will be even more evident how little the Ukrainian people have to say in their own country, when one takes into consideration the fact that the Politburo of the All-Union Communist Party is the policy-making body, from which the Ukrainians are virtually excluded. The Political Bureau (Politburo) of the Party, which exercises the "dictatorship of the proletariat" and is all-powerful, contains not a single Ukrainian. The present Premier of Ukraine, Nikita Khrushchev is a member of the Politburo, but like Manuilsky, is not Ukrainian, but

Russian. According to the Soviet Constitution, only the Communist Party is empowered to speak and act in the name of the people.

All Soviet legislative or executive organs are "elected" through the Politburo and its local branches in the Soviet republics. It is the Politburo which designates all members of the Supreme or People's Commissars (now Ministers). In the Ukrainian Communist Party, sub-branch of the All-Union Communist Party, all powers are concentrated in the hands of Russians, Georgians, of everybody but Ukrainians. General Secretaries of the Party in Ukraine, are rarely Ukrainians. In the past there were Ukrainians in the government like Mykola Skrypnyk, Panas Lubchenko, Bondarenko, Petrovsky and others. All of them, however, were "liquidated" or forced to commit suicide.

It would be useless to go into further discussion and demonstration of the fact that Ukraine has much less independence than any of our States or the British colonies. Ukraine is not an independent state, but a Russian-dominated country, a fact which is convincingly demonstrated once again by the vast and concentrated purges, instigated and executed by the Moscow central authorities.

The Ukrainian Underground

Another factor that fashions the tactics of Ukrainian Foreign Minister Manuisky in the United Nations, is Stalin's ardent desire to show the United States and Great Britain that the Soviet Union is strong and ready for any emergency. But the reality is quite different, according to those students of Soviet affairs who do not rely merely on the Soviet press.

Premier Khrushchev's revelation about his troubles in Ukraine is only a part of the entire truth. Despite the policy of persecution and mass deportation constantly conducted by the Soviet Government in Ukraine, the Ukrainians remain bitterly opposed to Stalin's regime and do not cease fighting for their liberation. It is now apparent that Hitler's lack of insight with his policy of *Schrecklichkeit* in Ukraine helped Stalin immeasurably in keeping dissatisfied Ukrainians together. Yet in the first weeks of the Soviet-German war entire divisions of the Soviet Army went over to the enemy. Millions of Soviet citizens would have unhesitatingly thrown their lot in with Germany had Hitler realized how bitterly Stalin's rule was detested by his subjects. Instead of that the Nazi "supermasters" employed Stalinist measures on an even more intensified scale.

In the fall of 1941, at the peak of German military might, thousands of the Ukrainians went into the underground to form a Ukrainian Insurgent Army which fought the Germans to the last days of their occupation of Ukraine. The outside world, however, knew little or nothing about the gigantic struggle of the Ukrainian people against the Germans. All the resistance in Ukraine was credited to Stalin's partisans, whose activities, according to Victor Kravchenko's *I Choose Freedom*, were far less effective than those of the Ukrainian nationalist underground. Entire districts and regions in Ukraine were under virtual control of the Underground, which not only fought the Germans but maintained administration and control over a large portion of the Ukrainian people. German supply and ammunition trains were blown up, their man hunts for slave laborers were constantly paralyzed. When they managed to forcefully organize a Ukrainian division, part of it went to the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, and the rest of it, thrown on the Western front, surrendered readily to the American and British forces in April, 1945.

When the Red Army re-occupied the Ukrainian territories, thousands of Red Army men and officers swelled the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. The Germans gone, this Ukrainian Underground is reported to be waging an implacable war against the Soviet forces in Ukraine. They are said to operate in northwestern parts of Ukraine and Carpatho-Ukraine. The Ukrainian Underground is reported as being well supplied with arms and ammunition. A good number of Soviet Army officers, who know Soviet tactics and organization, make this insurgent underground extremely efficient in fighting the Soviet forces. All efforts of the Soviet Government to win the insurgents over have met with still more increased activities on the latter's part. For instance, last fall Ukrainian Foreign Minister Dmitri Manuilsky delivered a great speech before the teachers' convention in Lviv. While his harangue was entirely devoted to the Ukrainian Underground and its almost legendary leader, Stepan Bandera, he promised in the name of the Soviet Government to "pardon" all who will cease their anti-Soviet activities. This was after the "liquidation" of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine.

Anti-Soviet activities, however, have considerably increased last Summer when the Warsaw Government forcefully repatriated over a million Ukrainians to the east side of the Curzon Line. The resistance led to serious difficulties for Stalin's government in Ukraine. Tens of

thousands of young peasants, displaced workers and deserters from the Soviet Army are building up the Ukrainian Insurgent Army.

Dmitri Manuilsky's incessant attacks upon the United States and Great Britain in the United Nations are significant in that they are a part of a plan to divert or conceal the events now taking place in his supposedly independent Ukraine. It is more than certain that the "independent" Ukraine may be one day "liquidated" by an executive order of the Politburo together with Minister Manuilsky, as has happened previously with other Soviet "independent" states and their ministers.



A UKRAINIAN PLAN FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF EUROPE ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO

(The 100th Anniversary of THE BROTHERHOOD OF ST. CYRIL AND METHODIUS,
a Secret Ukrainian Political Organization, 1846-1946)

By NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ

IT IS the task of the men of science to determine whether a people have typical characteristics that last as long as such people continue to live as a group. Some scientists give a positive, others a negative answer. This article, however, supplies material which would prove that the national traits of peoples are more or less constant.

A hundred years have now passed since the inception of the first modern political organization of the Ukrainian patriots, the Brotherhood of St. Cyril and Methodius, which was founded in 1846 in Kiev. A retrospective analysis of the historical events of a hundred years ago will yield the ideas of the Ukrainian people, which have always been the same whether in the times of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, of Mazepa, or times of national and social enslavement of the Ukrainians by others. They prove to be the same now in the atomic age—purely democratic.

A hundred years ago the Ukrainian people found themselves in a state of political exhaustion due to their two-hundred year struggle for liberation. Europe was slowly forgetting the last phase of this heroic struggle undertaken at the beginning of the eighteenth century by the great *hetman* of Ukraine, Ivan Mazepa. The untiring diplomatic efforts of his spiritual successors—the “Mazepintzi,” who against great difficulties tried to continue the fight for the liberation of Ukraine, also were forgotten.

Europe saw the Russian tyranny of Peter the Great as an advent of dark forces. Democratic Ukraine lay prostrate under the heavy boot of despotism. It was Moscow's intention to convince the world that there is no separate Ukrainian people, that the Ukrainians are nothing but southern “Russians,” a part of the Russian people. The Russian Tsars succeeded in this wise and at the beginning of the nineteenth century, ill-advised history experts were, indeed, convinced that the entire European East is inhabited by Russians. Strangely enough this illusion still persists in the heads of some would-be experts on Eastern European history even today.

Defeated But Not Conquered

In the Eastern Ukraine, which was under the control of Moscow from 1654, the Russian government worked to demoralize the Ukrainian upper classes through political privileges at the expense of the common man. This policy was successful and led to a deep division between the Ukrainian masses, subjected to serfdom by the Russians and the Russified nobility. But both nurtured deep hatred for the Russian occupation of Ukraine.

In the Western part of Ukraine, which came under the domination of Russia after the partition of Poland, an organized religious and political terror followed the annexation. Eight millions of Ukrainian Catholics of Oriental Rite were brutally forced to abandon all their ties with the Vatican and Western Europe in order to become part of the Russian nation with its Orthodox religion as a substitute for Catholicism. The Tsar and his government has found a mighty imitator in the present Red dictator, who is mercilessly persecuting the west-minded Ukrainians in this portion of Ukraine which recently went under Communist rule.

Though politically oppressed, the Ukrainians nonetheless retained their strong historical traditions which kept their spirit alive and made them always ready to fight for their liberation. It is this Ukrainian historical tradition which does not let the Master in the Kremlin sleep calmly. The vast purges that are now taking place in Ukraine among even Ukrainian Communists, is the best proof that Moscow is deathly afraid of this spirit of free Ukraine. It was the heroic past of the Ukrainian people which brought about the national rebirth.

The new trend of romanticism which came to Ukraine from Western Europe, brought a literary and cultural movement which attracted the spiritual values of the masses, hitherto expressed in their folklore and tradition. It is only natural that interest in Ukraine's past, its rich folklore, its tradition and the like should awaken the youth of the Ukrainian nobility, who despite their superficial Russification, had retained ties with and memories of the famed Kozak order, which for centuries fought for the "honor, faith, freedom and glory of Ukraine," as expressed by the greatest poet of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko. All this contributed heavily to the awakening of the Ukrainian youth who gradually went over to the camp of those who declared themselves fighters for the social and political emancipation of the Ukrainian mas-

ses. As a result the Ukrainian movement became purely democratic and remains such to this day.

In the first half of the nineteenth century, Pan-Slavism in its first idealistic form had an enormous influence upon the formation of the nationalist ideas of the young Ukrainian generation. This Pan-Slavic movement originated among the small West-Slavic peoples such as the Czechs, Slovaks, Slovenes, Serbs, Croats and Bulgarians in the course of their struggle against Turkey and the reactionary Austria of Metternich.

The best representatives among the leaders of this idealistic Pan-Slavic movement was the Slovak Jan Kollar and the Czech V. Safarik. Their movement had a liberal and democratic trend which recognized the right of each people to organize their own political life. It propagated the idea of a federated state in which all Slavic peoples should be united on the basis of complete political independence and equality.

At the beginning reactionary Russia was definitely hostile toward this liberal movement of small Slavic peoples. Only later on did she succeed in gaining control of it. She was very quick to change this originally liberal and democratic movement into a reactionary one which became an instrument of Russian imperialism. Eventually this Pan-Slavism found its expression in a total Russianism which did not hesitate to persecute bitterly the Slavic Poles, Ukrainians and White Ruthenians. This reactionary Pan-Slavism, redesigned and modernized, is now but a tool of Soviet imperialism directed by the Kremlin.

These two movements, then, occidental romanticism and liberal Pan-Slavism, contributed to the rebirth of Ukrainian nationalism and patriotism among the young Ukrainian generation of the last century.

Leading Personages of the Ukrainian Young Generation of the 40's of the XIXth Century

The study of the history and folklore of a people was particularly responsible for the awakening of the national consciousness among those small peoples who were under the influence of the French Revolution. Ukraine underwent the same process of rebirth. Ukrainian history and Ukrainian folklore already aroused the Ukrainians during the Napoleonic Wars. It is a generally known fact that among the so-called Russian "Decabrist" revolutionaries there were many Ukrainians. Kiev, the national capital of Ukraine, was considered by many Slav leaders as the capital of a future Slavic federation, a fact that contributed also to the awakening of Ukrainian national ambitions.

It was a Pole, Michal Czaykowski, who wanted Kiev the capital of all Slavic peoples, although he would have been glad as well to see Kiev within the frontiers of a restored Poland. The Russian Khomiakov, one of the creators of Russian reactionary Pan-Slavism, also was in favor of Kiev as the capital of all Slavs because, "Kiev could do much better than Moscow or Petersburg as the capital because it lies on the border of two different worlds." It was a natural thing for the Ukrainians to be still more proud and look upon their capital as if it were the national Mecca of Ukraine.

From the first decade of the nineteenth century on the Kharkov University produced a group of Ukrainian historians and students of Ukrainian folklore. Among them was Mykola Kostomariv, the first modern historian of Ukraine. A devoted patriot, he was a man of science and intelligence. In 1845 he settled in Kiev as a professor of the Kiev University. He soon became the organizer of a Ukrainian secret political society. Kostomariv wrote its statutes and laws, and its ideological work. *The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People*, which became a political bible for the Ukrainian youth.

At that time there lived in Kiev another prominent Ukrainian, Panteleimon Kulish, a teacher of a *gymnasium*, an historian and an ardent collector of Ukrainian folklore. Kostomariv and Kulish became the most active members of the Ukrainian youth group in Kiev. Among the latter were such future writers and historians as Mykola Artemovskiy, Vasyl Bilozersky and Opanas Markovich. This group comprised over a hundred young men and women, all of the better classes and eager to contribute to their national cause.

But it was the arrival of Taras Shevchenko at Kiev that considerably enhanced the political prestige of the group. Shevchenko had returned from the Petersburg Art Academy and was already famous for his poetry. A self-made man and once a serf, Shevchenko attracted all who came into contact with him. His romanticism did not limit itself to the study of the history and folklore of Ukraine. He revealed to the group his broad plans for the social emancipation of the Ukrainian peasants and for the political liberation of the Ukrainian people from Moscow.

Thus at the end of 1845 this group of young Ukrainian writers, poets and historians organized the first Ukrainian political organization, the Brotherhood of St. Cyril and Methodius.

Political Ideology of The Brotherhood of St. Cyril and Methodius

The three men, Shevchenko, Kostomariv and Kulish, started immediately on a program for their organization. The attainment of a Pan-Slavic federation was the first and foremost political ideal professed by all the members of the group. "Despite our intentions"—writes Kostomariv in his autobiography—"we conceived the federated system as the happiest life for all Slavic peoples. We saw these Slavs united among themselves in a federation modeled on the ancient Greek cities or the United States of North America".¹

But all agreed that in such a federation of all Slavic peoples, Ukraine should have political freedom and should not be dependent upon the Russian Tsars.

Taras Shevchenko was the political ideologist of the Brotherhood. In his political poems, published in his volume *The Kobzar* in 1838, he called upon his brother Ukrainians to awaken. His poems such as *The Great Tomb*, *The Dream* and *The Caucasus* were known and enthusiastically read by all the Ukrainian *intelligentsia*, and all the members of the Brotherhood used them as their political program. In *The Great Tomb* Shevchenko accuses Russia of being Ukraine's greatest enemy. He blames *Hetman* Bohdan Khmelnytsky for signing a pact with Russia which was the beginning of the political enslavement of Ukraine. He reminds his fellow Ukrainians about the "Ukrainian Lidice" of 1708, when *Hetman* Mazepa's capital, Baturyn, was razed to the ground and its inhabitants slaughtered by Russian troops. Empress Catherine II also continued the process of destroying Ukrainian liberty. In *The Caucasus* Shevchenko defends the ideal of human freedom. He condemns imperialistic Russia for having destroyed the liberty of the Caucasian peoples. He forecasts, though, that the despotism of Russia will perish, and freedom will see its triumph and victory.

Shevchenko's genial vision and his nationalist appeal to the past of Ukraine, were a strong counter-balance to Kostomariv's idealistic romantic dreams of a Slavic federation. Thus Shevchenko's influence upon the political *credo* of The Brotherhood of St. Cyril and Methodius was preponderant and this in brief was: Ukraine should be a free and democratic republic; and she should be a member of the Slavic federa-

¹ *Literaturnoye Naslediye. Autobiografia. Poslednaya Rabota N. I. Kostomarova.* St. Petersburg, 1890, p. 61.

tion on the basis of complete equality with others. Even the Soviet critic of this particular period of Ukrainian history, Ivan Pilhuk, confirms the idea that Shevchenko had definitely influenced the Brotherhood. He writes: "Shevchenko's literary writings have very close ties with the activity of this political society. It was his poetry that contributed to the political program of the Brotherhood".²

The constitution of the Brotherhood provided that all members of the federation were to be democratic. Serfdom was to be abolished and all social classes were to be equal in all free republics before the constitution. Each government of the federated republics would be responsible for compulsory education for all. All class privileges were to be abolished. The death penalty was to be abrogated as well. Religious liberty was guaranteed, but the Brotherhood was not in favor of religious propaganda in order to avoid inter-religious struggle in the member states.

This, however, did not mean that the Brotherhood was indifferent to religion. The Brotherhood itself was based on Christian principles. The name of the organization—from the Saints Cyril and Methodius—indicated that the members of the Brotherhood were imbued with a religious spirit.

One of the leading members of the Brotherhood, V. Bilozersky, wrote: "The Christian religion has brought to the world a new moral spirit, which hitherto has been absent. The Saviour has revealed to humanity love, peace, liberty, equality and brotherhood of all the peoples. He also has given them an understanding of how to achieve these great ideals."

Mission of Ukraine

In Ukrainian history, ancient and modern, there are writers and historians who dwell upon the role that Ukraine was destined to play in the history of human civilization. This subject attracted the attention of men of letters especially during the crucial moments of Ukrainian history. After the fall of the Ukrainian National Republic after the first World War, a young Ukrainian historian, Yuri Lypa, wrote a major study, *The Destination of Ukraine*. In this work the author tries to demonstrate that the mission of Ukraine was and is now to be a vanguard of Western European civilization in the east of Europe. Ukraine

² Pilhuk, Ivan: *Kyrylo-Methodiiske Bratstvo ta Literaturniy Protses 40-60 rokiv*. VITCHYZNA, Kiev, 1946, I.

is bound closely by spiritual and intellectual ties with the Western World; therefore she is capable of fulfilling her mission. Also bordering upon Eurasian Russia, Ukraine becomes the first target in this Eurasian movement westward.

It is significant that the Russian government, whether it was White or is Red, concentrates all its efforts to wipe out all the vestiges of Western civilization in Ukraine. Ukrainian culture, largely influenced by the cultural trends from the West, is particularly persecuted. The Ukrainian Catholic Church was an obstacle to the Russian spiritual expansion in Central and Western Europe. Stalin decided that it should disappear. During the last purges of the personnel of the Communist Party in Ukraine, the Soviet government paid especial attention to the cultural influence exerted by the West.

At the times of the Brotherhood of St. Cyril and Methodius, Mykola Kostomariv in his *Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People*, also touches upon the mission of Ukraine. His book was an ideological catechism for the members of the Brotherhood. His leading thought was that the masses of all peoples are basically good, and that all evil comes from the Tsars and other tyrants.

According to Kostomariv Ukraine's neighbors, "Russia and Poland had tsars and upper classes who perverted Christian liberty, given to men by divine and natural laws. Only Ukraine had preserved the dignity of a human being. Ukraine had neither a Tsar nor a ruling nobility, but instead had her Kozaks who advocated freedom and equality among all men. These Kozaks were completely equal, since their leaders were elected by equal vote and served those who had elected them, according to the teachings of Christ. There was neither aristocratic pomp nor titles among these Kozaks".³

It is incumbent upon Ukraine to defend those who are oppressed, it is Ukraine that, according to Kostomariv, was to be a champion of equality among men. It was Ukraine's mission in the past and it will be her duty to guard those ideals in the future. He wrote: "Tsar and nobility are not of the Slavic family, but of German and Tartar origin... Although Ukraine is politically submerged, she is not dead, her voice that called all the Slavs to freedom, is heard in all the Slavic world . . . She will be heard when she arises from her political tomb, and with her all the Slavic peoples will arise against those who oppress them..."⁴

³ Vozniak, M.: *Kyrylo-Methodievske Bratstvo*, Lviv, 1921, p. 104.

⁴ Vozniak, op. cit., pp. 107-108.

Practical Aims of the Brotherhood

The ideology of the first Ukrainian modern political organization, as indicated by quotation from the *Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People*, was purely democratic. Its mystical coloring was influenced by Adam Mickiewicz's *Books of the Polish Pilgrimage*. But the Brotherhood of St. Cyril and Methodius was not only a society of dreamers. Shevchenko, spiritual leader of the Brotherhood, was not a dreamer himself. According to P. Kulish, the organization had a really practical aim: to raise their own people from mental marasm, and to liberate Ukrainian peasants from serfdom.⁵ The members of the Brotherhood developed a very aggressive activity among the students of the Kiev University. A proclamation issued to the Ukrainian people provided a plan for a republican Ukraine in a confederation with other Slavic peoples.

The second proclamation directed to the Russians and Poles pointed out all the injustices to Ukraine committed by the Russian Tsar and the Polish nobility. It was specifically underlined that neither the Russian nor the Polish peoples as such were responsible for the actions of their government.

The existence of the Brotherhood could not long be kept secret. The Russian police was quick to "liquidate" the organization. But before that happened, the ideas of such a Pan-Slavic federation had spread beyond the borders of Ukraine as far as the Czechs during the Pan-Slavic Congress in Prague in 1848, and also to Western Ukraine under Austria where they were acclaimed by the congress of the Ukrainian Scientists held in Lviv in 1848.

Russian Reprisals

It was self-evident that the Tsarist government could not tolerate such a radical group which planned the dismemberment of the Empire and the liquidation of the Tsarist throne. Through an informer, a student Petrov, the Russian police learned about the existence of the Brotherhood in 1847. Long investigation conducted by Count Orlov, the chief of the Imperial police, brought severe penalties upon the young Ukrainian patriots and dreamers. Although Shevchenko was not found guilty, he received the most severe punishment. After a few months of military training he was sent to a Turkestan desert with special instructions issued by the Tsar himself that Shevchenko should

⁵ Vozniak, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

neither write nor paint during his years of exile. It was more than the premature spiritual death of a great poet. He came back from exile in 1857 completely broken in health and after four short years died.

* * *

The hundredth anniversary of the Brotherhood of St. Cyril and Methodius is the anniversary of modern Ukrainian nationalism. The ideals that were the very foundation of the Brotherhood, are still very much alive today among the Ukrainian people. They want to see their country free and independent in a great family of equally free nations.

The idea of federation with other peoples, however, proved to be a political failure. The Ukrainian idealists of a hundred years ago held the misconception that the enemies of the Ukrainian people were merely the Russian Tsars and Polish nobility, and that the peoples themselves could come to an understanding and be able to solve their political differences peaceably.

But the Revolution of 1917 taught the Ukrainians another lesson. The Tsars and the nobility have gone, yet there is no freedom for the Ukrainians. The socialist government of Alexander Kerensky and the communist dictatorship of Lenin-Stalin did not hesitate to enslave Ukraine again.

Newly-reborn Poland also did not follow the great precepts propounded by Mickiewicz in his *Books of the Polish Pilgrimage*, but like Lenin's Russia went into war against the Ukrainian republic.

The hard reality of the present day has convinced the Ukrainian people that they have to correct the ideas of the Ukrainian idealists of 1846. They know that not a federation with other Slavs but the complete political independence of Ukraine is the only true and just solution of the Ukrainian problem.



APPEASEMENT OF THE USSR AND THE RIGHTS OF SMALL NATIONS

By FLOYD A. CANE

The Movement to Eliminate Small States

A DETERMINED movement by writers of various persuasions during the war challenging the right of small states to exist and proposing their absorption by one or another of the greater powers, has without question had an important influence upon statesmen of the western powers in their policies towards Russia. This movement both rationalized and justified the policy of appeasement of the USSR during and after the war, particularly as it affected the rights and interests of the small states of Central-Eastern Europe. Whether or not this movement had its primary cause in the drive of Nazi leaders, in 1939, to obtain acceptance by the western powers of their proposal to partition the world into three or four great regions under the hegemony of Germany, Great Britain, the United States, and the USSR, at least it began to be discussed on a wide scale at about that time, was later taken up by scientific writers and made the basis of definite proposals to do away with small states. These proposals were directed particularly at the small states of the Central-Eastern European area. This anti-small state movement played a considerable part in providing the leading statesmen of the Anglo-American powers with adequate reasons for yielding to the demands of the USSR as regards this area and thereby sacrificing the principles they had advocated in the Atlantic Charter.

The arguments of the proponents for larger political entities were based upon several leading contentions. Some like George T. Renner, the geographer, would consolidate the small states of Europe into a few political units. Renner proposed the integration of Europe into nine large states, so organized as to include all peoples of common ethnic stock in each unit.¹ Thus the chief causes of contention would be removed, and if each unit were made strong enough to resist encroachments by the others, a durable peace would ensue. Renner's plan is obviously impossible because (1) it would tremendously enhance the power of Germany and the Soviet Union; (2) already existing states

¹ G. T. Renner, *Maps for a New World*, Colliers, June 6, 1942, pp. 14-16.

such as Norway, Sweden, Finland and Denmark would not be willing to join together, or with Great Britain; (3) a Balkan Union, even if it could be created, would be no match for a Greater Germany or an augmented USSR and hence would continue to be the "powder keg" of Europe; and (4) the idea of a satisfied state has been demonstrated to be a fiction. A strengthened Germany and USSR would be even more of a menace to the peace of the world than they were before because their drives for expansion are unlimited. The other states, even in their expanded form, would not be able to resist them.

Other writers of socialist persuasion like G. D. H. Cole have reached similar conclusions but by a different route. Cole opposed the restoration of an independent free Poland and Czechoslovakia and the idea of the federal organization of the states of Central-Eastern Europe because he thought that they would quarrel among themselves or be dominated by their stronger neighbors. Because of modern economic and military developments, great states must be erected whose jurisdiction extended over more than one nationality, and whose powers covered not only matters of peace and war but economic affairs as well. Europe would thus be divided after the war into two or three great states, one in the east dominated by Russia, one in the west dominated by Great Britain, and possibly a Central European State dominated by Germany. Cole seemed to favor the spread of Soviet power over eastern Europe and even Red domination of Germany rather than restoration of the pre-war situation with its capitalistic milieu and its separate, obsolete national states. Unable to provide economic or political security for their subjects, Cole argued, these small states insisted upon their absolute national independence and thus brought about the downfall of the League of Nations and prevented international economic collaboration. This produced international atomism and anarchy.²

Cole's point of view was obviously biased towards Soviet Russia because he seemed to feel that the USSR was the best example of contemporary socialism³ and it would be disloyal not to support her.

Another approach to the subject was that of the apologists for one or another of the Great Powers as exemplified by E. H. Carr, the British publicist. Carr undertook to draw a distinction between self-determination and nationalism by demonstrating that the concept of self-determination involves an act of free choice whereas nationalistic groups are

² G. D. Cole, *Europe, Russia, and the Future*, New York: MacMillan, 1942, pp. 5-9, 32, 73-86, 118-123.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

differentiated on the basis of natural or cultural differences such as race, language, traditional beliefs and customs, etc. While national groups tend to desire to live under the same government in western Europe, he contends, this is not the case in Eastern Europe where, although nationalism is not absent, it is so mixed up with religious, economic, and social questions that it plays a secondary role.⁴

Carr admits that self-determination is still important but attempts to reduce it to a matter of the free choice of individuals and not of nations. On the other hand, in every great state ample provisions should be made for the recognition of cultural differences. Combinations of small states, as in the Little Entente, will not work. The existence of small states with their conflicting policies prevents adequate provision for economic security and results in interference in their affairs by the large states which leads to wars. There is no real solution except submission of small states to the control of a Great Power on the basis of economic security and military necessity.⁵

Defects in the Great Power Theory

This line of reasoning seems to be burdened with an underlying bias which might be called the "great power complex." While Cole pretends to view the European scene objectively, it is obvious that he is influenced by two principal considerations: socialism and nationalism. His predilections for Soviet Russia are so strong that he even dickers with the idea of allowing Russia to absorb Great Britain but later rejects this unhappy solution in favor of a western European bloc of nations under the presidency of Great Britain.⁶

In the case of Carr, the entire book is written as a guide to British foreign policy. Since he concludes on the basis of practical politics that Great Britain would not be willing for long to compete with the USSR in Eastern Europe and evidently takes lightly the desires of the small nationalities of that area, it is not difficult for him to reason away any claims they might have to consideration as national states.⁷ Nevertheless, Carr is compelled to admit that individual men and women should be allowed to consent to their incorporation into a political state subject to the economic and military exigencies of the case and that a state composed of discontented peoples is bound to be essentially weak and unstable.⁸ If these principles had been given adequate consideration

⁴ E. H. Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, New York: MacMillan, 1942, pp. 40-47.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 50-69.

⁶ Cole, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8.

⁷ Carr, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-47.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 48-49.

during the war, Finns, Balts, Poles, and Ukrainians would not have been delivered bodily to the Russians, and the peoples of the Balkans subjected to Soviet occupation and exploitation. No one who knows anything of the facts of the case will contend that these peoples were given either individually or as groups a free choice of whether or not they should become subjects of the Soviet Union. In fact, their political independence was crushed under the weight of superior Soviet power and their liberties destroyed by imposition of a brutal dictatorship. All of the evidence coming from non-Soviet sources goes to prove not only that these peoples did not wish to submit to Russian rule but that if given a free choice now they would in overwhelming numbers vote for severance from the USSR.

Yet, the governments of Great Britain and the United States not only allowed this to happen, they actively cooperated in bringing it about. Churchill's statement that Russia was entitled to friendly neighbors on her western flank was more outspoken but no more indicative of this spirit of appeasement than the silence of the diplomats of the United States at Russia's seizure of territory and incorporation of alien peoples into the USSR and her ratification of these usurpations at the Yalta Conference.⁹

The Doctrine of Appeasement

The bankruptcy of the policy of appeasement of the USSR has now become perfectly obvious. Yet, this doctrine has dominated the policies of the western Allies throughout the course of the war and the postwar period. The theories of Carr, Cole, Renner, *et al.* are thoroughly grounded in the policy of appeasement. Take the case of Cole. In the past an exponent of democracy and political pluralism, here we find him abandoning his democratic views and in particular his former insistence upon the rights of self-determination of social, economic, and political groups¹⁰ and advocating expansion of the Soviet Union over most of Europe, engulfing, if need be, Germany and even Great Britain herself, to say nothing of the small nations of Central-Eastern Europe. His justification for this complete about-face is that modern conditions of transportation and communication and the development of new weapons of war have necessitated obliteration of small states and their subordination to or incorporation into some huge political aggregation.

⁹ W. J. Ehrenpreis and M. Kridl, "Poland," *Central-Eastern Europe*, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1946), pp. 414-416.

¹⁰ G. D. H. Cole, *Social Theory*, New York, 1920.

This would not be too bad, he feels, because Russia is a socialist state. Yet Cole was perfectly aware, when he wrote, in 1942, of the brutal labor policies of the USSR, the harsh regimentation of public opinion, and the policy of bloody "liquidation" of all opposition to the regime.

Why should he, then, be willing to condemn millions of non-Russians to involuntary servitude in order to enhance the power and prestige of the Soviet Union? The aggrandizement of the USSR at the expense of her neighbors is not an indispensable consequence of modern military and economic conditions. On the contrary, the policies of the western Allies in appeasing Russia have operated to raise against them a much more formidable enemy than before. This, of course, was not apparent to Cole and his associates. Blinded by their fear of another war, their desire to have a "satisfied" Russia, or to expand the area of socialism, these writers fell once more into the tremendous error of appeasing a potential opponent of enormous strength. Why they should do so is difficult to understand. The costly results of attempting to appease Germany were even then becoming clear.

The same criticism applies to Carr. His theory, based on a strict power viewpoint, that Central-Eastern Europe is too far away from Britain for the British to be concerned and that, therefore, it should be allowed to fall into the arms of the USSR smacks too much of British appeasement doctrines in the pre-war sell-out of Czechoslovakia and may prove to be an even more costly mistake. Carr's position here is not only illogical but based upon the disastrous appeasement doctrine. It is illogical because the very conditions of rapid transportation and communication and development of new weapons of war to which he and others refer have brought every part of the world into close contiguity and made every trouble spot a source of potential danger to every other part of the world.

It is futile to assume, as Carr seems to do, that the non-Russian peoples of Central-Eastern Europe will be satisfied to remain under Soviet domination. The opposition to Russian rule in Poland, the Baltic States, Ukraine, and the states of the Balkans is becoming all too apparent. By yielding to Soviet pressure, allowing the Kremlin to absorb 274,000 square miles of alien territory and over 24 millions of non-Russian people, the United States and Great Britain have violated the basic principles upon which they fought the war and confuted the doctrines of democracy for which they profess to stand.¹¹

¹¹ See "A Realistic Appraisal of the Peacemaking," *World Report*, 1:14 (August 22, 1946), pp. 22-23.

The Appeasement Policies of the Western Allies

The doctrines of Cole, Carr, Renner, *et al.* rationalized the policy of appeasement adopted by the western Allies towards the USSR. This policy rested upon the premises that only large states can any longer exist and that small states must, therefore, make up their minds to be absorbed or become appendages of one or another of the great powers subject in all essential respects to their control. Perhaps, Roosevelt, Churchill, and other leaders of the western Allies held the mistaken impression that if Russia were to be granted the right to assume hegemony of the small states of Central-Eastern Europe, her intervention would be based upon western models, conceding to the peoples of these areas rights of free elections, freedom of initiative in organizing opposition parties, and autonomy on all political questions except those involving foreign relations. Perhaps, they even believed that these peoples would be consulted by the Soviets and given a choice of coming under Red control or remaining independent. This assumption seemed to be implied in the terms of the Yalta agreement.

Yet, acceptance of this theory would impute to these leaders a degree of naivete hardly comprehensible under the circumstances. Reference to the record will make this clear. In September, 1939, the USSR declaring that the "Polish State and its government" had ceased to exist, invaded Poland before she had surrendered to Germany and proceeded to divide Polish territory with the Nazis. On the pretense that the majority of the population of Eastern Poland were non-Poles, but Ukrainians and White Ruthenians, Red agents conducted a bogus election in the area after arresting or deporting all opposition leaders in which a majority vote was obtained in favor of incorporating Eastern Poland into the USSR. In November, 1939, the territories of Western Ukraine and Western White Ruthenia were made a part of the Soviet Union. In January, 1944, Stalin proposed to the Polish Government-in-Exile that Poland's post-war frontier be established at the Curzon Line and that German territory be ceded to Poland to balance her losses in the east. In spite of their pledges in the Atlantic Charter and elsewhere that the will of the population would be respected, the Allies made no move to oppose this. A strange silence prevailed in Washington and London while Stalin beat down the legitimate government in London and proceeded to set up his "Union of Polish Patriots" as the puppet government of Poland. At the Moscow Conference in October, 1944, the Allies weakly yielded and attempted to compromise.

Finally at Yalta, in February, 1945, Churchill and Roosevelt agreed to the cession of Western Ukraine and Western White Ruthenia outright to Russia, adding insult to injury by yielding most of the places in the new Polish government to Stalin's puppets.¹² The agreement to cede Eastern Poland was made without conditions whereas the promise to Poland of German territory in compensation was made subject to ratification at a peace conference.

Even less justifiable was the careless and ill-considered manner in which the Ukrainian people were handed over to the tender mercies of the Red dictator. During the thirties while millions of Ukrainians were being killed, starved, or deported for their resistance to collectivization not a word of protest came from the governments of the United States and Great Britain. No recognition was given to the fact that the Ukrainians are not Russians and do not wish to remain under Soviet control. The large Ukrainian populations of Eastern Poland, Bessarabia, and Bukovina were handed over to the USSR without a word of protest. The existence of a Ukrainian Insurgent Army fighting even now against the Soviets seemed to make no difference and even the desperate pleadings of Ukrainian displaced persons in the American and British sectors of Germany after the war not to be sent into Soviet territory failed to convince the Allies of this fact. Anxious to please, and appease Russia, Allied statesmen cooperated with the Kremlin in reducing millions of non-Russian peoples to slavery.

What Do the Western Powers Gain?

So far, little has been said of the rights of the smaller nations of Central-Eastern Europe. The reason for this is that to base an argument against obliteration of the identity of these small nations or their complete subordination to the Russian colossus upon moral principles is bound to fail unless it can be shown, concomitantly, that it is not to the best interests of the western powers to allow this to happen. This becomes apparent when it is recalled that these powers in the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms proclaimed ideals applying to these as well as other peoples which they later repudiated because the ideals were seemingly in conflict with their self-interest. Hence, it would be unprofitable to spend much time demonstrating that mere size is no criterion of the right of states to exist unless it can be shown that human,

¹² See the author's chapter on "Central-Eastern Europe Under Russian Occupation," *Central-Eastern Europe*, op. cit., pp. 609-612; and "Poland's non-Communists Balk at Russian Rule," *World Report*, 1:4, June 13, 1946, pp. 10-12.

cultural, and civilized values are correspondingly enhanced by bigness. Obviously, they are not. On the other hand, the right to exist as independent political entities should belong to national groups as well as individuals if they feel the necessity of this. Carr's argument that the peoples of Central-Eastern Europe have no real desire to establish themselves as separate states will not stand analysis. All recent indications show that these peoples value this right as much as they do life itself. Certainly, every individual and every group which feels itself to be consciously differentiated should have the right to be consulted before being bartered about from one sovereignty to another. This does not mean a plebiscite conducted under threat of torture or deportation but an election managed in such a way that consent can be freely given without fear of consequences.

The argument that nations can be grouped together under the common sovereignty of a large state and still enjoy cultural freedom would be true only under certain special conditions. These would have to include the right freely to consent to enter into such a relationship; to be accorded constitutional guarantees of the areas of freedom they desire and merit; and to have a voice in the government which is to rule over them. No such specifications were laid down by appeasement ideologists of the western powers and no attempts were made to insist that the small states of Central-Eastern Europe be granted these privileges before being forced into the Soviet Union against their wills. On the contrary, the policies of the Allies were based strictly upon their fear of the military power of Soviet Russia and their disinclination to be forced into a stand upon the morality of the situation which might lead them into war.

In like manner, the argument that small nations must yield their lives to large states because only in this way can the advantages of rapid transportation and communication be fully utilized, and trade facilitated, turns out to be only another phase of the appeasement argument. This doctrine rests upon the assumption that if small nation-states lying between large states are eliminated then communication and trade will be speeded up. This would be true only if the large states, so reconstituted, were willing to trade and communicate and placed no impediments in the way. Seemingly this was what the appeasers had in mind when they advocated handing these small states over to Soviet Russia. Yet, experience has demonstrated that, far from facilitating trade and communication, imposition of Russian control over this area has brought it to a complete standstill. Moscow has blacked out

the entire area as regards communication and refused to trade with the Allies across the border, or allow commerce on the Danube to be opened up. Nor does the past record of Russia's trading policies with the Allies offer much hope for the future.

The same thing is wrong with the argument that the existence of small states promotes wars. In the first place, this is not true since small states are not in a position to make war and will not do so normally unless they become the puppets of large states which may have belligerent aims in view. Certainly, the small states of the pre-war era were victimized in this way but it does not follow that if they are brought under more complete domination by a larger power, it will make for peace. The present example of Yugoslavia's belligerent policy towards the United States under the direction of Tito and his Russian-sponsored government is an excellent case in point. The theory that elimination of the small powers in Central-Eastern Europe would solve the problem of danger of outbreak of wars in the Balkans is thus exploded. In fact, because they acted as buffers between the great powers, small states, reluctant to become the battlegrounds of contending armies, did what they could to stave off war, helped to mitigate the grinding clash of the competitive policies of the great powers, and lessen belligerent tensions. Now that the forces of the USSR and the western powers stand face-to-face across a common border in Europe, is the danger of conflict any less than before? On the contrary, the tensions have vastly increased and the danger of open conflict seems much more imminent.

In summation, therefore, it has become abundantly clear that the policy of appeasing the Soviet giant has not worked. Although, the USSR has profited in territory and populations, acquired as a result of the war, more than any other power, she is not appeased. On the contrary the gains she has already obtained have only whetted her appetite for more. Instead of accepting her gains and cooperating with the western powers in making a peace settlement as she was expected to do, Russia is pressing against her borders on all sides and testing every weak spot in the allied armor with the object of expanding her holdings still further.

On the other hand, the Allies have sacrificed their moral principles and lowered themselves from their high moral position by selling out their Allies and friends to the USSR while at the same time they have by their appeasement policies vastly strengthened the power of the Soviet Union to oppose them and possibly to make war upon them. Instead of resulting in expanded trade and commerce between nations,

the great power theory has had just the opposite effect. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the policy has miserably failed in every particular.

What Is To Be Done?

Since without question continuation of the present policy of appeasement of the USSR will not work, what can be done to save the situation? It is the thesis of this article that had the western powers lived up to their moral commitments, stood by their friends and Allies in the Baltic States, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Ukraine, and the Balkans, and resolutely opposed their absorption by the Soviet Union, their present position would have been much stronger both morally and politically. The fact that this was not done has weakened the Anglo-American powers and strengthened the relative position of the USSR towards them. The solution lies, it is suggested, in two policies, one a short-term and one a long-term program. The short-term policy should have as its essential feature the breaking of Russia's grip on the Central-Eastern European area and over the nation-states of that area including whole Ukraine. The long-term policy should aim at the organization of Central-Eastern Europe in terms of voluntary association in a federation large enough to stand by itself yet capable of preserving the values of national cultures and local self-government.

As regards the short-term policy the *sine qua non* is how to implement it without producing war. Fear of war should not be allowed to interfere since this is one of the most potent causes of appeasement policies. War cannot be avoided by strengthening your opponent. Conversely, it may be prevented by weakening him, or if it turns out to be unavoidable, by staging it at a time when you are in a stronger and he in a weaker position. The time seems ripe now to abandon present futile defensive policies and pursue offensively and vigorously a plan of splitting the opposition. Everywhere in Central-Eastern Europe a reaction is setting in against the Communist invader. Within the USSR itself rumors are emerging, in spite of the blackout of news, of disaffection amounting (in Ukraine and certain other areas) almost to civil war. Mounting dissatisfaction with existing conditions seems also to prevail among the Russian population generally. In Ukraine, nationwide opposition to Stalinist policies has led to formation of secret, underground armies of liberation which, backed by aid from abroad, are bravely carrying on a life and death struggle for liberty from the Soviet tyrant.

A similar resistance movement is being maintained in Poland and

probably, less spectacularly, among Russia's other so-called satellites. This aid from abroad should be vastly strengthened. A leaf from the Soviet book might be taken. Secret aid could be given the anti-Soviet organizations of the various refugee nationalist Polish, Ukrainian, Baltic, and other groups. Though the United States government could not officially sponsor such aid, it could remove its present oppositionist attitude and by permitting private individuals and groups to organize to this end, enable them to secure more effective results than at present. A powerful propagandist organization should be erected to promote anti-Soviet propaganda among non-Russian peoples both at home and abroad. This campaign might be strengthened by a reassertion of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and a statement by public officials of the intention of their respective countries never to recognize or accept the breakup or seizure of any territory of friendly allied powers by force. While, no doubt, the western powers are bound by the Yalta and other secret agreements with the USSR, they cannot be deterred from expressing their disagreement with them or of advocating new arrangements more in accord with justice. A determined campaign of major proportions along this line would do much to place the USSR on the defensive, strengthen the opposition of dissident elements in the Soviet Union, promote internal dissension, and weaken the foreign policies of the Kremlin. If conducted with sufficient skill, determination, and funds, it might lead to civil war and eventual disintegration of the USSR. This would be a godsend for the western world.

The second, long-term, step would involve organization of the peoples of Central-Eastern Europe into a federation, permitting interstate trade and commerce, and common policies of defense, yet providing adequate guaranties for cultural devolution and local autonomy. If voluntarily entered into and democratically run, such an organization might go far to solve present difficulties. Moves in this direction have already been made.¹³ From the point of view of the power situation, if such a grouping proved sufficiently cohesive and was efficiently organized it might function to bar what remained of the Soviet nightmare from the confines of Europe and at the same time balance the power of Germany. Much experimenting would, no doubt, need to be undertaken but, without question, the possibilities in this plan for finding a way out of the present impasse are very great.

¹³ See Feliks Gross, *Crossroads of Two Continents*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1945, Chs. III-VI.

JOHN DEWEY'S LIFE-WORK VIEWED BY A FOREIGN OBSERVER*

By VOLODYMYR BEZUSHKO, M.A., PH.D.,

JOHN DEWEY began as an idealist, and later he formed his own view of the world. Positivism gained his interest but not thoroughly. In philosophy as well as in pedagogy he has developed new ideas based on philosophical tradition. He has aimed at bringing old elements into agreement with the necessities of our time and these he has seen in methodology, logic, pedagogy, sociology etc. He has stirred many minds by his deep observations of children.

John Dewey reveres nature and considers human beings as constituents of nature and nothing else. The most distinctive fact of nature is motion. A great many phenomena can be explained by it. Motion produces alteration, but Dewey also perceives static elements, which are combined with changeable ones in an organic way. Movement in social surroundings produced language and even mental powers, a new phenomenon in nature. The special physico-chemical compositions produced forth what we term soul. The analogy of music seems brilliant to Dewey, since this, though a most ethereal art, is most mechanical in its peculiarities and construction.

Impulses, the inborn tendencies of man, attain meanings in social surroundings, and they yield habits. Man is a being of habit, not of understanding. Our understanding is a product of our habits. We think when hindered, in order to overcome the hindrances in our way. Different surroundings produce different habits and thus different men. The human mind should be decisive in forming appropriate habits.

Dewey sees union and association in nature everywhere; and therefore we do not wonder that he considers social phenomenon as the principal phenomenon of nature and the leading principle of man. In one passage Dewey expresses his thought that man encounters brutal forces only in nature and advises men to look for rescue by cooperation with other men; men wring secrets from nature cooperatively and in the same way shape a better social life. The deepest

* A "Summary" in the author's treatise in Ukrainian, *John Dewey Philosopher and Pedagogue*.

influences go from man to man and on that account man is greatly influenced by family, comrades, good neighbors, spoken words etc. Regeneration will be brought about by free associations of men, and so he warns man against a conviction that a favorable change will set in by itself. No man, he says, is bound to obtain it himself.

What about the question of the freedom of man, and the question of free will? Dewey perceives besides other constituents wilfulness and freedom in nature. Man, belonging to nature, partakes of its constituents. Man should make use of freedom within the boundaries designated by nature. In that connection Dewey notes that freedom without an economic basis is illusion.

Dewey expresses his opinion in such matters of life as religion and art, too. Religion is, he says, a general favor of human nature. Art is indispensable to man, an innate requirement. He prefers religion as well as art to blossom as genuine flowers of life. Art, by bringing satisfaction, delight and freedom fulfils its moral function; whoever makes art and play lose their infinite freedom, robs them of their moral function. In former times knowledge enabled men to subject other men. Francis Bacon made possible the subjection of nature. Dewey desires that knowledge shall serve to better the life of man. It is possible to investigate the situation carefully and then reach conclusion. On the basis of consequences we are to judge things and events. The value of ideas is dependent on guiding action and they are verified by action.

From the naturalistic standpoint it is impossible to explain such manifestations as perception and forethought. Some perceive contradictions in Dewey's philosophy as, for example, contradiction between the world as organism and the pluralistic view of the world, between the principle of continuity and evolution which brings novelty. We remark that Dewey's views are many-sided as life itself is. He surprised people holding a mechanistic view of the world by asserting that the formula S-R is insufficient to understand man, because every man as an individual needs individual treatment.

There is a general agreement as to the importance of his analysis of our way of thinking. Dewey says that all our theses should be controlled by reference to the concrete material. As to the conception of the concrete we call attention to such remarks of Dewey as: the first necessity for scientific thinking is to be freed of the tyranny of sensitive stimuli and habits; that freeing is a condition of progress (*How We Think*); and: "Objects and qualities as they naturally present themselves or as they are "given," are not only *not* the data of

science but constitute the most direct and important obstacle to the formation of those ideas and hypotheses that are genuinely relevant and effective" (*Logic*, p. 425).

Dewey, though now closely associated with the phenomenologists, thinks that nevertheless we reach truth, though it may be very scanty. He is of the opinion that by experiment we can improve our social life. Some have wanted to name his philosophy experimentalism, though Dewey has thought more than experimented. Knowing the limits of our potentialities, he says that humility is more needed at the moments of our triumph than at those of our failure.

* * *

In education Dewey seeks to develop personal self-reliance in the pupil and the socialization of the pupil, after having made known to him the foundations of industry, economy and politics. He wants to educate the fighter for a better life and society. (1) He names power, glory, honor, magnificence, truth: noble ideas; he calls diligence, obedience, moderation, humiliation—plebeian ideas. (2) He knows such male properties as courage, energy, and a spirit of enterprise, and such female ones as submissiveness, indulgence, gracefulness, and faith. (3) He wishes to endow society with attributes of good, truth, beauty, power, and harmony.

In education, movement is to be an educational element. Elementary education should be built upon four instincts: the social instinct, the building instinct, the investigating instinct and the instinct of self expression. In the child's ninth year Dewey perceives a transition from the play phase to the work phase and in the 12th year a transition to reflective thinking. Independently acquired knowledge is best and most lasting, and on that account the laboratory method is the best one. It has been observed that Dewey's formal grades favor science and manual arts as subjects of instruction and those of Herbart, the humanistic subjects.

Dewey first made the child the center of the school, and then after he emphasized the child's socialization. The demands of Dewey on the teacher are very high. He wishes the instruction to be led along the line of personal interest. But in fact it is decided by the social circumstances and the material conditions of a person. The social necessities decide in the matter of school programs, and the teacher is obliged to suit the programs to the pupil's capacity. Dewey thinks that instruction

should begin with science and come later to humanistic subjects and not vice versa.

In his school Dewey wanted to make movement an educational element. This modest beginning has re-echoed in the whole world, making its influence felt on such systems of instruction as the Dalton Plan, which has given due regard to the individual demands of pupils, the labor school of G. Kerschensteiner, at which group work has been cleverly prepared, the Russian technological school, at which industry has been made a foundation even of elementary school, the Decroly school, at which the self expression of children has reached its climax, the project method—and the concentrated instruction.

In the Dewey School the pupils gained confidence in their capacities and powers and learned to know that society is a matter of great importance. Probably the aim of the school was put too high, but the school has passed into the history of education as a significant experiment in constructing new school curricula, and many ideas originated by Dewey, while directing the school, have been used in contemporary schools throughout the world.

Play has been made an inseparable essential part of school life by Dewey. The school is obliged to teach its pupils suitable forms of play. Dewey perceived that school discipline had weakened and he considered this fact abnormal and resolutely gave his ideas for restoring school discipline: the pupil is to accommodate himself to, and to pay attention to, the rights of others.

John Dewey gave education a new meaning to parents and teachers, and gave delight and freedom to create to children.

With Whitehead and B. Russell he represents the contemporary Anglo-Saxon philosophy, and is a worthy successor to such pedagogical authors as John Locke and Herbert Spencer.



RUSSIA AND THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REVOLUTION 1917

By WALTER DUSHNYCK, B.A., M.A.

IN MARCH, 1947, it will be thirty years since the mighty Empire of the Russian Tsars met its doom in one of the greatest revolutions of the world. In the general upheaval that engulfed all of Eastern Europe, Ukraine and her people took an active and decisive part. Long oppressed, yet always striving for their national freedom, the Ukrainians saw in the fall of the Romanovs the beginning of a new era in their national existence. They were encouraged not only by the highly inflammable slogans of the Russian Revolution, but were also led to believe as well that World War I would bring a new and better order for a war-weary humanity. Woodrow Wilson's principles of national self-determination found a healthy and spontaneous response in Ukraine.

The new Russian Provisional Government which succeeded the corrupt Tsarist regime, however, considered itself the heir to Tsarist imperialism and continued to deal with non-Russian peoples in Tsarist fashion.

While America and other democratic countries acclaimed the advent of the new revolutionary government in Russia, the newly-liberated peoples of the Empire found themselves preparing for a new and momentous fight for their national freedom.

Ukraine was the major country among the latter. Had her national independence had support and cooperation from the supposedly democratic Russia of Kerensky, the whole history of the 1919-1939 period would have certainly taken a different course, and perhaps avoided the domination of Communism in Eastern Europe and World War II.

The character of the Ukrainian role in this turbulent period can be briefly summarized. The Ukrainian Revolution was more than a concerted protest against tyranny. It was the expression of a desire stifled for centuries for the regaining of its independence, with attendant freedom for its political, cultural and spiritual life. With a background of a separate and distinct language, art, thought and way of

life, the character of the revolution in Ukraine was first and foremost a nationalist affair.

1. The Ukrainian Status in Russia

Forced to ally herself with Russia in her struggle with Poland, Ukraine under *Hetman* Bohdan Khmelnytsky concluded the Treaty of Pereyaslav in 1654, with Tsar Alexei of Russia. Thereafter, the many attempts on the part of Khmelnytsky's successors, *Hetmans* Vyhovsky and Doroshenko, to drive the encroaching Russian troops out of the country were in vain, despite the aid rendered later for reasons of mutual interest by the Poles and the Turks.

Meanwhile, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was becoming gradually Russified. The Metropolitan of Kiev, dependent upon the Patriarch of Constantinople was placed in 1685 under the domination of the Patriarch of Moscow through the interference of the Russian Tsar.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, *Hetman* Mazepa of Ukraine, allied with King Charles XII of Sweden, led the Ukrainians against Peter the Great. Both were defeated at the Battle of Poltava in 1709. Catherine the Great delivered the final coup in 1775 when she destroyed the Zaporozhian Sich, the last stronghold of the independent Ukrainian Kozaks.

After 1775, Ukraine, on the right and left bank of the Dnieper River, lost her autonomy and was partitioned into administrative districts (*gubernias*) and was placed under the control of the central Russian government in St. Petersburg.

But though Ukrainian political life was suppressed, Ukrainian nationalism underwent a strong resurgence beginning in 1798, with Ivan Kotliarevsky, Taras Shevchenko, Panteleimon Kulish, Mikola Kostomariv, Petro Artemovsky and others as the leaders of the national and cultural *risorgimento* of the Ukrainian people. Their literary activities aroused the Russian Minister of Home Affairs, Valuev, to issue a formal *ukase* in 1863 forbidding the printing of Ukrainian books, saying, "The Ukrainian language does not exist, has never existed and cannot exist."¹

The Revolution of 1905, rocking Ukraine as well as Russia, brought temporary alleviation. The Russian Government consented to the use of the Ukrainian language in private schools, in the press and

¹ Clarence A. Manning: *Ukrainian Literature*, p. 71.

in books, and in cultural and scientific societies, subject to the approval of the authorities. The Ukrainians organized political societies and sent their representatives to the *Duma*.

The life of the Ukrainian masses was still unchanged, however, and their rights as well as those of the Russian people were very limited as compared with the peoples of the Western European countries. Yet it was at this point that the Ukrainian national movement gained its strongest impetus. Despite the ensuing reaction which saw the political parties dissolved or driven underground, newspapers abolished, and the forbidding, once again, by the Russian Premier Stolypin, of the use of the Ukrainian language in public life because he considered the Ukrainian national movement a stepping stone to separation,² the desire for freedom grew rapidly in strength and intensity and culminated in the proclamation of independence in 1917.

2. The Ukrainian Situation in Austro-Hungary

The Ukrainians enjoyed more privileges in the Austro-Hungarian Empire than in Russia. With the accession of Emperor Franz Joseph to the throne in 1848, all the numerous nationalities comprising the Empire were given substantial rights.

The General Ruthenian Council (*Holovna Ruska Rada*) was organized in Lviv on May 2, 1848, and took upon itself the task of mobilizing the Ukrainian political forces throughout the Empire. In 1860 Eastern Galicia, the seat of the Ukrainian national movement, was granted autonomy and a local diet was organized in Lviv with both Ukrainian and Polish representatives participating, the latter forming a large majority. Ukrainian deputies were elected to the central Austrian Parliament in Vienna.

The Ukrainian language was admitted in schools, courts, administration and the press. The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, which recognized the sovereignty of the Pope, was unhampered. Political parties, cooperatives, cultural and sport societies, banks and other organizations were allowed to function with the utmost freedom.

Education became so widespread that illiteracy rapidly fell far below that in Ukraine under Russia. General economic conditions, however, were poor, and the peasants were no better off than in Russia.

Thus, at the end of the nineteenth century, the Ukrainians in Eastern Galicia had begun to dream of a free, independent state with

² Doroshenko, Dmytro: *History of the Ukraine*, Edmonton, 1939, p. 601.

its attendant advantages and, by 1918, had fully united with the Ukrainians in Russia in their efforts to form a vast Ukrainian independent state.

3. The Russian Revolution and the Ukrainians

March, 1917, found the Russian Empire in turbulent disorder, following a series of economic and military disasters.

In Ukraine, the people not only were directly affected by these disasters but they suffered because of their nationalism as well.³ Thus, the Ukrainians hailed the fall of Tsar Nicholas in March and believed that this was the beginning of a new era in their history.⁴

The question of autonomy separated all the various nationalities from the newly constituted Russian Provisional Government. The Finns, Estonians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Georgians, Poles and Ukrainians met with hostility not only from the Provisional Government but also from those Russian groups which still desired to have the Empire remain intact.

As the minority peoples organized along nationalist lines of action, the Provisional Government became more amenable to compromise. For example, on March 6, 1917,⁵ the Provisional Government approved the Finnish constitution. On March 28, it issued a proclamation recognizing the Georgian Orthodox Church as autonomous and outside the jurisdiction of the Russian Holy Synod.⁶ It also released a vague proclamation on April 11, 1917, promising amelioration of conditions for the Polish people.⁷

The Ukrainians, having suffered severe repression under the Tsar, were not extensively prepared when the Revolution came. Acting slowly at first, they gradually gathered sufficient momentum to proclaim their autonomy late in 1917.

At the beginning, the Ukrainian Revolution was more cultural and social than political. The Tsarist regime had destroyed the Ukrainian parties and organizations during the reaction in the first decade of the twentieth century but some parties like the Ukrainian Progressive Party (founded in 1908) were organized secretly and functioned underground.

³ Khrystiuk, Pavlo: *Ukrainska Revolutzia. Zamitky i materialy do istoriyi ukrainskoyi revolutzii*, Prague, 1921-1922. (4 vols). Vol. 1, p. 7.

⁴ Vynnychenko, Volodymyr: *Vidrodzennia natsii*, Kiev-Vienna, 1920. Vol. 1, p. 31 et seq.

⁵ *Viestnik Vremennogo Pravitelstva*, March 7, 1917.

⁶ *Ibid.*, March 28, 1917.

⁷ *Ibid.*, April 12, 1917.

However, the Ukrainian Revolution found the people lacking in many essential political and nationalist elements in the early days, and not until later did most of the leaders realize that to achieve their independence, they would have to strike out for themselves, independently of the Russian proletarian movement.

At first, the Revolution in Ukraine was led by the newly founded cultural and educational societies, economic organizations and groups, the committees of workers, peasants, soldiers, and professionals, but within a few weeks the Ukrainian Central *Rada* (*Ukrainska Centralna Rada*) was founded and took the leadership of the nationalist movement.⁸

4. The Ukrainian Organizations

COOPERATIVES: These were large organizations existing legally throughout Ukraine. Their purpose was in part the distribution of economic goods and the creation and maintenance of small bank and credit establishments. They also maintained cultural and national activities, such as national festivals, concerts commemorating famous poets, *hetmans*, etc. The Ukrainian *intelligentsia*, in general, participated in the cooperative movement and gave it valuable leadership.

In March, 1917, the Central Committee of Cooperatives was formed to unite the cooperative movement throughout Ukraine and give it central direction. In the first days of April, 1917, the Ukrainian cooperatives held a congress in Kiev which passed a momentous resolution demanding autonomy for Ukraine.⁹

ZEMSTVOS: These were provincial councils established in 1864 in which the nobility, the town bourgeoisie, the *intelligentsia* and the peasants were represented. They exercised some autonomous influence in education, health and road construction measures. Although not purely Ukrainian, most of them favored the Ukrainian national movement, published provincial papers in the Ukrainian language and later supported the Ukrainian Central *Rada* in its struggle against the Russian Provisional Government.

TEACHERS AND STUDENTS: These were organized before the war. They held congresses, conventions and lectures for peasants and workers. To promote Ukrainian literature and education in the Ukrainian language, they formed a "Society for the Propagation of Instruction in Ukraine." Teachers and students also worked in *Prosvita* (Enlighten-

⁸ Khrystiuk, op. cit., I. pp. 13-14.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

ment) societies and cooperatives and were the vanguard of the Ukrainian Revolution.¹⁰

UKRAINIAN SOLDIERS: The Ukrainian national elements in the Russian army played an extremely important part in the Revolution. Soldiers and officers of Ukrainian nationality from the beginning supported the movement for the Ukrainization of the army and backed the demands of the Ukrainian Central *Rada* for autonomy. The Russians were finally obliged to recognize the demand for separate Ukrainian forces, and these regiments later formed the nucleus of the Ukrainian national army. The spirit of the Ukrainian soldiers was uncompromisingly nationalist as shown by the first and second Military Congresses in Kiev during the first months of the Revolution.¹¹

UKRAINIAN PEASANTS: Despite the efforts of the Tsarist regime, the Ukrainian peasants had not been Russified and when the Revolution broke out, were still consciously Ukrainian. Their strong reaction to the poetry of Shevchenko is the best proof of this. Persecution served only to sharpen the distinction. They formed a huge reservoir from which the *intelligentsia* drew fresh blood. When the Revolution came, they held congresses and conventions, such as the first Ukrainian Peasant Congress on April 6-7, 1917, in Kiev, at which they passed a resolution demanding national autonomy and the distribution of land among the peasants.¹²

UKRAINIAN WORKERS: This class was not very well organized at first, because it was largely composed of imported workers from Russian industrial centers. These enjoyed preferential treatment inasmuch as the factories were generally owned by the Russians. The proportion of the Ukrainian workers in the factories, however, steadily increased during the war and when the Revolution came, the Ukrainian workers formed a strong nucleus in support of the national government.

5. The Ukrainian Political Parties

The Russian Government forbade the formation of Ukrainian political parties in the nineteenth century, but after the 1905 Revolution, they were permitted for the first time. Besides the legal parties there was the secret Ukrainian Revolutionary Party (*RUP*), from which others stemmed later. The platform of this party is set forth in

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

a brochure, entitled *Independent Ukraine*,¹³ prepared by Mykola Mikhnovsky, a Ukrainian lawyer and organizer of the *RUP*, and an outstanding figure in the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917. The party advocated the complete separation of Ukraine from Russia. Several leaders of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 were members of the *RUP*, including Simon Petliura, Dmytro Antonovich, Volodymyr Vynnychenko, Andrey Livitsky, Volodymyr Sadovsky, Volodymyr Chekhovsky, M. Porsh and others.¹⁴

The most revolutionary of the reborn parties in March, 1917, was the Ukrainian Progressive Party (*TUP*) which changed its name to the "Union of Ukrainian Autonomists and Federalists" in April, 1917. The program of the party called for autonomy for Ukraine within a federation, distribution of land among the peasants and state control of large industries.¹⁵

The second of these reorganized parties was the Ukrainian Social Revolutionary Party which had been secretly organized in 1913 and published an illegal organ called *Borotba* (The Struggle). Its program called for:

1. Political autonomy for Ukraine
2. Cultural and educational freedom for the Ukrainians
3. Distribution of land among the peasants.

The party held its first public convention on April 4-5, 1917, and demanded the convocation of a Ukrainian Constitutional Assembly in order to proclaim the autonomy of Ukraine.

The Ukrainian Social Democratic Party, led by V. Vynnychenko, a brilliant author and later premier of the General Secretariat of Ukraine, followed the Russian Social Democratic Party on social questions. It also supported the autonomy of Ukraine.

The Ukrainian Radical Democratic Party also favored Ukrainian autonomy within a federated Russia and was more willing to compromise with the Russians.

In the summer of 1917 a shift began, impelled by the class turmoil of the nation. The parties gradually aligned themselves in two broad groups, although retaining their own organizations. On the extreme left, there was the Communist Party of Ukraine and on the right, the Ukrainian Nationalist Party. The latter demanded the complete independence of Ukraine under a *hetman* or other executive.

¹³ Fedenko, Panas: *Ukrainsky bromadsky rukh 20-bo viku*. Podiebrady, 1934, p. 10.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁵ Khrystiuk, op. cit., I, p. 33.

These parties together with the Ukrainian organizations and social groups, led the Ukrainian National Revolution.

The Ukrainian patriots residing in St. Petersburg and Moscow, the Russian *chinovniks* (officials), officers, soldiers, teachers, students and workers, took a very active part in the March Revolution. For example, the Volynsky Guard Regiment, composed chiefly of Ukrainians, refused to shoot down the Russian workers when ordered into the streets to put down the outbreak in St. Petersburg.¹⁶ Various Ukrainian organizations and political parties in St. Petersburg and Moscow supported their compatriots of Kiev in the struggle for autonomy with the Provisional Government.

6. The Formation of the Ukrainian Central *Rada*

The March Revolution created unprecedented enthusiasm in Kiev. From the time of the founding of the first Ukrainian state on the Dnieper River, Kiev had been the center of art, culture and learning among the Ukrainian people.

Amid the turmoil of revolutionary events, the principal Ukrainian organizations, banding together for the common cause, organized the Ukrainian Central *Rada* (*Ukrainska Centralna Rada*) in Kiev, on March 17, 1917. Their platform was "the establishment of the territorial autonomy of Ukraine and the guarantee of the rights of the national minorities."¹⁷

The first act of the Central *Rada*, lead by Professor Mikhailo Hrushevsky, an outstanding Ukrainian historian who had just returned from exile, was a greeting sent to Premier Lvov and Minister of Justice Alexander F. Kerensky, with the expression of the hope that "in a free Russia all the legal rights of the Ukrainian people will be satisfied."¹⁸

The formation of the Ukrainian Central *Rada* was one of the most important events in the modern history of Ukraine. Although at first the *Rada's* authority extended only to Kiev and Kiev province, it was the first time in a century and a half that such an organization had arisen to speak in the name of the Ukrainian people. Although the *Rada* had no specific program, its driving force was derived from the desire of autonomy for Ukraine. As Khrystiuk states, this lack of

¹⁶ Lototzky, Alexander: *Storinky z mynuloho*. Warsaw, 1939, Vol. III, pp. 318-326.

¹⁷ *1917 god na Kievshchyni. Kbronika sobytty*. Gosudarstvennoye Izdatelstvo Ukrainy. Sostavly A. Yrhizov, V. Manilov, F. Yastrebov. 1928. Kharkiv, p. 4. Citing *Visty Ukrainskoyi Centralnoyi Rady*, No. 1.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4. Citing *Visty Ukrainskoyi Centralnoyi Rady*, No. 2.

program was a boon in that it permitted free discussion of all problems and gave the leaders time to align the masses who had been released from serfdom but fifty-four years earlier.¹⁹

On March 22, 1917, the *Rada* issued a proclamation headed "To the Ukrainian People," in which it urged the Ukrainians to fight for their rights. On the same day, the Ukrainian officers from the Kiev garrison formed a Ukrainian Military Council under the auspices of the Central *Rada* to organize the Ukrainian soldiers in Kiev.²⁰ On March 27-28, a Ukrainian Cooperative Congress was held in Kiev which, besides holding a discussion on economic affairs, passed a resolution demanding Ukrainian autonomy.²¹

On April 1, the *Rada* organized a huge demonstration in Kiev in which 110,000 persons participated. Armed Ukrainian troops marched together with students, bourgeoisie, representatives of different organizations and the clergy, under 320 Ukrainian flags and banners. Resolutions and messages demanding autonomy for Ukraine were continually sent to St. Petersburg. The Provisional Government met these with silence.

Thus the attitude of the Ukrainians regarding autonomy was beginning to crystallize. The idea of an All-Ukrainian Congress now matured. The *Rada* wished to extend its authority and influence, while organizations and parties outside Kiev desired to be represented. In its struggle with the Russian Provisional Government, the Central *Rada* had need of the support of every group in Ukraine to back its demands. Furthermore to become the spokesman for a nation rather than a province, the *Rada* had to organize an administration for the entire country and transform itself into a national government.²²

7. The All-Ukrainian National Congress in Kiev

These were the reasons for the convocation of the All-Ukrainian National Congress, which finally met in Kiev on April 18-21, 1917. There were 1,500 delegates representing Ukrainian organizations, parties and societies in Ukraine and beyond her frontiers. There were, for example, delegations from Moscow and St. Petersburg, the Baltic and Black Sea Fleets and Ukrainian representatives of Eastern Galicia. This last delegation was extremely important because it marked the

¹⁹ Khrystiuk, op. cit., I, p. 16.

²⁰ *Kievskaya Mysl*, No. 68. Cited by *1917 god na Kievshchynie*, p. 10.

²¹ Doroshenko, op. cit., I, p. 46.

²² Khrystiuk, op. cit., I, p. 38.

first open move for union of both Greater Ukraine under Russia and Western Ukraine under Austria-Hungary, which was to be achieved on January 22, 1919.

With nationalist fervor, various committees prepared extensive and detailed reports. So intense was the Ukrainian tone of the first National Congress in modern Ukrainian history that when Commissar Sukovkin, representative of the Russian Provisional Government in Kiev, attempted to speak in Russian, he was shouted down.²³ After heated debates, the Congress agreed on autonomy as the most important point and passed resolutions, summarized as follows:²⁴

1. The Congress recognizes that "only national territorial autonomy will secure the needs of the Ukrainian people and all other nationalities on Ukrainian soil."
2. The Ukrainian and other non-Russian peoples should have autonomy in a Russian federated system of government.
3. The Russian Constitutional Assembly should be convoked, but the Ukrainian activity during the interim should be concentrated on preparing for autonomy.
4. The Central *Rada* should be recognized on the national basis as the highest Ukrainian authority, with representatives from all minorities participating.
5. The Congress "recognizing the right of every nation to self-determination," urges:
 - a) That the frontiers between the states in the Russian Empire should be determined by the will of the people in the territories affected;
 - b) That besides the representatives of belligerent states, delegates from nations not recognized as states but on the territories of which war was being waged (meaning Ukraine) should be permitted to attend the future Peace Conference.

The Russian Provisional Government did not answer these resolutions.

The All-Ukrainian National Congress also drafted a plan for the reorganization of the Central *Rada*. Two-thirds of the members were to represent the cities and provinces as such and one-third the cooperatives and the political parties as organizations. The total membership was to be 150, but because of the revolutionary crisis, the *Rada* never

²³ *Ibid.* Annex II, I, p. 125.

²⁴ Doroshenko, *op. cit.*, I, p. 59; Khrystiuk, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 39-40; 1917 *god na Kievshynie*, p. 30.

actually adhered to this figure. On March 17, 1917, the *Rada* numbered 112; in July it was 800. The members were elected by local committees, and the election of members from the cities and the provinces was based on universal suffrage. The members from the cooperatives and parties were chosen by the respective committees and organizations. About fifteen percent of the theoretical total membership of 150 was supposed to be chosen by the Central *Rada* itself. Among these were to be representatives of minorities, proportionately distributed. Actually the *Rada* never chose any members, for the minorities sent their own delegates.

The Central *Rada* thus was a mixture of the territorial system and corporative representation. According to Doroshenko, it was representative of all Ukrainian groups.²⁵ Because of the crisis and the tempo of the times, the disproportionately large number of delegates from the professional and other organizations was never cut down. Later, with the influx of workers' and soldiers' deputies, these groups became the majority. Therefore, the *Rada* became gradually more and more leftist and radical.

The *Rada* called itself the "representative organ of the entire Ukrainian nation" empowered to "execute the will of this nation as expressed by the first Ukrainian National Congress."²⁶ The *Rada* elected an executive body of between eighteen and thirty-three members to handle its functions while it was not in session. This body became known as the "Committee of the *Rada*" or the "Little *Rada*" and functioned until the creation of the General Secretariat on June 25, 1917.

A new period in the Ukrainian movement began with the creation of the Central *Rada*. Following the All-Ukrainian National Congress, the Ukrainian masses took an active part in the struggle for the autonomy of Ukraine.

The Ukrainian peasants held their own congresses not only in Kiev but in almost all other Ukrainian provinces, including Odesa, Kherson, Kharkiv, Poltava, Katerinoslav, Podolia and Chernihiv.

Khrystiuk writes that the Ukrainian masses, chiefly peasants, were neither reactionary nor radical and that the Ukrainian Revolution was neither socialist nor communist.²⁷

²⁵ Doroshenko, *op. cit.*, I, p. 71.

²⁶ *Instruktsia Ukrainskoyi Centralnoyi Rady*, No. 1, Published in the *Visty Ukrainskoyi Centralnoyi Rady*, No. 4, 1917, pp. 3-4.

²⁷ Khrystiuk, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 47-48.

Some Russians agreed with this. Thus the Communist historian Zolotarev writes:

The typical characteristics of the social structure of the population of Ukraine, the nationalist stamp of the struggle for "liberty and land," the geographical situation of Ukraine as the *place d'armes* on the crossroads of world revolution, to the markets of the east and to the shores of the Black Sea—all these factors contributed to the various characteristics of the Ukrainian Revolution.²⁸

He continues:²⁹

In this lack of class distinction lies the strength of the bourgeoisie. Its slogans were that the land should belong to the *kulaks* instead of to the Ukrainian proletariat, and national freedom should be taken from the Russian workers—it means the struggle against the "commune" and the bolsheviks.

Contrary to the Russian, the Ukrainian policy had a distinctive nationalistic stamp. It relied exclusively on the classes of its nation to destroy the class struggle within the national organism.

The Ukrainian soldiers also played a leading part in the national autonomist movement. In April 1917, they demanded the formation of the first Ukrainian regiment. The Russian Provisional Government, fearful of the massing of armed Ukrainians, refused despite the offer of the Central *Rada* to send the regiment to the front.³⁰ Nevertheless, the Ukrainians organized the Bohdan Khmelnytsky Regiment and the Russian command was obliged to recognize the *fait accompli*.

From May 18 to 21, 1917, the First Ukrainian Military Congress was held in Kiev and this passed a resolution requesting the Provisional Government to recognize the autonomy of Ukraine and appoint a special minister for Ukraine in the Provisional Government. Another resolution pledged support to the Central *Rada*, a third urged "peace without annexations and indemnities" and the fourth urged the Ukrainization of the army.³¹

The Provisional Government's attitude was expressed by Alexander Kerensky, Minister of Justice, who told the Central *Rada* in June while on a visit to the southeastern front:

Wise Ukrainian people will find a good solution together with the Russian people, and the Constitutional Assembly will decide the question.

The All-Ukrainian National Congress, composed of delegates from

²⁸ Zolotarev, A.: *Iz istoreye Centralnoy Ukrainskoy Rady* (1917) god. Kharkiv, 1922, p. 3.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³⁰ Khrystiuk, op. cit., I, p. 49.

³¹ 1917 god na Kievshchynie, pp. 66-67.

all walks of life and all shades of political belief voiced this undying desire for independence and freedom. Its convocation marked the end of the first period of the Ukrainian Revolution. An organized and intensified struggle between the Ukrainians and the Russian Provisional Government then began. Through their official and representative body, the Central *Rada*, the Ukrainians demanded national autonomy. The Provisional Government, however, was inflexible in its stand on Ukrainian autonomy. It would wait until the convocation of a Russian Constitutional Assembly, and this only would have the right to pass on such political questions as a separate, autonomous government for Ukraine.

This procrastination on the part of the Provisional Government in its dealing with the Central *Rada*, was largely responsible for the swift spread of Bolshevik propaganda in Ukraine, as well as in Russia. It finally precipitated a crisis which not only caused the downfall of the Provisional Government itself, but left Ukraine and other countries politically and militarily unprepared to cope with the force which was Bolshevism. Once again oppression fell upon Ukraine. Once again the opportunity for the resurrection of a democratic and stabilizing state in Eastern Europe was lost.



COMMITTEE FOR THE AID OF REFUGEE UKRAINIAN SCHOLARS

OUR APPEAL TO YOU:

"It Is More Blessed to Give than to Receive"

If ever in our times the immutable moral truth imbedded in this perennial injunction for more humanized existence stands clearly and boldly beyond the facade of verbal equivocation enshrouding any degree of individual or corporate selfishness and self-centeredness, it is now. In western and southern Europe today are thousands upon thousands of refugees heavily laden by the plight of bare livelihood and the dreaded uncertainties of the future. Most of them are non-Jewish and constituted in large number by Ukrainians torn from their native land by Soviet oppression and persecution. Freedom and the desire to live as free and worthy human beings form their only sustaining hope amidst material privation and hardship. Today they are being partly and temporarily maintained by UNRRA and the charitable aid of many private organizations, which truly represent the response of stirred consciences toward the misfortunes of others, but what of tomorrow, when governmental relief sponsorship subsides and the exhaustion of private funds is reached? Will the problem cease then? Equally important, what of the hundreds of talented students of world culture whose value to American and Canadian life may prove immeasurable?

With an eye toward this serious problem and the hope of resolving it as much as possible, the Committee for the Aid of Refugee Ukrainian Scholars has been formed. It was widely recognized by countless Americans, Canadians, English, and Ukrainians that among the thousands of unfortunate Ukrainian refugees are exceptionally talented and highly resourceful scholars, artists, and writers whose actual contributions to Ukrainian and human culture have already been immense and whose potential renditions to American and Canadian cultural development bear great promise. Certainly, and concretely, a man who served intimately with Bohomoletz at Kiev in the formulation of a life-extending serum, or a man who was destined to paint the portrait of Stalin and is now undertaking one of Pope Pius XII, or a man who

has laboriously worked on many volumes of Eastern European history admittedly bears special promise in the freer climate of American and Canadian cultural activity and portends to be an economic charge upon no one. These prominent cases mount in number and deserve the fair attention of all far-seeing Americans and Canadians. Many do foresee their vital contributions.

To obtain affidavits and funds for the settlement of these many stranded scholars in either the United States or Canada is the prime objective of the Committee which consists of many prominent names. The organization is made up as follows: Dr. Nicholas D. Czubytyj, editor of the *Ukrainian Quarterly*; Mr. Lev E. Dobriansky, New York University; Miss Julia Kusy, Bellmore Ed. Sys., N. Y.; Mr. William H. Chamberlin, author; Prof. Alexander A. Granovsky, Univ. of Minnesota; Prof. Clarence A. Manning, Columbia University; Dr. T. K. Pavlichenko, Univ. of Saskatchewan, Can.; Prof. Vladimir Timoshenko, Stanford Univ.; Prof. Nicholas Britsky, Univ. of Illinois; Dr. Mykola H. Haydak, Univ. of Minnesota; Dr. Isydore Hlynka, Canadian Science Service; Prof. Watson Kirkconnell, McMaster Univ., Can.; Prof. Alexander J. Nedzel, M.D., Univ. of Illinois; Dr. Murray Senkus, Univ. of Indiana; Prof. George W. Simpson, Univ. of Saskatchewan, Can.; and Prof. Stephen Timoshenko, Stanford University. Moreover, sponsoring the work of the committee are Honorable Rhys J. Davies, M.P., House of Commons, Eng.; Rev. Dr. Gustave Dumas, S.J., Fordham Univ.; Very Rev. Dr. Robert I. Gannon, President, Fordham Univ.; Hon. Anthony Hlynka, M.P., House of Commons, Can.; Rev. John Haynes Holmes, the Community Church of N. Y.; Dr. Sidney Hook, New York Univ.; Lancelot Lawton, author; Dr. Broadus Mitchell, Int'l. Ladies' Garment Wrks.' Union; Mr. Norman Thomas, author; Mr. Louis Waldman, counselor at law; and Dr. Bertram D. Wolfe, author.

The work of this organization has succeeded so far in establishing relations with two well-known religious bodies for the issuance of corporate affidavits to transport and re-settle here a favorable number of these refugee scholars. Through one of these groups the matter is being presently accomplished in Europe: the execution of corporate affidavits, as well as private affidavits, await momentarily financial arrangements to be made by people who in goodwill fully sympathize with this project.

Yet, the work already accomplished still leaves many notable Ukrainians, possessed of similar talents and unblemished character as

the persons referred to above, uncovered. It is particularly to extend further our aid to include them that we make this appeal to every reader of this journal for funds or private affidavits. Their cultural and economic promise is unquestionably sound, not only to themselves but to the further free growth of American and Canadian culture. For such an end, you can justly say—"It is more blessed to give than to receive!"

Address all material to:

Mr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Secretary
C. A. R. U. S.
Washington Square College
New York University
Wash. Sq., N. Y. C.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE WAR AND UKRAINIAN DEMOCRACY, by N. Hryhoriiv.
Toronto, 1945, 206 pp.

Prof. N. Hryhoriiv, the author and a prominent member of the old Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionary Party, actively participated in the building of the Ukrainian National Republic after the first World War (1917-1920). He is now in America. In writing *The War and Ukrainian Democracy* the author wanted to prove that democracy was always a predominant force among the Ukrainian people. It is almost self-evident that such people like the Ukrainians, without big capitalists or owners of great landed property, could not be anything but democratic. During the war, however, here in America there were trends, inspired by the communist propaganda, that were hostile to the Ukrainian people, and that questioned the democratic character of the Ukrainian movement.

One may question whether the author has fulfilled his purpose in his book. Prof. Hryhoriiv presents several documents which are supposed to prove his thesis. He himself writes only short introductory notes to each chapter, of which there are eight. The two first chapters are filled with the documents of the ancient history of Ukraine; therefore, these are of great importance, inasmuch as the Slavic departments in American libraries are far from complete.

In the ensuing chapters one notices that because of his lack of contact with Ukraine, the author is compelled to limit his sources of information to the Ukrainian press published in this country. The documentary value of such information, therefore, is questionable.

The author, being a socialist, believes that socialism was the only decisive force in the Ukrainian movement. He undoubtedly underestimates Ukrainian nationalism which, before the outbreak of this war, had a following of 90% of the young Ukrainian generation. For the same reasons he overestimates the effect of communism in Western Ukraine, where most of the members of the Communist Party of Western Ukraine were not native Ukrainians. Prof. Hryhoriiv, furthermore, ignores those trends and cultural movements of Western Europe which

had a definite influence upon the formation of the Ukrainian democratic mind.

Nevertheless, for the most part Prof. Hryhoriiv was able to compile historical documents of value and excerpts from the press in a book which could be handy as a reference source for newspapermen and editors.

NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ

"MARTYRDOM IN UKRAINE," by Walter Dushnyck. The America Press, New York. 45 pp.

The best possible way to counteract propaganda is to pull the props from under it, by exposing to public view the real and bare facts which such propaganda obscured. This has been admirably achieved by Mr. Dushnyck in regard to that very much obscured picture in recent history of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, in territories recently occupied by the Soviets, "voluntarily" breaking its Union with the Catholic Church of Rome, renouncing the supremacy of the Pope and "returning" into the fold of the holy Russian orthodox Church under the Moscow Patriarch.

No reader having perused the 45 pages of Mr. Dushnyck's volume filled exclusively with facts and excerpts of documents is likely to ever fall for the Soviet propaganda line about "spontaneous religious movements of the masses, who wished to throw off the yoke of Rome." Here is an *exposé* in cold facts of the various subtle as well as brutal methods of engineering undertaken by the Soviet Government to bring about the "free and voluntary" apostasy of some five million Catholics, who had been Catholics since the sixteenth century. The engineering feat was carried out by two separate arms of the Soviet Government: the secular NKVD and the spiritual Patriarchate of Muscovy. The method of approach and execution of the appointed task was typically Soviet: the proper Church authorities were by-passed (for convenience all the Bishops were imprisoned, exiled or killed), the masses of the people were not consulted on any point; instead, a committee was brought to life consisting of *three parish priests*, and those three with the blessings of the NKVD and subsequent approval by 213 more "delegates," delivered all 5 million Ukrainian Catholics into the hands of the Moscow Patriarch, who welcomed them to their "Mother's embrace, to the Russian Orthodox Church."

The liquidation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church was the first act of its kind performed by the Soviet Government after World War II. Undoubtedly, judging by events shaping in Yugoslavia in recent weeks, similar acts will follow and they will follow the same pattern. Already the Primate of the Catholic Church of Yugoslavia was condemned for "treason," it is but a few steps more and the masses of Catholics in Southern Europe will likewise be welcomed into the fold of "Holy Mother, Russian Orthodox Church."

It is well that a document of Mr. Dushnyck's insight and exposure of unadulterated facts is available at this time: it will enable religious leaders to be on guard and clearly foresee developments in all those countries which are satellites of Moscow. It would be wishful thinking to expect that knowledge of the procedure of their machinations will forestall any moves by the Soviets, or their arm, the Russian Orthodox Church, once they have embarked on the course of eliminating the Catholic Church in another country. Future writers on the encroachment of the power of the Soviet State upon the religious freedom of its subjects would do well to follow the pattern set forth by Mr. Dushnyck: get the facts, publicize the facts and nothing but the facts, and no propaganda machinery will be able to refute them.

In conclusion, it is noteworthy to add that although the booklet deals with religious persecution, it is not silent on the political plight of Ukrainians under Soviet rule, and although the author does not say it in so many words, the reader himself must come to the conclusion that Ukraine will have religious freedom only when she achieves political freedom.

ROMAN OLESNICKI

UKRAINE—BETWEEN POLAND AND RUSSIA, by Nicholas D. Czubyj, Ph.D. Reprinted from *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 331-351.

The author begins his discourse by mentioning two cases of recent years in which Ukrainian-Polish and Ukrainian-Russian territorial problems were settled arbitrarily. The first marked the abandonment by the Polish government, after 600 years, of claims to Ukrainian lands. The second is the proposal by the Soviet Union accepted by the United Nations that Ukraine be admitted as an independent nation to the world organization.

Proposing the thesis that "these two events do not herald any

Golden Age for Eastern Europe" the author gives an historical analysis of the Ukrainian nation and its ethnological and political problems and their implication for neighboring states. Of interest is the point made that at Russia's insistence that Poland has given up its claims to Ukrainian territories and has reclaimed Germanized lands which she had claimed hundreds of years ago. This situation supplies "plenty of material for Polish-German troubles for another 600 years," the writer predicts.

The relaxation of Polish claims however does not solve the problem of Ukrainian independence. Reviewing the relentless persecution by the USSR of Ukrainian institutions notable among which is the Ukrainian Catholic Church the author states: "The terroristic rule of the Kremlin over Ukraine in the last 25 years does not afford us an example of a liberal solution. On the contrary, it gives us ample proof of the attempted extermination of its (the Kremlin's) opponent." The persecution of the Church in Ukraine is described in narrative detail.

The monograph is highly recommended for any who wish a true picture of Ukraine today. There is no independence in Ukraine "where persons are being deprived by the Soviets themselves of even the most elementary human rights." The method of subjugation of a people by attacking its most fundamental institutions is outlined and offers a good insight into the Bolshevik psychology. A worthwhile study of nations, conflicts, persecution and suffering.

No student of East European problems can afford to fail to read *Ukraine—Between Poland and Russia*.

MICHAEL J. NAGURNEY
Associate Editor *The Ark*
Stamford, Conn.

PEACE ATLAS OF EUROPE, by Samuel Van Valkenburg. *Duel*, Sloan and Pearce, New York, 1946, 179 pp.

This book, published by the American Foreign Policy Association, was written by three members of the editorial staff of the Association. The first part of *Peace Atlas of Europe*, by Mr. Valkenburg, is a serious study of the problems of political boundaries. The author stresses the importance of economic and ethnographical factors and the question of future national minorities. Yet his main theme is how to preserve security and lasting peace, and for that he is ready to sacrifice the principles of justice outlined by the Atlantic Charter.

Analyzing the new map of Europe, the author is of the opinion that the Netherlands should be augmented territorially, disregarding the fact that any addition of German territory will certainly be a seed of future conflicts. The Rhine region, according to the author's reasoning, should be an independent state, while the Saar, Alsace and Loraine should be directly incorporated into the French Republic.

Mr. Van Valkenburg has no hope for the Baltic States and believes that no force will ever take them away from the Soviet Union. The Curzon Line, dividing the new Poland and the Soviet Union, is held to be just and the best possible solution. But he is guilty of certain historical inexactitudes when he writes that this boundary was a "line of demarcation between Soviet Russia and the new Poland state" in 1919. Actually it was not so. It was a frontier between Poland and Eastern Galicia, which at that time was not as yet part of the Polish state, but under the disposal of Council of Ambassadors in Paris. Farther north the Curzon Line separated Poland from the independent Ukrainian National Republic, which at that time was at war with the Soviet Union. In discussing the new frontiers between Poland and the Soviet Union, the author ignores the existence of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, which, of course, is incorrect. He knows, on the other hand, that in Bukovina there are Ukrainians who were striving for an independent Ukrainian state in 1917.

The book was published before the Stuttgart speech of Secretary of State Byrnes, but the author thinks that the western frontier of Poland is only temporary, because the Germans would never consent to the annexation of their ethnographical territory.

Mr. Valkenburg has no definite plan for Trieste; he thinks that ethnographically it should belong together with western Istria to Italy, but for economical reasons he would rather see them annexed by Yugoslavia. The author touches the problem of Balkan federation, the Dardanelles and even Ireland. Palestine should be given to the Jewish people as their national state.

The second part of the book contains shorter articles. Groves Haines in his *Political Factors in Boundary Making* analyzes those political and economical factors which contribute to the final boundary decisions. Martin Ebon in his *Clashing Power Interest* discusses the international situation, aggravated by the rivalries of the Great Powers.

With a few exceptions, the book provides interesting material and can serve as a good source of information on European relations.

NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ

POLAND'S RIGHTS TO JUSTICE, by Andrew J. Krzesinski. The Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1946. 120 p., \$2.00.

This book was intended to present the case of Poland as a victim of Allied dealings with Stalin's Russia. In writing it, Dr. Krzesinski no doubt had good intentions. Carried away, however, by uncritical belief in his cause, he has failed to prove that Poland's stand is one of complete righteousness. It is an historical fact that Poland fell victim to Nazi aggression; that there was no breaking in morale or resistance of Polish people with respect to the German "super-master"; that they contributed considerably to the Allied cause with their armed forces and their underground movement. All this is known and recognized.

But when Dr. Krzesinski speaks of the "attractive Polish nationalism," and Poland's historical "mission," he is open to severe criticism from those who treat seriously the tragic history of the Eastern European nations. In his romantic appraisal of Poland's historical "mission" he does not recognize the plight of submerged peoples who regard Polish nationalism in the same manner as Dr. Krzesinski regards the nationalism of Hitler or the communist imperialism of Stalin. Discussing the results of the Yalta Agreement and the loss of half of pre-war Poland, the author is guilty of some historical inexactitudes. For example, he states that the Poles were a predominant "majority" in those Ukrainian and White Ruthenian territories lost, and that the Ukrainians and other peoples had willingly come under Polish domination in the past because "Polish nationalism, Polish character and way of life . . . were very attractive" (p. 66).

Dr. Krzesinski has, of course, a right to his own opinion. However, it is not in Poland's interest to write about her imperialistic and denationalizing policies with regard to the Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Jews and White Ruthenians. These people have their own views on "attractive" Polish nationalism, to be sure, quite different from those of the author, for they were direct victims of the Polish brand of expansionism.

Polish nationalism was largely responsible for the growth of Russian imperialism. After the Polish-Ukrainian war of 1648-1651, Ukraine was forced to seek "protection" in Russia, giving the latter a considerable push in her western expansion. In 1667, Poland and Russia divided Ukraine and imposed serfdom on the peasants, hitherto unknown there. Then, in 1919, the new Poland, only freshly liberated herself, immediately started a war with the Ukrainians and Lithuan-

ians. General Haller's Polish army, fully equipped by the Allies, conquered Eastern Galicia (Western Ukraine), and General Zeligowski "took" a slice of Lithuania and its ancient capital, Vilna—all in direct contradiction of the Wilsonian principles of national self-determination. Poland's treatment of her minorities from 1920 to 1939 is notorious. Outstanding examples were the "pacification" of Ukrainian villages by Pilsudski's *uhlans* and the concentration camp at Bereza Kartuska under the Polish "Himmler," Col. Kostek Biernacki. In 1939, when Czechoslovakia lay prostrate beneath Hitler's heel, the Polish Government did not hesitate to carve a neat portion from the dying country, including the city of Teschen. Surely the Czechs and the Ukrainians did not ask to be Polonized.

These are only a few examples of the bad side of Polish nationalism, which Dr. Krzesinski obviously prefers to ignore. German nationalism, no doubt, also was an "attractive" force to Hitler or Rosenberg, but not to the Poles; Czechs and others who suffered through its excesses.

Dr. Krzesinski's book is a good demonstration how not to propagandize even a worthy cause. Everybody knows that Poland has had a bad deal. She fought the Axis during the war, yet lost her independence. The resurrected Poland is ruled by men from Moscow. But a case for Poland can hardly be erected on the quicksand of her "attractive" nationalism. In Poland there were minorities even less fortunate than the Poles—minority-sized themselves—long before the advent of Hitler.

WALTER DUSHNYCK

"ANIMAL FARM," by George Orwell. Harcourt, Brace & Company, New York, 117 pp., \$1.75.

The eighteenth century revolutions, followed by an almost universal acceptance of the existence of a code of human rights, could take place only after the moral and spiritual ground has been prepared for them. From an historical perspective of today, we attribute as much credit for the French Revolution to the satirists as we do to the political leaders of those days. It was men like La Fontaine, Voltaire, Benjamin Franklin who broke the taboo in which divine rights of kings and the perpetuity of political institutions were shrouded.

The moral atmosphere of today is in many respects reminiscent of the eighteenth century. Then kings, princes and the "better classes" were the sole dispensers of political rights and interpreters of what was good for the people. Now it is another class of the annoited, the high priests of Marxian doctrine who not only claim, but where possible brutally enforce their privilege of knowing and telling the people what constitutes the only good for them.

Mr. Orwell being himself partial to some aspects of Marxism soon became aware of the moral atmosphere surrounding Soviet bureaucracy and of the fact that this atmosphere has to be thoroughly cleansed before an attempt at getting rid of the bureaucracy and its system can be made. He chose a wise and sharp weapon with which to pierce the darkness behind the "iron curtain": the sword of ridicule.

This delightful tale of a revolution in the animal world against the tyranny and exploitation of man is told as simply and directly as a fable by the master La Fontaine. And yet a quarter of a century of contemporary history is unmistakably there for all of us to recognize: the purge trials, the engineered famines, the construction of useless projects, the birth of a new aristocracy and finally the complete turn of the wheel: the masters of the revolutionary movement achieve a more thorough enslavement of the animals than their previous masters (men) ever dreamed of.

One of the most revealing chapters of the book is the description of foreign relations of Animal Farm and the dealings of the master pigs with humans. When rumors began to spread among humans that there is threat of starvation on Animal Farm, the head boar Napoleon promptly orders the grain bins to be filled with sand, with a little layer of grain on top and invites Mr. Whymper for a casual stroll through the store shed to see the food bins, while at the same time some sheep are instructed to remark in his presence that food rations had recently been increased. This is about the most perfect picture of the Soviet Union's food policies and their foreign propaganda that has yet been presented.

The value of this fable is many-sided, and this is what will make it lasting. Animals representing the various stages of the revolution are presented in such a general way, that it is anybody's privilege with a little imagination to substitute contemporary humans for the images of animals. We can easily identify Stalin and Lenin, and the various

component nationalities of the Soviet Union. But if we use our imagination a little further, we can identify with as much ease Messrs. Joseph E. Davies, Henry A. Wallace and other western protagonists of the Soviet system.

In conclusion the reviewer will express a wishful thought: may some means be found for this book to be read by the inhabitants of the Soviet Union; it might in time prove to be the first spark to ignite the light of desire for a real change.

ROMAN OLESNICKI

§

UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN AND BRITISH PERIODICALS

"Stalin's American Slav Congress," by Walter Dushnyck. *America*, National Catholic Weekly, September 21, 1946, New York City.

"The Soviet *élite* is convinced that the time has come when their historic 'mission' can be realized: world conquest for communism"—writes Mr. W. Dushnyck in *America*. The author points out that when in May 1943, the Comintern was "dissolved," the Western Allies sincerely believed that Stalin has abandoned his dreams of world revolution. "The world revolution—writes the author—was not called off because of the war; it was only delayed." He states that in the same year (1943), the Russian agents, both of the NKVD and the Comintern organized an extensive spy ring in Canada, as was revealed by Igor Gouzenko, former Soviet code clerk at the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa. "The American Slav Congress," writes Mr. Dushnyck, "was founded in 1943, simultaneously with the reestablishment of the Russian (Soviet) Orthodox Church and the resurgence of imperialistic Pan-Slavism in the Soviet Union. The American Slav Congress was to serve both as a transmission belt of Russian ideology and as a potential American fifth column." He points out that the American Slav Congress' central committee met in July in Cleveland and had decided to create a bloc of American Slavs who would support Stalin's imperialistic policy in the world.

The writer asserts that the Soviet Government intends to strengthen its fifth column on this continent and declares that "it is inconceivable that we could send to the Soviet Union an American group which would organize and support a political party directed against the Stalin government."

"Russia's Ruling Class," by John Fischer. *Harper's Magazine*, October 1946, New York City.

As a member of the UNRRA mission in Ukraine, Mr. John Fischer, who is also an associate editor of *Harper's* magazine, worked

closely with the bureaucrats of the Soviet Union. Upon his return to the United States he wrote a series of articles, of which one is on his experiences with the Ukrainian Soviet Government in Kiev. Vassily Vladimirovich Khomyak was in charge of the special agency set up by the Ukrainian government to handle the distribution of UNRRA supplies in Ukraine. "The Communist Party," writes he, "is a tiny, privileged ruling class marked off from the great herd it governs as sharply as any ruling class in history," Khomyak is, of course, only a subservient man who takes his orders from the Boss, Nikita Khrushchev, whom editor Fischer prefers to call "the governor of the Ukrainian Republic." The author points out that he is not a native Ukrainian, but Russian and during the Great Purge (1937-1938), Stalin sent him in to "boss the stiff-necked Ukrainians, whose native political leaders had got themselves liquidated for treason."

"The men who run now Ukraine, argue that their government is democratic," writes Mr. Fischer. "To them democracy means government *for* the people; and they unquestionably are working for what they believe to be the long run good of all Soviet citizens. Or, anyhow, what the Politburo has decided is good for them."

There is no pretense, of course, that this government is *by* the people, nor any real understanding what it means. The communists regard the non-party masses as a "herd of lazy, slow-witted, bearlike creatures, benumbed by centuries of serfdom, who have to be coaxed and chivvied along the road to The Perfect Society by the Party shepherds."

"Continuity in Russian History," by Vladimir de Korostovetz. *The Contemporary Review*, September, 1946, London.

The author discusses the historical background of the present Soviet dictatorship and states that dictatorial characteristics mark the entire Russian history. The state power in Russia, he writes, grew up on the autocratic traditions of Asia. This despotic power of Russia conquered Ukraine which always was a part of Christian Europe, and therefore culturally and psychologically was gravitating toward the West. Kiev, this religious center of the Eastern Europe, fell into Russian hands, and with it also the Church, which became an instrument of Russian imperialistic policy.

The Russian system of government was throughout history a system of despotism, supported by a small group of a selected caste like the nobility in the times of Ivan the Terrible or the Communist Party under Stalin. It is, he continues, only natural that Russia's Power rest upon the police regime and terror. The Russian autocrats were able to prevent the development of a middle class which would have been a basis for a democratic republic, and always conducted extensive purges in order to remove those who were becoming dangerous to a clique of despots.

Mr. de Korostovetz, who is a known authority on Russian history, states that the restoration of a military caste and the re-establishment of a new Orthodox Church, prove that Russia definitely has returned to the times of Tsarist despotism. The author analyzes thoroughly the sources of Russian-Ukrainian antagonism.

"The Russian Culture Purge," by Dwight MacDonald. *Politics*, October, 1946, New York City.

The author tries to prove that the Soviet Union is now preparing for a new war with the Western Powers, and is bringing all its citizens under a rigid control and submission. This will, he adds, explain vast purges in all the phases of Soviet cultural life. All branches of culture such as literature, arts, theater and the like have to be purged of all elements of the Western civilization in order to develop a psychological antypathy towards the West among the Soviet citizens. The new Soviet culture, he writes, subscribes to three criteria: a) art is a political instrument, b) art is a duty, not a delight, c) Western culture is alien to and inferior to Soviet culture.

In Ukraine, besides, a stress is put on the "theory" that Ukrainian culture should be completely "detached" from its past, which therefore, cannot be idealized as is the case with the Russian culture of Alexander Nevsky or Pushkin. The Politburo has ordered the Ukrainian writers to idealize and praise such renowned enemies of the Ukrainian people as Peter the Great, Catherine the Great or Stalin the Bloody.

"The Politburo," by Victor Kravchenko. *Fortune*, September, 1946, New York City.

Mr. Victor Kravchenko, author of the best seller *I Chose Freedom*, writes about the real power in the Soviet Union: the Politburo. As former high member of the Soviet hierarchy, he knows what he is talking about when he reveals that ten members of the Politburo exercise the "dictatorship of the proletariat" over 200 million people. The article provides an interesting material for those who want to learn the essence of "Soviet democracy." -

"Europe's Homeless," by William J. Gibbons. *America*, National Catholic Weekly, October 19, 1946, New York City.

The author Rev. William J. Gibbons analyzes the problem of millions of European refugees. He states that the democratic powers should seriously treat this question, which is the sorest spot on the organism of humanity.

"The Russian Orthodox Church During World War II," by John S. Curtis. *The American Review of the Soviet Union*, August, 1946, New York City.

"In all publications of the American Russian Institute, effort is made to ensure the accuracy of all statements of fact." Such is the laudable maxim printed on the second page of the above publication, published by the American Russian Institute. Accuracy should, of course, be characteristic of any scientific undertaking.

But the reader will raise his eyebrow upon reading Mr. Curtis' article on the Russian Orthodox Church. The question of the Church is usually complicated, especially in the Soviet Union, where reality is hardly ever reproduced by its written pronouncements. Mr. Curtis accepted without any reservation what was written in a propaganda book, *Truth About Religion in Russia*, as well as *The Information Bulletin* published by the Information section of the Soviet Embassy in Washington. It is well known fact that in 1943, when Stalin needed

American help the most, he "made peace" with the Church in order to placate the Western democracies, which were uneasy about the persecution of religious life in the Soviet Union. This superficial information, we think, is not enough for anyone to write about the "improvement in the relations of the various religious denominations," as writes Mr. Curtis. Furthermore, he mentions the "growing friendliness to the Russian Church and other dominations." We doubt his "accuracy" very much when we confront his article with the brutal persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine. This "improvement" of the Russian Orthodox Church is highly questionable when one takes into consideration the fact that the new Russian Orthodox Church is a functional organ of the Soviet governments which openly supports and approves the policy of persecution of non-Russian peoples in or outside the Soviet Union.

The most flagrant example of Mr. Curtis' inaccuracy is the presentation of the Ukrainian Catholic (Uniate) Church in Western Ukraine. The author writes that the forceful conversion of the Ukrainian Catholics to the Orthodoxy is a deed of the Russian Orthodox Church with "the aid of Soviet authorities." In fact, it was the Soviet Government itself which liquidated the Ukrainian Catholic Church under the shield of the Russian Orthodox Church. The author prefers to ignore the instructions of the Soviet government's representative Khodchanko to the Soviet authorities; he conveniently "overlooks" the protest of three hundred of Ukrainian Catholic clergy. The author misleads by asserting that Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church Joseph Slipy went to Moscow, for it was his delegation that went to Moscow instead. Finally, he also prefers not to mention the fact that all the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy was arrested, their Church organization destroyed, and that only then was the Russian Orthodox Church able to "succeed" in bringing some five millions of Ukrainian Catholics under the Patriarchate of Moscow. He is equally wrong in his historical dates. The Brest Union with Rome took place not in 1589, as writes Mr. Curtis, but in 1596. The original documents about the active intervention of the Soviet Government against the Ukrainian Catholic Church are amply publicized in the American press.

The author's ignorance of this problem is also attested to by his misrepresentation of the position of the Russian Orthodox Church in the United States. For instance, he writes that the conservatism

of the Russian Orthodox Church in America was responsible for the negative attitude toward the "unionistic endeavors" of the Patriarch. But actually, the Patriarchate demanded that the Russians in America swear allegiance to the Soviet Government their American loyalty notwithstanding. Prof. Curtis' article is more an article of the Soviet Information Bulletin type than any scientific research.

"Light on Nazi Foreign Policy," by DeWitt C. Poole. *Foreign Affairs*, October, 1946, New York City.

The author of the article was a member of the American mission sent by the American Government to Germany to study the policies of the Nazi government, from 1933-1945. His conclusions, therefore, are based on first-hand information. During his trip to Germany, Mr. Poole had several conversations with civil and military leaders of the Third Reich. Some of them are now executed after the War Crime trial in Nuremberg. His impressions are that most of them were sincere at that time.

His conversations, observations and other materials gathered in Germany became a source of a serious study, which Mr. Poole in his modesty does not call history, but a raw material for history.

According to the author, the Nazi foreign policy was divided into three periods: 1933-1935, 1936-1940 and 1941-1945.

In the first period, writes Mr. Poole, the Nazi foreign policy gravitated to the continental orientation of Adolf Hitler. He supposedly was seeking a permanent agreement with Poland and other Western European States in order to conceal his anti-Soviet plan, which had for its final goal the conquest of Ukraine.

The second period was marked by the Anti-Comintern Pact of the Axis Powers, which eventually caused the serious deterioration of relations with Soviets, England and France, but the Munich Pact, the Soviet-German non-aggression pact, and finally the conquest of Poland, brought the Nazi dictator to a complete and decisive triumph. He united not only all the German territories, but crushed all the neighboring states with direct or indirect assistance of the Soviet Union.

The third period (1941-1945) of the Nazi foreign policy is the

most important because it brought the final downfall of Hitler and his entire war machine. Mr. Poole is convinced that the cause of his debacle is blundering policy in the East, especially in Ukraine. The author thinks that despite the readiness with which the Soviets shared with Hitler the loot in Poland and the Baltic States, they did not want the war at that time.

In the first days of German-Soviet war Hitler came into the contact with the Ukrainian problem. Mr. Poole writes: "In Western Ukraine especially the spirit of Ukrainian Nationalism was running counter to Moscow. More lively still, was a spirit of active rebellion against Moscow among the broad masses of the peasants . . . During the opening weeks of the campaign, according to these Germans, soldiers deserted from the Soviet armies by the hundreds of thousands. It was said that the German General Staff desired to treat these prisoners in accordance with established international practice, having in mind that they might eventually be used to stir up civil strife in Russia . . . But Hitler's view was different."

Hitler did not even bother to send those prisoners to Germany, but sent them instead to numerous camps in occupied Poland, where they had to die from hunger and misery. "He (Hitler)—writes Mr. Poole—did not feel the need for advantageous help and rejected all plans for drawing the peoples of the Soviet territories into the struggle. As the armies moved forward, Erich Koch was named Reichskommissar for the East. He was an outspoken opponent of any sort of concessions to nationalist Ukraine."

"Ukrainians were for him no better than slaves who should receive only the subsistence absolutely necessary for the upkeep of their working strength."

It was only natural that in response to such a brutal policy of the Nazis the people of Ukraine declared a life-or-death struggle to the German army in Ukraine. A vast underground Ukrainian army was organized which fought the Nazis to the last days of their occupation of Ukraine.

Mr. Poole's article is a serious study of Ukrainian-German relations, presented to the American reader in a true light. It would be worthwhile if Mr. Poole would write a book in which he could use amply his material on this hitherto little known subject in America.

“World Judgement on Persecutors,” by John LaFarge. *America*, National Catholic Weekly, October 26, 1946.

Rev. John LaFarge, well-known and distinguished Catholic writer, analyzes the trial of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz at Zagreb and relates his impressions of this great man of God whom he met personally in 1938 in Yugoslavia. The author writes: “A man who bore upon every inch of him the stamp of an apostolic man of God, a genial friend of all classes and kinds of people, and a courageous vindicator of human rights.” Father LaFarge writes, furthermore, that the case of Archbishop Stepinatz should be brought before the General Assembly of the United Nations: “That issue is not simply the case of wrongs inflicted upon a single individual, however worthy he may be. It is the wide issue of the emergence of religious persecution, *deliberately, coldly planned*, as a skilled instrument of political policy.”

It may be added that Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz is not alone to fall victim of the atheistic Soviet state. The head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine, Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, is since 1945 in a Kiev dungeon, awaiting a political “trial.” Dead are in Soviet prisons Bishop Khomyshyn, and his auxiliary Latyshevsky. Bishop Shimrak, head of Greek-Catholic Ukrainians and Croats in Yugoslavia, was equally murdered coldly by the Soviet Commissars in Yugoslavia.



THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

Volume II

1945-1946

AUTUMN—WINTER—SPRING—SUMMER

Subscription: Yearly \$4.00; Single Copy \$1.00

Published by UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA
with the Support of Contributions of Americans of Ukrainian Descent

Edited by Editorial Board

Editor-inChief, NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ

Associate Editor, STEPHEN SHUMEYKO

Editorial Address: PROF. NICHOLAS D. CZUBATYJ

P. O. Box 565, Mahwah, New Jersey—Tel. CRagmere 8-3767-M

New York City

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II

(BOOK REVIEWS IN ITALIC)

	PAGE
Andrusyshen Constantine H., Skovoroda, the Seeker of a Genuine Man	317
Bahryany Ivan, Why I Do Not Want To Go "Home"	236
Bezushko Volodymyr, John Dewey's Life-Work Viewed by a Foreign Observer	359
<i>Bullitt William C., The Great Globe Itself, A Preface to World Affairs—</i> Walter Dushnyck	294
Cave Floyd A., Appeasement of the USSR and the Rights of Small Nations . .	348
Cave Floyd A., Soviet Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice	120
<i>Chamberlin William H., America Partner in World Rule—</i> Lev E. Dobriansky	188
Chamberlin William H., The Ukrainian Struggle for Freedom	111
Committee for the Aid of Refugee Ukrainian Scholars, Our Appeal to You . .	376
Cundy Percival, Lesya Ukrainka	252
Czubatyj Nicholas D., Power-Policy and Dependent Nations	265
Czubatyj Nicholas D., Russian Church-Policy in Ukraine	43
<i>Czubatyj Nicholas D., Ukraine—Between Poland and Russia—</i> Michael J. Nagurney	381

Czubatyj Nicholas D., A Ukrainian Plan for the Organization of Europe	
One Hundred Years Ago	339
Czubatyj Nicholas D., The Ukrainian Underground	154
Dobriansky Lev E., Ominous Features of a Divided World	142
Dobriansky Lev E., The World of Freedom and the World of Tyranny	274
Dushnyck Walter, Independent Ukraine: Fiction or Reality	331
Dushnyck Walter, The Importance of the Displaced Persons	285
<i>Dushnyck Walter, Martyrdom in Ukraine—Roman Olesnicki</i>	380
Dushnyck Walter, Russia and the Ukrainian National Revolution 1917	363
Editorial, The Coming Peace Conference	105
Editorial, Free Press	11
Editorial, A Nation Fighting for Its Existence	205
Editorial, Two Ukraines Facing the United Nations	305
Editorial, Ukraine and UNO	5
<i>Heyman Hans, "We Can Do Business with Russia"—Roman Olesnicki</i>	90
<i>Hindus M., The Cossacks, the Story of a Warrior People—Lev E. Dobriansky</i>	191
Hlynka Anthony, On Behalf of Displaced Persons	167
<i>Hryboryiv Nicefor, The War and Ukrainian Democracy—</i>	
Nicholas D. Czubatyj	379
Kirkconnel Watson, The Future of European Freedom	210
<i>Konovalow S., Russo-Polish Relations—Nicholas D. Czubatyj</i>	292
<i>Kravchenko Victor, I Choose Freedom—Roman Olesnicki</i>	186
<i>Krzesinski Andrew J., Poland's Right to Justice—Walter Dushnyck</i>	384
Kurdydyk Anatole, Autumn Leaves Are Falling	33
<i>Laserson Max, Russia and the Western World—Lev E. Dobriansky</i>	92

	PAGE
Manning Clarence A., <i>The Moses of Ivan Franko</i>	227
Manning Clarence A., <i>Taras Shevchenko: Selected poems. Translated</i> <i>with an Introduction—Percival Cundy</i>	87
Manning Clarence A., <i>The Significance of the Soviet Refugees</i>	14
Manning Clarence A., <i>Ukraine and the World Crisis</i>	310
Manning Clarence A., <i>The Ukrainian Position in 1946</i>	132
Margolin Arnold D., <i>From a Political Diary; Russia, the Ukraine and</i> <i>America—Lev E. Dobriansky</i>	289
Nagurney Michael, <i>Ukraine Under a Deliberate Blackout</i>	80
Olesnicki Roman, <i>The Ukrainian Cooperative Movement</i>	36
Orwell George, <i>Animal Farm—Roman Olesnicki</i>	385
Roucek Joseph S., <i>The Problem of "Second Generation"</i>	57
Salesbury Harrison, <i>Russia on the Way—Roman Olesnicki</i>	297
Scientificus, <i>Science Under the Banner of Marxism</i>	25
Schuman Frederick L., <i>Soviet Politics at Home and Abroad—Roman Olesnicki</i>	182
Shumeyko Stephen, <i>American Interest in Ukraine During World War I</i>	66
Ucrainica in American Periodicals	96
Ucrainica in American and British Periodicals	194
Ucrainica in American and British Periodicals	384
Valkenburg Samuel Van, <i>Peace Atlas of Europe—Nicholas D. Czubytyj</i>	382



F-IV

159